

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
June 12-13, 2007**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Allan Vigil, called the meeting to order at 1:03 p.m. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Vigil, were Vice Chair William H. Cleveland and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbuton, III, and Richard L. Tucker.

Chair Vigil took a moment to welcome Regent Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr. to his first Board of Regents meeting before moving on to the safety briefing.

SAFETY BRIEFING

The Director of Management and Operations for Real Estate and Facilities, Sandra L. Neuse, gave the Regents and audience a briefing of basic safety information in the event of an emergency.

INVOCATION

Regent Felton Jenkins gave the following invocation: Our most gracious heavenly Father, we come before you today, not with one prayer, but with three. First we offer a prayer of thanksgiving. We thank you for this day and all of the blessings of this day. We thank you for our country, of course, but we thank you for the world. Help us to be better citizens of the world. Second, we ask your forgiveness. We have made mistakes of omission and commission, some of the heart, some of the head and some purely from our ignorance. We ask that you forgive us those errors and make us better people. Third, we ask your guidance and direction as we go through this meeting today. Beyond that, as we go through life, we ask for your direction and guidance in all that we do. Now, may the words of our mouths and the meditations of our hearts and the actions of our lives be acceptable in your sight, oh Lord, our strength and redeemer. Amen.

RECOGNITIONS

At this time, Chair Vigil invited the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, Thomas E. Daniel, to introduce Senator Jack Hill.

Mr. Daniel thanked Chair Vigil and announced that there were some special guests with the Board today. First he asked everyone to welcome Robin Wade, the Budget Analyst for the Senate Budget and Evaluation Office. He then said he was also delighted to have Senator Jack Hill of Reidsville in attendance. Mr. Daniel said that Senator Hill is the influential Chair of the powerful Senate Appropriations Committee. He noted that his office worked very closely with Senator Hill and his staff during this year's session of the General Assembly. Mr. Daniel stated that Senator Hill was a champion for the Board and the University System. When the Capital projects at Savannah State University and Macon State University were deleted from the budget, it was Senator Hill and his colleagues who restored these funds. This is just one example of his strong support of public higher education and for the state of Georgia. Mr. Daniel asked everyone to please join him in welcoming Senator Hill and in saluting him for his dedicated service. The audience applauded as Senator Hill took the podium.

Senator Hill thanked Chancellor Davis, the members of the Board of Regents, staff, and the presidents in attendance for the opportunity to come by and get, what he believed was, a “free lunch”. The Senator jokingly added that he actually expects to see it on the lobbyist disclosure report. He then stated that it was great to get the chance to meet informally with all of those who attended the luncheon. He said he encourages that type of informal gathering because he really believes that they are all in this together. Senator Hill stated that the state of Georgia is so blessed with the higher education institutions and leadership that it has, and he considers the signal honor of his life is to have been apart of promoting higher education in Georgia. He thanked the Board for letting him come by and visit with them today. He jokingly commented that he was not sure about Mr. Daniel’s earlier statement about “the powerful committee” because the folks who lost their minors in the veto probably do not think it he is very powerful today. He thanked the Board for the opportunity and asked that they let the legislature know how they can work with them to have great things continue to happen in Georgia.

Chair Vigil thanked the Senator for joining the Board at this meeting.

REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR

Chair Vigil called upon the Chancellor to make some opening remarks. They are as follows.

“Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I apologize for not being able to join you earlier. I had to make a trip to Augusta this morning. I start always by thanking you for your commitment and the contributions that you make. I will point out a number of those during my remarks. But also, to demonstrate my growing cultural sensitivity, I want to point out that we do have a new art exhibit here this month. This is the work of ten faculty members from Kennesaw State University, and we certainly appreciate their contributions in this installation. At the August meeting, we will have a new installation from North Georgia College and State University. Again, this gives us the opportunity to showcase the real talent that we have within our System.

I have two things that I want to go over today. First, I was going to invite Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna

back at any time to view these exhibits, and that is code for saying that this is his last board meeting with us in his current capacity as our interim Chief Academic Officer. We had to finally yield to his wishes to return both to his University of West Georgia campus and to some semblance, he tells me, of a normal life. Beheruz, we are certainly appreciative. He answered our call for assistance when Dan Papp left to lead Kennesaw State. He has served with distinction during that period, although he has become more famous for his 2 a.m. emails to everyone in the System. He has helped me personally in my never-ending quest to acquire needed cultural insights into higher education and the System; he was certainly instrumental in that. A while back we launched a national search for a Chief Academic Officer, and Dr. Sethna will certainly represent a benchmark against which we will compare the next person in this job. Beheruz, on behalf of the Board and the staff – indeed, the entire University System – we thank you for your excellent work. (Dr. Sethna received a standing ovation from the Board and audience.)

I have another announcement. It is quite likely that this will be Dr. Carlton Brown's last meeting as well. Dr. Brown joined me in January after nine and a half years of distinguished service at Savannah State University. If I could ever say that anyone has exceeded expectations on the job it has been Dr. Brown. The System-wide projects are of great importance and significance to getting us moving and acting more as a system. Dr. Brown has brought great structure, great order, and a web-based system that is being put in place that will endure after his departure. So again, I want to thank, on behalf of the Board, the staff, and the entire System, Dr. Carlton Brown, for excellent contributions during his period here. Please join me in thanking Dr. Brown. (The audience applauded.)

We have what can only be described as a very rich and robust agenda over the next two days. It really reflects two things. One, the fact that you will have July off, and two, good governance and risk management suggests that we get through as many things as we can this month before you delegate your responsibilities to me over the next two months and give me the authority to act on your behalf. So it is probably wise that we get all of these things out of the way before the August meeting.

As always, let me tee up some of the key Board activities and then close with some items of interest. I am going to start with students, since students are the focus of our actions and decisions. We are pleased that Travis Horsley a freshly minted graduate from Middle Georgia College and Isaac McAdams, who attends Augusta State University, are here today to give an update on the Student Advisory Council's current activities. This month, Dr. Sethna will bring forward recommendations on another program that directly affects our students and that is the Regents' Test. These recommendations are not the reason he is leaving us, it is in fact to start his new semester at the University of West Georgia. I especially want to thank Regents Potts and McMillan for their leadership and work on this issue since the last meeting. I also want to thank Regent Poitevint for her ongoing support as well. These three Regents have been working very hard to help us bring forward what I think will be an excellent recommendation in this area. Your work on behalf of our students is most appreciated.

The Associate Vice Chancellor & Chief Audit Officer, Ronald B. Stark, continues to labor in the seemingly inexhaustible mines of the approvals and authorities project. This month he will be joined

by both the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, and Dr. Sethna to bring some items forward for your information. This is a complex project, and has, perhaps, taken a lot more time than we had originally anticipated, but I believe it is one that will ultimately have significant impacts on our efforts to make the entire System more responsive and flexible.

Tomorrow we will again turn our attention to strategic planning. Our Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, will continue his march through our major strategic thrusts. This month Rob and Georgia Highlands President Randy Pierce will look at how the plan will address the need to create more capacity in the System. I anticipate that by August, we will finally be ready to have you roll out the finished product.

As you know, our system-wide projects, under the leadership of Dr. Carlton Brown, support the Strategic Plan. This month you will hear a presentation from Georgia State President Carl Patton on an exciting System-wide project: the STEM – or Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics initiative. I won't steal Dr. Patton's thunder, but let me point out one chilling statistic that illustrates why this is such an important area. In 2006, out of 25,579 baccalaureate degrees, the University System produced a grand total of three high school physics teachers. That's right – three! Which, I might add, is better than North Carolina which has turned out three in the last four years, according to some comments by Erskine Bowles, the system head there. This state cannot afford to continue down this path, not when countries such as India and China are churning out math and sciences graduates and teachers in the thousands. We have a key responsibility to change this pattern, and our STEM project will help. You should also look for major programmatic thrusts in the fiscal Year ("FY") 2009 Budget to address this issue.

In Committees, let me call your attention to several items. The Committee on Finance and Business Operations will be asked to approve the FY 2008 operating and capital budgets. Last month, you approved the overall budget, allocations, and tuition. Now that the Governor has signed the FY 2008 budget, we have finalized the dollars – \$5.7 billion from all sources. I have just a couple of notes on the final budget. The General Assembly has added funds for a variety of special projects at our institutions. The Governor, in signing the appropriations act, has identified a few of these special appropriations and provided us with greater flexibility in using these funds to address our strategic needs and priorities. These funds total \$1.15 million for our institutions. We are working with the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget ("OPB") as we determine the best use of the funds. There were some additional redirects for programs in the Georgia Public Libraries and the Cancer Coalition. There also were some vetoes of facilities projects not in the Governor's budget recommendations. With your approval of the FY 2008 Budget, you will close the loop on this budget cycle. There will be no rest, however. You will begin the FY 2009 Budget loop in August!

Although not part of the budget, I do want to call your attention to the Governor's veto of House Bill 476 that dealt with the International Baccalaureate ("IB") program. We certainly appreciate the Governor's veto of this bill. Our opposition to the bill was not grounded upon the IB program, but rather upon the precedent such legislation would have set: a precedent that established the right of the General Assembly to determine academic policy at our institutions. I want to state publicly that

the IB program is an excellent one and that many University System institutions already award credit for higher-level IB courses and will continue to do so. Our Academic Affairs staff will work with our colleges and universities with the objective of achieving consistency of acceptance across the Access Institution and Comprehensive University sectors. We want to ensure that the acceptance criteria are well publicized for all of our institutions, so that any high school student potentially interested in the IB program will be able to know in advance the score at which he or she can be awarded credit for a higher level IB course at a particular institution.

Further, the Academic Affairs staff will work with the Department of Education and local school systems to publicize and enhance the many opportunities that exist for alternative or advanced credit options for school students such as IB, Advanced Placement, dual enrollment, the special academies, and early college. In addition, in my role on the Alliance of Education Agency Heads, I will continue to press for additional funds to help expand the IB program. In the Academic Affairs Committee, you will receive the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson's, report on the System's Extramural Income for FY 2006. Please note this important report. It does relate to our Strategic Plan and our action goal to increase the research dollars generated by the System.

During this meeting, you also will be asked to take action on several other important items. This is the month you elect a chair and vice-chair for the coming year. You also will be given some recommendations associated with our search for a new president at Georgia Southwestern State University. This follows your selection just two weeks ago of Dr. Earl Yarbrough as the new president at Savannah State University. You will meet Dr. Yarbrough in a few minutes. And in Executive and Compensation Committee, you will hear our thoughts on the current policy 203, which deals with presidential retirements and resignations. As you can see, this is a full agenda. I do want to point out, however, that the team and I appreciate your engagement and your frank and candid discussion of the many issues. And, as always, we appreciate your completing the response forms. These are very helpful in our planning for future board meetings.

An update on some other activities taking place outside of this meeting: since the May meeting, I have continued my second round of campus visits, with stops at Gainesville College, Georgia Perimeter College, the University of West Georgia, and Waycross College. These visits are extremely helpful to me. They not only allow me to see the excellence of our institutions, they also allow me to see and hear about the impacts of the many changes that we are trying to make.

In May, Regent Bishop represented the Board, and was joined by Linda Daniels and Michael Miller in our Facilities Office to received the 2007 Georgia Trust for Historic Preservation Award for Stewardship. The presentation occurred at the Trust's annual meeting in Brunswick. Last weekend a number of Regents joined the Governor to celebrate the achievements of High School valedictorians from across the state. The Governor advised me after the meeting that he was particularly appreciative of your presence.

As I mentioned earlier, in August, we will bring forward the Strategic Plan. But we are not on hold.

There are a wide range of programs underway that are a solid platform for the Plan. Let me just mention several and how they fit into our larger strategic framework. One of the areas of focus of the Plan is the need to broaden access. The Georgia Tech Promise program does this. As you know, the Georgia Institute of Technology announced this program as a way to increase the availability of need-based aid. As of June 1, 44 entering freshmen have been selected for the program, along with 48 returning undergraduate students. Here are some interesting facts:

- The average parent income is \$19,088.
- The income level for eligibility in the program is set at \$30,000 or less.
- The average GPA for the returning students is 3.01.
- And 70 are eligible or remain eligible for the HOPE scholarship.

This program is doing what Tech officials intended and hoped – providing additional aid for students that, even with high academic achievement, still need help beyond HOPE to attend college. The numbers are small at present, but this is clearly the direction in which we need to go! We simply cannot afford to allow needy but capable students to drop out of this system. Another area of the Plan focuses on the need to increase study abroad opportunities for our students. One of the supporting programs for this effort is the federally funded GLOSSARI project – yet another acronym: Georgia Learning Outcomes of Students Studying Abroad Research Initiative. The project was featured in the June 1 issue of Inside Higher Education where the International Programs Director, Richard Sutton, presented current data on the project. Dr. Sutton made a presentation to the Board last August on this project. GLOSSARI is helping us provide a significantly higher level of accountability and assessment for our policies and programs.

Yet another area of focus for the Plan and in our System wide projects is professional development and efforts to create a true leadership culture. The Georgia Public Library Service (“GPLS”) also is engaged in leadership development. PINNACLE is designed to give such an opportunity for the next generation of library leaders. PINNACLE stands for Public Library Institute for New and Creative Leadership Education. The first class of 20 is currently being selected – one from the GPLS staff and the remainder from library systems around the state. Congratulations to the Assistant Vice Chancellor for GPLS, Lamar Veatch and his team for their initiative in this important area of our overall focus. (The audience applauded.)

Last week, the local development authority charged with the disposal of the Naval Property in Athens accepted the offer submitted on behalf of the University System by the University of Georgia. First, let me thank President Adams and his team for the successful conclusion of this submission. Related to this, our FY 2008 Budget includes \$2.8 million for the Board to begin the more intensive planning for medical expansion in Georgia. Obtaining the naval property is a clear positive for our future plans. Over the coming months, Dr. Rahn and his team at the Medical College will undertake the serious work to bring forward for your consideration the best possible plan. This plan must significantly increase the number of physicians the University System trains and produces for the benefit of the more than nine million people in this state. I do not have to point out that the decisions we make will be closely watched and analyzed by many interested and concerned individuals and

organizations. And that is a good thing. It is good to know that such an important issue generates real interest and passion. It says that Georgians are engaged and want us to make good decisions. And we will – on behalf of the entire state. We will make decisions based upon the facts – primarily based upon facts that drive us to the most effective and efficient way to produce more doctors for this state. So, given the high interest and visibility in this project, I have committed to an open and transparent process. We are going to discuss our directions openly. We are going to communicate our findings and our recommendations.

As we do medical expansion planning in this, our 75th year, it is wise not to forget the wisdom of those Georgians who created this University System in 1932. The absolute desire and need to subordinate the aspirational needs of institutions to the needs of the State through a unified System of public higher education has never been greater or more apparent. We as a System, you as a Board, will not go wrong in following this historic tradition.

In this report, I have discussed a number of substantive issues. There is one additional issue that I want to bring to your attention. On July 1, the Georgia Immigration and Compliance Act becomes effective. This law affects the University System of Georgia. The intent of the Georgia General Assembly with this law is clear: the University System of Georgia will follow federal law in respect to immigration status. The question that has been raised is: “What does this mean?” It means that as of July 1, any ambiguity concerning the eligibility of undocumented students for tuition waivers will be clarified. All University System presidents have been advised that under federal law, such benefits cannot be granted. And our policy is to comply with federal law, as expressed through the University System’s common application process available through Georgia College 411. This application process asks prospective students to indicate U.S. citizenship or visa status. As you know, we have held a number of public forums to solicit public comment and to inform. Our review indicates that with respect to the intent of the Georgia legislation, the course I have outlined ensures the University System’s compliance with the law.

Let me close by reflecting on the University System’s history. As I have noted elsewhere, a theme running through our 75 years is one of working to broaden access to public higher education. We continue to believe that a more educated Georgia is this state’s best investment. This action, unfortunately, does not advance that goal. We, however, will continue to work with our many partners to advance this noble and sound goal, within the context of the law.

This is a longer report than normal, but we have a lot of ground to cover! All of these activities, however, do keep coming back to the central core – our mission of educating more Georgians to higher levels than in the past. There are many pieces that must interlock to make this happen. And I appreciate very much your work and your attention to the many details we bring before you. But more than that, I appreciate your focus on our mission and on the ways your policy decisions contribute to that mission. Please enjoy your “summer vacation.” Rest assured, however, that we will have a full plate ready for you when you return in August. So get some rest.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report.”

Chancellor Davis said that he would be happy to answer any questions. Chair Vigil recognized Regent Jenkins who asked the Chancellor to be a little more specific about the July 1 date and exactly what happens with respect to illegal aliens. Chancellor Davis responded that the System already has all of the policies and procedures in place at the moment. He stated that he advised presidents earlier this year that the System would not knowingly grant benefits to undocumented students, so that is already in effect. Under the law, he continued, the System has to have policies in place that suggest that it is in compliance with the law. They believe that those policies already exist, primarily in the form of applications which indicates citizenship status. The bottom line, he said, is that after going through hearings and the testimony and receiving a large number of comments from concerned and interested individuals on both sides of the issue, the System Office believes that the policies are in place at the moment and the System is in full compliance with federal law. As a point of clarification, Regent Jenkins asked if as a practical matter that meant that there can be no in-state tuition granted to a nonresident alien. Chancellor Davis said that was correct.

There were no further questions.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, by Secretary Julia M. Murphy, who announced that Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr. had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meetings held on April 17-18, 2007, May 2, 2007, and May 30, 2007, were unanimously approved as distributed.

INTRODUCTION OF NEW PRESIDENT AND CO-CHAIRS OF THE CAMPUS PRESIDENTIAL SEARCH COMMITTEE FOR SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY

Chancellor Davis thanked Chair Vigil and stated that it was his pleasure to introduce the newly elected president of Savannah State University, Dr. Earl G. Yarbrough, Sr. As Dr. Yarbrough stood to be recognized, the audience applauded. Chancellor Davis continued, stating that Dr. Yarbrough was accompanied by the co-chairs of the campus-based Presidential Search and Advisory Committee, Dr. Emily Crawford, Vice Chair of the Faculty Senate, and Dr. Irvin Clark, Assistant Vice President for Student Affairs. On behalf of the Board and the System, Chancellor Davis thanked Drs. Crawford and Clark for the committee's diligence in evaluating the field of candidates and narrowing it to a set of some very well-qualified finalists. He added that the choice was not easy, but he believes the Board has made the correct one.

Chancellor Davis said, as the Chairman noted earlier, the Board and System also owed thanks to Regent Elridge McMillan for heading up the Special Regents Committee that interviewed the finalists and made the recommendation to him. He stated that he was then assisted by the Executive

Vice Chancellor and Interim Chief Academic Officer, Beheruz N. Sethna in recommending Dr. Yarbrough to the full Board. Chancellor Davis then gave the audience some background information on Dr. Yarbrough.

He began by stating that Dr. Earl Yarbrough has two decades of experience as an academic administrator at historically black universities. Most recently, he has been a full professor at Virginia State University (“Virginia State”) in Petersburg, Virginia, where he served as Provost and Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs from 1998 to 2003. In 2004, while a tenured professor of industrial technology at Virginia State, Dr. Yarbrough completed a year-long fellowship in Washington, D.C., with the Kellogg Foundation Minority Serving Institution Leadership Program. This program prepares minority professionals for the challenges and rigors of becoming university presidents, chancellors or taking on other senior leadership roles in higher education. He has also completed the Harvard University Institute for Educational Management.

Dr. Yarbrough also has administrative experience at two other public historically black universities (“HBCU”). He served as the first dean of the School of Technology at North Carolina Agricultural and Technical State University in Greensboro, North Carolina, from 1986 to 1998. From 1984 to 1986, he served as chair of the Industrial Technology Department at the University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff in Pine Bluff, Arkansas. Dr. Yarbrough holds a Ph.D. in industrial education from Iowa State University, a master of arts in industrial studies from California State University at Los Angeles and a bachelor of arts in industrial education from Wichita State University.

After giving the introduction, Chancellor Davis asked everyone to join him in welcoming Dr. Earl Yarbrough. The audience applauded as Dr. Yarbrough took the podium.

Dr. Yarbrough thanked Chancellor Davis for his warm introduction, joking that he “kind of knew the guy the Chancellor was talking about. He said that as the agenda was long, he would keep his remarks brief. Dr. Yarbrough thanked the Board for its confidence in him to lead Savannah State University, stating that it is something that he had dreamed of doing for sometime. As Chancellor Davis mentioned, Dr. Yarbrough has already served at three historically black institutions. Although he was not educated at an HBCU, Dr. Yarbrough stated that during his first experience in Arkansas he learned to love what HBCUs do for young people. The value added for those youngsters is tremendous and he is just so happy to be a part of Savannah State University and to work with those young people there. Dr. Yarbrough also thanked the Special Regents Committee for his interview and for their confidence in him. He thanked the campus committee for the same reasons and Parker Search for doing an excellent and professional job. Dr. Yarbrough concluded his remarks by dedicating his service to Savannah State University, the region, and the state. He, again, expressed his appreciation for being chosen as the next president of Savannah State University.

Chair Vigil thanked Dr. Yarbrough for his remarks and welcomed him to the University System of Georgia.

PRESENTATION: STUDENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL

Chair Vigil asked the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Tonya Lam to introduce two students from the University System who have served as leaders on the Student Affairs Council over the past year.

Dr. Lam greeted the audience and introduced herself. She stated that having come to the System Office from a campus she is frequently asked, "What do you miss most?" She said that it is this time of year; the happy/sad time when faculty and staff say good luck and good-bye to the students they have gotten to know well and worked closely with over the previous years. Dr. Lam explained that each year, she has the opportunity to work with 35 of the brightest, most energetic and enthusiastic students from across the state. The Student Advisory Council ("SAC") is comprised of 35 members, one student from each of the 35 campuses. SAC meets four times during the year where the members discuss issues that are relevant to their individual campuses and to students across the state. Dr. Lam said that the problem of serving bad food in the cafeterias and parking problems come up every year, but the students also talk about things like advising and taxes on text books. They also share examples of things that their individual student government associations ("SGA") sponsor that have positive impacts on students both at their own institutions, in the community where those institutions are located, and for people across the nation. They also have fun. Dr. Lam said that it is time for her to say good-bye to this year's group, but first she would like to introduce two of this year's most active members. One of whom will be moving up and one who will be returning to SAC next year.

Dr. Lam began by introducing Isaac McAdams, a rising senior at Augusta State University who is majoring in political science and minoring in philosophy. Isaac is a member of the Political Science Honor Society and received the Phi Kappa Phi Scholastic Achievement Award in his sophomore and junior years. He is on the Dean's List. He is a Governor's Scholar, a Watson-Brown Scholar, a Pamplin Scholar, and, of course, a HOPE Scholar. Isaac has been reelected to his second term as president of the SGA and will continue with SAC this coming year. Travis Horsley was first introduced to the Board in January when he attended the January Board meeting. Travis held the unique distinction of being the only dual-enrolled member of SAC. What is a dual enrolled member? In May, Travis, who is 17 graduated with his associate degree from Middle Georgia College where he was a student in the Georgia Academy of Mathematics Engineering and Science ("GAMES"). The GAMES program is a dual-enrollment program where academically talented high school students can complete their junior and senior years of high school at the same time they are earning their associate degree. In May, Travis also earned his high school diploma. He has been accepted to the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT"), where he will start in the fall. He has already had a preliminary advising session with his GIT advisor and has been told he will graduate on time.

Dr. Lam then turned the podium over to Mr. Travis Horsley.

Mr. Horsley greeted Chair Vigil, Chancellor Davis, and the Board and thanked Dr. Lam for her warm welcome. He said that the Student Advisory Council for the 2006-2007 year had three stated committees which were the Connectivity Committee, HOPE Eligibility Committee, and the

Academic Advisement Committee. The objective of the Connectivity Committee, which Mr. Horsley had the honor of chairing, was to create better communication between the Board of Regents and SAC and to increase representation and accountability. The objective of the HOPE Eligibility Committee of which Mr. McAdams was chair, was to improve student retention through price signaling. Finally, the objective of the Academic Advisement Committee was to articulate the student interest for achieving excellent advising within the System. The foundation of advisement should stem from a collaborative effort between faculty and students.

Next Mr. Horsley highlighted some of the action items for each committee. The Connectivity Committee's first action item was for SAC members to attend Board of Regents meetings. He stated that this item was achieved as SAC members had attended Board of Regents meetings including the January meeting at which he and Nicole de Vries were present to hear the Chancellor give his State of the System address. The Connectivity Committee also wanted to increase awareness of the goals and purpose of the Board of Regents throughout the System. Mr. Horsley said that they have done this through reviewing processes other states have gone through to acquire things such as student-regents and their SAC, or whatever they may call it in their respective states, are structured. He said that through this process they have learned a lot of unique ways on how they, as student leaders, can better communicate with their Regents and, hopefully, help other states in their ability to communicate with their trustees or regents in the same way. The Committee also wants to increase SAC representation by having robust attendance. He said that is always a good measure to increase one's credibility and they hope that they can communicate better with the Regents along the way.

Mr. Horsley then introduced Mr. Isaac McAdams to discuss the action items of the HOPE Eligibility Committee. Mr. McAdams thanked Mr. Horsley and began his part of the presentation. He introduced himself and stated that he is the president of the SGA at Augusta State University as well as the chair of the Committee on HOPE Eligibility for the SAC. Mr. McAdams stated that at the beginning of the year, the members of the HOPE Eligibility Committee saw a problem with the way many freshman approach their first year of college. He said that they know about the low retention rates on many System campuses but that they also have firsthand experience with the mentality or expectations of freshman that often lead to poor academics during their first year. For one reason or another, he continued, the motivating forces that are present in a student's life before they reach college are lost upon stepping into the halls of their chosen institution, or, alternatively, it could just be that they just were not ready for the rigor of college. He stated that his committee thought that the HOPE Scholarship could be used to help freshman prioritize academics during their first semester. To that end, the Committee came up with a framework. The idea, he said, is to reconsider when HOPE money is awarded so as to send a signal to the student to say, "You might need to really focus on this year if you want to keep this scholarship." It is the Committee's hope that a change in when money is disbursed will keep students from just trying out college and not really giving it an honest try, possibly shooting themselves in the foot through poor early academic performance. Mr. McAdams said that it is a novel idea, but he is confident that if given a try, it would increase the caliber of freshman academics throughout the University System. However, he stated that having the Legislature implement a change which is this big, noticeable, and unclear at first glance will most probably not happen without some serious research to support it. Over the next year, the Committee

will examine the characteristics and success rate of students such as the number of students with a GPA between 3.0 and 3.3 who retain HOPE. For those who do not retain HOPE, the Committee will examine whether or not there are similar contributing factors that institutions can address. In summary, Mr. McAdams said that the Committee wants to see if there are other ways to address freshman laxity without changing the HOPE Scholarship.

Additionally, this Committee is interested in seeing the effect the new high school GPA calculations being implemented by the Georgia Student Finance Commission (“GSFC”) have on HOPE. These new changes, he said, are intended to reduce the number of formally qualified students which will hopefully, in turn, save some more lottery money. It is also predicted that eliminating the less qualified students will help reduce the percentage of students who lose HOPE after their first year. Mr. McAdams said they would have to wait to see about that. He then thanked the Board for their time and turned the podium back over to Mr. Horsley.

Mr. Horsley stated that their last committee, the Academic Advisement Committee, was also their most successful committee. This committee had the honor of meeting with President Ronald M. Zaccari of Valdosta State University who is leading the System-level project on Enhanced Advising Processes. In this meeting, the Committee stated some of the goals they hope will be implemented across the entire System. Those suggested practices are as follows.

- All Faculty members will serve as an advisor
- Each institution will centralizes an advisement center with an established purpose mission and guidelines; departments within the school can add policies to compliment this approach
- Faculty members will attend an advisement training program
- An Introduction to academic advising program will be implemented throughout the system; possibly correlate this program with a managing goals and career for success class or an introduction to student life course that all campuses are required to have
- Advisors welcome their advisees with an introduction letter that states the name, department and contact information for that advisor
- Students are given the opportunity to evaluate the advisor – this evaluation is added to the faculty member’s overall review
- Incentive programs are implemented to reward and encourage outstanding advising
- All participants in the advising process take their responsibilities seriously

Mr. Horsley thanked the Board again for their support and invited the Regents to attend the Summer SAC Retreat. He stated that Regent Potts had already accepted the invitation and said that if others could attend as well, it would hopefully facilitate better communication between the Regents and the students. He thanked the Board for their time and said that it has been an honor for both him and Mr. McAdams to serve on the Student Advisory Council.

Chair Vigil thanked Mr. Horsley and Mr. McAdams and said that the Board would like to encourage the Student Affairs Council to send students to observe every Board meeting. He added that the Board looked forward to hearing from SAC students in the future.

Chair Vigil asked Chancellor Davis to make one additional recognition before moving into the Committee meetings. Chancellor Davis stated in his early introduction of Dr. Yarbrough, he was remiss in not handing out one more thank you and making one additional introduction. He then recognized Dr. Julius Scott who acted as the Interim President for Savannah State University from January to July 1, 2007. Chancellor Davis stated that Dr. Scott did a wonderful job at Savannah State University and noted that this was not the first time Dr. Scott had stepped in and helped the System, and he hoped it would not be the last. He asked Dr. Scott to stand and be recognized. The audience applauded.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: ACADEMIC AFFAIRS (REGENTS' TEST)

Chair Vigil turned the floor over to Regent Poitevint, the chair of the committee, who convened the Academic Affairs Committee as a Committee of the Whole. Chair Poitevint thanked Board Chair Vigil and introduced the Interim Chief Academic Office & Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, to give a presentation.

Dr. Sethna thanked Chair Poitevint. He then addressed the Board, saying that the subject for this Committee of the Whole is the Regent's Test, subtext: "take 13". He said that they would try this one more time. Dr. Sethna said that just so there is no doubt about his intellectual abilities, he wanted to share that one of his favorite movies is "Weekend at Bernie's," in which a corpse keeps coming back to life again and again even after they dispose of him numerous times. Dr. Sethna joked that he was a stand-in for that movie, and is therefore only acting out his role where the Regents' Test is concerned.

Dr. Sethna said that he had a long list of people to thank for helping to get to this stage. He stated that he might get to those at the end of the presentation. He then outlined the work that had been done thus far. He said that the Board talked about the Regents' Test ("RT") many times and that the Regents had asked the staff some incredibly fine questions to which staff has responded in detail. He said that aside from a quick review of what has gone on in the past, the guts of the presentation would focus on how the Board and System Office can help students through early diagnosis. For that, he thanked Regent McMillan who was an early proponent for using the RT as a diagnostic tool. He thanked Regent Potts for giving the staff the idea of looking at the Georgia High School Test ("GHSGT"), and he also thanked Chair Poitevint for shepherding the RT discussion numerous times.

Dr. Sethna then gave what he referred to as a "preview to the end" of the presentation where he would recommend to the Board that they use the Regents' Test with all of the modifications approved in March, plus the one he would present momentarily, "early diagnosis." Dr. Sethna said that he would propose using tools such as the Georgia High School Graduation Test to diagnose a problem early and therefore help a student early. He then outlined the discussion stating that he would first discuss highlights from the changes that Regent Jolly proposed and which the Board approved at its last meeting. He said they would then discuss the GHSGT, its relationship to the RT and some cautions concerning its use in this process. Finally, he said that he would go over the recommendations in detail.

Summarizing an extract from the Board Policy Manual, Dr. Sethna stated that the purpose of the RT is to ensure that students obtaining a degree have the minimum level of reading and writing skills. The Board policy states that there are two System-mandated courses called the Regents' Skills Courses.

Dr. Sethna next went over the changes that the Board approved in March. The first change modified the timing and reporting of results. He explained that prior to that change the Regents' Test required students who had not passed it by 45 semester hours to take remedial courses. For this reason, students and institutions delayed the taking of the Regents' Test because the System Office reports results of first time failures. Therefore institutions and students wanted to get as much as possible under their belt before taking the test. Dr. Sethna said that this causes some of those who need help not to get the help early enough. Under the new timing change approved in March, students are encouraged to take it early, and the System Office is going to report results at 45 hours, not first time failures.

The second change the Board approved in March is to modify the method of teaching for students who need more assistance. Students who repeatedly fail the test will receive help in individualized sections. Dr. Sethna acknowledged that this would, of course, take more money, but the System is prepared to do that as an investment in its students. The method of testing will also be modified, providing a limited number of appeals and an alternative test for persons who have medical conditions or other documented reasons for why they cannot pass the current test. Included in that recommendation is a sunset provision which means that the Board will ask the System Office to do a very rigorous review, no later than three years from today and report the results to the full Board. Funding needs for implementing these new recommendations were also discussed at the March meeting.

After that summary, Dr. Sethna stated that he wanted to move on to the "new stuff," which includes the use of the Georgia High School Graduation Test ("GHSGT"). He read an extract from the GHSGT website explains that all students seeking a Georgia high school diploma must pass the Georgia High School Graduation Test in four content areas. For this discussion, Dr. Sethna said that the English Language Arts Test was the only relevant content area. Every high school student who graduates from high school must have passed this test. This means that the range of scores that the University System sees for admissions will be between 500, the minimum passing score and 600, the maximum score on the test.

Dr. Sethna stated that the Office of Academic Affairs staff has studied the relationships between the GHSGT score in the 500 to 600 range and passing the Regents' Test and found modest correlations between the GHSGT and the RT. The System Office of Academic Affairs staff believes the GHSGT can be helpful at both ends of the spectrum. At the high end, a GHSGT score of 580 can be used as an additional measure to exempt the RT. Currently a high SAT score is used as a way to exempt the RT. Today, Dr. Sethna proposed allowing students who get a score of 580 out of the possible 600 to exempt the Regents' Test. Dr. Sethna said that approximately 2% (Essay) to 4% (Reading) of students will earn such an exemption. He stated that what was perhaps more relevant for today's

discussion was the students' scores on the low end. At this point he said he must split the discussion into the Reading Test and Essay Test because the correlations are different for each one.

First he discussed the Reading Test. In the Reading Test, he explained, there is a high degree of correlation between GHSGT score and failure rates on the RT, especially when combined with the SAT score. Students who have a GHSGT score less than 515 and SAT Critical Reading, which used to be called verbal, less than 400 have an 86% chance of failing the RT based on their pre-college variables. If the System staff identifies students who fall in this category they have already identified those students who have an 86% chance of failing the Regents' Test.

This is an ideal example of how the System can help students early. Once they are identified, they can be helped. Dr. Sethna said that students who are identified fall in this category, staff could send these students a letter saying that if their GHSGT score is less than 515, then they must take the RT-Reading/Comprehension Test before matriculation. The "must" changes into a recommended if the student's SAT score is higher than 400. So if the student gets a 515 on the GHSGT he/she is required to take the RT before matriculation, but if the student produces an SAT score that is higher than 400 then it is "strongly recommend" that he/she take it. If the student passes, there are no additional requirements. He/she is through the RT requirement. More importantly, if a student takes the Regents' Test before matriculation or just after matriculation and fails it, there is no record. Dr. Sethna explained there is no downside in advising, strongly recommending, or requiring a student to take the RT because if students take it the day they enter or before they enter, there is no penalty and there is no record on their transcripts. If the student fails, he/she must register for the Regents' Skills Course in first or second semester, ideally in the first semester, but perhaps in the second semester, that way students who fail it will get the help they need early in their career.

Dr. Sethna stated that on the Essay Test, the correlations are much weaker. Scores on essay tests are more variable compared to reading scores. Therefore it is more difficult to find a definitive GHSGT score that is a strong predictor of an RT Essay failure. At a score of 500, the probability of failing the Regents' Essay Test on the first take is 33%. This is not a strong relationship. Rather than force a placement with these scores, it is recommended that these scores are used in an advisory capacity. These students would receive a letter that strongly recommends that the student take the Essay Test before matriculation. If the student passes, there is no further requirement. If the student fails, he/she will get the needed help in the first or second semester. This is how the System Office of Academic Affairs proposes to use the GHSGT.

As this analysis does not apply to a non-Georgia high school graduates, Dr. Sethna stated that they would continue to use the SAT test score to exempt these students on the high end. If the students do not exempt, they would be strongly encouraged to take the RT in their first year. Non-Georgia high school graduates who have no SAT scores will be required to take the RT before matriculation. Again, he said, the same branching applies. If they pass, fine. If not, they will be required to take the Regents' Skills courses in their first year.

Regent Rodwell asked if Dr. Sethna meant both ACT and SAT. He said that she was absolutely right

and said that every time he mentioned the SAT he meant the equivalent scores on the ACT as well.

Dr. Sethna then summarized the presentation thus far. He said that if approved, they would require or strongly encourage students with lower GHSGT scores to take the RT before matriculation and, if they fail, they would be required to take the Regents' Skills courses in their first or second semester. He said the rationale is early diagnosis. Along with that plus point, however, there is a caveat that the Board would need to examine very carefully.

Students may get help early in their programs. They are able to pass the RT early. The implications are as follows. Currently, the Regents' Test is not required in the first year, but currently, 25% of entering freshman class drops out of school. That number is 40% at access institutions. This is a segment of students who, currently, do not typically take the RT because they are not required to take it until 45 hours. These students who drop out have a median SAT Critical Reading score much below those who stay in college. So these are not some of the System's strongest students. With this new recommendation, these students will be told, along with all other students, that they must take the RT and/or the Regents' Skills Courses in their freshman year prior to completing core courses. Essentially, the System will be taking that whole group of students who typically have not taken the Regents' Test and insisting that they take it early in their program for the best reasons, early diagnosis. However, by doing that it is very likely that there will be a significant increase in initial failure rates on the RT and in the number of students enrolled in the Skills Courses. By taking a group of students who, by and large, are not prepared and insisting they take the RT, the initial failure rates will go up. However, on the positive side, there is a huge payoff. The payoff will be more students receiving early diagnosis and help and, hopefully, graduating on time.

Dr. Sethna next discussed some practical considerations. While the System Office has been in touch with the Georgia Department of Education ("GDOE") to obtain the base data for this analysis, they will need to be included in detailed discussions so that they may be informed partners in this implementation. If the Board agrees to this, the System Office will need to work on a method by which it taps into these scores and sends the letters in an automated sense. He stated that all of those details had not been worked out as of today. Dr. Sethna said that they have no reason to believe that everything will not go well because we have been in touch with them and the Chancellor sits on the Alliance of Education Agency Heads ("AEAH") and the System has good relations through the Chancellor.

Dr. Sethna stated that schedules for faculty and for many students have already been drawn up for Fall 2007, so some implementation would start in later semesters. The items the Board approved in the March meeting can start sooner, but each of them may have significant monetary implications, and need to be supported at the System and institutional levels. He said that the System Office has identified a president to lead a System-level task force on the RT, including accountability measures. He assured the Board that there would be follow-up and that this matter would not die or drop out of interest after this meeting.

Chancellor Davis asked Dr. Sethna if he would like to give the Board the name of the president who

will lead this task force. Dr. Sethna jokingly replied that it was a person of rather weak intellect who “jumps in where angels fear to tread.” He then announced that he had volunteered to lead the task force. He said that this new role was consistent with his “Weekend at Bernie’s” role.

Dr. Sethna said that before moving to the actual final recommendation, the staff would like to recommend that the Board directs System staff to proactively pursue identification of the students at risk of not meeting the RT requirement before matriculation or early in their first year, using measures such as the GHSGT and SAT scores or other predictive variables that will help with early diagnosis. He also recommended that they do the same with improvements in the structure and delivery of the Regents’ Skills courses. Dr. Sethna said that it is particularly important to the Board that passing rates of minorities are improved and that System presidents should be directed to cooperate fully with this effort. Presidents should also be directed to closely monitor the progress of student athletes to insure timely completion of the Regents’ Skills course requirement.

Dr. Sethna then gave the final recommendation of the staff which is that early diagnostic measures such as the Georgia High School Graduation Test be used upon entry and early in their first year to identify and assist students who might be at risk of not meeting the Regents’ Writing and Reading Skills requirement. He then read a portion of Policy 307 on the Regents’ Writing and Reading Skills requirement states that the “requirement shall be determined by the Chancellor.” Dr. Sethna said that policy would continue until the new core curriculum with its attendant assessment measures is implemented.

Dr. Sethna said the staff wanted to present a starting point that demonstrates some ways in which the effectiveness of the Regents’ Test can be improved by using early intervention and early diagnosis measures. As they bring forth that recommendation, the staff also asks that they be allowed to implement them and then reevaluate this as new assessment measures and the new core curriculum come into place. Dr. Sethna said that concluded his presentation and yielded the floor back to Chair Poitevint for questions.

Chair Poitevint said she would open the floor for questions, but first she wanted to, again, thank Dr. Sethna, Dr. Leslie Caldwell and everyone on Dr. Sethna’s committee for the hours and hours they put into the Regents’ Test. She also thanked them for being so extremely responsive to the Regents’ questions and concerns because every facet of this procedure had been reviewed and re-reviewed. She further stated that where it might be the same Regents’ Test in content, there is really not anything about the procedure involved in this that is the same Regents’ Test. She again thanked Dr. Sethna and his team for all of their hard work.

Chair Poitevint recognized Regent Tucker who asked Dr. Sethna what would be the dynamics of requiring anyone who does not exempt the Regents’ Test either through the ACT, SAT, or the High School Graduation Test to take the test pre-admission instead of just the ones who fall short of certain thresholds? He added that since there is no penalty for failing, why not just have everyone who does not automatically exempt take the test pre-admission? Dr. Sethna answered that the only reason his recommendation does not reflect that is because of the low-correlations. As a statistician,

he said, he was not able to put his force behind that recommendation. He further explained that if the probability is very high that those students would fail he could say, "Yes. Do it!" However, if the probability is modest that students would fail it, he could not give the same recommendation. Dr. Sethna emphasized that the reason for his hesitation was statistical, adding that it is the Regents' prerogative, to have all students who do not exempt the Regents' Test take it pre-admission if that is what they wish to do.

Regent Tucker stated that he is always for simplifying. He reasoned that if the System Office has certain requirements that a person has to complete in order to matriculate, why not have everyone meet those requirements. Regent Tucker added that since the staff has already pinpointed the students who may be more in jeopardy of failing, they could certainly put something in place for second semester. That way if the students are not able to take the test prior to the fall admission, then they could take it prior to the winter semester because the schedules for those testing dates have not been set. Dr. Sethna stated that Regent Tucker's comment was valid, but again stated that he is just not able, to date, to commit to doing that. Dr. Sethna stated that he is certainly able to commit to trying to make that happen. He added that, thus far, his office's conversation about the implementation with campuses has been very low, so his staff needs to involve them in this discussion because that is where the action is. He added that he could not guarantee that will happen, but he and his staff could certainly strive to that goal.

As a follow up, Regent Tucker stated that he did not want to unnecessarily delay things that need to happen, but said if the staff made this effective with the academic year of 2008, they would have more time to bring people up to speed in high school as they are taking the high school graduation test to let them know that not only is it a requirement to graduate high school, but this is where they exempt certain requirements for college. Regent Tucker added that schools might get a better result from that test if the students knew there was more at stake, no penalty, but an incentive to do better. Dr. Sethna said that he was very comfortable with an implementation date of Fall 2008 for those very reasons. If some of these things could be started earlier, he added, he would be happy to do that.

Chair Poitevint recognized Regent Jenkins who said that he thought Regent Tucker had a good point about simplifying it and making everybody take it. He then reviewed the numbers and asked if he was looking at them correctly. Since Dr. Sethna's concern was as a statistician, Regent Jenkins asked if what he was looking at was that with a score of 500 the probability of failing is only 33%. Dr. Sethna said he was correct. Students with a score of 500 on the High School Graduation Test have a 67% chance of passing the Regents' Test. Regent Jenkins then stated, as a point of clarification, that a person in that category is strongly recommended to take the Regents' Test pre-admission. If the student passes, it is okay, but if the student fails, then he should take the Regents' Test again in the first or second semester. Regent Jenkins then said that someone could possibly put taking the test off all the way to the end of the second semester. Dr. Sethna said they could not wait until the end of the semester because the class starts on the first day of the second semester. Therefore if a student walks in the door in August, the latest he/she can put off taking the test is January 5.

Regent Jenkins said that he may be reading this wrong, and read following statement from the

presentation, “Strongly recommend that a student take the Regent’s Test, Essay before matriculation. If a pass, no further requirement. If a fail, take the Regents’ Test in the first or second quarter.” He then asked whether or not students had to take the Regents’ Test course until after they fail the Regents’ Test. Dr. Sethna stated that the proposed procedural change would require him to take it before matriculation, or strongly recommend it. Regent Jenkins said that he wants it to be required. Dr. Sethna responded that there is nothing in what his committee found, except for the statistical reason that he mentioned earlier, that would cause him to raise a strong objection to this suggestion. He stated that if that is the Regents’ pleasure, then his staff can do that. Dr. Sethna also said that Regent Tucker was absolutely right in that it would be a simple message. “If you haven’t exempted it, take it.”

At this time, Chair Poitevint asked if any another Regent had a question. Dr. Sethna then asked her if, with her permission, he could ask his staff if they saw a problem with this approach. With permission granted, he then called on Dr. Leslie Caldwell, Dr. Cathie Mayes Hudson, and Dr. Sandra Stone instructing them to come up to the podium.

Dr. Stone said that she could only foresee logistical problems if the implementation were being scheduled for this fall. Dr. Sethna said that it would not be for this fall, but next fall, fall 2008. He then recognized Dr. Caldwell. Dr. Caldwell stated that the only problem that he saw, which was not a minor one, but a strategic one, is that there are 50,000 plus students entering the System each year. Many of them, perhaps as many as half will exempt the Regents’ Test. That still leaves 25,000-30,000 students to give this test to, prior to matriculation. He stated that the problem, as he sees it will be one of organizational difficulty. He added that if he were to give his recommendation, he would suggest trying Dr. Sethna’s idea for a year or a semester to see how much that helps. He further stated that the staff has a lot of changes that it is recommending. Many of those, he believes, will help tremendously in the problems that students are having with the Regents’ Test. Dr. Caldwell said that his suggestion was just an offset for the strategic problems that the schools will have scheduling students and finding space prior to matriculation for those students.

Chair Poitevint recognized Regent Tucker who stated that there was an alternative to Dr. Caldwell’s statement. Regent Tucker stated that since none of this had been done in the past, anything that is done is going to be, hopefully, an improvement. He then said that instead of requiring the test pre-admission, students should be required to take it within so many days of matriculation so that they can at least get into the remedial study in the beginning of the second semester if they should need it. He then said that he recognized there is a logistics issue of having people test that are not on campus and that he would not begin to imagine how much trouble that is, but instead of prior to admission have them test sometime in the first 30 days. Regent Tucker added that he believes Dr. Sethna and his staff are on to something that with a few tweaks can be figured out. Dr. Sethna said that he was certainly willing to go with the pleasure of the Board on this suggestion as this was not a critical point in his recommendation. He added that he does recognize the logistical issues that Dr. Caldwell pointed out.

Chair Poitevint asked if there were any other questions or concerns. She then recognized Regent

Bernard who said that he may be a little naïve and need a little remedial education on this issue, as this was his first Board meeting. He expressed his appreciation for the background information included in the agenda materials, which, he stated he actually read. Regent Bernard then said that he agreed with Regent Tucker. He explained that he has four young children, and is a little concerned thinking back to his own college days, at the maturity level of someone that might be at risk as a teenager. When adults say “I strongly encourage you,” he said, they are basically saying “It’s optional.” Regent Bernard said that he thinks if it is optional, many students will wait and defer it, just like he would have waited and deferred as a teenager because no one *wants* to take a test. He added that he liked Regent Tucker’s idea. He further stated that if the Board is going to go down this path, if the test is diagnostic, then intervention is needed earlier, not later. The wiggle room may cause some of that 33% that might be at risk, to wiggle themselves into extra years in college and a lack of remediation going through a semester or two before they really get the help they need. For this reason, Regent Bernard said he liked the idea of requiring as Regent Tucker identified.

Following Regent Bernard’s remark, Dr. Sethna asked Chair Poitevint for permission to give Regents McMillan and Potts the opportunity to make comments because they worked very closely on the proposal. Regent McMillan said that he would yield to the statistician. Regent Potts said that, first of all, Dr. Sethna gave a great presentation. He said that he could add nothing to the way Dr. Sethna summarized all that they have been hammering over the last several weeks. He further stated that he believed in “letting the data speak and putting together a plan based on what those data say, and then have an accountability system and adhere to it.” Regent Potts said that he was comfortable with Regent Tucker’s statement as well. Regent Potts said that it pushes past what the staff can statistically feel comfortable in doing, but if everyone really believes that early diagnostic is the right thing to do—which having gone through a bout with cancer, Regent Potts swears early diagnostics is a great thing—then that is a bold move, and he could certainly get comfortable with that.

Regent McMillan said that he agreed with what Regent Potts said because that was always his premise. He stated that he was never going to love the Regents’ Test, but could support using it for more diagnostic purposes.

Chair Poitevint recognized Chancellor Davis who pointed out there is nothing in the resolution that requires changing to adopt this. We could adopt it with the understanding that we will try and get a system that either does it at matriculation or very soon after entry. There is nothing in here that really indicates time frame. Then we can come back and make the report. It will be the focus of a System-wide project, so you will be getting regular feedback on it.

Chair Poitevint recognized Regent McMillan who said that he had one additional question to ask Dr. Sethna. He mentioned that they had previous discussion on English 1101 and 1102 and asked if at some point there could be further discussions with the people who write the syllabi for those courses to incorporate some of the things that the RT covers in those classes. For example, the timed essay portion of the test. Regent McMillan said that he felt that should be a part the ongoing teaching methods. In other words, there should be some correlation between those courses and the Regents’ Test.

Dr. Sethna said that they have already shared those correlations or lack thereof with the vice presidents with a clear message that where those large numbers of variance exist that they under the microscope to see if they can address that.

Chair Poitevint next recognized Regent Hatcher who said that for the direction and what they have heard today he applauds Chair Poitevint, Dr. Sethna, and the Committee's work on it. "It seems to me that this is the right direction for us to be going. I think Regent Tucker's addendum to it is a good one. Regent Potts, I know that a lot of this is your authorship and I commend you for it. Do you want to put this in the form of a motion, because I will be glad to second you?"

Regent Potts asked Chair Poitevint if it were time for the motion to be made. She replied that it was. Regent Potts said that it would be his pleasure to move that the Board of Regents approve the recommendation as outlined by Dr. Sethna with the clear understanding of what the Board defines as "early" per the discussion led by Regent Tucker. Regent Hatcher seconded the motion. Chair Poitevint thanked them and turned the meeting back to Chair Vigil who called for the vote.

The motion was properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted.

Upon reviewing notes from the Board meeting and careful consideration of the Regents' comments, the staff has the following understanding.

The Board directs System staff to develop a requirement for University System of Georgia students who are not subject to other directives or policies of the Board to take the Regents' Test as soon as feasible after matriculation into a System institution. Staff should attempt to arrange testing early in the first semester. The purpose of this early testing is to allow early intervention for students who need help meeting the Regents' Skills requirement. When indicated, students should be directed into a skills course as early as the second semester.

COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: INTERNAL AUDIT, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES (APPROVALS AND AUTHORITIES)

Chair Vigil announced that they would forego their 15 minute break and instead take a 5 minute break and go into their committee meetings.

Chair Vigil asked Regent Jenkins, as today's Chair of the Internal Audit Committee, to open the meeting of the Committees of the Whole for Internal Audit, Academic Affairs, Real Estate and Facilities.

Chair Jenkins stated that in absence of the Chair of the Internal Audit Committee, Regent Leebern, he would convene the Committee meeting. On behalf of Regent Poitevint, the Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee and on behalf of Regent Tucker, the Chair of the Real Estate and Facilities Committee, he called to order the Committee of the Whole to discuss approvals and authorities. He stated that this was probably the third or fourth time that the Board had a session like this where they

went through these policies and suggested changes. He added that Mr. Stark has reported back that people who have been affected by these policies are very much in favor of them. These changes, he continued, allow decisions to be made more quickly and easily. It also puts the decision in the pocket of the person who has to implement those decisions. He then directed his fellow Regents' to go the appropriate section in their Board books. He said that the presentation would be divided into three parts and reminded them that these were only information items and no action would be taken at this meeting. Chair Jenkins said that the plan was that they would discuss the items at this meeting and any suggestions that the Board made or any other additions would be brought back at the August meeting at which time they would vote upon. Chair Jenkins then said that Item 1 would be explained by the Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor, Ronald B. Stark. For Items 2 through 5, the Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor, Beheruz N. Sethna, would lead the discussion, and then the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, would take the Board through Item 6 dealing with section 900.

Chair Jenkins said that anyone who had any specific suggestions or comments for any of the sections should let Vice Chancellor Stark know no later than July 10. With that introduction, he asked Mr. Stark to begin his presentation.

Mr. Stark thanked Chair Jenkins and said that Dr. Sethna forgot to make a very important announcement in his presentation earlier. He said that both he and Dr. Sethna were up for an award for the person who brings the same subject back to the Board the most. It is called the "Energizer Bunny Award." He said that maybe tonight while the Regents were having dinner they could discuss which of them should win.

Mr. Stark then began his presentation. He said they are nearing the end of the presentations on approvals and authorities. He said the staff would be coming back in August with what they hope will be the final presentation for approval. He stated that there were over 300 recommendations by the eight approval and authorities presidential committees. These 300 items included many policies, but they also included many items in the Business Procedures Manual, the Academic Affairs Manual and other manuals. He said that the System Office staff would be working on those recommendations as well. He stated that those changes would be made internally, but would be in support of the changes made in the Policy Manual. As done in the past, the policy that is being eliminated would be shown by a strikethrough with the new policy highlighted in yellow. He then asked everyone to turn to Tab 13 in their Board books so that he could begin.

The first proposed change Mr. Stark brought forward was intended to clarify the delegation authority of the Chancellor. When the policy allows the Chancellor to delegate an action, responsibility or approval, this change will allow him to delegate or re-delegate as deemed necessary. The specific change reads, "The Chancellor is authorized to delegate or re-delegate all approvals and actions designated by the Policy Manual." Mr. Stark said that this was the only change in this section. He asked if there were any questions before they moved on into the Academic Affairs section.

Chair Jenkins stated that he and Mr. Stark spoke very briefly about making a change in the first

sentence which reads, “The Board of Regents shall elect the Chancellor annually”. He said that since the Board changed the bylaws to say, “at the first regular meeting following May 1,” he would recommend that the same language that is in the bylaws go in the Policy Manual in that sentence. Mr. Stark said that since changes are supposed to sit on the table for a month, with the approval of the Board, he would make that change as done in the bylaws and include it for approval in the August meeting. Chair Jenkins then addressed the Board and stated that as they go through the information with the three different presenters, they should raise their hands if they have any questions during any point in the discussion. He then asked Mr. Stark if he had any additional information to add for this item. As there were no other questions, Mr. Stark turned the floor over to Dr. Sethna.

Dr. Sethna thanked Mr. Stark and Chair Jenkins and announced that they would just move through the changes in the order in which they appeared in the Board books. He said that he would point out the ones that were fairly procedural and distinguish them from the ones that were substantive. He then directed them to the highlighted portion on page 7. Dr. Sethna said that the first highlighted section was simply a title change and required no discussion. The second highlighted change was, again, fairly procedural, stating that the chief academic officer would approve updates and changes to the institutions’ comprehensive program review plan. Dr. Sethna said that he did not regard these as being substantive. He then asked everyone to move on to page 10 where there was a substantive change in the first paragraph under policy 302.03. It was not a highlighted change because it was a deletion, but it was still substantive. Dr. Sethna said that the words “responsibilities and” had been stricken from the policy which previously read, “An administrative officer having faculty status shall have all the responsibilities and privileges of faculty membership.” Dr. Sethna said that this wording had unfortunately been used from time to time by some faculty to say, “Well, we do not want this particular person to get tenure because this person has not taught the whole gamut of three courses, has not published in so many journals,” etc. He said that when they appoint an administrative officer, they want that person to be able to do his administrative work even if he or she holds faculty privileges. The next change Dr. Sethna pointed out was a minor typo, changing “Corp” to “Corps.” Dr. Sethna said that they would not spend any time on that or the last change on page 10, which was just a terminology issue, “State Colleges and Universities and Associate Degree Colleges” to “State Universities, State Colleges, and Two-Year Colleges.”

The next section referred to admissions requirements. Dr. Sethna asked the Board to consider: rather than exceptions to the use of the “satisfactory” and “unsatisfactory” grade symbols being approved by the Chancellor, designate the System chief academic officer be the responsible party.

Dr. Sethna stated that Chair Jenkins asked him a very good question about two-year institutions. He then directed the Regents to read through this section of the manual fairly carefully so that they could see that it still implies that two-year institutions should have SAT scores. He explained that the Board did not change the policy when the System Office made the change that allowed two-year institutions to not look at SAT scores. This was done as a three year pilot only. Dr. Sethna stated that they are in the third year of that pilot, and are already in the process of evaluating the pilot. Toward

the end of this year, he said the Board would get the opportunity to revisit that pilot and see if they are comfortable with it. As it was a question raised by Chair Jenkins, Dr. Sethna stated that he wanted to be sure to point it out to the full Board.

On page 14, Dr. Sethna pointed out a fairly modest modification that moved authority to approve exceptions in the grading system to the chief academic officer of the System. He said that exceptions to the policy would be reviewed by the Board bi-annually to keep them abreast of changes in various admissions standards at the institutions. He added that the staff did not recommend that institutions be allowed to set their own admissions standards without any oversight or approval, which was reflected in the language of the policy as presented. The admissions standards item continued on page 16 where the staff asks that the University System chief academic officer continue to have the ability to look at these recommended changes.

Dr. Sethna then asked everyone to go to page 22 for the next changes. The first change was a name change from the Education Research and Extension Committee to the Academic Affairs Committee. The second change was: “Institutions may require funds greater than the stated minimal funding levels.” Dr. Sethna stated that relative to the dollar amounts in the table provided in the policy, institutions may set a higher bar depending upon their costs and their desires and their ability to raise funds and that is fine. As a side bar, Dr. Sethna stated that many months ago the Academic Affairs Committee asked the System Office staff to investigate these dollar amounts. The staff found a great consistency of opinion among all sectors except research universities. The staff has turned over the analysis of the research institutions to the four research universities to say “look at your amounts and come back to Academic Affairs if you wish to change that.” Such a change could, in the future, be brought to before the Board, but that is not being recommended today.

The next change, on page 23, was reasonably substantive. This change requires that before a president certifies that the institution has funds to the System Office of Academic Affairs that the certification must actually be documented that such funds exist. For example, if the president has promised \$1 million, then he/she must confirm that those funds are in the bank or in a particular repository. Dr. Sethna said that the change on page 24 was a substantive change, but also reasonably procedural. Currently, if a president from one System institution wants to recruit an administrator or faculty member from another System institution, they have to ask permission to interview or consider that person. The staff recommends changing the policy so that the current institution would be informed only just before the offer is made. Dr. Sethna explained that the staff made this recommendation because if a person is interviewing and does not get the job, he/she could face repercussions by letting his/her home president know that he/she is on the job market.

Dr. Sethna said that the substantive change on page 26, post-tenure review, was related to the issue that he discussed earlier where administrators who have faculty rank are reviewed at post-tenure review. Sometimes, faculty say ask these administrators, “How much have you published and why aren’t you publishing as much as Joe Blow or Jane Doe in the department?” Dr. Sethna said that seems to be an unreasonable standard, thus the recommended change does not subject administrators who have tenure and also may or may not have teaching responsibilities to post-tenure review in the

normal sense as long as the majority of their duties are administrative. After that person finishes his/her administrative assignment, goes back to the faculty, they will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will have approximately five years to build their academic resumes before they are evaluated as a faculty member.

The change on page 27 is a title change from “Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs” to “University System Chief Academic Officer.” The next highlighted section, pages 27 and 28, reflects the kind of criteria that already exists in the Policy Manual for promotion. It just tweaks those phrases and includes it in this section. Dr. Sethna stated that the next series of changes on pages 28-31 were very, very substantive: the authority to award tenure. He said that thus far, the Board has approved tenure. He said that the Board already decided in a previous meeting that promotions would be decided by the presidents. Tenure currently still resides with the Board. This set of changes authorizes the institutional president to award tenure, but there are several caveats to that. On page 29 for example, tenure on appointment, a president is allowed, by this change in the current policy to award tenure on appointment to an outstanding, distinguished senior faculty member, typically one who has held tenure at another institution. However, if the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure must be approved at the level of the Chancellor. This means that a pure administrator, who has not held tenure anywhere else, cannot be awarded tenure by the president him/herself. That decision must rise to the level of the Chancellor.

Regent Jolly asked Dr. Sethna what “the level of the Chancellor” meant. Dr. Sethna said that the Chancellor would approve it, which is a difference from today as the Board currently approves it. Regent Jolly then asked if he could just say “the Chancellor” because “The level of the Chancellor” sounded ambiguous. Dr. Sethna agreed to change the wording accordingly. Chair Jenkins jokingly told Regent Jolly that he would get the reputation of being a lawyer if he kept pointing things out like that.

Dr. Sethna continued his presentation, asking everyone to turn to page 30. He said that the changes on this page were simply follow-throughs to the same general concept that tenure would be awarded by the presidents. Page 31, however, contained an entirely new idea that stems from the Chancellor’s desire to have fiscal responsibility for these tenure decisions. As a caveat, Dr. Sethna said that the staff has not taken this to the chief academic officers and presidents as they normally do, but they would next month. He then summarized the highlighted section as follows. When a department is very heavily tenured, the institution loses contraction capability. If the environment changes, for example, a field tanks in the market, then the institution no longer has the ability to contract. Therefore, based on University System of Georgia experiences and data from other systems, the staff chose a percentage of 67% as a cut off point. Under this recommended change, a president can award tenure up to the point that the department is 67% tenured. Once it becomes more than 67% tenured, the president can still favorably consider to tenure but he/she would have to do two things. One is an analysis of the liability. The president would have to have a dollar analysis of the liability associated with the decision to tenure a department above 67%. This solid fiscal analysis of costs and benefits should show how that institution is going to manage the risk and what the positive benefits come

with that decision. Dr. Sethna stated that the exact percentage is 66.67%. He then reiterated that if a president wants, tenure above 67% is still possible under this recommended provision, if the Board approves it, but the justification for it becomes higher.

Chair Jenkins said that he had another “lawyer comment” for Dr. Sethna. He then said that in the phrase, “tenured in that field or department,” “field or department” could be subject to a lot of different interpretations. He said that Dr. Sethna had a very specific percentage figure, but it was not clear, in his view, what it applies to. He asked if using department by itself would work since everyone typically operates within a department. Dr. Sethna said that although everyone is in a department, the field is the critical point. Chair Jenkins said that he just wondered if there was a better word for “field” since people could argue about the definition of a field. Dr. Sethna asked if “discipline” would suffice. Chair Jenkins said he believed “discipline” was still subject to the same concerns. He suggested that the language should be more specific. Dr. Sethna said that he was thinking beyond terminology to the full concept. For example, there are some institutions, smaller institutions that two disciplines are combined in the same department. He said that his home department at University of West Georgia was a good example, the Department of Marketing and Real Estate. Dr. Sethna explained that if the real estate market tanked, then just by virtue of being in this department, it might not trigger this provision. He said that his gut is saying that they are better off leaving the “and” in there because that could be part of the justification. For example, “if indeed, the real estate market does tank and their professors were tenured there, can they teach in the other field? If the answer is yes, then the bar becomes lower. If the answer is no, then the bar is higher and that is part of the justification that must be presented to the Chief Academic Officer and the Chancellor.” Dr. Sethna said that he did not have a good “lawyer- proof” phrase to share with Chair Jenkins, but in the interim the staff would work on it.

Dr. Sethna continued with his presentation, moving on to the last substantive change: classification of non-tenure track personnel. Dr. Sethna stated that this was not as expensive a decision as the one the Board had just reviewed. He added that the staff was comfortable recommending that it be relegated to the institutional president. With that, Dr. Sethna concluded his presentation and asked if there were additional questions. As there were none, Dr. Sethna turned the floor over to Ms. Daniels.

Ms. Daniels thanked Dr. Sethna and stated that in light of the types and significance of changes proposed by the campus committee looking at Facilities issues, she previously presented the recommended changes in concept form. The basic ideas were presented at the Statesboro Board meeting. She said that she also had workshops, one-on-one sessions, and follow-up phone conversations with the Regents to address questions and make modifications. At this meeting she would propose, as an information item, some actual changes in policy language that are the culmination of all of those efforts. Ms. Daniels said the items she would focus on were summarized on pages 33-36 under tab 13. She also said that as she went through the information she would reference those items where the summary is called out as well as the page number where the actual policy language is proposed. She then moved on to the first item, the reorganization and expansion of the existing Policy Manual Section 900. She said the legend for the Policy Manual language started in the middle of page 36, and here they would begin to see the reorganization and expansion in this section 900.

There were a number of new sections proposed that were noted as such in italics. For example sections 901.02 and 901.03. Ms. Daniels said those sections would be added at a future date and the schedule for introduction of future sections would be proposed as part of the action item she would bring forward in August. She added that this was her attempt to wrestle Dr. Sethna and Mr. Stark for the Energizer Bunny Award. As the process would need to take place over a series of months, Ms. Daniels said that she did not want to introduce that process into the current approvals and authorities series of exercises because the Board would then be convinced that it would never end.

Ms. Daniels said that since they do need to be responsive to the presidential committee that made the recommendations she would focus on the 15 items that the committee specifically requested as approval and authority items. She added that the staff has also taken suggestions and feedback from the one-on-one sessions and workshops into account and recognize the need to reorganize the facilities section into a more organized, intuitive, and user-friendly series of arrangements. Given that she was recommending the reorganization of the policy sections, she said she wanted the Board to know that all existing Policy Manual sections were accounted for in this exercise. Even if something is to be deleted, it was shown with a strike-through. She further explained that the information shown in italics was notes to the Board that for their consideration during the process but would ultimately disappear from the policy language. She added that this is a little bit different than some of the presentations the Board has seen so far.

Moving into an example in the policy language expansion, Item 2 on page 37, New Policy 901.04, Ms. Daniels stated that the staff is expanding existing Policy 904 which is related to the current Board requirement that the System Office of Facilities has a procedures manual for all building project procedures. She said that series of opportunities to provide for guidance on procedures needed to be expanded to address all Real Estate and Facilities areas of responsibility including construction, real estate due diligence, and master planning. Ms. Daniels said that her office is also responsible for a number of other issues for which there are published guidelines on its website and that are of use and referenced as official Board procedures.

Ms. Daniels then addressed Item 3, an update to the Naming Policy (existing Policy 912), on page 38. She said that the new language streamlines the policy and separates it from related procedural changes and a proposal for a Template for Institution Place Naming Guidelines. At the end of this policy presentation, she included draft language of the facilities naming process and guidelines that she said would help address the Board's call for a level of consistency in the System's naming efforts. For the record, Ms. Daniels said that these documents were a work in progress that she offered up for concept and format only. She said that she still had a great deal of work to do with the System chief advancement officers on this tri-part set of policy, process and guidelines. Ms. Daniels said that the staff was confident that they would have a meaningful set of documents to help navigate the sensitive realm of facilities naming when their work was complete. She then asked for the Board's permission to hold the discussion of the Naming Policy to the end of this Policy Manual review when they could review it in tandem with the supporting process and guidelines drafts.

Regent Carter asked Ms. Daniels for clarification on what she had discussed thus far and for

additional indicators as she went through the rest of her material so that he could follow more closely. Ms. Daniels agreed to do that and explained that the staff is trying to take the existing policy that has gotten very involved in procedures and guidelines, separate that out, and simplify the policy into much more targeted and concise policy language. Within that policy, they would reference the procedures and guidelines for namings that Ms. Daniels is working to develop and edit with the institution Chief Advancement Officers. Regent Carter then asked if this would come up for a vote in August. Ms. Daniels said that the procedures and guidelines would not necessarily come up for a vote, although she would like to present the work of the committee to them at a later meeting. The policy, however, would come up for a vote. As a point of clarification, Chair Jenkins said that specifically the language on pages 38 and 39 would come up for a vote in August, but it is the procedures and guidelines that would not come up for a vote. He added that the language as presented was subject to whatever changes are made between now and then. Ms. Daniels said that was correct. Regent Carter asked whether all of this policy was or if some of it was procedures and guidelines. Regent Jenkins said that all of it was policy, except when she gets to the end and talks about the namings procedures. To facilitate the presentation, Chair Jenkins asked if Ms. Daniels would continue to call out the page number as well as the section number when appropriate. Ms. Daniels agreed to do that.

Ms. Daniels then continued with her presentation, stating that she had just covered page 38, New Policy 901.07, which is the naming policy and Item 3 in the summary. She asked that they come back to the Naming Policy at the end of the discussion because of the issues surrounding it. On page 41, Ms. Daniels pointed out some incidental changes where the staff uses the terminology “University System chief facilities officer” in lieu of “vice chancellor for facilities.” Page 42, Section 904 is project authorization, an existing section of the Board Policy Manual, Policy 902. Regent Hatcher asked if the authorization amount on page 43 was changing. Ms. Daniels said that it would not and explained that the authorization level shown is exactly as it currently stands. She said that she was requesting that the delegated authority for the \$1 million given to the chief facilities officer be clarified, so that it is incumbent upon her to ensure that any of those projects are in accordance with campus master plans. Ms. Daniels said that neither she nor any of her successors would make those kinds of exceptions for anything that was not already authorized by the Board in light of its master planning. Regent Hatcher asked if somewhere in this language it stated that projects could not be split up. Linda said not in this language, but the staff actually does address it in a number of their building project procedures and other procedures and guidelines. She added that the initial paragraph designating the vice chancellor’s or the chief facilities officer’s delegated authority is really to set up, for the Board’s consideration, the ability to delegate this same project authorization to System institutions. The second paragraph is the substantive issue for the Board’s consideration, to give the chief facilities officer the ability to delegate based on strength of planning professionals at an institution, the same authority to authorize projects under \$1 million, but in accordance with the Board’s campus master plan. Ms. Daniels said that there is a great deal of work that goes on, particularly at the System’s larger institutions which would fall into this category and could be streamlined by this change. She said that the staff would also like to propose developing additional sections on addressing emergency and other projects which are not currently addressed in the Board’s policy.

On Page 43, Ms. Daniel said that the section highlighted in yellow, Section 904.02, 904.03, and 905, is an existing section, Section 902, which the staff is moving to this location, setting the stage for adding additional sections to help further clarify the capital implementation process. Chair Jenkins asked Ms. Daniels if Section 904.02 on page 43, which read, “the Board of Regents shall establish on an annual basis, the projects to be included on the recommendation of the Chancellor,” would be changed. Ms. Daniels said that it would not. Chair Jenkins asked if that section would need to be changed or expanded given the Board’s new developing capital model. Ms. Daniels said that she believed that the basic statement was still correct, but that it certainly could be elaborated on. She said that she believed that was the concept behind the additional section on the capital procurement program, to better articulate that as it evolves. Chair Jenkins clarified by saying that he was asking the question in reference to some information that occurred before he came on the Board. He said that at one time, the Board actually voted on projects during the spring. He stated that since the language says “the Board of Regents shall establish on an annual basis . . .” he was a little unclear about what “the Board of Regents shall establish” means if that language will remain. Ms. Daniels replied that was a reflection of when the staff put the annual capital request in the budget. Chair Jenkins said that there was a point in time when there was a big vote using computers and the like. He noted that although the procedure had changed, the language had not been changed. Ms. Daniels stated that this was the original language. She further stated that she could not speak to the time that the Board did the priority voting, but she still believes that this speaks to putting the project request in the budget and may reflect the fact that the staff brought a slate of projects forward to the Board for consideration, but it is language that has not changed. Regent Tucker said that the Board would still establish the projects, but it was just a matter of how they establish them. He said the Board used to establish them by a vote on a priority list. Now they are established by the new project funding model. He added that whatever the policy of establishing, this just says that the Board will set those projects at some point. Chair Jenkins said that it may not need to be changed at all, but Ms. Daniels might consider the possibility of being a little bit more specific, i.e. when does the Board do it; what is the process for the Board doing it, rather than just saying, “shall be done.” Ms. Daniels said that she certainly would do that. She noted that she was trying to focus more on the presidential recommendations, but Chair Jenkins was absolutely right in that in the process the staff is highlighting other voids in the policy that may need further fleshing out in the future. She added that they were certainly open to addressing the Board’s needs in that regard.

Chair Jenkins recognized Chancellor Davis who suggested that everyone open their notebooks and take out pages 33-36 because that showed the items that Ms. Daniels was walking through. He added that they all seemed to be getting lost on the implementation language as opposed to the summaries which were shown on those pages. For example, the concern that was voiced about Policy 904 is summarized in Item 4. All of the substantive changes in Policy 904 are summarized on page 33. He added that the Policy 904, which started on page 42, was essentially the implementing language for these changes. He said that as Ms. Daniels walks through the detail, it might be helpful to refer to the summary pages. Ms. Daniels asked if everyone was comfortable with that and then moved on to Item 5 on page 45.

Under Section 906, Contracting, Ms. Daniels said they would address a significant number of

recommendations made by the campus committee including changing the level of delegated authority to approve qualifications based selections (“QBS”), the ability to sign contracts, the authority to address change orders on bid projects and also for institution presidents to approve the selection of master planning consultants. Also under this section, the staff proposed authorizing an increase in the dollar value from \$1 million to \$5 million for the level of contracting authority and for the selection of consultants on construction projects. This proposed change covers all four issues. Ms. Daniels said that the staff is interested in dramatically increasing the delegated authority in all of these areas, but they can all be rolled into this single contracting language both delegating the authority and stating the amount to be increased from \$1 million to \$5 million.

Ms. Daniels said that the next item, which is the reason why the staff was comfortable requesting this significant increase delegated authority, was a new requirement that they would like to place on themselves to report back to the Board of Regents on an annual basis. She said that this reporting requirement on contracting was addressed in Item 6 on page 46 in new policy 906.02. It requires an annual report on contracting including qualifications-based selections to the Board. Ms. Daniels said that with this proposed change, the Board would be able to meet its fiduciary and stewardship responsibilities. She added that the staff believed in addition to streamlining their workflow, this would also improve the Board’s ability to have an oversight level of information as they give staff policy direction on contracting matters.

The next item, Item 7 was on page 50, of the policy rewrite. New Policy 909.02 changes the chief facilities officer’s delegated authority to accept gifts and purchase of real property from \$100,000 to \$250,000. Item 8, on 52 is New Policy 909.04, which relates to easements and site license agreements. Ms. Daniels said that this section needed to be updated, but that the staff would not further delegating authority for site licenses. She said that they would like to look at the development of easements at a future date and bring that back to the Board for consideration. Ms. Daniels stated that these types of matters that are real property issues need to be reviewed fairly carefully with the Attorney General because the Board of Regents holds title to property, and there are certain things that the staff is not comfortable delegating to the institution level.

Similarly, Ms. Daniels said that Item 9 on page 53, which was the introduction to a section on leasing as landlord, would also need to be addressed with the Attorney General and particularly with the System’s research institutions and institutions that have a housing mission. She said that the Chancellor’s authority to lease out housing space and the authority to lease research space where the Board is leasing out as landlord to research companies, the existing policy language is not currently serving the System. She further stated that the newer trends in research and economic development were not being met and the staff would like to establish a task force to further define this Board’s policy on leasing as landlord.

Ms. Daniels said that the Board’s president’s home policy also falls under this group. That language was provided in policy 910.05 on page 55. Ms. Daniels said that policy also needed to be updated at the request of the presidents. She said that Item 10 on page 57 was another increase in delegated authority. She said proposed change would increase the staff’s ability to process rental agreements as

tenant by increasing the chief facilities officer's authority to process agreements from \$5,000 to \$20,000. Ms. Daniels stated that reviewed the numbers of leases that the System Office of Facilities currently processes and the dollar values associated with this level of delegated authority with some of the Regents. She said that this proposed change would allow her to, within her delegated authority process, about 25% of the Board's leases for a fairly modest amount of the dollar value of the leases that the Board currently pays while leaving the larger leases for the Board approval. Ms. Daniels added that there was also a annual reporting requirement associated with this proposed change. Chair Jenkins asked Ms. Daniels what the previous number was. Ms. Daniels replied that it was \$5,000. She said that the staff looked at \$25,000, but, in accordance with feedback they received in the workshops, they bumped that back down to \$20,000.

Ms. Daniels next discussed Item 11 on page 58 which increases the Chancellor's and University System chief facilities officer's delegated authority to allocate emergency MRR funds. For the Chancellor it goes from \$200,000 to \$500,000. For the chief facilities officer it goes from \$200,000 to \$250,000 respectively. Ms. Daniels said that there were a number of new proposed sections but ultimately those were the substantive changes to the Facilities section that the Committee on Approvals and Authorities recommended. She said that they had also addressed items 12, 13, and 14 which eliminate wordy, unnecessary verbiage; change titles to a generic form; and ensure consistency of descriptions. She stated that Item 15 contained a number of issues that were either previous policy language or a request by the presidents in the committee to provide adjustments in various procedures manuals. For this reason, she said the Board would see series of requests to incorporate information into the various procedures manual that may not have been appropriate policy level information.

With that, Ms. Daniels ended her overview of the policies and procedures section. She stated that she would now discuss the Naming Policy and the processing guidelines that the staff would like to complement that policy change. She stated that she appreciated everyone's efforts and patience as the staff has been trying to address the Facilities naming policy issues. She then directed them to the beginning of the new draft naming policy on page 38. Ms. Daniels said that based on the Board's input and the subsequent white paper that the staff put together the staff dramatically stripped the policy language of detail and are proposing new procedures and template guidelines to supplement what they hope will be a clear and concise policy document.

Ms. Daniels asked the Regents to review the naming procedures and guidelines drafts on page 61. She referred to these draft documents as "straw men," for the new procedures and a proposed naming guideline template, emphasizing that it is still a work in progress under review with a committee of chief advancement officers. Ms. Daniels stated that the Board has given clear direction that the procedures for accomplishing a naming need to be consistent for all System institutions. She said the procedural guidelines on page 61 were an initial step at laying out some of those issues. One issue of concern among System institution advancement officers is the timing for events and the impact on fundraising. Ms. Daniels said that the chief advancement officers ("CAO") understood that the System Office is trying to address the Board's concern about media coverage before Board action related to a facility naming. She said that she is working with the CAO task force to find suggestions

on ways to address this without hamstringing their fundraising capabilities.

Ms. Daniels said that the template guidelines, which began on the next page, were intended to articulate issues each campus should address in their institution specific naming guidelines. The Board has requested a level of consistency in the issues addressed by each institution in its naming guidelines, particularly trying to draw out the issue of fundraising related to namings. Ms. Daniels stressed that she and the committee were still editing the template and did not perceive that they had already gotten it right. She said that they pulled information from all of the existing naming guidelines that were considered best practices and cobbled them together. Now they needed to go through an editing process to refine the template and more specifically to work with the campus CAOs, possibly by sector. Ms. Daniels stated that in her discussions with the System institution CAOs they were addressing the dollar amounts and percentages associated with facilities naming giving and other specified concerns so that the documents could be edited. She said her goal is to simplify the policy language and give the staff some flexibility in editing those procedures and guidelines over the summer.

Ms. Daniels reiterated that this was an information item to be considered and commented on, noting that it would be adjusted before it becomes an action item in August. She asked for feedback from the Board on the policy language, adding that the focus is on getting policy level information into the policy and allowing the procedures and guidelines to then attend to the detail.

Regent Hatcher asked to be recognized and said that he thought splitting up the policies and the procedures and guidelines made a lot of sense because the guidelines could be addressed by institution rather than as a whole. Regent Hatcher then noted that although the guidelines discussed fundraising, the policy as proposed really did not have an emphasis on fundraising. He said that the consensus after they discussed this point in the Executive and Compensation Committee earlier in the day was that the emphasis should be added in the policy itself to push for fundraising and then use the guidelines, by institution, to determine how that would be implemented. He then suggested adding that fundraising emphasis in the policy section itself. Chair Jenkins said that it was a good point and asked Ms. Daniels if she could incorporate that comment into the specific language of the policy that the Board would be voting on. Ms. Daniels said that she absolutely would and mentioned that Regent Hatcher had given her a heads-up about that concern and her staff has already been thinking about a way to do add in the language. She said it would be very simple to add a basic paragraph that addresses a policy level emphasis on fundraising. Chair Jenkins said that he thought that, from time to time, a number of the Regents had pointed out the need to emphasize fundraising as much as possible with the naming applications, so Regent Hatcher's comment tied in well with that.

Regent Carter stated that he had gotten feedback that said the dollar amounts that are on page 65 would severely damage fundraising. Ms. Daniels said that she would like to absolutely go on record as saying that they put this document out as a "straw man". She then said that she should have just drawn blanks instead of carrying over the language in the various policies that were culled into this form. She said that it was never their intention to designate any specific dollar value at this point as

they are still seeking input on that. She apologized for any confusion this may have caused and said that they would put in blanks and work on filling those in on the institutional guidelines. Chair Jenkins added as a point of clarification that these guidelines and procedures would not be voted on in August. Ms. Daniels said that was correct. She said that she would like to present them as an information item, but that she was not sure whether the guidelines and procedures were ever actually voted on. She added that they certainly could if they wanted to bring them forward specifically for a vote. Regent Hatcher said the guidelines and those amounts would be different depending on the size of the institution. He added that he believed it was up to Ms. Daniel and the staff to work with each institution to come up with the right guidelines, resulting in a set of guidelines for each institution to use in their fundraising efforts.

Regent Carter asked for clarification on what they would be voting on in August. Ms. Daniels explained that while they would not be voting on the guidelines, she hoped to have the policy language for Section 900 as it relates to Items 1-15 to the Board's satisfaction. She said that the vote would be on the policy language only, not the guidelines and procedures. Ms. Daniels added that she hoped to bring back enough information on namings so that the Board would be comfortable with lifting the moratorium. She said that to ensure progress, the Real Estate and Facilities staff planned to do a lot of work over the summer with the institution Chief Advancement Officers. She would then bring a work product back to the Board, but it would not require action.

Regent Carter then asked for more information on the moratorium on namings. Ms. Daniels explained that the moratorium on namings went into effect in March, as the staff began analyzing the policy. At this time the Board can still approve namings, but only as exceptions. She further explained that the Board has been very flexible and open in that regard. When asked how long the moratorium would last, Ms. Daniels stated that the staff would be working as a task force very diligently over the summer. At this point, Chancellor Davis stated that he did not want to give the impression that the System is foregoing opportunities with the moratorium. He said that in the moratorium, the System Office instructed institutions to "hold off if you can, but do not lose an opportunity because of the moratorium. If you believe that your project is at risk, bring it forward." He said several institutions have done that and this Board agreed to move those forward. Chancellor Davis said that the goal was to have a policy that gives guidance to people developing naming opportunities. In the moratorium, the System Office asked them to hold off until they are given that guidance, but if they cannot hold off, then come forward. He assured the Board that the System Office is not compromising or holding up fundraising because of the moratorium. Regent Carter thanked the Chancellor and Ms. Daniels for the clarification.

Regent Tarbutton then made the following points. He directed everyone to the section on interior namings on page 39. Under the final paragraph, it reads "the University System chief facilities officer shall be notified for information purposes only on any such interior space naming on a timely basis." A couple of paragraphs prior to that, it mentioned the power to remove names. Regent Tarbutton said he believed it would be appropriate to include that the Board should be notified not only when an interior space is named, but when there is a removal for the name as well. Ms. Daniels made note of his recommendation.

In regards to Regent Hatcher's earlier point on the need for institutions to be able to participate in fundraising at different levels, Regent Tarbutton said he believed it was a crucial issue. He stated that as he has gone through these policies he noted the differential among sector institutions (research universities, state universities, and access institutions) when it comes to endowed chairs. He said that he believed that could be a good beginning framework if the institutions were separated by sector. Lastly, in the middle on page 66, it reads, "it is the policy of the college/university to forward the formal naming request to the Board of Regents only after at least 50% of the gift has been received by the college/university." Regent Tarbutton believes that policy is in direct conflict with the beginning part of the corresponding procedure. He said that it did not flow well to first ask for 50% of the funding before submitting the name. He said that he believed that needed to be thought out a little bit more because if someone gives money and he/she wants to get a building named for themselves they have no incentive to give half of the money and without the guarantee of the naming. He then thanked the Board for allowing him to make those points. Chair Jenkins said that those were good points and reminded the Board that Regent Tarbutton's last point would not be voted on in August. He then asked Ms. Daniels to take those comments into consideration as she worked on the procedures.

Chair Jenkins asked if there were anymore questions, at which time Regent Bernard directed his fellow Regents to the last paragraph in Section 901.07 which read, "the University System chief facilities officer reports periodically to the Board on the history of places, facilities, and interior space namings including the status of fundraising." Regent Bernard stated that this was probably already done on a historical basis of archiving, but he thought that the Board might need a policy in place that required the chief facilities officer to archive all names, place names as well as interior space names, that are reported to the chief facilities officer. He said that he was not trying to give Ms. Daniels more job requirements, but when he read the policy, he said it did not seem anyone is required to historically archive those namings in one place. Regent Bernard added that as people move and die it seems that the Board might want to require itself to do that. Ms. Daniels stated that the staff has a good starting point because in preparation for this item they did do a history going back a number of years based on Board agenda action where namings were presented. She stated that they do not currently have the interior namings, but they would certainly look into that as well. Chair Jenkins asked Ms. Daniels to add a sentence to the policy that reads, "University System chief facilities officer shall archive or record all names and report periodically" or something to that effect. Ms. Daniels agreed to do so.

Chair Jenkins thanked her and asked if there were any further questions. There being none, he took the opportunity to remind the Regents that they had until July 10th to communicate specific comments that they would like incorporated for consideration at the August meeting to any of the three presenters and/or in writing to Mr. Stark. Chair Jenkins then called for a motion to close the Committee of the Whole. The motion was made and seconded.

Regent Jenkins then yielded the floor back to Chair Vigil.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Wednesday, June 13, 2007, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Allan Vigil, called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Vigil, were Vice Chair William H. Cleveland and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbuton, III, and Richard L. Tucker.

RECOGNITION OF ERIN HAMES

Chair Vigil asked the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy, to introduce Ms. Erin Hames.

Ms. Murphy stated that after graduating from the University of Georgia's College of Education, Ms. Hames taught at Wakefield Middle School in Raleigh, North Carolina for three years. There she was named "First Year Teacher of the Year" and served on the School Improvement Team. Upon leaving North Carolina, Ms. Hames returned to her home state where she enrolled in law school at Georgia State University; her expected graduation date is May 2008. While in law school Erin has worked in Governor Perdue's office as both a Legal Intern and a Legal Fellow until her recent appointment to Education Policy Analyst.

Ms. Hames thanked the Board and said that she was happy to be at today's meeting. She stated that Governor Perdue is very supportive of what the Board is doing and that she was just happy to be there to witness the proceedings. She thanked the Board again for having her as a guest and then took her seat. The audience applauded.

Chair Vigil welcomed Ms. Hames, stating that the Board looked forward to working with her on behalf of Governor Perdue and encouraged her to enjoy the meeting.

SAFETY BRIEFING

The Director of Management and Operations for Real Estate and Facilities, Sandra L. Neuse, gave the Regents and audience a briefing of basic safety information in the event of an emergency.

Later that morning Chair Vigil asked the Chancellor to give a follow-up to the announcement made during that morning's safety briefing. Chancellor Davis stated that the earlier announcement regarding the FBI's increased vigilance regarding terrorism on college campuses was meant to provide general information on what was going on nationally. As some people were now calling into the System Office with questions about an eminent terrorist threat, he asked Ms. Neuse to take the podium and clarify the earlier announcement, which she did.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, June 13, 2007, by Secretary Julia M. Murphy, who announced that Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr. had asked for and been given permission to absent on that day.

INVOCATION

Regent Felton Jenkins gave the following invocation: Our most gracious heavenly father, we come before you again today, as we did yesterday, offering the same three prayers. First we offer a prayer of thanksgiving for your graciousness to all of us, for the blessings of this day, and especially for the opportunity to serve in the various capacities that we serve. Second, we ask your forgiveness for our errors and omissions, our mistakes, and our failures, forgive us. Finally, we ask your guidance and direction in all that we do here today and as we go forth from this place, as we undertake the tasks that you have given us to do. Now, may the words of our mouths and meditations of our hearts, and the actions of lives be acceptable in thy sight, oh Lord, our strength and redeemer. Amen.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: STRATEGIC PLANNING

Chair Vigil stated that the Strategic Planning Committee would now meet as a Committee of the Whole. He then turned the floor over to Regent Cleveland the Chair of the Committee. Chair Cleveland convened the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. He stated that the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, and President John Randolph “Randy” Pierce of Georgia Highlands College would present an information item about the second goal in the strategic plan, creating additional enrollment capacity.

Mr. Watts thanked Chair Cleveland and stated that they were continuing the recent practice of having an information item on one aspect of the strategic plan. In April, the Board heard a presentation on restructuring the core curriculum. This month, the presentation focused on the second goal, creating additional enrollment capacity. President Randy Pierce of Georgia Highlands College chaired the planning team on the second goal. The Associate Vice Chancellor, Strategic Research & Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, the Director of Planning for Facilities, Alan Travis, and the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, participated in the research and analysis. Mr. Watts explained that they were present to help answer any questions at the end of the presentation. Mr. Watts advised the Board that although they would, of course, answer questions at the Chair’s pleasure, it may be more useful to hold questions until the end of the presentation. He also noted that they might want to refer to the printed copy of the maps in their Board materials when Dr. Pierce reached the map section of the presentation, adding that the resolution may be a bit better.

Mr. Watts then gave background on strategic goal two. He said that with the exception of Regent Bernard, the full Board had seen the graph displayed in the presentation before. The best estimates indicate that the System needs to prepare for up to 100,000 additional students by 2020. This estimate is based on current population growth trends and does not assume an increase in the high

school graduation rate or an increase in the rate of non-traditional students going to college. If those rates increase, which some predict, then this may be a conservative estimate. The good news is that the demand side of the equation will be very strong. There will be plenty of students for every single one of the System's institutions to grow. The question is not whether the System will grow, but whether the Board and System Office staff wants to plan this growth and use this opportunity to shape the System.

Mr. Watts said that they would discuss three facets of the Board's second goal at this meeting. 1) Increasing the use of access institutions in underserved areas. Access institutions are the System's state colleges and two-year colleges. 2) Increasing the use of comprehensive universities and further developing a robust tier of comprehensive universities to retain more students in Georgia. 3) Expanding the joint use of facilities where feasible and productive.

Next, Mr. Watts discussed University System of Georgia enrollment by sector. He stated that the enrollment pattern in the System is different from that of many states because the University System of Georgia uses its access institutions and comprehensive universities less than others. The usual pattern is more triangular in shape. Last year, in fiscal year ("FY") 2007, the System spent approximately \$4,500 in state funds for each full-time equivalent student in the access sector; \$5,500 for each full-time equivalent student in the comprehensive university sector; and almost double that on each full-time equivalent student in the research university sector. It is cost effective to use the access colleges and comprehensive universities to meet enrollment demand if they are an appropriate academic fit for a student.

The System Office's planning recognizes several assumptions, issues, and constraints. Even with the new capital model, they know that funding for new facilities will be limited and that it is more efficient to build capacity appropriately within existing institutions. Within the access sector, for example, Georgia Perimeter College, which operates five campuses, does so at a lower cost per student than the sector average. Research universities will continue to grow somewhat, and perhaps change in their mix over time of lower division, upper division, and graduate students, but the System Office staff does not anticipate dramatic growth in this sector. In some part, because the growth in students will not be in the highest SAT ranges, the academic fit for the bulk of these students will be at the comprehensive universities and access colleges.

Mr. Watts stated that it is not always easy to define access. At one time, it was defined by geographic distance—having a college within a certain number of miles of any resident. He said that everyone who had driven to the meeting today knew, though, in certain parts of the state, distance is less important than travel time. If a student cannot get to a location after work to attend an evening class, then it does not matter how few miles away it may be. On the other hand, he added, the System cannot make convenience an absolute standard. The state and the System cannot afford to build and operate a campus at every crossroads in Georgia. The Board and System Office need to maintain a System-wide perspective, rather than an institution-centered perspective. To avoid duplication and inter-institutional competition, geographic responsibilities of access institutions, particularly in the metropolitan Atlanta area need to be clarified.

Mr. Watts continued stating that they need to ensure that whatever they do in the short-term to expand also permits growth over the long term. This influences discussions about land, building design, and the like. While they can project numbers of students, it is less easy to project how many biology majors there may be at a particular place. For example, many students at access institutions are undecided regarding a major during their first two years. Additionally, he said the System has to confront the barriers to effective institutional partnerships. Historically, the joint use of facilities is not acknowledged in the capital or budget processes.

At this time, Mr. Watts turned the floor over to Dr. Pierce to discuss the current population trends around the state and in metropolitan Atlanta and the challenges they present.

Dr. Pierce thanked Mr. Watts, members of the Board, and Chancellor Davis. He stated that this has been a fascinating opportunity for him to look at the trends and data. He said it has also been a pleasure to work with the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, Director of Planning for Real Estate and Facilities, Alan Travis, Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, and, of course, Mr. Rob Watts.

Dr. Pierce then began explaining each map that appeared in the presentation. He said the first map showed projected population growth from 2006 to 2020 by county. He explained that the darker the color, the larger the growth in population. The map showed that growth is expected all across the state, but not at the same rates or magnitude in every area.

The next map showed the population growth by region. All regions, he said show growth. More modest growth of up to 25,000 new residents is projected in the east Georgia region, in the southwest Georgia region, in the Columbus region, and in the southeast and southwestern fringes of Atlanta. Moderate growth of up to 40,000 new residents is projected in the Macon/Warner Robins region, in the Augusta region, in the south Georgia region, and in the northeast Georgia region. More significant growth of up to 65,000 new residents is projected in the northwest Georgia region and in the coastal Georgia region. Profound growth of up to 1.1 million new residents is projected in the Atlanta region. Dr. Pierce noted that 75% of all the state's growth to 2020 is projected to occur in the Atlanta region.

Given this growth, Dr. Pierce stated that they know they have some access challenges in several areas of the state. For example, there are no access colleges in the Columbus region, Augusta region, and Savannah region. At the present time, Columbus State University, Augusta State University, and Savannah State University play dual roles. They are comprehensive universities, but owing to the absence of a local access institution, they also admit under-prepared students in their university college programs. As these areas grow and these institutions reach a certain size and want to focus on their comprehensive university mission, Dr. Pierce said the System will have to make plans to provide access for students needing a two-year or state college. Columbus State University, he pointed out, is at that point now. They have reached a size that makes sense for them to concentrate on their comprehensive university mission. In the planning process, the System will need to designate one of its access institutions to work with Columbus State in order to serve the access

mission in the Columbus area. In the future, Augusta State and Savannah State may reach this same point in their development. He added that the growth in metro Atlanta will also require additional access locations.

Dr. Pierce then said it was time to look more closely at the Atlanta region. He referred to a map that showed population growth in metro Atlanta by sub-regions and county to 2020. Again, he explained that the darker the color, the larger the growth. The Athens/Oconee area and the far southern area of around Lamar County, he stated, are growing at the most moderate numbers and rates, but only relatively speaking. Each of these two regions will add from 10,000 to 20,000 new residents by 2020. Every other region in the metro Atlanta area will add from 160,000 to 250,000 new residents by 2020.

Dr. Pierce further stated that some of the individual county growth numbers are extremely dramatic. He cited the following examples:

County	Projected Growth
Douglas	25,000 (or more new residents)
Paulding	41,000
Clayton	46,000
Cherokee	54,000
Forsyth	55,000
Henry	61,000
DeKalb	91,000
Cobb	118,000
Fulton	160,000
Gwinnett	207,000

He added that 14 of every 100 new residents in Georgia between now and 2020 will live in Gwinnett County alone.

Dr. Pierce continued stating that in those locations where there are already institutions, they can expect those institutions to become larger. However, looking at the future, they can see that they have or will have need for additional access in the far northern suburbs, in in-town and south Atlanta, and in the west, southwest, and south suburbs. Like the other areas with limited access noted on the statewide map, these general areas in metro Atlanta need to be on the System's planning horizon.

He further stated that solutions to meeting the needs of these underserved areas must involve most of the metro-area institutions. As no one institution can possibly meet this demand, there will be opportunities for all. In addition, some of the existing locations in the metro area are in the very early stages of their development and present obvious opportunities for future expansion. Dr. Pierce then named the following three examples, Georgia Gwinnett College, The Newton Campus of Georgia Perimeter, and the Bartow Campus of Georgia Highlands.

At this time Dr. Pierce turned the floor back over to Mr. Watts to discuss additional planning needs. As Mr. Watts reached the podium, Chancellor Davis asked him to take a moment to put the current size of the school population in Gwinnett into perspective. Mr. Watts stated that the Gwinnett County Public School population is over 160,000, which is a larger number than the entire county populations of 148 of Georgia's 159 counties: a massive school system and a very good school system.

Mr. Watts stated that this discussion comes at an excellent time because the institutions and the Board are thinking right now about longer-term capital needs and plans. Apart from creating a need to expand the reach of our access institutions in under-served areas, this growth gives the System a great opportunity to develop its comprehensive universities further. By creating a more robust tier of limited doctoral-granting institutions, which currently includes Georgia Southern, Valdosta, West Georgia, and Kennesaw, the System can retain more well-prepared students in Georgia. The System's fifteen comprehensive universities currently range in size from just over 2,000 to approximately 20,000 students. By 2020, they will be larger, some much larger.

Mr. Watts pointed out that the System also has the opportunity for more distinct missions for its comprehensive universities. At the present time, there is the leadership and military mission at North Georgia College & State University, the technology mission at Southern Polytechnic State University, the liberal arts mission at Georgia College & State University, and the HBCU mission at Savannah State University, Albany State University, and Fort Valley State University. Other institutions, he said, may want to explore mission differentiation.

Furthermore, the System can optimize facility use through effective partnerships between comprehensive universities and access institutions. Mr. Watts stated that if they think strategically and comprehensively about solutions in higher-growth areas, one option is a joint effort by two institutions working together. He noted that this is happening in some areas of the State already, adding that they should develop a model for how this should work most effectively for all parties.

Additionally, there are clearly opportunities for institutions with excess capacity. Mr. Watts said that while they only have a limited ability to engineer student choices, some share of the enrollment demand in the metro Atlanta area can be shifted to other areas. Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, and Valdosta State University have shown this.

Next, Mr. Watts discussed the growth in terms of the strategic capital model. The Board's strategic capital model allocates 25% of the GO bond investment over the next six years to targeted strategic needs. Creating capacity is one of those strategic needs, along with research and meeting workforce needs in critical fields, such as the health sciences. With respect to creating capacity, the strategic capital allocation can be used to: 1) improve access in underserved areas; 2) expand institutions in high-growth areas; 3) develop comprehensive universities; 4) promote joint use of facilities; and 5) tap excess capacity.

Mr. Watts reminded the Board that this was simply an information item and no action was being requested at this time. He said that at the appropriate time, the System Office would recommend a process in which Chancellor Davis would designate a lead access institution in the Atlanta sub-regions and in other selected areas. The Chancellor would specify the critically underserved areas. Some of these areas, such as the area west, southwest, south and southeast of Atlanta, may require the engagement of multiple institutions. The Chancellor would also establish guidelines for institutions to use as they develop proposals, including the required academic plans, budget plans, participation by local communities, and the like.

Mr. Watts further explained that the lead access institutions would work with the University System of Georgia comprehensive university partners—and, in some cases, research university partners and the local communities—to develop comprehensive solutions to creating capacity. The System Office staff would then establish an integrated, streamlined approach to capacity planning and implementation. The Chancellor would recommend to the Board any new sites or significant expansions at existing campuses and sites. The Board would make final decisions on new sites and significant expansions at existing campuses and sites and on capital investments, including strategic bond allocations.

In closing, Mr. Watts stated that the high school class of 2020 would enter school a year from now. The System's task is to be prepared when the class of 2020 graduates are ready for college. He said that they could allow inertial forces to determine the System's growth, or they could shape it more intentionally, making better use of their cost-effective access institutions, developing the potential of their comprehensive universities, and optimizing the use of facilities through joint-use agreements. He reiterated that the System needs room for at least 100,000 more students. The process of creating capacity should be coordinated at the System level by the Chancellor and the Board to maximize the impact of System resources. From coastal Georgia to the mountains, the future prosperity of all regions of the state is linked to the University System.

Mr. Watts said that the staff would come back at the August Board meeting and ask that the Board authorize the Chancellor to move forward. He then opened the floor for questions.

Chair Cleveland recognize Regent Potts who asked Mr. Watts if he would venture to estimate what the number might look like with the Department of Education's ("DOE") anticipated increase in high school graduation on top of this systemic growth. Mr. Watts said that he did not have a good estimate of that, but that it is certainly not insignificant. Regent Potts stated that 100,000 was a low number. Mr. Watts agreed and said that if the DOE is able to move the high school graduation rate up to 85% or 90% from where it is now to meet their goal it would be a significantly larger number of graduates than the System Office is estimating now. Chancellor Davis added that the System Office staff will plan for alternative outcomes. He added that the current plan also does not make any assumptions about rate of increases about Hispanic populations. While they have picked a conservative planning target, he said, they would not do point planning. Instead, they will look at various options and alternatives.

Chair Cleveland asked if there were any other questions. He then recognized Regent Bernard who asked if the System staff liaisons with Metropolitan Planning Organizations (“MPOs”), transportation agencies, and the economic development agencies around the state so that they are coordinated in their approach of where expansion is needed. He noted that it sounded as if one of the problems that Mr. Watts mentioned was not just distance, but also time and asked again if they were working with these other agencies as part of this plan. Mr. Watts said that they were. He stated that University System staff participates in all of those interagency councils and committees, especially those concerned with economic development and the things that he mentioned. Mr. Watts stated that he is not the person who does that, but there are people who do and give reports back to the Chancellor. Chancellor Davis added that one of the System’s somewhat unique problems is that its capacity is not necessarily—although it is in large part—it is not necessarily driven by an indigenous population because they want people to come from different parts of the state. Therefore they have to make product offerings, particularly at comprehensive universities, more unique and differentiable and attractive to get people to come where they think the System will have capacity and where they can best serve the needs. So the problem is slightly different and depends on more than what is going on in a local population.

As there were no other questions, Chair Cleveland thanked Mr. Watts and turned the floor back over to Chair Vigil. Chair Vigil thanked them for their presentation.

PRESENTATION: SYSTEM LEVEL PROJECTS (STEM)

Chair Vigil invited the Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Carlton Brown, President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Jan Kettlewell, to make their presentation on the System-level projects.

Dr. Brown greeted the Board and said it was a pleasure to have an opportunity to bring one of the System-wide projects before them. He said that he and the staff have shared on several occasions the many things that they are doing with System-wide projects, with nine currently active and a number prepared to be launched now.

Before he introduced the current project, he said he would first address another project which was in line with the FBI announcement made during the safety briefing and articles in local and national papers concerning murders and killings on campuses, which are, of course, a byproduct of what occurred at Virginia Tech. He stated that the staff wanted to make sure that the Board understood that before that crisis developed, one of the first System-wide projects designated was one that dealt with emergency preparedness on all System campuses. Even before that, the System had established a template for every campus to develop its emergency operations and all of its disaster planning. Dr. Brown said that what the committee has done is attempt to take all of that up to its finest point for each campus. He said that one of the issues that the Virginia Tech tragedy raised and that the article he read that morning in USA Today also raised, is that some campuses where these kinds of disasters have occurred have been cited for knowing that there was a problem and either not taking action or not feeling able to take action. Dr. Brown stated that one of the next projects that the System will

launch has to do with looking at all of the issues relative to student health and behavioral issues which will effect how they deal with counseling, how they handle students who present certain behavioral problems. The project will try to work with the entire System to move a plan forward in that regard. He said that he wanted to let the Board know that before going into today's topic.

Dr. Brown said that the System-wide project on science, technology, engineering and math ("STEM") was the first full project brought before the Board in which the System Office is moving forward. The initial report, he said, was fully endorsed and funded and now ready to move into the implementation phase. Dr. Brown said that this project is first for two reasons. Firstly, it finished first in the first phase with a lot of fire and drive from its leadership with Dr. Patton and Dr. Kettlewell. Secondly, it promises to be a project that will have a tremendous impact on how Georgia addresses the major national problem regarding science, technology, engineering and math. He said that the Chancellor foreshadowed to the Board in his opening remarks what some of the issues are by mentioning how few physics teachers have been prepared by the University System of Georgia and by many other systems. He said what they hoped to bring to the Board at this meeting is what this System will do to address those problems over the next several years. With that introduction, Dr. Brown asked Dr. Patton to begin the presentation.

Dr. Patton greeted the Board and stated that he was speaking today as chair of the Presidents' Initiative on Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics, also known as "STEM." He said that he would set the stage for this presentation and that Dr. Kettlewell would present the details.

Dr. Patton stated that the charge that the committee received from the Chancellor was three-fold:

- To increase the number of K-12 students interested in science, technology, engineering, and mathematics.
- To increase the number of students in college who pursue the STEM disciplines.
- To increase the number of teachers prepared who are better able to keep K-12 students in the STEM pipeline.

He then listed the other members of the committee which included: President David A. Bell, Macon State College; President Thomas Z. Jones, Armstrong Atlantic State University; Vice President for Educational Affairs Virginia Michelich, Georgia Perimeter College; Dr. Paul A. Ohme, the Principal Research Scientist for the Center for Education Integrating Science, Mathematics, and Computing ("CEISM"), Georgia Institute of Technology; President Daniel S. Papp, Kennesaw State University; and President Lisa Rossbacher, Southern Polytechnic State University. Dr. Patton chaired the committee. Dr. Patton also noted that Ronald J. Henry, Provost and Vice President of Academic Affairs at Georgia State University, and Jan Kettlewell, Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives in the University System Office, served as key staff members for the committee. He said that Dr. Kettlewell and Dr. Henry were well positioned for this work because they serve as principal investigators for the large University System of Georgia National Science Foundation grant for Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics ("PRISM").

Before he turned the presentation over to Dr. Kettlewell, President Patton highlighted a few of the areas she would touch upon that the committee found so compelling. He said that the University System is graduating so few students in the STEM fields that it is losing its competitiveness. He said the System is preparing way too few math and science teachers. He further stated that there is a pipeline problem, explaining that in high school not enough students are taking upper level science and math courses that would allow them to pursue these fields in college. He said that the supply problem is getting so severe that Georgia has to rely upon other states and countries for its math and science teachers. He said that the committee is proposing an integrated approach to these problems, but did not reinvent the wheel. Dr. Patton said that as a national expert on STEM, Dr. Kettlewell would give the Board the details of a three-part strategy proposed by the committee to: influence K-12 students to prepare for STEM disciplines in college, increase the success of STEM majors in the System, and produce more and better science and math teachers for our K-12 schools. He then turned the podium over to Dr. Kettlewell.

Dr. Kettlewell greeted the Board and began the presentation with a brief overview of the problems that the committee is trying to solve. Firstly, the System is graduating too few students in the STEM fields which include: Life Sciences, Chemistry, Physics, Geology, Mathematics, Computer Science, Engineering, and Engineering Technology. For example, she said that the System graduated slightly more than 1400 students in engineering in fiscal year (“FY”) 2006. She then noted that China and India produce close to a million engineers annually, while the U.S. and Europe combined produce 170,000 annually. She said that about 35% of their undergraduate college degrees are in engineering and the natural sciences accordingly to a UC Berkeley study. Dr. Kettlewell continued stating that the percentage of University System Bachelor of Science (“BS”) degrees in engineering, engineering, technology, and the natural sciences is about 8%. She then referred the Regents to a slide on the System’s production in engineering technology, mathematics and in the physical sciences. She asked that they note that in mathematics the number is less than 1% of total System BS degree graduates. She then reiterated that the University System of Georgia is preparing too few science and mathematics teachers.

Dr. Kettlewell stated that too few System students succeed in their required introductory science and mathematics courses in the freshman and sophomore years. In mathematics it is about 50% in Georgia and nationally. In high school, not enough students are taking upper level science and mathematics courses to adequately prepare them for college. She then directed their attention to a slide which showed a “close up view” of the magnitude of teacher shortages in science and mathematics in the Georgia Public Schools. Dr. Kettlewell stated that, according to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission Workforce Report 2006, about 45% of Georgia’s teachers come from out of state. She further stated that if the University System and private colleges in Georgia do not prepare the balance, the schools will put less than qualified teachers in the classroom. On average, if the System met its targets, it would be meeting about 15% of need. She said that these estimates were determined from current vacancies, increased number of new teachers needed for the projected 13.4% growth in student enrollment, and projected teacher attrition.

Dr. Kettlewell stated that the Board might recall from previous presentations she has made that the

quality of the teacher is the most significant variable in affecting what K-12 students do and do not learn in school. The second most important variable is the quality of the curriculum. She said that these problems are systemic. She further stated that the P-12 schools and University System intersect in two important ways. The first is student flow. The students move through the P-12 schools, and then into and through the University System of Georgia. The second is teachers. College students in the University System prepare to become teachers and then move into the public schools to teach the next generation of P-12 students. She said the purpose of the diagram shown in the slide is to illustrate that continuous flow. Dr. Kettlewell emphasized that this is not a K-12 problem, or a University System problem, it is the state's problem. She said that if the STEM problems are viewed within this framework, the connections become clear. Within the P-12 schools, the science and math courses students take in high school will have a direct bearing upon their success in science and mathematics introductory courses in college, which in turn will influence how many of these students will become STEM majors in college. Within the University System, how the introductory courses are taught will influence how many students wish to become science and math teachers in the schools. The University System's continued engagement with P-12 teachers in their ongoing professional development will also have a bearing on the quality of teaching that goes on in the public schools, which in turn will influence the preparation of the public school students for college.

The sources for the STEM strategies presented by Dr. Kettlewell came from research; lessons learned in the PRISM initiative; and lessons learned in the Mathematics, Engineering, and Science Achievement ("MESA") initiative. The research used to develop the STEM strategies includes studies from the University of California, Berkeley and the Business-Higher Education Forum. PRISM is the System's comprehensive Research and Development grant from the National Science Foundation ("NSF") in four geographic regions of Georgia. It involves 7 System institutions and 15 school districts and the System Office and the Georgia Department of Education at the state level. PRISM has had three external reviews by NSF and for the critical site visit received the highest possible rating. MESA, which started in California, and involved Georgia Perimeter College and Darton College in Georgia. Dr. Kettlewell said that from these studies, the STEM Committee adopted three sets of strategies which are designed to: 1) influence K-12 student preparation for and interest in majoring in STEM in college; 2) increase the success of STEM majors in college; and 3) produce more and better science and mathematics teachers for the schools, which in turn will lead to increased preparation of K-12 students in STEM fields. Dr. Kettlewell said that she would talk about the STEM strategies within these three categories. The following is a summary of those points.

Category 1: Strategies designed to influence K-12 student preparation for and interest in majoring in STEM in college.

Strategy 1: The University System can continue its partnership with the Georgia Department of Education and support the work of the current state school superintendent who is trying to raise the requirements for high school graduation. The System will advocate for all high school graduates to complete four years of mathematics, and four years of science, in order to earn a regular high school diploma. Through Georgia's participation in the American Diploma Project, the expected level of proficiency is to meet national benchmarks.

Strategy 2: The University System will replicate the PRISM Public Awareness Campaign to influence middle and high school students' course-taking patterns by positively altering their perceptions about science and mathematics, and to reinforce parental and guardian involvement to increase students' interest in science and mathematics. This strategy is about building aspirations. It will include replicating all of the PRISM materials statewide that have been used in just four regions of the state. External funds will be raised to replicate the billboards, radio, and television spots.

Strategy 3: The University System will replicate the PRISM Academy for Future Teachers of Science and Mathematics throughout the University System of Georgia. To date in the PRISM Academy there have been 259 participants (99% minority) indicate plans to attend college. The first two students from this program who have graduated from high school started at Georgia State University this fall, one majoring in mathematics, one in the sciences.

Category 2: Strategies designed to increase the success of STEM majors in college.

Strategy 4: The University System will replicate Project MESA, which focuses on underrepresented groups. Georgia would be second only to California in offering this program statewide. In California, the initiative is at community colleges as feeders of STEM majors to the senior institutions. One hundred percent of the MESA community college students who transfer to four-year institutions are in math-based majors.

Dr. Kettlewell discussed the next three strategies together because they focus on the introductory courses in science and mathematics. She said that presently students view these introductory courses as “gatekeeper” courses. It is the committee’s goal for them to become “gateway” courses. They want to work on helping faculty change their teaching methods. She said that the students do need to work harder, but the faculty and staff could also do some things to help them have greater success.

Strategy 5: The University System will replicate the PRISM state-level Institute on the Teaching and Learning of Science and Mathematics throughout the System to focus on teaching college introductory courses in mathematics and the sciences. Introductory courses hold the key to student success for those seeking degrees in STEM and for prospective science and mathematics teachers. Through this strategy faculty members will develop teaching methods that have been shown to be more effective, while maintaining high standards and expectations.

Strategy 6: The University System will set targets as to the percent of students completing the introductory science and math courses with a grade of A, B, or C, and the percent of students who withdraw.

Strategy 7: The University System will participate in a national project, Mathematics Success, to determine what works and what does not work to improve student success in Developmental Mathematics, College Algebra, Pre-calculus, and Calculus I.

Strategy 8: The University System will set annual institutional production targets for baccalaureate

degrees conferred in the STEM disciplines, FY 2007-FY 2013, and make reaching these targets high institutional priorities.

Category 3: Strategies designed to produce more and better science and math teachers for the schools which in turn will lead to increased preparation of K-12 students in STEM fields.

Strategy 9: The University System will establish a structured “mini-grant” program for STEM and science and mathematics education faculty to collaborate in learning communities with K-12 teachers and for STEM faculty to work on increasing student understanding of the subject matter in introductory science and mathematics courses. In PRISM, when science, mathematics, and science and mathematics education faculty members participated in K-16 learning communities, teachers changed their teaching practices, elementary teachers increased content knowledge, and higher education faculty learned techniques for diagnosing student difficulties in college courses. Despite the new Regents’ Policy, Work in Schools, which is intended to recognize and reward faculty for such work, it will be necessary initially to provide faculty with the incentives to do this work until the campus culture changes to one that values it.

Strategy 10: The University System will replicate Project FOCUS from PRISM—a project where undergraduate science and mathematics majors get exposed to teaching in the public schools through working with elementary students.

Strategy 11: The University System will ask each System institution to complete an annual self assessment on changes within the institutional culture toward optimizing the intent of the new Board Policy “Work in the Schools”.

Strategy 12: The University System will set teacher production targets in science and mathematics for middle grades and high school teachers, FY 2008-FY 2013, and make reaching these targets high institutional priorities.

Dr. Kettlewell drew the Regents’ attention to the next slide which showed all 12 strategies. She said that it is important for them to note that the strategies are not isolated. They cannot just lop one off and forget about it because it is the connections across the three major categories, listed above that can make this happen. Moving to the next slide, Dr. Kettlewell showed a picture of the STEM Initiative logo and stated that the name of the STEM Initiative is Math + Science = Success. This name and logo were developed and tested through market research through the PRISM grant, and it resonates with elementary and high school students. Dr. Kettlewell stated that implementation would be led by President Patton and the System Office of P-16 Initiatives would continue to support him in that implementation. She further stated that the implementation would be done in phases, noting that the Chancellor has designated \$1.6 million for FY 2008 to start the first three strategies. The first strategy, to influence high school course taking requirements, is not a financial item. It is a matter of continuing the System’s partnership and support for the work of the Department of Education. The second strategy is to jump start increased production of STEM majors through the System’s access institutions through MESA, as described earlier in the presentation. The third strategy for FY 2008 is

to jump start both the increased production of STEM graduates and science and mathematics teachers through the hiring of increased faculty members in these fields to increase capacity. The balance of the strategies would begin in FY 2009, assuming funding is available.

Dr. Kettlewell then stated that while there will be some leading indicators of progress, ultimately the success of this initiative will be determined by the numbers. She then directed their attention to a slide showing the production targets. She stated that she did not list all of the production targets on the slide, but she wanted to give them a few examples. She explained that the numbers on the chart represented actual degrees awarded in FY 2006 and their target for 2013. She said that FY 2013 was chosen as the target date to give a five year window from FY 2008. Dr. Kettlewell continued to explain the chart showing how success would be measured by the numbers. For example, in FY 2006, the number of BS degrees awarded in STEM disciplines was 4,726. The goal by the target, FY 2013 is 7,200. Targets were set in each of the following areas:

- BS Degrees in STEM Disciplines
- BS Degrees in Mathematics
- BS Degrees in Physical Sciences
- Middle School Teachers in Mathematics
- Middle School Teachers in Science
- High School Teachers in Mathematics
- High School Teachers in Science
- Grades of A, B, and C in Introductory Science and Mathematics Courses
- High School Students Taking Rigorous Science and Mathematics Courses

Dr. Kettlewell said that, in a nutshell, that was a quick walk through STEM. She said she tried to outline what the problems are, where the committee's strategies came from, what they are going to do, and how they are going to hold themselves accountable. She then asked if there were any questions.

Regent Pittard addressed Dr. Kettlewell and President Patton, saying that in business there is a saying that what gets paid gets done. He then asked if they were confining themselves and their thoughts to the boundaries that are on them now. For example, he said, they were not in control of tuition or the HOPE scholarship, which made him question whether or not they were maintaining within that boundary or if they were going everywhere in their thought process. The reason he asked is that he has often been concerned that as good as the HOPE Scholarship is it does not differentiate rigorous academic involvement from other academic involvement. Regent Pittard stated that he was a management degreed BBA, Bachelor of Business Administration, and his roommate was studying physics. Regent Pittard said that what his roommate went through versus what he went through academically was as different as night and day, but in the HOPE Scholarship they were looked at as the same. Regent Pittard stated that his 3.0 grade point average ("GPA") was worth every bit as much as his roommate's 3.0. He then said he wondered if the HOPE Scholarship is a barrier to STEM because people will go to an academic direction that will keep their GPA within the HOPE Scholarship range. He further stated that the rigorous academic necessity of STEM is something that

the System needs to discuss with its partners on the HOPE Scholarship side.

The second point Regent Pittard made was on tuition differentials. Regent Pittard said that this was an area over which the System does have control but does not utilize nearly enough. He stated that if the System has oversubscription in business schools, turning away people who want to be in business school, the businessman in him says that prices need to go up significantly there. However, they need to be offset by pricing going down in those disciplines the System needs students to pour into. Regent Pittard said that if they look at it mathematically, it is neutral revenue. They are neither hurting HOPE nor hurting System institutions. They would be getting the same amount of revenue in if they offset tuition going up with tuition going down in those needed disciplines.

Regent Pittard characterized his final comment as a personal issue that he ran into. His wife's sister is a world renowned marine biologist, a field that is right there in the "sweet spot" of STEM. When she was coming close to retirement from her career which was at the age of 55, Regent Pittard said that she did not receive contact from anyone asking what she was going to do with the rest of her life. He said that she would have been incredibly interested to have heard from the Board of Regents or a high school system about guest lecturing or teaching, so that the students could learn about all of the things that she did, cutting edge research, on the estuaries of Georgia. He said that she could have been asked to come back and teach in Savannah, Brunswick or along the coastal part of the state. He further stated that he did not know how much intellectual capacity the System wastes every year with retirees and with people who end their scientific career at the Savannah River Plant and a hundred other scientific environments throughout the state by not recruiting that second career person into the campuses. Regent Pittard stated that he really does think there is great focus that the System could bring to input-in versus input-out and not always think about how to get the two-year student to be a junior in science. He asked, "What about supporting a 55-year-old coming back and being a junior in science?" Regent Pittard concluded his comments by saying to President Patton, "Let's get outside of the boundaries of what we are allowed to do now and let's make presentations that are going to require that we have changes in HOPE, changes in tuition, an to recruit a different kind of alternative student versus the ones that we have."

President Patton responded by saying that Regent Pittard made a lot of great suggestions and many that his committee has discussed as a group. He said that he took a few notes. Dr. Patton said that he is a guy who believes in pricing, and he thinks they need to address pricing. He then noted that the Board actually did approve an increase in the amount Georgia State University ("GSU") charges for its MBA students and thanked them for that. Regarding Regent Pittard's point about some fields being more difficult than others Dr. Patton stated that the committee has discussed the need to get more support to students who are in those difficult disciplines so that they can succeed in those disciplines and they do not give up and drop out. So although they have not addressed the pricing problem, they have addressed the support problem.

Dr. Patton further stated that he thinks the differential tuition is an important aspect to take a look at, but there is also a national conversation on STEM. Dr. Patton said that at a presidents' meeting he recently attended they discussed having some differential of pay for people who teach in STEM

fields. He said that they had also discussed that as a committee, but did not bring it forward as a recommendation at this meeting. He said that it is something that the committee will take back and talk further about. Dr. Patton added that perhaps people who do go into those fields ought to be paid more. He said that as a committee they had been trying to look at those items that were in their control, but maybe they need to rethink that. Maybe instead of just looking at the things they can control, he said, they should think a little more broadly. Dr. Patton said that he would take that back to the committee.

Dr. Patton then discussed some policies and programs that addressed some of the issues raised by Regent Pittard's comments. Dr. Patton stated that the System has a policy which allows institutions to hire back faculty in critical areas after they retire at 49%. He said that this policy is often utilized. Secondly, he stated that the System does have programs such as GSU's Teacher Education Environments in Mathematics and Science ("TEEMS") program, where they recruit people in a second career into an 18 month program where they become teachers. Dr. Patton added that they do try to reach out and get people who have been in the sciences, engineering, nuclear physicists, and the like to come back. He said that the committee did not incorporate that aspect into their work, but he has made some notes. Dr. Patton added that the kind of comments Regent Pittard made are critical ones, and he supposed the committee would come back and be so bold as to suggest some changes in HOPE. He added that he remembered the last time he testified to a couple of committees here in Georgia about changes in HOPE. He said that suggestions were not very well taken, but he would try again because he is resilient.

Next, Regent Carter asked if the committee had considered whether or not the System has the capacity to absorb the target goal of 4,000 to 5,000 more students in the STEM disciplines. Dr. Kettlewell said that in some institutions and majors yes, at others, no. She stated that part of the funding that has been allocated is to increase faculty capacity where needed to support the increased number of majors. In physics, for example, the System probably has more capacity than in biology because of the relatively low number of physics majors that are currently enrolled. So there is variation by discipline and by institution. Regent Carter then asked if the System is successful in producing additional people within these disciplines is there anything that the System can do to provide or encourage the provision of opportunities for them. He said that he asked because people hear all the time about students earning education degrees who teach for a year or two and find out they cannot make enough money to satisfy their needs. These students then change careers. With this being the case, he asked if there were anything that they could do to pull people toward wanting to not only get educated in these disciplines but to work in those disciplines.

Dr. Patton said that he could respond in two ways. Firstly, he said that earlier he brought up the subject of differential pay which the presidents discussed Monday at a National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges ("NASULGC"), meeting. He said they discussed the concept for differential pay for people in these fields and he thinks that is something that the University System of Georgia needs to discuss. He added that he thinks that is something that the K-12 system needs to discuss as well. Secondly, he said, there is the concept of induction. Dr. Patton said that they practice this at GSU and Dr. Kettlewell is an expert in this area as well. He said that in induction

they try to support their teachers after they graduate and go into teaching. They support them in the first several years to help them become solidly grounded in their profession so they will not leave. Dr. Patton said that while it is true that many teachers leave because of the low pay, other teachers leave because of their feeling that they are not being successful and that it is just not the right field for them. For this reason they try to support their teachers through what they call an induction program. Dr. Patton asked Dr. Kettlewell if she would like to comment further on that point.

Dr. Kettlewell said that she would just agree with Dr. Patton that the transition is important. On the K-12 side, she said that the differential salary is not yet something that Georgia has undertaken, but she thinks it is on everyone's radar screen and people know that at the end of the day, as Regent Pittard said earlier, "What you pay for gets results," so that does have to be taken into consideration. Dr. Kettlewell stated that the Chancellor also had some ideas on this one that he and she talked about. She then asked the Chancellor to join the discussion. Chancellor Davis addressed the Regents saying that their points were good and that the System Office should actually be moving forward with some proposals in the near future consistent with Regent Pittard's price signaling comment. From a teacher remuneration perspective, he said that it has come to the point that people really have to want to teach more as a passion than as an economically viable profession. He said that this is the reason for the high turn over rates. Since we are losing teachers, he said, there have some traditional programs which they could reintroduce/re-enhance such as tuition forgiveness for education graduates who stay and teach for "X" number of years. He said that they could also form partnerships. For example, he said that the System could partner with local communities receive funding to give state bonuses for salary enhancements in critical fields. Chancellor Davis said that he has already asked Dr. Kettlewell to look into and bring forward some ideas in this area, hopefully from a "workforce development" perspective, which seems to always play well in versus a "need" perspective. He said that they could then start to move some of these initiatives forward through the General Assembly, adding that the initiatives would be costly, in the tens of millions of dollars, but that the end product and the goal is worth that. He then assured the Board that the System Office is addressing the issues that the Regents have raised.

Chair Vigil asked if there were any other questions. There being none, President Patton and Dr. Kettlewell thanked the Board for their time and Chair Vigil thanked them for their presentation.

At approximately 10:10 a.m., Chair Vigil announced that the Board would take a ten minute break before convening into their Committees.

COMMITTEE REPORTS

At approximately 10:20 a.m., Chair Vigil stated that Board would now hear Committee reports.

EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at approximately

11:00 a.m. in room 7019. Committee members in attendance were Chair Allan Vigil, Vice Chair William H. Cleveland, and Regents Robert F. Hatcher, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Richard L. Tucker. Chair Vigil reported to the Board that the Committee met and reviewed one information item, which required no action.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Committee on Academic Affairs met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at approximately 4:00 p.m. in room 6041. Committee members in attendance were Chair Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Patrick S. Pittard and Willis J. Potts. The Vice Chair of the Board, Regent William H. Cleveland, was also present. Chair Poitevint reported to the Board that the Committee reviewed 32 items, including two Walk-On items, 25 of which required action. Additionally, 343 regular faculty appointments and personnel issues were reviewed and recommended for approval. Of the total requests, 272 actions were part-time retiree appointments. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Clarification of Mission Statement without Changing Mission or Institutional Sector, Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President James A. Burran that Dalton State College (“DSC”) be authorized to clarify and streamline its current mission statement without changing mission or institutional sector, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: DSC sought to clarify and further streamline its current mission statement without changing mission or institutional sector. Revising the institutional mission statement is a goal identified in Dalton State College’s 2006 – 2010 Strategic Plan. The existing statement dates from 1998, when DSC initially changed sectors from a two-year college to become a state college. The proposed mission statement was approved at the institutional level during DSC’s December 8, 2006 faculty meeting.

Current Mission Statement

Dalton State College serves Northwest Georgia by offering associate, certificate, and targeted baccalaureate programs of study and a wide variety of public service and continuing education activities. Located at the center of the greatest concentration of carpet production in the world, the College is a comprehensive institution; one of only two in the University System authorized to offer a full range of technical programs in addition to the traditional pre-baccalaureate curricula and targeted baccalaureate offerings which meet workforce development needs of the Northwest Georgia area. Through direct and technological collaboration with neighboring technical institutes and other colleges and universities on the one hand, and outreach and cooperation with local preschool, primary, and secondary systems on the other, Dalton State College acts as an educational broker to meet the needs of business and industry and to provide opportunities for all persons within its service

area to live self-fulfilling and productive lives.

Dalton State College shares with the other state colleges of the University System of Georgia the following core characteristics or purposes:

- a commitment to excellence and responsiveness within a scope of influence defined by the needs of the local area and by particularly outstanding programs and distinctive characteristics that have a magnet effect throughout the region or state;
- a commitment to a teaching/learning environment, both inside and outside the classroom, that sustains instructional excellence, functions to provide University System access for a diverse student body, and promotes high levels of student learning;
- a high quality general education program that supports a variety of well-chosen associate programs and prepares students for transfer to baccalaureate programs, learning support programs designed to insure access and opportunity for a diverse student body, and a limited number of certificate and other career programs to complement neighboring technical institute programs;
- a limited number of baccalaureate programs designed to meet the educational and economic development needs of the local area;
- a commitment to public service, continuing education, technical assistance, and economic development activities that address the needs, improve the quality of life, and raise the economic level within the college's scope of influence;
- a commitment to scholarship and creative work to enhance instructional effectiveness and to encourage faculty scholarly pursuits; and a responsibility to address local needs through applied scholarship, especially in areas directly related to targeted baccalaureate degree programs;
- a supportive campus climate, necessary services, and leadership and development opportunities, all to educate the whole person and meet the needs of students, faculty, and staff;
- cultural, ethnic, racial, and gender diversity in the faculty, staff, and student body, supported by practices and programs that embody the ideals of an open, democratic, and global society;
- technology to advance educational purposes, including instructional technology, student support services, and distance education;
- collaborative relationships with other System institutions, State agencies, local schools, technical institutes, and business and industry, sharing physical, human, information, and other resources to expand and enhance programs and services available to the citizens of Georgia.

In all that it does, Dalton State College strives for the highest possible standards of quality and excellence and systematically assesses and evaluates its effectiveness. Especially in its combination of associate level studies in the liberal arts and targeted baccalaureate degrees with a large complement of career programs in health-related, business, and technical fields; in the quality of its preparation of students for work or further study; and in its role as a broad-based information resource for the people of Northwest Georgia, the College seeks to build upon its strengths and to justify recognition as an academically respected, student-oriented, and community-centered institution.

Proposed Mission Statement

Dalton State College is dedicated to providing broad access to quality higher education for the population of Northwest Georgia, thereby enhancing the region's economic vitality and quality of life. As an institution of the University System of Georgia, Dalton State College offers targeted bachelor's degrees, a full range of associate's degrees and career certificate programs, and a wide variety of public service and continuing education activities. The College's work is strengthened by partnerships between the College and Northwest Georgia businesses and industries, governments, and schools.

The mission of Dalton State College consists of the following core commitments:

- 1) selection, support, and development of a talented, caring faculty and staff dedicated to scholarship and creating an open, cooperative, technologically enhanced learning environment;
- 2) excellence in a learning environment dedicated to serving a diverse student body, promoting high levels of student achievement, and providing a range of educational and student life opportunities and appropriate academic support services;
- 3) public service through continuing education, economic development, and cultural activities that address the needs and improve the quality of life of the region; and,
- 4) continuous improvement in all aspects of its operations through the use of inclusive, participatory planning and meaningful assessment.

In fulfilling its mission, Dalton State College seeks to prepare and inspire its students to be active members within their professions and communities. As Dalton State College looks to the future and its place in a competitive, global society, it seeks to build upon its strengths as an academically respected, student-oriented, and community-centered institution.

2. Establishment of an External Master of Science in Nursing with a Major in Clinical Nurse Leader by the Medical College of Georgia offered at the School of Nursing at Athens ("SONAT"), Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") be authorized to offer an external Master of Science in Nursing with a major in Clinical Nurse Leader at the School of Nursing at Athens ("SONAT"), effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: MCG currently offers the Board of Regents approved Master of Science in Nursing with a major in Clinical Nurse Leader on its Augusta campus. The program offers a distinctive pathway to educate highly competent nurse clinicians in outcomes-based practice. The program is set apart because it is offered as a second degree, accelerated nursing program for individuals already possessing a baccalaureate or higher degree in another non-nursing field or profession. The program

was developed to positively impact shortages in the nursing workforce. The program will not require students to attain a baccalaureate degree in nursing before matriculating into the master's level program. The degree has been identified as a pathway to attract and educate students to become competent nurse clinicians and facilitate quality improvement strategies for enhancing patient healthcare. The program supports the *Healthy People 2010* objective of "access to quality health services" by increasing the workforce pool and intellectual capital of new nursing graduates throughout the state.

Delivery: The School of Nursing at Athens site has already been approved for delivery of the Bachelor of Science in Nursing via distance education technologies. MCG offers undergraduate and graduate level programs at the site. The requisite infrastructure, resources, and programmatic assessment processes have been established and support other nursing programs currently offered at a distance. The SONAT site is equipped and staffed with existing faculty for the didactic delivery of the program. A location and funding for the clinical portion of the curriculum have been secured. Clinical supervision and placements will occur at Athens Regional Hospital.

Need: Significant interest has been identified for this program across the state. To address burgeoning demand, MCG seeks to offer the existing Master of Science in Nursing with a major in Clinical Nurse Leader in Athens.

Objectives: The approved Clinical Nurse Leader program is designed to educate and prepare students to gain the competencies and skills needed as clinical nurses in an accelerated learning environment. The program will provide the essential nursing knowledge needed for graduates to sit for the registered nurse licensure examination ("NCLEX").

Curriculum: The 60-semester-hour program is provided in an accelerated format to accommodate the required pedagogical and clinical content. The program requires that students begin taking such courses as Pathophysiology, Introduction to Epidemiology, Nursing Therapeutics, and Professional Nursing. Students then progress sequentially to taking such courses as Integrated Healthcare, Clinical Leadership and Management, and Multi-system and High-acuity Nursing Practice. The last semester, generally the fourth semester in this accelerated program, is a clinical residency during which the student will be engaged in an intense, nurse-precepted clinical experience.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 8, 12, and 16 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program has been developed with a combination of new and existing courses. The program is currently offered on the Augusta campus of the Medical College of Georgia. President Rahn has provided reverification that establishing the program can be accommodated within funds presently available and through institutional reallocation. SONAT, the distance site, is equipped and staffed with MCG's existing faculty.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success

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

3. Establishment of a Master of Arts in Teaching Programs for Initial Teacher Certification, North Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David Potter that North Georgia College & State University (“NGCSU”) be authorized to establish Master of Arts in Teaching programs for initial certification, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: NGCSU requested the reconfiguration of degrees based on a consensus definition of the Master of Arts in Teaching degree that was reached by a committee of University System of Georgia Deans of Education. The purpose of the Master of Arts in Teaching degree is to offer a master’s degree route to initial teacher certification for individuals who already hold a bachelor’s degree in an academic discipline.

The grid below depicts the existing Master of Education programs and the establishment of Master of Arts in Teaching programs:

<i>Master of Education with Majors in:</i>	<i>Master of Arts in Teaching with Majors in:</i>
Special Education	Special Education
Middle Grades Education	Middle Grades Education
Art Teacher Education	Art Education
Teaching Field - Mathematics	Mathematics Education
Physical Education Teaching and Coaching	Physical Education
Teaching Field - Science	Science Education (Biology, Chemistry, Physics)
Teaching Field – Social Science	History/Social Science Education

The Master of Education programs will continue to be offered as advanced certification degree programs. Such action will address the needs of the community to provide currently certified teachers with advanced knowledge in their intended area of interest. Both the Master of Arts in Teaching degree and the Master of Education programs that offer advanced certification will continue to co-exist and serve the needs of two different constituencies.

4. Establishment of a Master of Arts in African-American Studies, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to establish a Master of Arts in African-American Studies, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: In 1994, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia formally approved the establishment of the African-American Studies department at Georgia State University. During a

relatively short tenure as an academic unit, the Department of African-American Studies has assumed a prominent position on the national landscape in the field of Black Studies. Since fall 2002, the national office of the National Council for Black Studies, the discipline's professional association, has been headquartered in the department. A substantial body of scholarship and research is widely cited based on the material produced by GSU African-American Studies faculty. The department's 50-course curriculum promotes intercultural perspectives at Georgia State University and helped to further generate student interest in a master's level degree program.

Need: The department averages approximately 70 undergraduate majors per year. During fall 2006, departmental courses generated 1,685 credit hours. Approximately 25% of all African-American Studies majors who earned a bachelor's degree have pursued graduate studies in an array of disciplines at such institutions as the University of California, Los Angeles ("UCLA"), The Ohio State University, Temple University, Syracuse University, Georgia State University, and the University of Maryland at College Park. An opportunity for advanced study of the scholarly investigation of people of African descent offers training for future educators and civic leaders. Presently, only 20 African-American Studies graduate programs, 14 masters' and 6 doctor of philosophy programs exist in the nation. Students attending the annual student summit sponsored by the National Council for Black Studies have expressed an interest in pursuing a master's degree in African-American Studies at GSU. The City of Atlanta's rich legacy of African-American culture and research venues will significantly expand training opportunities in African-American Studies. The proposed Master of Arts in African-American Studies is a desirable addition to the graduate program offerings of Georgia State University. The program builds upon the accomplishments of the department's major and is the next logical step in the development of this academic unit. Finally, the projected degree enhances two key goals of the University's strategic plan: 1) to advance interdisciplinary inquiry; and 2) to promote intercultural perspectives.

Objectives: Students who earn a Master of Arts degree in African-American Studies will gain knowledge in the following areas: 1) history and parameters of African-American Studies; 2) theoretical orientations of African-American Studies; 3) methodological approaches used within the discipline; and 4) strategies used to develop community institutions.

Curriculum: The 36-semester-hour program includes such core requirements as Evolution and Scope of African-American Studies, Theories in African-American Studies, Research Methods in African-American Studies, and Black Feminist Thought.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 20, and 23 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: GSU possesses the critical mass of scholars (e.g., seven core faculty members and 15 associate faculty members) to staff a Master of Arts degree in African-American Studies. President Patton has provided reverification that establishing the program can be accommodated within funds presently available.

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

5. Establishment of a Major in Mathematics and Statistics under the Doctor of Philosophy, 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 Mathematics and Statistics under the Doctor of Philosophy degree, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: GSU proposed the establishment of a Doctor of Philosophy ("Ph.D.") with a major in Mathematics and Statistics degree. The program includes concentrations in mathematics, bioinformatics, and biostatistics. The concentrations address the critical need for mathematics faculty as well as the need for highly trained specialists in the areas of bioinformatics and biostatistics. The mathematics concentration will graduate mathematicians with a broad knowledge of the core areas of pure and applied mathematics. The concentrations in bioinformatics and biostatistics will graduate strong bioinformaticians and biostatisticians with a broad background in applied areas for direct placement in business, industry, governmental institutions, and research universities.

Need: The proposed program is an extension of present departmental programs at the bachelor's and master's degree levels. The Department of Mathematics will offer the program such that it builds on the strengths of other instructional and research programs at the master's level. Demographic projections suggest an approximate 24% increase in high school graduates in Georgia over the next 10 years. To fill teaching positions required to address this increase, a substantial number of qualified Ph.D. graduates will be required. Over the last decade, the production of new doctorates in mathematics remained constant, while the annual attrition rate among faculty members has risen from under 1.5% in 1986 to a steady 3% since 1998. Professional organizations such as the American Mathematical Society and the American Statistical Association are reporting at the national level that greater percentages of new Ph.D. graduates are finding employment in business and industry rather than in colleges and universities.

Objectives: For all of the concentration areas, graduates will be required to demonstrate knowledge of the discipline. This includes the ability to understand research problems in one or more areas of mathematics and statistics. Students will gain an appreciation for the history of the subject and the sequence of results that has led to the current state of development of one or more areas of mathematics and statistics. Bioinformatics and biostatistics are interdisciplinary research areas where mathematical and statistical methods and modeling techniques are developed in order to analyze and interpret biological and medical data.

Concentration in Bioinformatics: As biology depends increasingly on data, algorithms, and models it is becoming more quantitative, computational, and mathematical. Bioinformatics is a recently developed mainstream area in response to the needs of the "new biology" – the data-rich methods

and modeling techniques used to analyze biology and related data. Bioinformatics is an information science that underlies advances in chemistry, physics, medicine, agriculture, energy, and pharmaceutical industries. The concentration area includes analysis of genetic data resulting from biological experiments.

Concentration in Biostatistics: Biostatistics is a field that creates and applies methods for quantitative research in medicine and biology. For example, biostatisticians analyze data and create new methods in: 1) the determination of major risk factors for heart disease, lung disease, and cancer; 2) testing new drugs for various diseases; and 3) the evaluation of environmental factors harmful to human health, such as tobacco, asbestos, and environmental pollutants.

Concentration in Mathematics: The mathematics concentration is organized to provide students with knowledge of core areas of mathematics, including analysis, matrix theory, algebra, discrete mathematics, and applied mathematics. These areas are chosen to prepare students to take faculty positions that involve teaching a broad range of courses and to give the students the background to choose and pursue further specialization and thesis work. The areas are also consistent with the current strengths of the department.

Curriculum: The program requires a total of 84 to 87 semester hours for completion depending on a student's prior master's level coursework. Students will be required to take at least 84 semester hours including 54 hours of course work beyond the bachelor's degree and 30 hours of dissertation research. The program will consist of a core of courses and three concentrations: mathematics, bioinformatics, and biostatistics.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 6, 12, and 18 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: President Patton has provided reverification that establishing the program can be accommodated within funds presently available.

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

6. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Nursing, Macon State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell that Macon State College ("MSC") be authorized to offer a Bachelor of Science in Nursing, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: MSC currently offers accredited Associate of Science in Nursing and Registered Nurse to Bachelor of Science in Nursing ("RN-BSN") completion nursing programs. A generic Bachelor of Science in Nursing degree will provide a more direct route for students to earn a baccalaureate degree in a cost-and-time efficient manner. A generic Bachelor of Science in Nursing program at

Macon State College will provide another educational opportunity for qualified students who seek a baccalaureate degree. Graduates of this program will be qualified to provide health care services in the Central Georgia region. The program will assist in meeting the demand for qualified nurses in Georgia. Macon State College has maintained approval for the associate's nursing degree from the Georgia Board of Nursing since 1971 and full accreditation by the National League for Nursing Accreditation Commission ("NLNAC") since 1979. In April 2002, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia granted approval for MSC to offer an RN-BSN completion program. The RN-BSN completion program received full approval from the Georgia Board of Nursing in September 2005, followed by NLNAC initial accreditation in March 2006.

Need: The Bureau of Labor Statistics has projected a national need of more than one million new and replacement and registered nurses by the year 2012. As a result, nursing schools around the country are exploring creative ways to increase student capacity and new student populations. Based on reports from the Georgia Department of Labor, current statistics indicate that hospitals in Georgia currently have over 6,000 openings for new jobs; anticipate a need for over 3,000 new jobs; and will need to fill or replace over 2,000 health care positions. Bibb County alone reports that nursing is the largest growing profession and predicts a need for an additional 1,130 registered nurses by year 2012 to meet current health care needs. Student demand for nursing education is evidenced by the number of applications received by MSC for its existing program (e.g., over 300 applicants for 50 available seats each year for the past five years) and the request by students for additional cohorts.

Objectives: Graduates of the proposed program will be expected to complete the following: 1) incorporate and evaluate caring behaviors in professional practices with clients, peers, self, and other health care providers; 2) evaluate research for use in professional practice; 3) collaborate on the analysis of issues related to health policy and evaluate evidence-based outcomes of health care; 4) apply ethical, legal, and regulatory standards of professional nursing in practice and decision-making; 5) perform nursing skills competently; and 6) apply principles of leadership and client advocacy in the delivery of nursing care focused on health promotion, restoration, and maintenance for individuals across the life span.

Curriculum: The MSC program will be a four-year professional program leading to initial nurse licensure. The program is based on a foundation of 60 hours of humanities, social sciences, physical sciences, and mathematics. Faculty who currently teach in the RN-BSN program are qualified to implement and teach in the proposed program.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates robust enrollments of 180, 200, and 240 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: Facilities and student resources are adequate and will not need to be duplicated for this program. President Bell has verified that the program can be established within funds presently available.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success

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

7. Establishment of a Master of Business Administration at a Site in Forsyth, North Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David Potter that North Georgia College & State University ("NGCSU") be authorized to establish a new Master of Business Administration degree at a site in Forsyth County, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: NGCSU sought approval to offer a new degree, the Master of Business Administration, not on its home campus, but rather, at a site in Forsyth County due to economic and demographic growth in the area. NGCSU projects that establishment of the program will advance the strategic directions of the institution as it strives to prepare military and civilian leaders in a global economy. NGCSU's proposed Master of Business Administration ("MBA") program is designed to prepare students for management careers in both the private and public sectors. Graduates of the program will have a comprehensive knowledge in the functional areas of business, the analytical tools necessary for making ethical and intelligent decisions, and an understanding of the global environment in which businesses operate.

Need: According to an MBA Market Feasibility Study Report prepared by Middle Tennessee State University, a strong demand exists for an MBA program in NGCSU's service area. As a leadership institution of Georgia and the state's senior military college, NGCSU has a special role in training military and civilian managers with designated responsibilities.

Objectives: Graduates of NGCSU's proposed Master of Business Administration program will be required to demonstrate analytical and quantitative reasoning skills to make decisions in a business environment; understand the broad business perspectives of accounting, finance, management, marketing, and strategic management needed to make integrated decisions in a business environment; demonstrate the application of ethical leadership and team building skills; and use strong oral, written, and multimedia communication skills to present research and decision analysis of business situations.

Curriculum: The program requires that students take 30-semester-hours of MBA courses to earn the degree. Core courses that shape the program include Accounting for Management, Corporate Financial Theory, Marketing Management, Management Science and Information Systems, Operations Management, Quantitative Decision Making, and Strategic Management for a Global Marketplace.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 50, 75, and 100 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: NGCSU plans to use North Forsyth County High School for the program or lease space. NGCSU has used space in the Piedmont Learning Center and the Forsyth County Board of Education and Professional Development for classes. A Memorandum of Understanding permits the

institution to continue use of the aforementioned space. President Potter has verified that the program can be established within funds presently available.

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

8. Establishment of an External Master of Agricultural Leadership with a Major in Agricultural Leadership at Griffin, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to offer the existing Master of Agricultural Leadership with a major in Agricultural Leadership as an external degree at the Griffin campus, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer its existing Master of Agricultural Leadership with a major in Agricultural Leadership at the Griffin campus. The program, administered through the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, offers residents of the Griffin area easy access to an opportunity to earn a master's degree. This is the only such program offered in the state by a public college or university. Admission to the cohort will be recommended by faculty in the Department of Agricultural Leadership, Education, and Communication committee based on the same admission criteria as required for the Athens-based program. Each student in the cohort will be assigned an advisor in the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. Library resources used by the current teaching program will be used at the Griffin location.

Need: High school agricultural education teachers and county extension personnel were polled to ascertain their interest in the delivery of the Master of Agricultural Leadership degree. Based on the results of that poll, interest in obtaining the degree was high but access was cited as an issue. A significant demand has been demonstrated from non-traditional students who live in the geographic region and are unable to attend UGA in Athens because of work or family considerations.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 20, 40, and 40 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the program can be implemented at Griffin within funds presently available.

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

9. Establishment of an External Bachelor of Science with a Major in Microbiology at Griffin, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to offer the existing Bachelor of Science with a major in Microbiology as an external degree at the Griffin campus, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer its existing Bachelor of Science degree with a major in Microbiology at the Griffin campus. The program, administered through the Franklin College of Arts & Sciences Division of Biological Sciences, offers residents of the Griffin area easy access to an opportunity to earn an undergraduate microbiology degree. A bachelor’s degree in microbiology offers students the foundation to continue their education in medical, dental, and veterinary fields. The closest university system institution with a similar program, Clayton State University, is approximately 30 miles away. All requirements for admission to the Bachelor of Science with a major in Microbiology inclusive of residency requirements will be the same as those that apply at the Athens campus. The curriculum of the program will be the same as is currently offered on UGA’s home campus. The degree-completion program requires that applicants meet transfer admissions requirements for students who have completed at least 60 semester hours of transferable coursework as well as admission requirements for the Microbiology major. A student advisor will be available to students permanently at this location.

Need: The career opportunities to choose from as a microbiologist depend on the level of education and training one receives. A baccalaureate degree in microbiology will help individuals qualify for technical, research and clinical positions. Some of these positions include: 1) Research assistant, providing technical support to conduct research working in a team with other scientists and a research director in an industrial, government, university or, medical school lab; 2) food, industrial, or environmental microbiologists, quality assurance technologists, working in industry, hospitals, or the government; 3) sales or technical representative, providing information about pharmaceuticals and other medical or scientific products to prospective customers; and 4) clinical and veterinary microbiologists, medical technologists, generally working in veterinary clinics or hospitals to identify disease-causing microorganisms in humans and animals.

The need for educated workers in careers related to the biological sciences is expected to grow substantially in the coming years. According to the Georgia Department of Labor, Workforce Information and Analysis Division, the demand for educated workers in careers related to the biological sciences is expected to increase between 30 to 50% by year 2010. The Griffin campus houses a research facility with 40+ faculty and 280+ support staff who are heavily engaged in research, offering students a unique opportunity to combine classroom and research experiences. A significant demand has been demonstrated from non-traditional students who live in the geographic region and are unable to attend UGA in Athens because of work or family considerations.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 15, and 25 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the program can be implemented at Griffin within funds presently available.

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

10. Establishment of an External Master of Education with a Major in Special Education at a Site in Gwinnett, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to offer the existing Master of Education with a major in Special Education as an external program at a site in Gwinnett, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer its existing Master of Education with a major in Special Education at a proposed site in Gwinnett. The program, administered through the College of Education, Department of Communication Sciences and Special Education, offers residents of the Gwinnett area easy access to an opportunity to earn a master's degree in special education. Most, if not all, courses will be offered in the evenings because prospective students teach during the day. The program is accredited nationally and will use the same assessments, rubrics, and standards as found in the program offered on the home campus in Athens. The blended delivery system, face-to-face instruction with some online capabilities, will help UGA expand program enrollments and reduce shortages of special education personnel that have been well documented at the national, regional, and state levels through a variety of resources.

Need: The Council on Exceptional Children (2001) reports that, nationally, institutions of higher education prepare only half as many teachers as are needed in any given year. According to the American Association for Employment in Education (2000), the southeastern U.S. has a "considerable shortage" of teachers across all areas of special education. Furthermore, the United States Department of Education indicates that, of employed special education teachers in Georgia, approximately one quarter are not fully certified (2002). The Georgia Professional Standards commission reports that the state will need 12,781 special education teachers by fall 2007 and 15,828 by fall 2012. Meanwhile, Georgia student teacher production has declined 59.8% in recent years from 5,415 in 1998 to 3,388 in 2002 (The Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2003). The proposed program is needed because the current pool of potential teachers includes individuals who require a flexible delivery system in order to obtain their teaching credentials. Lastly, a significant demand has been demonstrated from non-traditional students who live in the geographic region and are unable to attend UGA in Athens because of work or family considerations.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates steady enrollments of 15, 15, and 15 students starting every fall with the first cohort projected to enter in 2008.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the program can be implemented at a site in Gwinnett

within funds presently available.

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

11. Establishment of the Dual Degree Offering of the Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Public Health Degrees, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to offer as a dual degree offering the existing Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Public Health degrees, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer as a dual degree the existing Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Public Health programs. An expedient and resource-efficient means of addressing Georgia's chronic and pervasive health problems is to develop dual programs between health professional training programs in Georgia. The proposed dual degree administration of the Doctor of Pharmacy and Master of Public Health degrees enables students to acquire both degrees with an additional one and one-half years of study. A total of nine hours of elective and required course work in the UGA College of Pharmacy curricula would be counted as elective hour components in the UGA College of Public Health's Master of Public Health curriculum. The dual degree program has been supported as a natural progression of the College of Public Health to partner with other UGA colleges to meet teaching, research, and service objectives.

Need: The U.S. Public Health Service recognized and reinforced the need for a public health pharmacist in the publication, "*Public Health Workforce: An Agenda for the 21st Century.*" Several critical factors support the initiation of this dual degree program. The following factors exist and are projected to intensify in importance:

Societal Need

Georgia ranks last in per capita funding for public health among the 50 states and provides seven dollars per citizen for health funds spent on public health initiatives. In 1990, Georgia was ranked 40th on spending for public health, and 42nd on per capita spending on health. Chronic disease factors show that Georgia ranks 19th in cancer deaths, 42nd in premature deaths, 29th in the prevalence of smoking, and 43rd in the prevalence of obesity.

Student Demand

Several students currently in the pharmacy program have expressed an interest in pursuing post-graduate opportunities in public health. Students in the final year of the pharmacy program have expressed an interest in applying for various Master of Public Health options at Emory University. At present, a mechanism does not exist by which students may pursue a dual degree in Pharmacy and Public Health within 1,500 miles of UGA. The dual degree offering would enable students to complete both programs with an additional one and one-half years of study versus two or more years

of study and relocation from the area.

Public Health Pharmacy

National and international accrediting bodies and the World Health Organization currently address the importance of Public Health Pharmacy. The Accreditation Standards and Guidelines for a Professional Program in Pharmacy Leading to the Doctor of Pharmacy Degree adopted several revised competencies in January 2006. In addition, the accreditation guidelines address how pharmacists are essential to the provision of effective health care by ensuring that medication-related public health goals are more effectively achieved.

Other Reasons and Comparative Programs

The UGA College of Pharmacy exists to provide opportunities for students to meet personal and professional goals in order to positively impact the health status of patients. Through offering this proposed dual degree program, students at UGA would have an option for helping patients and society in a broader context than currently available for them in solely the pharmacy program. The benefit for the Master of Public Health student taking pharmacy courses will be to gain additional skill sets in areas of study pertaining to drugs and the drug use process. Such study areas could be applied to epidemiology and biostatistical research. The health promotion and disease prevention skills of the Master of Public Health graduate will be enhanced with the simultaneous appreciation of disease morbidity and mortality influence capabilities of the pharmacy profession.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 5, 10, and 15 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the dual degree program can be administered within funds presently available.

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

12. Consolidation of Nine Specific Master of Education Programs into Five Degrees, Augusta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President William Bloodworth that Augusta State University ("AUSU") be authorized to reconfigure existing Master of Education programs into five distinct majors, effective, June 13, 2007.

Abstract: Augusta State University requested approval to reconfigure and substantively change nine existing Master of Education programs into five distinct majors. The list below details the existing programs to be changed:

<u>Existing Master of Education Majors</u>	<u>Proposed/Reconfigured Programs</u>
Master of Education with majors in:	Master of Education with majors in:
Educational Leadership	Educational Leadership
Interrelated Special Education	Special Education
Intellectual Disabilities	
Counselor Education	Counselor Education
Elementary Education and Teaching	Curriculum and Instruction
Junior High/Intermediate/Middle School Teacher Education	
English Education	
Social Studies Education	
Health and Physical Education	Health and Physical Education

13. Regents’ Test: Follow-up Action from the March 2007 Board Meeting (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole)

Approved: The Board authorized the use of early diagnostic measures such as the Georgia High School Graduation Test upon entry and early in their first year to identify and assist students who might be at risk of not meeting the Regents’ Writing and Reading Skills Requirement. Policy 307 on the Regents’ Writing and Reading Skills Requirement states that the “requirement shall be determined by the Chancellor.” That policy will continue until the new core curriculum with attendant assessment measures is implemented.

Full details provided in the under the Committee of the Whole: Academic Affairs, Regents’ Test section of the minutes.

14. Georgia Gwinnett College Faculty Contracts

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel J. Kaufman that Georgia Gwinnett College (“GGC”) be authorized to establish faculty contracts for the upcoming academic year.

Abstract: The faculty contracts have been reviewed by both the Office of Legal Affairs and the State Attorney General’s Office. Reviews were conducted because Georgia Gwinnett College, although it does not offer tenure, does provide for certain faculty protections that are often found in tenure-track positions and contracts. A sample contract and contract acceptance are provided on the following pages.

Below is a description of Georgia Gwinnett College’s Renewable Faculty Contracts Policy:

Presidential Discretion

Each successful GGC faculty applicant will be eligible to receive one of the following contracts upon acceptance of an employment offer authorized by the President. For all initial faculty appointments, the President retains the discretion to determine whether a successful candidate will be offered a one

year standard non-renewable contract or a three (3) or five (5) year renewable contract according to the faculty rank guidelines noted below.

Assistant Professor and Below

Candidates offered the position of Assistant Professor or below will be eligible to receive either a three (3) year renewable contract or a standard one year non-renewable contract.

Professor and Associate Professor

Candidates offered the position of Professor or Associate Professor will be eligible to receive either a five (5) year renewable contract or a standard one year non-renewable contract.

Contract Expiration One Year Non-Renewable

A faculty member who is nearing completion of an initial one-year standard non-renewable contract will receive at least three (3) months advance written notice of intent to issue a new contract for the following year or notice of intent to end the employment relationship at contract end. Faculty serving under a second one-year standard non-renewable contract will receive at least (6) months advance written notice of intent to issue a new contract or notice of intent to end the employment relationship at contract end. Faculty serving under a one-year standard non-renewable contract after two or more years of service to the institution, will receive at least nine (9) months notice of intent to issue a new contract or notice of intent to end the employment relationship at contract end.

No further requirements other than the written notifications noted herein will be applicable in concluding the employment relationship for a standard non-renewable one-year faculty contract.

Contract Expiration Three or Five Year Renewable Contract

A faculty member employed under a three or five year renewable contract will receive at least nine (9) months written notice prior to the contract expiration in the last year of a renewable contract term; said notice shall state the President's intent to issue a new renewable contract for either a three (3) or five (5) year term (based on the faculty member's rank at contract expiration) or an intent to end the employment relationship at contract end.

No further requirements other than the nine (9) months written notification in the final contract year will be applicable in concluding the employment relationship for a three (3) or five (5) year renewable faculty contract.

Evaluations and Promotions

Regardless of the length or type of faculty contract offered, each year all full-time faculty members will receive a Faculty Performance Review. Performance reviews and promotions will be governed by the GGC faculty handbook, the Performance Review Guidelines and the Promotions and Credentialing Committee standards.

Provisional Period for Renewable Contracts

Faculty members serving under an initial three or five year renewable contract will be required to

complete a one time provisional period not to exceed six (6) months. At any time during the initial six months provisional period of a three or five year renewable contract, a decision can be made to notify a faculty member that a contract will not be forthcoming for the remaining two or four years respectively, except that written notice must be given at least three (3) months prior to the end of the initial contract year. Faculty members who have previously served under a non-renewable faculty contract with Georgia Gwinnett College will not be required to serve a provisional period upon acceptance of a renewable contract.

No further requirements other than the written notification outlined herein will be applicable in concluding the employment relationship during the provisional period of a renewable contract.

Sample contracts are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

15. 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.

16. Termination of the Master of Education with a Major in German, Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce Grube that Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”) be authorized to terminate the Master of Education with a major in German, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: GSOU requested approval to terminate the Master of Education with a major in German. The program was approved for deletion at the university level in spring 2000 due to low enrollments. Currently, no students are enrolled in the program. Georgia Southern requests that the Board of Regents remove the Master of Education with a major in German from its roster of approved degree programs.

17. Termination of the Bachelor of Science with a Major in Recreation, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to terminate the Bachelor of Science with a major in Recreation, effective September 2007.

Abstract: GSU requested termination of the Bachelor of Science with a major in Recreation effective Fall 2007. The program was deactivated in September 2004. All majors at that time have had three years to graduate.

18. Termination of Cooperative Associate of Applied Science Degrees, Gordon College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Lawrence V. Weill that Gordon College (“GOC”) be authorized to terminate cooperative Associate of Applied Science degrees, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: Gordon College requested approval to terminate specific Associate of Applied Science degrees offered cooperatively with Flint River Technical College and Griffin Technical College. The programs were identified through the institution’s Comprehensive Program Review process as not meeting productivity thresholds. The programs were deactivated in April 2005. In June the institution sought termination of the programs listed below:

Degree	Cooperative Institution(s)
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Business with options in:</i>	
Accounting	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
Computer Programming Technology	Griffin Technical College
Information & Office Technology	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
Microcomputer Specialist	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Health with options in:</i>	
Medical Assisting	Griffin Technical College
Paramedic Technology	Flint River Technical College
Surgical Technology	Flint River Technical College
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Services with options in:</i>	
Child Development & Related Care	Flint River Technical College
Cosmetology	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
Law Enforcement Technology	Griffin Technical College
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Technology with options in:</i>	
Air Conditioning Technology	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
Aircraft Structural Technology	Flint River Technical College
Applied Graphics Technology	Flint River Technical College
Applied Manufacturing Technology	Griffin Technical College
Automotive Technology	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical

	Colleges
Carpentry Technology	Griffin Technical College
Drafting Technology	Griffin Technical College
Electrical Construction & Maintenance	Flint River Technical & Griffin Technical Colleges
Electronics Technology	Griffin Technical College
Electronics/Industrial Specialist	Flint River Technical College
Industrial Maintenance	Griffin Technical College
Industrial Electrical Technology	Griffin Technical College
Industrial Maintenance Technology	Griffin Technical College
Machine Tool Technology	Griffin Technical College
Welding & Joining Technology	Griffin Technical College

19. Termination of Cooperative Associate of Applied Science Degrees, Middle Georgia College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to terminate cooperative Associate of Applied Science degrees, effective July 1, 2007.

Abstract: MGC sought approval to terminate its cooperative Associate of Applied Science degree programs offered in cooperation with Heart of Georgia Technical College and Middle Georgia Technical College. Over the past three years, enrollments in the cooperative programs have been quite low.

<u>Degree</u>	<u>Cooperative Institution(s)</u>
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Business with options in:</i>	
Accounting	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle Georgia Technical Colleges
Business and Office Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle Georgia Technical Colleges
Computer Information Systems	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle Georgia Technical Colleges
Computer Operations	Middle Georgia Technical College
Computer Programming	Middle Georgia Technical College
Marketing Management	Middle Georgia Technical College
Microcomputer Specialist	Middle Georgia Technical College
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Health with options in:</i>	
Medical Assisting	Heart of Georgia Technical
Pharmacy Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Practical Nursing	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle

	Georgia Technical Colleges
Radiologic Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle Georgia Technical Colleges
Respiratory Therapy Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
<i>Associate of Applied Science in Technology with options in:</i>	
Advanced Air Conditioning Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Air Conditioning Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical and Middle Georgia Technical Colleges
Automotive Fundamentals	Heart of Georgia Technical
Automotive Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Diesel Equipment Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Electronics Fundamentals	Heart of Georgia Technical
Electronics Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Welding and Joining Technology	Heart of Georgia Technical
Aerospace Planning and Production	Middle Georgia Technical College
Aviation Maintenance Technology	Middle Georgia Technical College
Drafting	Middle Georgia Technical College
Industrial Maintenance Technology	Middle Georgia Technical College
Aircraft Structural Technology	Georgia Aviation and Technical College
Aviation Maintenance Technology	Georgia Aviation and Technical College
Flight Technology	Georgia Aviation and Technical College

As a point of clarification, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, approved six Associate of Applied Science degree programs to be offered by Middle Georgia College on March 21, 2007. The degree programs listed below will replace the terminated cooperative degree programs that were at one time offered with Georgia Aviation and Technical College. Below is a list of the programs approved in March 2007:

- Associate of Applied Science in Air Traffic Management
- Associate of Applied Science in Aircraft Structural Technology
- Associate of Applied Science in Airport Management
- Associate of Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance Technology
- Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology (Airplane)
- Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology (Helicopter)

In addition, the following stand-alone degrees that are offered solely by Middle Georgia College are requested for termination:

- Associate of Applied Science in Criminal Justice

- Associate of Applied Science in Management
- Associate of Applied Science in Public Administration

20. Termination of Specific Program Majors, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to terminate specific majors, effective September 2007.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to terminate the following programs: Specialist in Education (“EdS”) with a major in Physical Education and Sport Studies and Master of Education (“MEd”) with a major in Exercise Science.

Specialist in Education with a major in Physical Education

Termination was requested for the EdS with a major in Physical Education and Sport Studies because there was no longer sufficient demand to justify retaining the program. Over the past eight years, only three degrees have been conferred for this program. Currently, no students are enrolled in the major. The graduate faculty of the Department of Kinesiology voted in favor of terminating this program. Students will not be adversely impacted by this action.

Master of Education with a major in Exercise Science

Termination was requested for the MEd with a major in Exercise Science. This program now duplicates the non-thesis option for the Master of Science in Exercise Science. The MEd with a major in Exercise Science previously served students pursuing allied health careers that did not involve research, such as clinical exercise physiology or athletic training. However, the non-thesis option for the MS with a major in Exercise Science was added in 2005 because it was a more appropriate degree for students who did not pursue careers in teaching. Students are no longer enrolled in the MEd in Exercise Science and the program is no longer needed. The graduate faculty of the Department of Kinesiology voted in favor of terminating this program. Students will not be adversely impacted by this action.

21. Establishment of the James Hovey Keels, Jr. Chair in Pulmonary Medicine, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the James Hovey Keels, Jr., Chair in Pulmonary Medicine, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: MCG requested approval to establish the James Hovey Keels, Jr., Chair in Pulmonary Medicine. The funds will support the training of pulmonary/critical care specialists and help physicians and scientists pursue studies of innovative treatments for lung disease. The MCG Foundation has \$500,000 on deposit to support this endowed chair.

Biosketch: The J. H. Keels, Jr. Endowment fund was established in September 2004. Mr. Keels was

a longtime owner and operator of a Walton Way gasoline station. He died on February 26, 2003 at the age of 84. Mr. Keels was a great supporter of MCG's educational, research and clinical mission. Having suffered from emphysema, he hoped MCG's research could one day help others with this condition.

22. Establishment of the H. Talmadge Dobbs Professorship for Teaching Excellence in Finance, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University ("GSU") be authorized to establish the H. Talmadge Dobbs Professorship for Teaching Excellence in Finance, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: Georgia State University sought permission to establish the H. Talmadge Dobbs Professorship for Teaching Excellence in Finance in the J. Mack Robinson College of Business.

The H. Talmadge Dobbs Professorship for Teaching Excellence in Finance will be a cornerstone for the university's finance department. The Dobbs Professorship holder shall be engaged in highly visible teaching, research, service or administrative activities consistent with the purpose of the professorship and his or her own academic interests. The activities of the Dobbs Professor will benefit both the Georgia State and Atlanta communities by providing leadership in teaching, academic research, and public service in the discipline of finance.

President Patton has verified that a sum of \$200,000 is on deposit with the Georgia State University Foundation. The funds were donated by the widow of H. Talmadge Dobbs, Ruth Reynolds Dobbs. The spending allocation from the endowed funds will be used to support the H. Talmadge Dobbs Professorship for Teaching Excellence in Finance in accordance with the policies and procedures of the University System and the Georgia State University Foundation.

Biographical Sketch: H. Talmadge Dobbs, Jr. served as chairman of Life Insurance Company of Georgia (often referred to as Life of Georgia) from 1977 until his retirement in 1981. He had a long and distinguished career in financial operations, having joined the company in 1933. In 1953, Dobbs was named to the executive committee, having been a board member since 1948. During his career with Life of Georgia, Dobbs also served as treasurer, executive vice president for finance, and vice chairman of the board.

Henri Talmadge Dobbs, Jr. was born October 14, 1915, in Atlanta, the son of Henry Talmadge Dobbs Sr., and Maggie Austin Dobbs. He was a graduate of Georgia State University and was a chartered financial analyst. Dobbs served in the Navy during World War II.

Dobbs was a trustee and chairman of the investment committee of the Georgia State University Foundation and a trustee of Young Harris College, Wesleyan College and Children's Healthcare of Atlanta (formerly Scottish Rite Children's Medical Center). He was a trustee and chairman of the investment committee of Columbia Theological Seminary and was a trustee and elder at Trinity

Presbyterian Church. Dobbs was a member of the Rotary Club of Atlanta and Capital City Club.

Georgia State University relationships include the H. Talmadge Dobbs Jr. Outstanding Finance Student Award, the H. Talmadge Dobbs Chair of Finance, his service as a trustee of the GSU Foundation, service as Director of the Alumni Association (1969 – 1972) and a charter member of the Centurion Club of the Alumni Association.

Mr. Dobbs passed away on December 1, 1989 of pulmonary fibrosis at Piedmont Hospital. He is survived by his wife, Ruth Reynolds Dobbs, a son, H. Talmadge Dobbbs, III, and three daughters, Joan, Nancy and Ruth, and several grandchildren.

23. Establishment of the Sarah P. and George E. Mudter Professorship in Cancer Research, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish the Sara P. and George E. Mudter Professorship in Cancer Research, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: The special professorship was funded by a lead gift made by Sara P. Mudter and her children, Patricia Mudter Hobbs and George E. Mudter, Jr., through their desire to strengthen the cancer research programs in the Division of Biological Sciences.

Biosketch: Both Sara P. Mudter, 1942 Bachelor of Science in Home Economics, and the late Georgie Emil Mudter, 1949 Bachelor of Science in Pharmacy, as well as their children, Patricia Mudter Hobbs, 1966 Bachelor of Arts, and George E. Mudter, 1972 Juris Doctorate, are graduates of the University of Georgia. The individual named to the professorship shall be a full professor with an outstanding national reputation. The holder of this professorship will not be rotated. As of April 3, 2007, the total fund balance was \$359,690. President Adams has verified that funds are on deposit with the University of Georgia to establish the professorship.

24. Establishment of the Elizabeth Garrard Hall Professorship in Early Childhood Education, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish the Elizabeth Garrard Hall Professorship in Early Childhood Education, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to establish the Elizabeth Garrard Hall Professorship in Early Childhood Education in the Department of Elementary and Social Studies Education of the College of Education. This special professorship was funded by a gift of \$250,000 by bequest of the estate of Elizabeth Garrard Hall. As of April 6, 2007, the total fund balance was \$270,125. President Adams has verified that the funds are on deposit with the University of Georgia to establish the professorship.

Biosketch: Ms. Hall, a 1934 graduate of the institution, earned a Bachelor of Arts degree and taught her first high school class in Fayetteville, Georgia. She was the widow of the late Cheston Hall, a chemist with the Coca-Cola Company. The Halls had a mutual desire to help young people and recognized the importance of a good education. The Hall Professor will honor Ms. Hall by providing a highly visible full professor with an outstanding national reputation in Early Childhood Education.

25. Revised Institutional Statutes, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Ronald M. Zaccari, that Valdosta State University (“VSU”) be authorized revise its institutional statutes, effective June 13, 2007.

Abstract: VSU has engaged in a process to review and revise its institutional statutes. The revision follows the institutional governance structure, organization, and committees and councils of the institution. Revised sections of the statutes were approved by the faculty and staff of VSU.

VSU sought approval from the Board for recent amendments made to the University Statutes. Changes to the statutes incorporate articles concerning the following areas:

- Combining Administrative Council, Strategic Planning Council, and Master Planning Council into the University Council;
- Changes to the general faculty voting procedures;
- Amendment regarding President’s response to the Faculty Senate; and
- Minor editing changes.

The statutes have been reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs. The statutes were found to be in compliance with Board of Regents policies. The revised statutes will remain on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

26. 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 Community Health Provide population survey to provide accurate estimates of the uninsured children in Georgia by age, location, family income, and other characteristics that vary with insurance status	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$425,000
Georgia Department of Community Health Utilize PeachCare claims records to provide data necessary for reporting care performance measures	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$110,000

Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide training and evaluation for the Aging and Disability Resource Center	3/15/07-3/14/08	\$55,000
---	-----------------	----------

University of Georgia

Georgia Department of Community Affairs Develop programs and activities in the area of radon awareness, testing, mitigation, and prevention	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$192,000
Georgia Department of Community Affairs Conduct, promote, coordinate, lead, manage, and facilitate a statewide youth summit on a biennial basis	7/1/06-6/30/07	\$150,000
Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Provide a pathway for ongoing professional development and growth in child development in early education knowledge, attitudes and skills for administrators, trainers, teachers, consultants and higher educational faculty	12/1/06-5/31/07	\$168,000
Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Build a program of recreational activities that have a therapeutic impact but that are also attractive enough to be self-selected rather than imposed on residents at Augusta Youth Detention Center	8/15/06-6/30/07	\$19,513
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Evaluate certified local government programs as needed and site visits to certified local government programs as needed and expand local planning section of the website in a more user-friendly way	7/1/06-6/30/07	\$42,000
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Provide assistance in development of the Office of Policy, Planning, and Budget within the Environmental Protection Division of the Department of Natural Resources and enhance the Environmental Protection Division's capacity for long-term planning and policy development	1/1/07-12/31/07	\$125,080
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Assess the potential relationship of brown marsh to residential docks and to other spatially documented phenomena	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$98,660
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Rehabilitate a historic building for adaptive re-use; develop, design and reproduce interpretive materials and wall displays which illustrate historical and cultural significance of building	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$50,000
Georgia Forestry Commission Create an educational display, a demonstration area, and an informational brochure showcasing southern pine beetle identification, infestation recognition, prevention and management	1/1/07-12/31/07	\$9,800
Georgia Forestry Commission Increase awareness in the community about the aesthetic, energy conservation and wildlife habitat values of trees in the suburban environment	9/1/06-8/31/07	\$7,071

Georgia Department of Community Affairs Assist the Department of Community Affairs and other state agencies in developing and implementing a strategy to increase the amount of material recovered from the solid waste stream for recycling	1/1/06-12/31/07	\$54,045
Georgia Department of Early Care and Learning Conduct an economic impact study of the childcare industry in Georgia, analyze the current childcare workforce, and outline opportunities for future analysis of childcare usage and quality in Georgia	1/1/07-12/31/07	\$501,943
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Conduct genetic investigation on the federally endangered amber darter, provide updated distribution map of the entire species and determine the historic population structure within and between the Etowah and Conasauga populations to explore potential cryptic diversity and management considerations	9/1/06-9/30/09	\$95,000
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Reduce the number of annual beach advisories and the enhancement of biofiltration in Beach Creek through the restoration of shellfish resources	11/13/06-9/30/09	\$340,327
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Support the Nonpoint Source Program's effort to accomplish central programmatic needs	8/15/06-9/30/07	\$41,910
Georgia General Assembly Create a data source to be responsive to the needs of the General Assembly and to improve local governance in Georgia	7/1/06-6/30/07	\$216,904
Georgia Student Finance Commission Promote student financial literacy in the areas of student loan management and in credit/debit management through peer-to-peer contact	7/1/06-6/30/07	\$5,000
Administrative Office of the Courts Assist the Administrative Office of the Courts in performing its mission of improving Georgia's court process for civil child abuse and neglect cases	12/1/06-11/30/07	\$30,000
Georgia Department of Agriculture Identify tropical soda apple infested sites in pasture and forestry scenarios	9/1/06-4/30/07	\$7,000
Georgia Department of Agriculture Produce an interactive, computer-based program to train private pesticide applicators	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$50,000
Georgia Department of Education Plan, schedule, and deliver two, one-week Culinary Institute I sessions for school nutrition managers	9/25/06-9/24/07	\$26,665
Georgia Department of Education Develop the Georgia's Teachers Success Model to support improved teaching practice through the development of tools, training, and resources to be used by educators to assess teaching practice and its impact on students	10/14/06-10/13/07	\$600,000
Georgia Department of Education		

Examine Georgia Performance Standards and curriculum materials for engineering and technology education engineering pathway, assemble a focus group of teachers, students, parents, engineers and school administrators to identify key themes and features related to the new GPS and curriculum revision initiatives	10/1/06-6/30/07	\$16,500
Georgia Department of Education Establish oversight and provide an honorarium for a Georgia Technology Education Program Certification Coordinator and provide opportunities to implement an online database for maintaining program certification records and facilitate development opportunities to guide technology teachers through the certification process	10/1/06-6/30/07	\$26,065
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide a statewide nutrition education program that increases the likelihood of people making healthy food choices consistent with the most recent dietary advise reflected in the Dietary Guidelines for Americans and the Food Guide Pyramid	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$421,858
Georgia Department of Human Resources Assist in conducting a needs assessment and analysis of existing data infrastructure to determine enhancements and changes that must be made to meet federal reporting requirements	10/15/06-6/30/07	\$45,104
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Assist in the development of rare species and conservation information for a Department of Natural Resources website that will provide easily accessible, continuously updated information to the general public	2/15/07-6/30/08	\$59,997
Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education Continue the assessment and evaluation of the Stay in School projects approved by the Department of Technical and Adult Education and determine the ways the projects have enhanced the completion and graduation rates of high school students	10/1/06-6/30/07	\$69,302
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 2001	12/7/06-6/30/07	\$24,683
Georgia Department of Community Affairs Establish Georgia Commission for Service and Volunteerism	10/1/06-9/30/07	\$153,022
Georgia Department of Education Revise and print the special education parent survey to meet Georgia's requirements	12/8/06-8/31/07	\$41,170
Georgia Environmental Facilities Authority Facilitate Town Hall meeting during 2007 and develop supporting materials and reports for meetings for statewide water planning for different regions of the state	8/1/05-12/31/07	\$33,500
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peanuts Determine if recently released large-seed and large-podded runner-type	1/1/07-	\$ 15,000

peanut cultivators have a different calcium requirement than cultivators with a seed size more closely related to Georgia Green and to determine relative susceptibility to pod disease, a symptom of calcium deficiency.	12/31/07	
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peanuts Determine how well the recently released runner-type cultivators are adapted to growers' fields in the southeastern United States	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$25,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Provide partial salary and support for a Public Service Faculty position located at Tifton	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$15,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Corn Evaluate both old and new herbicides for the control of Palmer amaranth in field corn	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$4,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peanuts Determine if peanut cultivators, with differing maturity timings, vary in relation to sensitivity to Gramoxone and determine injury mitigation effects of Baragran that are required to inhibit yield loss associated with Gramoxone applications.	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$2,000
Georgia Commodity Commission for Peanuts Determine the efficacy of various herbicides and develop cost effective weed management systems for the control of tropical spiderwort in peanuts	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$3,000
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Construct datasets of test scores, attendance, and behavior data collected for students of teachers using the Environment as an Integrating Context Model and comparison group students, and conduct various statistical procedures to test the hypothesis that student achievement is higher in the Environment as an Integrating Context than in their matched peers	1/1/07- 12/31/07	\$50,000

Georgia Southern University

Georgia Forestry Commission Conduct comprehensive, integrated planning and management to help identify and manage tree cover in Bulloch County	8/1/06 – 7/31/07	\$7,419
Georgia Department of Education Implement grade 8 mathematics and science Georgia performance standards in Heart of Georgia regional educational service area	8/1/04 – 6/30/07	\$52,506

TOTAL AMOUNT – JUNE 2007	\$ 4,486,044
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2007 TO DATE	\$30,482,930
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2006 TO JUNE	\$33,452,938
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2006	\$33,452,938

27. Information Item: Grants and Contracts Received by Institutions in the University System of Georgia for Research, Instruction, and Public Service for Fiscal Year 2006

Much of the financial support for the University System is derived from extramural sources. The dollar amounts for contracts and grants received by the institutions in FY 2006 are listed in Table 1.

The total external support for these activities in all institutions equaled \$831,043,460, an increase of \$25,681,296 or 3.2% above fiscal year 2005.

Graphs and tables associated with this agenda item are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

28. Information Item: Intellectual Property Income Summary in the University System of Georgia for Fiscal Year 2006

Total income received from intellectual properties during FY 2006 was \$17,765,567. This represents an increase of \$5,440,172, or 44.1% over FY 2005. Note: The amount for FY 2004 was unusually large because of a one-time royalty buy-down of \$28 million for one technology at the University of Georgia.

Institution	Inventions	Software	Copyrights/ Trademarks	Totals
Georgia Institute of Technology	\$600,811	\$1,349,004	\$808	\$1,950,623
Georgia State University	0	0	\$55,082	\$55,082
Medical College of Georgia	\$215,525		\$8,082	\$223,607
University of Georgia	\$15,397,871	\$72,307	\$36,245	\$15,506,423
Georgia Southern University	0	\$29,832	0	\$29,832
Totals	\$16,214,207	\$1,451,143	\$101,217	\$17,765,567

Graphs and tables associated with this agenda item are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs.

29. Information Item: Substantive Redirection of the Bachelor of Science with a Major in Early Childhood/Special Education, Albany State University

Abstract: Albany State University has substantively changed its Bachelor of Science with a major in Early Childhood/Special Education in order to comply with guidelines established by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission. The substantive change will enable the institution to expand the number of qualified special education teachers in Southwest Georgia who will impact the education of pre-school to fifth grade learners. The curriculum has been modified to provide specific

instruction for the special education general curriculum with an emphasis on learners in pre-school to fifth grade within early childhood education. The program combines early childhood education and special education into a unified curriculum. Students who complete the revised curriculum will have the requisite content knowledge and possess skills that encompass instructional strategies for disabled students.

30. Information Item: Approvals and Authorities, Audit, Real Estate and Facilities, and Academic Affairs Committees of the Whole

The Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor of the Office of Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, presented information concerning academic affairs-related approvals and authorities to the Audit, Real Estate and Facilities, and Academic Affairs Committees, which met as Committees of the Whole.

31. Establishment of an External Bachelor of Science in Education with a Major in Special Education at Griffin, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to offer the existing Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in Special Education as an external degree at the Griffin campus, effective June 13, 2007.

Walk-On: This item was added by unanimous consent to the Committee’s agenda.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer its existing Bachelor of Science in Education degree with a major in Special Education at the Griffin campus. The program, administered through the College of Education’s Department of Communication Sciences and Special Education, offers residents of the Griffin area easy access to an opportunity to earn an undergraduate education degree with a major in special education. The hybrid delivery of the program offers students a combination of face-to-face and some online instruction. All requirements for admission to the Bachelor of Science in Education degree inclusive of residency requirements will be the same as those that apply at the Athens campus. The proposed delivery of this existing program at Griffin requires the same didactic coursework and student work in school systems (e.g., practicum placements and student teaching) as is required at UGA’s home campus. Supervision of students in practicum placements and during their student teaching will be accomplished by a combination of face-to-face and remote supervision (e.g., cameras in classrooms), again using methods and models already approved and in use for the Athens-based program. Each student will have a faculty advisor at Griffin or from Athens. A degree program assistant will support the program and assist students. The proposed degree program will be equivalent in quality to its Athens counterpart and will be subject to review by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission and the National Council for Accreditation in Teacher Education.

Need: Shortages of special education personnel have been documented on national, regional, and state levels through a variety of sources. The Council on Exceptional Children (2001) reports that,

nationally, institutions of higher education prepare only half as many teachers as are needed in any given year. According to the American Association for Employment in Education (2000), the southeastern U.S. has a considerable shortage of teachers across all areas of special education. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Education indicates that of employed special education teachers in Georgia, approximately one quarter are not fully certified (2002). The Georgia Professional Standards Commission reports that the state will need 12,781 special education teachers by fall 2007 and 15,828 teachers by fall 2012. Meanwhile, Georgia student teacher production has declined 59.8% in recent years from 5,415 in 1998 to 3,388 in 2002 (The Georgia Professional Standards Commission, 2003).

Currently, efforts to prepare and retain special education teachers in the state of Georgia fall short of projected needs. The eight school superintendents in the Griffin Regional Education Service Agency area have indicated that a need exists to prepare teachers of special education. Distance and on-line education programs with courses in special education have enrollments of approximately 140 new students per year from locations other than UGA's Athens campus. A significant demand has been demonstrated from non-traditional students who live in the geographic region and are unable to attend UGA in Athens because of work or family considerations. Thus, the institution anticipates that sufficient enrollments warrant the offering of a Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in Special Education at the Griffin campus.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 15 students during the 2008 – 2009 academic year and 30 students during the 2009 – 2010 academic year of the administration of this program.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the program can be implemented at Griffin within funds presently available.

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

32. Establishment of an External Bachelor of Business Administration with a Major in General Business at Griffin, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to offer the existing Bachelor of Business Administration with a major in General Business as an external degree at the Griffin campus, effective June 13, 2007.

Walk-On: This item was added by unanimous consent to the Committee's agenda.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to offer its existing Bachelor of Business Administration degree with a major in General Business at the Griffin campus. The program, administered through the Terry College of Business, offers residents of the Griffin area easy access to an opportunity to earn

an undergraduate business degree. UGA will work collaboratively with Gordon College and Clayton State University to deliver the program. All requirements for admission to the Bachelor of Business Administration degree inclusive of residency requirements will be the same as those that apply at the Athens campus. The curriculum of the program will be the same as is currently offered on UGA's home campus. A student advisor will be available to students permanently at this location. Students will be able to supplement their class schedule, if they seek such an option, with courses that are taught by other UGA units at the Griffin campus. Students will find that sufficient library resources will be made available at the external site.

Need: A significant demand has been demonstrated from non-traditional students who live in the geographic region and are unable to attend UGA in Athens because of work or family considerations.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 12, 40, and 70 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: President Adams has verified that the program can be implemented at Griffin within funds presently available.

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

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at approximately 5:28 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Robert F. Hatcher, and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Felton Jenkins, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. The Chair of the Board, Allan Vigil, and the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy, were also present. Chair Hatcher reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed six items, four of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Fiscal Year 2008 Operating and Capital Budgets

Approved: The Board approved the fiscal year 2008 operating and capital budgets for the University System of Georgia. The total budget amount approved was \$5.7 billion. A full copy of the budget is on file in the Office of Fiscal Affairs.

2. Increase of Athletic Fee at Atlanta Metropolitan College

Approved: The Board approved the request of Interim President Gary McGaha to increase the athletic fee at Atlanta Metropolitan College ("AMC") to become effective in the fall semester 2007.

Background: Over the last several years, decline in enrollment at AMC led to a decision to begin a phase out of intercollegiate athletics. Interim President Gary McGaha has reviewed that decision and determined that the loss of the intercollegiate athletic program would accelerate enrollment loss. Under a new plan to revitalize the intercollegiate program, which would be restricted to men's and women's basketball programs, President McGaha believes that the enrollment at AMC can be increased. He also believes that this would help the public image of the institution and help create a stronger identity for the institution. The institution has presented a multi-year plan for the athletic program which has met the approval of staff.

At the present time, AMC is charging a \$30 per semester intercollegiate athletic fee. It is recommended that this fee be increased to \$45 per semester, which had been the rate prior to last year, to become effective in the fall semester 2007.

3. Adjustments to Professional Program Tuition Rates

Approved: The Board approved the adjustments to professional program tuition rates in addition to those approved at the May 2007 meeting for Clayton State University MBA Program and Georgia Southern University Master of Accountancy and MBA program. These rates will become effective in the fall semester 2007.

Background: The following table contains the professional program tuition rates approved by the Board of Regents at its May 2, 2007 meeting. Adjustments to the semester professional program tuition rates for two additional professional programs are shown below.

	In-State Tuition		Out-of-State Tuition	
	Current Rate	Recommended Rate	Current Rate	Recommended Rate
Clayton State University				
MBA Program				
Full-time	N/A	\$3,600.00	N/A	\$10,800.00
Less than 12 credit hours	N/A	\$300.00	N/A	\$900.00
Georgia Southern University				
Master of Accountancy				
Full-time	\$1,522.00	\$2,058.00	\$6,086.00	\$8,229.00
Less than 12 credit hours	\$127.00	\$172.00	\$508.00	\$686.00
MBA Program				
Full-time	\$1,522.00	\$2,058.00	\$6,086.00	\$8,229.00
Less than 12 credit hours	\$127.00	\$172.00	\$508.00	\$686.00

4. Adjustments to Out-of-State Graduate Tuition Rate for Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved adjustments to the fiscal year 2008 out-of-state graduate tuition rate for Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) Master of Music Therapy program. The rates will become effective in the fall 2007 semester.

Background: GCSU currently offers a Master of Music Therapy degree program in which the courses are taught almost exclusively online with the exception of two intensive weekends per semester where on-campus attendance is required. Since the program is primarily offered electronically in an online format it is attractive to music therapists employed full-time and whose circumstances would prohibit relocating to Georgia. The present out-of-state tuition rates discourage these prospective, full-time employed out-of-state students from enrolling in this program. GCSU is aware of only one other online Master of Music Therapy program in the country which is located in Indiana and charges \$406 per credit hour for out-of-state students. In order to be competitive with this program, GCSU has requested that the fiscal year 2008 out-of-state tuition rate for the Master of Music Therapy program be revised to \$400 per credit hour.

	In-State Tuition		Out-of-State Tuition	
	Current Rate	Recommended Rate	Current Rate	Recommended Rate
Georgia College & State Univ.				
Master of Music Therapy				
Full-time	\$2,144.00	\$2,476.00	\$8,577.00	\$4,800.00
Less than 12 credit hours	\$179.00	\$206.00	715.00	\$400.00

5. Information Item: Update on the University System of Georgia Liability for Other Post-Employment Benefits

The Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, provided an update to the Committee on the University System of Georgia’s liability for Other Post-Employment Benefits (“OPEB”).

6. Information Item: University System of Georgia Health Insurance Program Contracts Strategy for Plan Year 2008

The Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, provided a report to the Committee on the strategy for the University System of Georgia health insurance program contracts for plan year 2008.

COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: INTERNAL AUDIT, ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AND REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES (APPROVALS AND AUTHORITIES)

The Committees on Internal Audit, Academic Affairs, and Real Estate and Facilities met as

combined Committees of the Whole on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at approximately 2:44 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Internal Audit Vice Chair Felton Jenkins, and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. The Chair of the Board, Allan Vigil and the Vice Chair of the Board, William H. Cleveland, were also in attendance. Vice Chair Jenkins reported to the full Board that the Committee reviewed six items, none of which required action. He further stated that these items, incorporating recommended changes, would be presented as action items at the August Board meeting.

1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 100, Officers of the Board of Regents

Recommended: That the Board approve revisions to The Policy Manual concerning specific policies as outlined below and on successive pages for Section 100, Officers of the Board of Regents.

Specific Policies Recommended for Revision and Brief Details

Item 1.	Policy 102	Chancellor -- Empower Chancellor authority to delegate or re-delegate authority given to him in this manual.
---------	------------	---

The proposed revisions are provided according to each enumerated recommendation item. Please note the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted, bold texts represent additions.

102 CHANCELLOR

The Board of Regents shall elect the Chancellor annually. The Chancellor shall be given an annual letter of agreement. In case of any vacancy in the chancellorship, the Board shall name an Acting Chancellor who shall serve until the office of the Chancellor shall be filled.

The Chancellor shall be the chief executive officer of the University System as well as the chief executive officer of the Board of Regents and, as such, shall perform those duties that are prescribed by the Board. The Chancellor shall be responsible to the Board for the prompt and effective execution of all resolutions, policies, rules, and regulations adopted by the Board for the order and operation of the entire University System and for the government of any and all of its institutions. The Chancellor's discretionary powers shall be broad enough to enable him/her to discharge these responsibilities. **The Chancellor is authorized to delegate or re-delegate all approvals and actions designated by The Policy Manual.** The Chancellor shall attend and shall participate in, without the privilege of voting, all of the meetings of the Board and its Committees except as otherwise determined by the Board and shall be an ex-officio member of all Committees without the authority to vote. The Chancellor shall make recommendations for the appointment of institution presidents and senior level employees of the Office of the Board of Regents. Campus presidents shall make decisions regarding appointments, promotions, salaries, transfers, suspensions, and dismissals

for members of instructional, research and extension staffs, and all other employees of their institutions.

The Chancellor shall be a member of all faculties and other academic bodies within the University System. He/she shall decide all questions of jurisdiction, not otherwise specifically defined, of the several councils, faculties, and officers. The Chancellor shall have the right to call meetings of any council, faculty, or committee at any time (BR Minutes, 1986-87, p. 263).

The Chancellor shall have the power to veto any act of any council, faculty, or committee of any institution within the University System but, in doing so, shall transmit to the proper officer a written statement of the reason for such veto. A copy of each veto statement shall be transmitted to the Board of Regents.

Any council, faculty, or committee shall have the right of appeal from a veto of the Chancellor to the Board and to be represented before the Board by any member or members chosen from said council, faculty, or committee. The Chancellor shall prepare and submit to the Board of Regents such annual and special reports concerning the University System as the Board may require. The Chancellor or his/her designee shall be the medium through which all matters shall be presented to the Board, and to the Committees of the Board, including reports, recommendations, and suggestions from institutions, their faculty members, employees, and students. The Chancellor may, on his/her own initiative, make such reports to the Board as will, in his/her opinion, be helpful to the members in the discharge of their duties.

The Chancellor shall be responsible for the preparation for the Board of a suggested allocation of state appropriations to the institutions of the System. This suggested allocation shall be accompanied by a statement of the basis upon which it is to be determined. The suggested allocation shall be transmitted to the Board by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations with such modifications as the Committee may deem necessary. Budgets of the member institutions shall be submitted by heads of institutions of the University System to the Chancellor. When the Chancellor has approved the budgets, the Chancellor shall submit all of the budgets of the University System to the Board for final approval. The Chancellor shall be the regular channel through which policies of the Board of Regents shall be announced. The heads of University System institutions shall not make any announcements of the Board's policies until so authorized by the Chancellor.

The Chancellor may limit the matriculates to the educational facilities at the institutions of the System.

The Chancellor or his/her designee is authorized to execute all documents concerning federal aid to the University System of Georgia, including, but not limited to, applications, acknowledgments of grants, and other necessary documents, in the conduct of affairs on behalf of the Regents of the University System of Georgia in connection with the United States Government (BR Minutes, 1966-67, pp. 414-415). The Chancellor is further authorized to settle any claim or dispute against the

Board or its employees for an amount not to exceed \$300,000 of Board of Regents' funding (BR Minutes, May 2006).

The Chancellor and the Chancellor's designee are authorized and empowered to execute, accept, and deliver for, on behalf of, and in the name of the Regents of the University System of Georgia and under its Seal, and without prior approval by the Board, the following documents:

- A. Any and all rental agreements, supplemental agreements, and subrental agreements in which the Board of Regents is named as the tenant of the property rented and where the total rent to be paid by the Board does not exceed the sum of \$5,000 per month;
- B. Any and all contracts, agreements, deeds, licenses, or other instruments related to the purchase or gift of real property (other than property acquired by condemnation) at a purchase price not to exceed the average of three separate appraisals made by independent and licensed real estate appraisers and where the purchase price (or gift value) of the real property does not exceed the sum of \$100,000;
- C. Gifts, bequests, agreements, or declarations of trust in those instances where the initial gift or trust estate is \$100,000 or less, as well as those documents necessary to provide proper fiscal management of those funds accepted under the aforesaid authorization.

The Chancellor may, at his/her discretion, delegate the authority to execute said documents to the Treasurer or to the presidents of the several institutions in the University System, provided, however, that the Chancellor is not authorized to delegate to the presidents the authority to accept gifts of real property (BR Minutes, 1980-81, p. 241; January, 1997, p. 24).

The Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor's designee, is authorized to act without prior approval of the Board as the contracting officers for and on behalf of the Board of Regents, with authority to act for the Board in the execution of construction contracts, change orders to construction contracts, contracts for professional services, and the selection of architects and engineers and execution of architectural/engineering contracts for the preparation of plans for new buildings or engineering projects, major remodeling, allocation of rehabilitation funds, and other projects, except routine maintenance in the University System of Georgia, provided, however, that the authority so delegated shall not exceed the sum of \$1,000,000 for any one contractual obligation. The actions taken under the authority of this paragraph shall be reported annually to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities (BR Minutes, 1991-92, pp. 319-320).

The Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor's designee, is authorized to allocate to System institutions, without prior approval of the Board, capital outlay appropriations – rehabilitation funds (cash or bonds) in amounts not to exceed \$200,000 for any one project. The actions taken under the authority of this paragraph shall be reported annually to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities (BR Minutes, 1991-92, pp. 319-320).

The Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor's designee, is authorized to delegate any or all of the above authority to act as contracting officers to individual institutions in the University System of Georgia based upon an evaluation by the Chancellor or the Treasurer of the ability of an institution to properly administer the delegated authority. Such delegation of authority shall be administered in accordance with policies and procedures approved by the Chancellor, the Treasurer, or the Chancellor's designee (BR Minutes, 1991-92, pp. 319-320).

The Chancellor, and/or the Chancellor's designee, is authorized and empowered, in the name of and on behalf of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, to take or cause to be taken any and all such other and further action as, in the judgment of such officials, may be necessary, proper, convenient, or required in connection with the execution and delivery of such instruments documents or writings in order to carry out the intent of authority delegated herein. The Chancellor is authorized to develop procedures whereby nonmandatory (revenue-producing) auxiliary fees from campus operations, such as bookstore, dormitory, cafeteria, and vending machines, may be approved by him or her without prior approval by the Board (BR Minutes, 1980-81, p. 22).

Each Institution is authorized to develop procedures for approval of the following matters without the necessity of formal Board action:

- A. Adjunct (courtesy) appointments;
- B. Graduate teaching assistant appointments;
- C. Appointment of part-time faculty members, other than those faculty members who have previously retired from the System;
- D. Reappointments of temporary faculty, part-time faculty, and aliens; and
- E. Changes of designation for approved degree programs and approved administrative units.

The Chancellor shall make all recommendations regarding the establishment or discontinuance of all positions in the University System Office. He/she shall recommend the appointment of administrative officers and all other employees of the University System Office.

2. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 200, Institutional Governance

Recommended: That the Board approve revisions to Policy Manual concerning specific policies as outlined below and on successive pages for Section 200, Institutional Governance.

Specific Policies Recommended for Revision and Brief Details

- | | | |
|---------|---------------|--|
| Item 1. | Policy 205.01 | Comprehensive Academic Program Review
-- All requests for changes are to be submitted to the University System chief academic officer |
|---------|---------------|--|

The proposed revisions are provided according to each enumerated recommendation item. Please note the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted, bold texts represent additions.

Abstract/Rationale: It is recommended that Policy 205.01: Comprehensive Academic Program Review be further modified to state that all requests for changes to an institution's comprehensive academic program review schedule be submitted for review and approval by the University System chief academic officer. Updates will be provided as notification items.

Policy 205.01: Comprehensive Academic Program Review

Each University System institution shall conduct academic program review on a periodic basis. Consistent with efforts in institutional effectiveness and strategic planning, each University System institution shall develop procedures to evaluate the effectiveness of its academic programs through a systematic review of academic programs, to address the quality, viability, and productivity of efforts in teaching and learning, scholarship, and service as appropriate to the institution's mission. The review of academic programs shall involve analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data, and institutions must demonstrate that they make judgments about the future of academic programs within a culture of evidence.

The cycle of review for all undergraduate academic programs shall be no longer than seven years and for all graduate programs no longer than ten years. Programs accredited by external entities may substitute an external review for institutional program review, provided the external review meets University System and institutional requirements for program review. If an external accreditation entity's review cycle for undergraduate programs is ten years, the ten-year review cycle may be used for that program only. No program review cycle at any level shall exceed ten years.

The ~~Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic and Fiscal Affairs~~ **University System chief academic officer** must approve each institution's plan for the conduct of a complete cycle of program review and may require changes in the plan, providing adequate time for the change to be implemented. Each institution shall conduct program review according to the terms of its approved plan, with annual updates and requests for changes to the plan as necessary. **Requests for changes to the plan will be reviewed and approved by the University System chief academic officer. Updates to Comprehensive Program Review Schedules will be provided as notification items to the University System chief academic officer.** Planning and conduct of academic program reviews shall be used for the progressive improvement and adjustment of programs in the context of the institution's strategic plan and in response to findings and recommendations of the reviews. Adjustment may include program enhancement, maintenance at the current level, reduction in scope, or, if fully justified, consolidation or termination. Actions taken as the result of reviews and strategic plans shall be documented as provided below.

Each institution shall submit an annual program review report to the University System chief academic officer, which shall include a list of academic programs reviewed and a summary of

findings for programs reviewed during the previous year. The institution must summarize actions taken both as the result of current reviews and as follow-up to prior years' reviews. For each review, institutions must establish that the program has undergone review and is meeting rigorous standards. The report must identify (1) quality, viability, and productivity parameters measured, and (2) findings relative to internal standards, the institution's strategic plan, and, as appropriate, external benchmarks.

The University System chief academic officer shall monitor annually a small number of performance indicators for academic programs and shall initiate dialogue with the chief academic officer of the institution when programs do not meet the guidelines defined by the indicators. If further investigation justifies additional study, the institution may be asked to conduct an off-cycle review of such programs.

3. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 300, Academic Affairs

Recommended: That the Board approve revisions to the Policy Manual concerning specific policies as outlined below and on successive pages for Section 300, Academic Affairs.

Specific Policy Recommended for Revision and Brief Details

- | | | |
|---------|---------------|---|
| Item 1. | Policy 302.03 | Administrative Officers
-- Administrative officers have the privileges of faculty membership |
| Item 2. | Policy 305 | Grading System
-- "S" or "U" grade exceptions are to be approved by the University System chief academic officer |

The proposed revisions are provided according to each enumerated recommendation item. Please note the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted, bold texts represent additions.

Abstract/Rationale: It is recommended that Policy 302.03: Administrative Officers be revised in order to clarify and clearly differentiate the standards of performance required of administrators versus faculty members. The current language would mean that an administrative officer is held to the same teaching and research standards (e.g., number of classes taught, number of publications, external research grant dollars, etc.) as a full-time faculty member.

Policy 302.03: Administrative Officers

Faculty status of full-time administrative officers will necessarily vary with the size and complexity of the institution. A faculty member who has academic rank and rights of tenure in the Corps of Instruction and who accepts an appointment to an administrative office (other than president) shall

retain his/her academic rank and rights of tenure as an ex officio member of the Corps of Instruction but shall have no rights of tenure in the administrative office to which he or she has been appointed. The additional salary, if any, for the administrative position shall be stated in the employment contract and shall not be paid to the faculty member when he or she ceases to hold the administrative position. An administrative officer having faculty status shall have all the ~~responsibilities and~~ privileges of faculty membership. Administrative officers shall be appointed by the president with the approval of the Board of Regents and shall hold office at the pleasure of the president.

Research and Regional Universities: In addition to the Corps of Instruction, the faculty will include the president, administrative and academic deans, registrar, librarian, chief fiscal officer, and such other full-time administrative officers as the statutes of the institution may designate as having ex officio faculty status.

Each institution is required to file with the office of the Board of Regents a list of administrative offices which have faculty status (by office, not by name of individual).

~~State Colleges and Universities and Associate Degree Colleges~~ **State Universities, State Colleges, and Two-Year Colleges:** In addition to the Corps of Instruction, the faculty will consist of the president and the full-time administrative officers, and such other full-time administrative officers as the statutes of the institution may designate as having ex officio status. Each institution is required to file with the office of the Board of Regents a list of administrative offices which have faculty status (by office, not by name of individual) (BR Minutes, 1951-52, pp. 314-319; 1952-53, pp. 159-160; 1953-54, p. 225).

Abstract/Rationale: The last point of accountability on Policy 305: Grading System will reside in the System Office with the University System chief academic officer.

Policy 305: Grading System

All institutions of the University System of Georgia shall be on a 4.0 grade point average system. The following grades are approved for use in institutions in the determination of the Grade Point Average:

Grade	Grade Point Average
A	Excellent (4.0)
B	Good (3.0)
C	Satisfactory (2.0)
D	Passing (1.0)
F	Failure (0.0)
WF	Withdrew (0.0)

The following symbols are approved for use in the cases indicated, but will not be included in the determination of the grade point average.

"I" This symbol indicates that a student was doing satisfactory work but, for non-academic reasons beyond his/her control, was unable to meet the full requirements of the course. The requirements for removal of an **"I"** are left to the respective institutions; however, if an **"I"** is not satisfactorily removed after three academic terms of residence, the symbol **"I"** will be changed to the grade **"F"** by the appropriate official.

"IP" These symbols indicate that credit has not been given in courses that require a **"CP"** continuation of work beyond the term for which the student signed up for the course. The use of these symbols is approved for dissertation and thesis hours and project courses. With the exception of Learning Support or Developmental Studies courses, and Regents' Test remediation courses, these symbols cannot be used for other courses. These symbols cannot be substituted for an **"I"** (BR Minutes, 1988-89, pp. 77-78; 1990-91, p. 61).

"W" This symbol indicates that a student was permitted to withdraw without penalty. Withdrawals without penalty will not be permitted after the mid-point of the total grading period (including final examinations) except in cases of hardship as determined by the appropriate official of the respective institution.

"WM" This symbol indicates a student was permitted to withdraw under the Board of Regents policy for military service refunds (704.0401). The use of this symbol indicates that this student was permitted to withdraw without penalty at any time during the term. (BR Minutes, October 2001.)

"S" This symbol indicates that credit has been given for completion of degree requirements other than academic course work. The use of this symbol is approved for dissertation and thesis hours, student teaching, clinical practicum, internship, and proficiency requirements in graduate programs. Exceptions to the use of this symbol for academic course work must be submitted to the Chancellor **University System chief academic officer** for approval.

"U" This symbol indicates unsatisfactory performance in an attempt to complete degree requirements other than academic course work. The use of this symbol is approved for dissertation and thesis hours, student teaching, clinical practicum, internship, and proficiency requirements in graduate programs. Exceptions to the use of this symbol for academic course work must be submitted to the Chancellor **University System chief academic officer** for approval.

"V" This symbol indicates that a student was given permission to audit this course. Students may not transfer from audit to credit status or vice versa. Students may register, however, on a credit basis for a course that has previously been audited (BR Minutes, 1989- 90, p. 146).

"K" This symbol indicates that a student was given credit for the course via a credit by examination program approved by the respective institution's faculty. (CLEP, AP, Proficiency, etc.) **"K"** credit may be provided for a course the student has previously audited if the institutional procedures for credit by examination are followed (BR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 146).

Institutions are permitted to use other than the Uniform Grading System for the purpose of grading student progress in Learning Support or Developmental Studies (BR Minutes, 1974-75, pp. 109-11).

Cumulative Grade Point Average. The cumulative grade point average in each institution of the University System of Georgia will be calculated by dividing the number of hours scheduled in all courses attempted in which a grade of A, B, C, D, F or WF has been received into the number of grade points earned on those hours scheduled. The cumulative grade point average will be recorded on the student's permanent record. Institutional credit shall in no way affect the cumulative grade point average. Other averages may be computed by each institution for internal uses as may be required.

4. Revision of the Policy Manual, Section 400, Student Affairs

Recommended: That the Board approve revisions to the Policy Manual concerning specific policies as outlined below and on successive pages for Section 400: Student Affairs.

Specific Policies Recommended for Revision and Brief Details

- | | | |
|---------|-----------------|---|
| Item 1. | Policy 402 | Undergraduate Admissions
-- Exceptions are to be approved by the University System chief academic officer and reviewed by the Board biennially. |
| Item 2. | Policy 402.0101 | Freshman Requirements
-- Institutions may set higher requirements only with the written approval of the University System chief academic officer |

The proposed revisions are provided according to each enumerated recommendation item. Please note the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted, bold texts represent additions.

Abstract/Rationale: It is recommended that Policy 402: Undergraduate Admissions be modified to include a biennial review of any changes to institutional admission requirements as such revisions impact a given sector of the university system.

Policy 402: Undergraduate Admissions

Every student admitted as an undergraduate in any University System institution must meet the requirements for one of the categories listed below and must meet any additional requirements that may be prescribed by the institution. Applicants should be advised that meeting minimum requirements will not guarantee admission at any institution. Institutions may set additional and/or higher requirements than listed here. Except as explicitly permitted in this policy manual, any exceptions to these admissions policies may be made only with written approval of the ~~Chancellor~~ **University System chief academic officer. Exceptions to these admissions policies will also be**

reviewed by the Board biennially to ascertain how such action impacts other institutions within a given sector. Students must submit transcripts of all secondary and college work and must follow the application procedures specified by the institution to which they are applying.

Abstract/Rationale for Policy 402.0101: Freshman Requirements: It is recommended that Policy 402.0101: Freshman Requirements be revised to reflect the fact that state and two-year colleges should follow the current policy now in place until the success of that policy change can be evaluated. Additional language has been inserted to clarify that the current pilot policy does not now allow institutions in the state and two-year college sector to raise admission standards.

Policy 402.0101: Freshman Requirements

Students applying for freshman admissions to a University System institution must meet the following criteria:

College Preparatory Curriculum. Completion of the University System of Georgia's College Preparatory Curriculum ("CPC") requirements and graduation from a high school accredited by a regional accrediting association (such as the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools) or the Georgia Accrediting Commission or from a public school regulated by a school system and state department of education. Students applying to any institution must present credit for 16 specified CPC units.

The 16 specified University System CPC courses are:

- A. MATHEMATICS: 4 college preparatory Carnegie units of Mathematics, including Algebra I, Algebra II, and Geometry.
- B. ENGLISH: 4 college preparatory Carnegie units of English which have as their emphasis grammar and usage, literature (American, English, World), and advanced composition skills.
- C. SCIENCE: 3 college preparatory Carnegie units of Science, with at least one laboratory course from the life sciences and one laboratory course from the physical sciences.
- D. SOCIAL SCIENCE: 3 college preparatory Carnegie units of Social Science, with at least one course focusing on United States studies and one course focusing on world studies.
- E. FOREIGN LANGUAGE: 2 college preparatory Carnegie units in the same foreign language emphasizing speaking, listening, reading, and writing.

In addition to these minimum requirements, students are encouraged to take additional academic units in high school to improve their probability for admission and success.

Freshman Index. A designated score on the Freshman Index ("FI"), which is based on a combination of a student's SAT I or ACT assessment scores and high school grade point average (HSGPA). The Freshman Index is

$$\text{FI} = 500 \times (\text{HSGPA}) + \text{SAT I Verbal} + \text{SAT I Math}$$

OR

$$\text{FI} = 500 \times (\text{HSGPA}) + (\text{ACT Composite} \times 42) + 88$$

The minimum FI required for admission to a research university is 2500; regional university--2040; state university--1940; and a state or two-year college--1830.

In addition to the FI, students must have a minimum SAT I Verbal score of 430 and Mathematics score of 400 (or ACT equivalent) for admission to a university (research, regional, or state). Students without these minimum scores but with SAT I scores of at least 330 Verbal and 310 Mathematics may be considered for admission to a two-year college but will be required to exempt or exit learning support ("LS") in the areas of deficiency.

Institutions may set higher requirements for admission **only with written approval by the University System chief academic officer and a follow-up Board review of impacts to a particular institutional sector**. Students meeting the minimum FI requirements are not guaranteed admission.

A. EXCEPTIONS TO FRESHMAN ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS FOR SPECIAL GROUPS OF STUDENTS

Students may also be admitted as freshmen based on alternative evidence of college readiness. Following are modified or additional requirements for specific groups of applicants:

1. LIMITED ADMISSIONS CATEGORY

In recognition of the fact that a limited number of students do not meet established standards but do demonstrate special potential for success, institutions are authorized to grant admission to a limited number of such students. Institutions will use multiple measures whenever possible, such as interviews, portfolios, and records of experiential achievements, for students being considered for Limited Admission. The number of students who may be granted Limited Admissions will be restricted based on institutional sectors, with two-year colleges allowed the highest percentage for Limited Admissions. The FI required for Limited Admission to a research university is 2020; regional university, 1830; and state university, 1790.

Nontraditional freshmen will not be included in the Limited Admissions percentage allowed for each institution.

In addition to the FI, Limited Admissions students must have a minimum SAT I Verbal score of 430 and Mathematics score of 400 (or ACT equivalent) for admission to a university (research, regional, or state). Students with SAT I (or ACT equivalent) scores of at least 330 Verbal and 310 Math may be considered for Limited Admission to a two-year college but will be required to exempt or exit LS in the areas of deficiency.

At research, regional, and state universities, students granted Limited Admission must also have completed the 16-unit College Preparatory Curriculum ("CPC"). At state and two-year colleges, students may be considered for Limited Admission if they have a high school diploma or GED and meet the minimum SAT/ACT score requirements. A GED is acceptable only if the student's high school class has graduated. Certificates of attendance or special education diplomas are not acceptable.

PRESIDENTIAL EXCEPTIONS: Presidents of University System institutions may grant exceptions to the CPC and FI requirements for Limited Admissions if the student shows promise for academic success in college and has at least a high school diploma or GED credential. Institutions will be required to report to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs on those students granted Presidential Exceptions. Presidential Exceptions must be included as part of the institution's maximum percentage for Limited Admissions.

Students who enter under the Limited Admissions category (including Presidential Exceptions) must make up any CPC deficiencies in accordance with University System procedures. They must also be screened, as applicable, for placement in LS courses using the CPE or COMPASS administered by a University System institution and must meet University System criteria for exemption or exit of learning support in reading, English, and mathematics. (For students transferring from a Commission on Colleges ["COC"]-accredited DTAE technical college, comparable scores from the DTAE technical college may be used according to guidelines issued by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs.)

2. ALTERNATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR HOME-SCHOOLED STUDENTS AND GRADUATES OF NONACCREDITED HIGH SCHOOLS

Applicants from home schools or graduates of nonaccredited high schools may validate the CPC in an alternative way. SAT I scores and satisfactory documentation of equivalent competence in each of the CPC areas at the college-preparatory level may be used in lieu of the FI and Carnegie unit requirements of the CPC.

A student whose SAT I Composite (Verbal plus Mathematics) (or ACT equivalent) score is at or above the average SAT I score of the previous year's fall semester first-time freshmen admitted to the University System institution to which he or she is applying and who has completed the equivalent of each of the CPC areas as documented by a portfolio of work and/or other evidence that substantiates CPC completion qualifies for consideration for admission. Students in this category must also meet the minimum SAT I Verbal requirement and the minimum SAT I Mathematics requirement (or ACT equivalent) for the sector to which they apply.

Applicants who achieve designated scores on each of the following SAT II Subject Tests in a CPC area will be considered to have demonstrated equivalent CPC competence and

do not need to submit additional documentation in that area: English Writing, Literature, Math IC or Math IIC, American History & Social Studies, World History, Biology, and one of the following: Chemistry or Physics.

Students admitted in this category with satisfactory documentation of CPC competence in all areas will not be counted in the institution's Limited Admissions (including Presidential Exceptions) category. Those with qualifying SAT I scores and documentation of partial CPC completion may be admitted on the same basis and with the same conditions as other students with CPC deficiencies.

3. ADMISSION OF STUDENTS WITH OUTSTANDING SCORES

Students who demonstrate very high academic ability by achieving a composite SAT I Composite (Verbal plus Math) score in the upper five percent of national college-bound seniors according to the most recent report from the College Board and who show other evidence of college readiness may be admitted under this section. (An ACT score which is equivalent to this SAT I score may also be used.) Institutions must carefully evaluate such students to determine their ability to benefit from college coursework. Students must satisfy any CPC deficiencies in areas other than English or mathematics through college coursework.

Students admitted in this section will not count in an institution's Limited Admissions exceptions.

4. ADMISSION OF INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS

Freshman international students may be admitted in another admissions category or may be admitted in a separate category for international students under procedures established by the University System of Georgia. If these students do not meet the alternative admission procedures established under the University System of Georgia, they might be considered as Presidential Exceptions.

5. ADMISSION OF STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Because the core curriculum of each institution requires students to complete college-level courses in English, mathematics, social science, and science, all students must complete the high school CPC in these areas. Students with disabilities that preclude the acquisition of a foreign language may petition for admission without this CPC requirement according to procedures established by the System. Students with disabilities are expected to meet the sector's minimum SAT I or ACT score requirements but should request the appropriate testing accommodations from the agencies administering the SAT I or ACT.

6. JOINT ENROLLMENT/EARLY ADMISSION OF HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

The University System of Georgia recognizes the need to provide academically talented high school students with opportunities for acceleration of their formal academic

programs. This recognition has led to the development of two organized programs: (1) a joint enrollment program in which a student, while continuing his/her enrollment in high school as a junior or senior, enrolls in courses for college credit and (2) an early admissions program in which the student enrolls as a full-time college student following completion of the junior year in high school. The minimum admissions standards for both the joint enrollment and early admissions programs have been developed to allow certain advanced students to receive both high school and college credit for some courses. Procedures for admission, course selection, and instruction can be found in sections 301.01-301.06 of the Academic Affairs Handbook. (BR Minutes, September 2004)

7. RESIDENTIAL PROGRAMS

The University System of Georgia offers residential programs for gifted, talented, and motivated students at two institutions: the Advanced Academy of Georgia at the State University of West Georgia and the Georgia Academy of Mathematics, Engineering, and Sciences at Middle Georgia College. Admissions and program requirements are established by the individual institutions. (BR Minutes, September 2004)

8. EARLY COLLEGE

Early Colleges enhance students' opportunities to accelerate their education by participating in a joint high school/college program. Each Early College represents an approved partnership between a Georgia public school system and a University System of Georgia college or university. Students in University System of Georgia recognized Early Colleges are eligible for enrollment in college courses while they are enrolled in the Early College. (BR Minutes, September 2004)

5. **Revision of the Policy Manual, Section 800, Personnel**

Recommended: That the Board approve revisions to the Policy Manual concerning specific policies as outlined below and on successive pages for Section 800: Personnel.

Specific Policies Recommended for Revision and Brief Details

- | | | |
|---------|-----------------|--|
| Item 1. | Policy 803.0402 | Establishment of Special Faculty Positions
-- Institutions may require funds greater than stated minimum funding levels; endowment amounts must be assured and documented |
| Item 2. | Policy 803.05 | Intrasystem Recruitment
-- Intrasystem recruitment may occur only when an offer is being made to a candidate |

- Item 3. Policy 803.07 Evaluation of Faculty
-- Pre-tenure review policies shall be reviewed and approved by the University System chief academic officer; Administrators will not be subject to post-tenure review
- Item 4. Policy 803.09 Tenure
-- Criteria for tenure have been added to this policy
- Item 5. Policy 803.10 Non-tenure Track Personnel
-- Approval of the conversion of position type resides at the presidential level

The proposed revisions are provided according to each enumerated recommendation item. Please note the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted, bold texts represent additions.

Abstract/Rationale for Policy 803.0402: Establishment of Special Faculty Positions: Institutions may raise funds above the stated minimum funding levels. Special faculty positions will be established after funds for the position are assured, documented, and approved by the Board.

Policy 803.0402: Establishment of Special Faculty Positions

Support of Academic Positions from Gifts and Endowments

No endowed chair, professorship or fellowship will be established or announced without prior approval of the Board of Regents, and no initial appointment will be made to a chair, professorship or fellowship without prior approval by the Board. Recommendations to the Board concerning specially designated academic positions will be made through the Chancellor to the Board. Before the final action of the Board, such recommendations will be referred to the Finance and Business Operations Committee and the ~~Education, Research and Extension Committee~~ **Academic Affairs Committee**.

The minimum funding levels for each endowed academic position listed below shall be established periodically by the Board upon recommendation by the Chancellor. **Institutions may require funds greater than the stated minimum funding levels when developing support for endowed chairs.** (The initial recommendations are included below for each position.)

The categories of endowed academic positions shall be described as follows:

Research and Regional Universities		State Colleges and Universities and Associate Degree Colleges	
<i>Position Title</i>	<i>Amount</i>	<i>Position Title</i>	<i>Amount</i>
Distinguished University Chairs	\$2,000,000		
Distinguished Chairs	\$1,000,000	Distinguished Chairs	\$500,000

Chairs	\$500,000	Chairs	\$300,000
Distinguished Professorships	\$400,000	Distinguished Professorships	\$200,000
Professorships	\$200,000	Professorships	\$100,000
Distinguished Scholar	\$100,000	Distinguished Scholar	\$50,000
Fellowships	\$50,000	Fellowships	\$30,000
Lecture or Seminar Series	\$50,000	Lecture or Seminar Series	\$30,000

Specially Designated Faculty Positions Funded By Endowments

The endowed chairs, professorships and fellowships will be established by the Board of Regents upon request of the institutional President and recommendation of the Chancellor only after it is assured **and documented** that the endowment is properly funded and that the investment strategy of the endowment, wherever held, will meet the continuing demands of the chair, professorship or fellowship. This assurance must address the proper mix of capital growth, income production and liquidity. The institution will pay from its funds such amounts as are necessary to set the salary of the holder at a level commensurate with his or her record, experience, and position in the faculty. The endowment income will be used for salary supplementation and for other professional support of the holder of the endowed position, including assistance in the research of the holder.

The holder of a fellowship shall be a qualified person of any academic rank, without regard to tenure status. The endowed fellowship will be used to provide temporary support (not to exceed one academic year) of distinguished scholars who are in temporary residence at the institution while participating in planned academic programs; visiting scholars who are in temporary residence at the institution for special academic programs or purposes; institution faculty who have made unique contributions to academic life or to knowledge in their academic discipline; and institution faculty of any academic rank irrespective of tenure status, who have been selected for teaching excellence through procedures established by the institution (BR Minutes, 1989-90, pp. 147-148).

Abstract/Rationale for Policy 803.05: Intrasystem Recruitment: The proposed change to enable notification of the president of each institution will occur in those cases where an offer of employment is being made to the candidate.

Policy 803.05: Intrasystem Recruitment

It is recognized as a good practice for University System institutions to employ principal administrators and faculty members from other institutions of the System. When a president wishes to consider for employment a principal administrator or faculty member of another institution in the System, he/she shall ~~secure authorization from~~ **notify** the president of the employing institution ~~prior to contacting the~~ **before an offer is being made to the** principal administrator or faculty member.

When a formal offer is made, the letter shall include a statement to the effect that acceptance can be made only after all contractual obligations have been fulfilled ~~or a replacement secured.~~

Abstract/Rationale for Policy 803.07: Evaluation of Faculty: It is recommended that Policy 8+03.07: Evaluation of Faculty be revised to reflect the fact that administrators will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their job responsibilities are administrative in nature and are not classified as teaching responsibilities. As administrators, they are subject to administrative evaluation annually and every five years.

Policy 803.07: Evaluation of Faculty

Each institution shall establish definite and stated criteria, consistent with Regents' policies and the statutes of the institution, against which the performance of each faculty member will be evaluated. The evaluation shall occur at least annually and shall follow stated procedures as prescribed by each institution. Each institution, as part of its evaluative procedures, will utilize a written system of faculty evaluations by students, with the improvement of teaching effectiveness as the main focus of these student evaluations. The evaluation procedures may also utilize a written system of peer evaluations, with emphasis placed on the faculty member's professional development. In those cases in which a faculty member's primary responsibilities do not include teaching, the evaluation should focus on excellence in those areas (e.g., research, administration) where the individual's major responsibilities lie. Institutional policies and procedures shall ensure that each faculty member will receive a written report of each evaluation and that the results of the evaluation will be reflected in the faculty member's annual salary recommendations. Institutions will ensure that the individuals responsible for conducting performance evaluations are appropriately trained to carry out such evaluations (BR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 50; 1983-84, p. 36; May, 1996, p. 52).

Each institution shall conduct in-depth pre-tenure reviews of all faculty in their third year of progress toward tenure. The criteria established for promotion and tenure, emphasizing excellence in teaching, shall be used as the focus for these reviews. The institution shall develop pre-tenure policies, as well as any subsequent revisions (BR Minutes, April 1996, p. 39-47; May 1996, p. 52).

Institutions employing graduate teaching and/or laboratory assistants shall develop procedures to (a) provide appropriate training to support and enhance these assistants' teaching effectiveness, (b) conduct regular assessments, based on written procedures and including results of student and faculty evaluations, of each assistant's teaching effectiveness and performance, and (c) assess competency in English and, if needed, provide training in English language proficiency.

Senior administrators shall be evaluated by the administrator's supervisor, using a performance management instrument which emphasizes leadership qualities, management style, planning and organizing capacities, effective communication skills, -accountability for diversity efforts and results, and success at meeting goals and objectives. All senior administrators shall be evaluated by their subordinates (one level down) at least once every five years. Evaluation results will be the basis for the senior administrator's development plan.

Each institution shall conduct post-tenure reviews of all tenured faculty members. Each faculty member is to be reviewed five years after the most recent promotion or personnel action, and reviews shall continue at five-year intervals unless interrupted by a further review for promotion. **Administrators who have tenure and who may also have some teaching responsibilities will not be subject to post-tenure review as long as a majority of their duties are administrative in nature. At such time as an administrator may return full time to the faculty, she/he will be placed into the post-tenure review cycle and will be evaluated under those guidelines as a faculty member in the fifth year following the return to the faculty and at subsequent five year intervals.**

The institutional president shall review and approve institutional post-tenure review policies, as well as any subsequent revisions. These institutional policies must conform to the institution's mission and to System procedures for post-tenure review. Institutional policies also shall address cases in which a tenured faculty member's performance is deemed unsatisfactory (BR Minutes, April 1996, p. 39-47; May 1996, p. 52).

Abstract/Rationale: It is recommended that Policy 803.09: Tenure be remanded to the campus level. To that end, tenure decisions will reside with the institutional president. Changes in faculty policies would mean that institutions would need to report faculty tenure decisions for monitoring purposes to the Human Resources Data Mart (HRDM). Based on the discussion and informal poll of this policy as an information item during the April 2007 meeting of the Committee on Academic Affairs, it was suggested that both promotion and tenure decisions reside at the presidential level.

Policy 803.09: Tenure **and Criteria for Tenure**

- A. Each institution in the University System shall establish clearly stated tenure criteria and procedures that emphasize excellence in teaching for all teaching faculty. Such policies shall conform to the requirements listed below and shall be reviewed and approved by the ~~Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs~~ **University System chief academic officer**. The requirements listed below shall be the minimum standard for award of tenure, but they are to be sufficiently flexible to permit an institution to make individual adjustments to its own peculiar problems or circumstances. These policies are to be considered a statement of general requirements which are capable of application throughout the System and are not a limitation upon any additional standards and requirements which a particular institution may wish to adopt for its own improvement. Such additional standards and requirements, which must be consistent with the Regents' policies and approved by the Board of Regents, shall be incorporated into the statutes of an institution.

Criteria for Tenure

1. **Minimum for all three types of institutions in all professorial ranks:**
 - a. **Superior teaching; Demonstrating excellence in instruction**
 - b. **Academic achievement, as appropriate to the mission**
 - c. **Outstanding service to the institution, profession, or community**

d. Professional growth and development

Noteworthy achievement in all four of the above need not be demanded, but should be expected in at least two. A written recommendation should be submitted by the head of the department concerned, setting forth the reasons for tenure. The faculty member's length of service with an institution shall be taken into consideration in determining whether or not the faculty member should be tenured.

- 2. Research and Regional Universities: In addition to "1" above, tenure at the rank of associate or full professor requires the earned doctorate or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Neither the possession of a doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee of tenure.**
 - 3. State Universities: In addition to "1" above, tenure requires the earned doctorate or its equivalent in training, ability, and/or experience. Neither the possession of a doctorate nor longevity of service is a guarantee of tenure.**
 - 4. State and Two-Year Colleges: In addition to "1" above, tenure requires at least the equivalent of two years of full-time study beyond the bachelor's degree. Longevity of service is not a guarantee of tenure.**
- B.** Tenure resides at the institutional level. Institutional responsibility for employment of a tenured individual is to the extent of continued employment on a 100% workload basis for two out of every three consecutive academic terms until retirement, dismissal for cause, or release because of financial exigency, or program modification as determined by the Board.
- C.** Normally, only assistant professors, associate professors, and professors who are employed full-time (as defined by Regents' policies) by an institution are eligible for tenure. However, faculty members holding these professorial ranks who are employed by or on the staff of the Medical College of Georgia (MCG) on less than a full-time basis, and who also hold an appointment at the Veterans Administration Medical Center-Augusta, shall be eligible for promotion and/or the award of tenure by the Board of Regents **institutional president** (BR Minutes, 1979-80, p. 73; 1980-81, p. 303; 1990-91, pp. 369- 70). The term "full-time" is used in these tenure regulations to denote service on a 100% work load basis for at least two out of three consecutive academic terms. Faculty members with adjunct appointments shall not acquire tenure. The award of tenure is limited to the above academic ranks and shall not be construed to include honorific appointments (BR Minutes, 1990-91, pp. 369-70).
- D.** Tenure may be awarded, upon ~~recommendation~~ **approval** by the President, upon completion of a probationary period of at least five years of full-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher. The five-year period must be continuous except that a maximum of two

years interruption because of a leave of absence or part-time service may be permitted, provided, however that an award of credit for the probationary period of an interruption shall be at the discretion of the President. In all cases in which a leave of absence, approved by the President, is based on birth or adoption of a child, or serious disability or prolonged illness of the employee or immediate family member, the five-year probationary period may be suspended during the leave of absence. A maximum of three years credit toward the minimum probationary period may be allowed for service in tenure track positions at other institutions or for full-time service at the rank of instructor or lecturer at the same institution. Such credit for prior service shall be **defined approved** in writing by the president ~~and approved by the Board of Regents~~ at the time of the initial appointment at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this Policy Manual, in exceptional cases an institution **president may approve an outstanding distinguished senior faculty member for the award of tenure** ~~may recommend to the Board of Regents that an outstanding distinguished senior faculty member be awarded tenure~~ upon the faculty member's initial appointment; **such action is otherwise referred to as tenure upon appointment**. Each such recommendation shall be ~~considered by the Board individually and shall be~~ granted only in cases in which the faculty member, at a minimum, is appointed as an associate or full professor, was already tenured at ~~his or her~~ **a** prior institution, and brings a demonstrably national reputation to the institution (BR Minutes, 1983-84, p. 94; May, 1996, p. 52; April 2000, pp. 31-32). **If the person is being appointed to an administrative position and has not previously held tenure, the award of tenure must be approved at the level of the Chancellor.**

- E. Anything in this Policy Manual to the contrary notwithstanding, faculty members employed by the Medical College of Georgia (MCG) who hold a professorial rank in a tenure track position of assistant professor or above and who also hold a part-time or full-time appointment at the Veterans Administration Medical Center-Augusta (VA), shall as stated above (Section 803.09-C) be eligible for the award of tenure at MCG upon completion of at least five years of full-time or part-time service at the rank of assistant professor or higher. Such faculty members shall otherwise meet the same probationary periods, criteria for promotion, procedures and other requirements set forth in the Bylaws and Policy Manual of the Board of Regents and Statutes of MCG for the award of tenure to full-time faculty, provided, however, that such faculty members who have been employed previously by MCG for five consecutive years or more shall be eligible to apply for tenure.

The tenure of a faculty member who also holds a VA appointment shall apply only to that portion of a faculty member's salary and benefits which are provided directly by MCG. In no event shall the award of tenure to faculty members holding such joint appointments obligate MCG to assume any portion of the salary or other benefits provided by the VA.

In the event a faculty member who has been awarded tenure at MCG under the provisions of this section shall for any reason cease to be employed by the VA, the Medical College shall have the right, at its sole discretion, to revoke the tenure, employment or other affiliation of the faculty member by MCG without a hearing or other due process procedures or

requirements set forth in the Bylaws and Policy Manual of the Board of Regents and the Statutes of MCG for other full-time tenured faculty. After termination of employment or revocation of tenure, MCG shall not be obligated to provide such faculty members with any further salary, benefits or other financial support.

- F. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum time that may be served at the rank of assistant professor or above without the award of tenure shall be seven years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for an eighth year may be proffered if a recommendation for tenure is not approved by the ~~Board of Regents~~ **president**. The maximum time that may be served in combination of full-time instructional appointments (instructor or professorial ranks) without the award of tenure shall be 10 years, provided, however, that a terminal contract for the 11th year may be proffered if a recommendation for tenure is not approved by the ~~Board of Regents~~ **president** (BR Minutes, 1992 - 93, p. 188; April 2000, pp. 31-32).
- G. Except for the approved suspension of the probationary period due to a leave of absence, the maximum period of time that may be served at the rank of full-time instructor shall be seven years (BR Minutes, April 2000, pp. 31-32).
- H. Tenure or probationary credit towards tenure is lost upon resignation from an institution, or written resignation from a tenured position in order to take a non-tenured position, or written resignation from a position for which probationary credit toward tenure is given in order to take a position for which no probationary credit is given. In the event such an individual is again employed as a candidate for tenure, probationary credit for the prior service may be awarded in the same manner as for service at another institution.
- I. Upon approval of the award of tenure to an individual by the ~~Board of Regents~~ **president**, that individual shall be notified in writing by the president of his/her institution, with a copy of the notification forwarded to the ~~Chancellor or his/her designee~~ **University System chief academic officer**.
- J. Each institution shall provide data annually to the **University System chief academic officer** ~~Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs~~ showing the institution's tenure rates by gender and race.
- K. **By February 15 of each year, each institution will submit to the University System chief academic officer a list of names of faculty to be tenured, effective July 1. For each of these, the institution will provide the percentage of faculty who already hold tenure in that field and department. If, after the approval of tenure of the faculty member(s) under consideration, the above percentage will be less than or equal to 66.67%, the President may approve tenure for them without further consultation of Board staff. This percentage is one that is often used to allow for contraction capability in case of an enrollment downturn or shift in demand for that field. If, after the approval of tenure of the faculty member(s) under consideration, the above percentage will be greater than**

66.67%, the following information must accompany the name: An analysis of the expected institutional liability (\$ costs) associated with a positive tenure decision, how that risk is to be managed, and what the positive benefits are of this decision. After review and endorsement by University System chief academic officer, the President may approve tenure.

Abstract/Rationale for Policy 803.10: Non-tenure Track Personnel: It is recommended that Policy 803.10: Non-tenure Track Personnel be revised to demonstrate that tenure decisions will now be the responsibility of and reside at the presidential level.

Policy 803.10: Non-tenure Track Personnel

Institutions of the University System are authorized to establish professional positions designated as non-tenure track positions. Each institution shall prepare annually, along with its budget, a list of positions so designated for signations submitted during the budget year must also be approved by the Chancellor or his/her designee. Positions designated as non-tenure track positions or as tenure track positions may be converted to the other type only with approval by the ~~Chancellor or his/her designee~~ **institutional president**.

Non-tenure track positions may be established for full-time professional personnel employed in administrative positions or to staff research, technical, special, career, and public service programs or programs which are anticipated to have a limited lifespan or which are funded, fully or partially, through non-System sources. There shall be no maximum time limitation for service in positions in this category.

The following provisions shall apply to all non-tenure track professional personnel:

- A. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions shall not be eligible for consideration for the award of tenure.
- B. Probationary credit toward tenure shall not be awarded for service in non-tenure track positions.
- C. Notice of intention to renew or not to renew contracts of non-tenure track personnel who have been awarded academic rank (Instructor, Assistant Professor, Associate Professor, Professor) shall follow the schedule required for tenure track personnel. This schedule of notification shall not apply to other professional personnel.
- D. Individuals employed in non-tenure track positions may apply on an equal basis with other candidates for tenure track positions which may become available.

The transfer of individuals from tenure-track positions to non-tenure track positions shall be effected on a voluntary basis only (BR Minutes, 1982 – 83, pp. 255 – 256).

6. Revision and Reorganization of The Policy Manual, Section 900, Facilities

The Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels (the University System chief facilities officer), presented information on proposed Policy Manual revisions and reorganization of Section 900 regarding facilities.

Item 1 – Propose reorganization and expansion of existing Policy Manual Section 900: Real Estate and Facilities.

Item 2 – New Policy 901.04 - Expand existing Policy 904 requiring procedures for building projects to address all Real Estate and Facilities areas of responsibility. (For example, but not limited to, real estate due diligence, environmental guidelines, major repair and rehabilitation guidelines, and master planning template/guidelines)

Item 3 – New Policy 901.07 - Update Naming Policy (existing Policy 912). New language separates policy level changes and procedural changes. It includes delegation of naming of interior spaces.

Item 4 – New Policy 904 - Clarify the Board’s intent related to Facilities Project Authorization in existing Policy 902. Existing Policy 902 reserves the authority for the Board to authorize projects. The Board authorized (existing Policy 904) Building Project Procedure (“BPP”) manual allows the University System chief facilities officer to approve projects with cost below \$1 million. In addition, clarify that the University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority to approve projects under \$1 million applies only to projects that conform with the Campus Master Plan. No further delegation to the institutions is implied. The Board may wish to reconsider its position on further delegation to the institutions.

Item 5 – New Policy 906.01 - Change (existing Policy 709.01C) Board’s and University System chief facilities officer’s level of delegated authority to approve qualifications based selections (“QBS”) of architects, engineers, construction managers, planners, and other consultants. Allows for further delegation of authority to the presidents of the institutions.

New Policy 906.01 - Increases University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority (existing Policy 709.01C) to sign contracts from \$1 million to \$5 million. Allows for further delegation of signature authority to the presidents of the institutions through the BPP. (New Policy 906.02 requires annual report to the Board.)

New Policy 906.01 - Increases University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority to sign change orders on bid projects. (Note: there are currently restrictions and guidelines for bid project change orders in the BPP manual. These checks and balances will remain in place for change orders.

New Policy 906.01 – Allows University System chief facilities officer to delegate authority for institution presidents to approve selection of master planning consultants and increase contracting authority for master planning contracts. (New Policy 901.04 requires all campus master plans be

accomplished in accord with the University System of Georgia campus master planning template/guidelines.)

Item 6 – New Policy 906.02 requires annual report on contracting (including qualifications-based selections) to the Board.

Item 7 – New Policy 909.02 – Change existing Policy 701.01 and 102B to increase University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority for acceptance of gifts and purchase of real property from \$100,000 to \$250,000. Limit delegated authority based on conformance with campus master plans, no reversionary clause, and no other restrictions on use.

Item 8– New Policy 909.04 and its subsections – Reiterates existing Policy 914 and its subsections regarding easements.

Item 9 – New Policy 910 – Use of Board of Regents property including Leasing as Landlord to be expanded on:

Future New Policy 910.03 – Will change existing Policy 909.03 to shift authority to lease housing to outside groups, for up to one year, from the Chancellor to the institution president. Further – Will clarify intent and change existing Policy 915.03 to shift authority to lease housing to outside groups, up to 2,000 square feet for up to two years, from the Chancellor to the institution president. Attorney General approval of standard forms of agreement, and reporting to the University System chief facilities officer would be required.

Future New Policy 910.04 - Change existing Policy 915.01A to shift authority to lease University System of Georgia owned laboratory and research space to private entities, from the Chancellor to the institution president. A special task force needs to be assigned to recommend procedures and guidelines for this practice. Implementation of this policy change should be contingent upon putting procedures and guidelines in place. Coordination with the Attorney General, standard forms of agreement and reporting would be required.

New Policy 910.05 - Update needed for existing Policy 909.02 related to Presidents’ homes.

Item 10 – New Policy 911.01 - Change existing Policy 102 to increase University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority to authorize, execute, accept and deliver all rental agreements as tenant from \$5,000 to \$20,000. Address limits on amendments to such delegated agreements.

Item 11 – New Policy 912.03 - Increase Chancellor’s and University System chief facilities officer’s delegated authority to allocate emergency MRR funds from \$200,000 to \$500,000 and \$200,000 to \$250,000 respectively (existing Policy Section 102).

Item 12 – Change policy to eliminate wordy, unnecessary verbiage.

Item 13 – Change policy to change titles to a generic form.

Item 14 – Change policy to ensure consistency of descriptions.

Item 15 – Modify various Regents procedures and guidelines as follows:

Modify Real Estate Guidelines to address “limiting” language related to number of options to renew on standard (non PPV) lease agreements through appropriate procedures and guidelines (in lieu of policy).

Modify BPP manual to delegate approval of payment of invoices from the Office of Facilities to the institution with notification to the Office of Facilities. Clarify intent through levels of delegated authority.

Modify BPP manual to delegate selection of and approval of testing and lab fees from the Office of Facilities to the institution. Requires training to meet requirements of new State Construction Manual. Consider having levels of delegated authority.

Modify BPP manual to incorporate the requirement that – (portions of Existing Policy 709.01) Construction contracts which involve expenditures of \$25,000 or more shall require certification by the contractor that a drug-free workplace is provided to the contractor's and subcontractor's employees in accordance with laws of the State of Georgia and further that - All such construction contracts shall contain a certification that the contractor will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, sale, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance or marijuana during the performance of the contract (BR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 387).

Modify BPP manual to incorporate new Campus levels of delegated authority.

Modify BPP manual to incorporate new facilities naming procedures and guidelines.

Background: This information is presented based on the premise that decisions should be made at the lowest level where management is given the responsibility to act and is held accountable for their actions.

These concepts were proposed by the Approvals and Authorities Committee for Facilities co-chaired by Presidents Thomas A. Wilkerson of Bainbridge College and Thomas Z. Jones of Armstrong Atlantic State University. The committee was made up of: James Black, Chief Business Officer, Valdosta State University, Michael Renfrow, Assistant Vice President/Campus Planning & Facilities, University of West Georgia, Jack Reynolds, Director of Plant Operations, Dalton State College, Janet Kirkpatrick, Director of Facilities, Middle Georgia College and Dr. G. Wayne Clough, President, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Proposed reorganization of Section 900

LEGEND

Plain text = existing policy language

Highlighted in yellow = new text

Italics = notes to reader to eventually be eliminated

~~Strike through~~ = existing policy text to be deleted

Board of Regents Policy Manual: Section 900: Real Estate and Facilities

901 GENERAL POLICY ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

Expand this new section as needed

The term “real estate” includes land and anything permanently affixed to or growing upon the land. All rights issuing out of, annexed to, and exercisable within or about real property. Any estate or interest in real property.

The term “facilities” includes buildings of all types, as well as campus grounds and athletic venues. It includes all outdoor areas of a USG institution including streets, entrances, gates, and landscape features, such as quadrangles, gardens, lakes, fountains, recreation fields, and such.

901.01 LEGACY OF OWNERSHIP *(OLD SECTION 901)*

Title to all real, personal, and mixed property of whatever nature of each of the institutions named in the Bylaws of the Board is vested in the Board of Regents, to be held by said Board in trust for the benefit and use of the institutions entitled thereto, it being the purpose and intent of the General Assembly that the Board of Regents shall hold title to the property or assets of each institution, so that each institution shall receive the use and benefit of the property devoted to its use, and in no event shall the property or assets of one institution be subject to the liabilities or obligations of any other institution, provided, however, that this restriction shall not prevent the Board of Regents from utilizing the facilities, educational or otherwise, of one institution for the advancement or assistance of another (Acts, 1931, pp. 7, 26).

901.02 PORTFOLIO MANAGEMENT AND UTILIZATION

Add New Section on asset management including reference to Building and Real Estate inventories, space utilization (standards) and joint use of space.

901.03 COMPLIANCE AND RISK MANAGEMENT

EXPAND NEW SECTION as necessary.

The Board of Regents recognizes the importance of compliance with all applicable laws and regulations and to that end encourages the employment of knowledgeable professionals in the acquisition, development, planning, design, construction/renovation, management and operations of its real estate and facilities. In the absence of specific laws or regulations, industry standards and good management practices shall be followed.

Pro-active efforts shall be initiated to ensure that compliance is addressed and risks are appropriately managed.

901.04 BOARD OF REGENTS PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES *(OLD SECTION 904 deleted and expanded to address broader range of Facilities issues)*

~~Building projects authorized by the Board of Regents shall be processed in accord with the procedure prepared by the Chief Facilities Officer, recommended by the Chancellor, approved by the Board of Regents, and published under the title, Building Project Procedure.~~

The Board of Regents holds the University System chief facilities officer responsible for the establishment of the procedures and guidelines under which the acquisition, development, planning, design, construction/renovation, management, and operation of facilities of the University System of Georgia shall be accomplished. Documentation of Board of Regents procedures and guidelines shall be maintained and updated in electronic format and shall be readily available to institutions, consultants, vendors, and any other parties involved in work on University System of Georgia (USG) Facilities related initiatives. A complete list, and access to current documents will be accessible on the USG web site. Hard copies will be available in the Office of Facilities.

The University System chief facilities officer shall work with the Attorney General's Office to make available to institutions standard forms of agreement, contracts, and other templates of legal documents that might expedite or facilitate Real Estate and/or other Facilities transactions.

The University System Chief Facilities Officer shall periodically update the Board on the status of documents available for guidance on USG facilities related topics.

901.05 TRAINING AND STAFF DEVELOPMENT *ADD NEW PARAGRAPH on the importance of training and staff development in knowledge of, and compliance with, applicable laws, regulations, and industry standards as well as Regents' procedures and guidelines related to all Real Estate and Facilities issues.*

901.06 DELEGATION OF AUTHORITY *EXPAND NEW PARAGRAPH on Delegation of Authority in this section and any clarification needed.*

For the purposes of the Board of Regents Policy Manual Section 900, unless specifically designated otherwise, the Chancellor's designee shall be the University System chief facilities officer.

901.07 PLACE NAMING *(OLD SECTION 912 updated for consideration. Significant detail was shifted to Board of Regents place naming procedures and guidelines which are included at end of section)*

The Board of Regents considers the naming of **a place in the University System of Georgia** (in honor of a living or deceased individual, corporation, foundation, or organization) to be one of the highest **distinctions and most distinct honors** that it can bestow. **Place naming shall require authorization by the Board of Regents and shall be in accord with Board of Regents procedures and guidelines.**

In light of the importance and magnitude of this honor, **The place naming** following policy shall apply to the naming of all Board of Regents real estate and ~~physical~~ facilities. **(See section 901 for definition.)** This includes ~~streets on~~ all property owned or leased by the University System of Georgia, including facilities constructed by affiliated organizations of the institutions.

~~The term "facilities" does not include interior spaces such as rooms, hallways, etc., within buildings and sports facilities. The President of College/University has the authority to name such interior spaces. The President of College/University will notify the Board of Regents, on a timely basis and for informational purposes only, any such interior space naming.~~

Although place namings are considered permanent, the place namings of facilities and grounds of an institution will endure only for the useful life of the facility or feature and not in perpetuity. If a facility or area is demolished, destroyed, developed or substantially changed, a named building or area may no longer exist. In that event, the president of an institution may determine if maintaining the name for transfer to a new facility or area is appropriate. The president ultimately determines the validity of maintaining a name for transfer at the institution level and shall seek Board approval as appropriate.

Situations may occur which would warrant the removal of a name from a place in the University System of Georgia. Circumstances may dictate that the parameters under which a name was bestowed have changed to the extent that consideration must be given to removing the name. As place naming authority lies with the Board of Regents, so does the authority and responsibility to remove a name.

The president of an institution is authorized to act, without prior approval of the Board of Regents, in the authorization of interior space namings, and naming removals, on behalf of the

Board of Regents, with authority to act for the Board in the authorization of names, and removal of names, that are in accord with the Board of Regents place naming procedures and guidelines. The term interior space includes rooms, hallways, etc., within buildings. The University System chief facilities officer shall be notified, for informational purposes only, on any such interior space naming on a timely basis.

Move the following stricken text to Board of Regents Place Naming Procedures and Guidelines

~~The act of naming a University System facility or street is the conferral of not only a high honor, but also a conspicuous honor. It publicly exhibits the judgment and standards of the University System of Georgia and signifies lasting approval of the actions of the honoree. Given the fact that a name may be on display for decades, the task of naming should not be taken lightly. Rather, each institution should carefully consider each name, seek advice, and use the utmost discretion in ensuring that those upon whom such an honor is bestowed are truly worthy.~~

~~In order to allow for the individual being honored to enjoy and take part in the honor when it is bestowed, the Board of Regents will allow facilities and streets to be named after a living individual if the person to be honored has provided outstanding service to the institution, to the nation, or to society, and has served with distinction.~~

When naming is to honor a living person for outstanding and distinguished service as a public servant, that person must have been disassociated from employment by or service to the University System or from state or federal government employment for at least two years prior to the naming. **In the event that the individual being honored is no longer living, the standards listed above will still apply, however, the two year waiting period may be waived.**

Move the following stricken text to Board of Regents Place Naming Procedures and Guidelines

~~In light of the fact that every institution within the University System is different, "outstanding service" is intended, to a certain extent, to be a flexible standard. Each naming situation must be judged on its own merits after taking into account the facts that are relevant to the person being honored and the institution involved. The president of each institution shall endeavor to ensure that the proposed naming is consistent with the interests of the institution and the University System and that the value of service warrants the action proposed.~~

All proposed namings will be submitted to the **University System** chief facilities officer who shall then submit the recommendations to the Board of Regents **for approval in accord with the Board's place naming procedures and guidelines.** The Board of Regents must approve the proposed name of a facility or street, whether to honor an individual, corporation, foundation, or organization or to memorialize a deceased individual.

Move the following stricken text to Board of Regents Place Naming Procedures and Guidelines

All namings pursuant to this policy should be subject to periodic review to determine that the naming continues to be consistent with the interest of the institution as described in The Policy Manual. Since naming often occurs in recognition of a gift or commitment to an institution, Institutions shall maintain current will develop guidelines for **place** naming opportunities covered by Board of Regents policy at their campuses, including appropriate financial commitments corresponding to such naming opportunities. These **Updates of institution place naming** guidelines will be submitted to the Board of Regents **University System chief facilities officer** for review (BR Minutes, May 2004).

The University System chief facilities officer shall report periodically to the Board on the history of place (facilities and interior space) namings including the status of fund raising in association with such namings.

902. STRATEGIC CAPITAL PLANNING

902.01 SYSTEMWIDE MULTI-YEAR PLANNING AND FUNDING MODEL

Add New Section on multiyear strategic programming and funding model (cash, State G.O. bonds, other financing options)

902.02 CAMPUS MASTER PLANNING (OLD SECTION 908.01)

A master plan for capital development of each institution shall be maintained on a current basis in the office of the Board and at the institution. Development and maintenance of such plans shall involve continuous study by the office of the **University System** chief facilities officer under the supervision of the Chancellor and the respective institutions. The **University System** chief facilities officer shall periodically inform the Board of the scope and direction of campus master plans for capital development (BR Minutes, May 1995).

903 OFF CAMPUS INSTRUCTIONAL SITES

THIS EXISTING SECTION (920) NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED (w/ Academic Affairs) AND UPDATED:

In accordance with Section 303.03 of The Policy Manual, University System institutions may offer instruction at locations away from their home campuses. Institutions must follow appropriate procedures for approval to offer such instruction as specified in Section 303.03. No institution may propose the use of any off-campus instructional location prior to approval of the academic program(s) to be offered at that location.

Once approval to offer external instruction has been secured, any utilization of off-campus facilities must adhere to the following guidelines:

- Every off-campus instructional location in the University System of Georgia will conform to all appropriate standards of due diligence, structural integrity, adequacy of resources, and responsible use as designated by the **University System** chief facilities officer. Facilities will be appropriate to support the academic purpose of the off-campus location and will reflect quality standards comparable to home campus facilities.
- Any off-campus instructional location that requires or anticipates no capital investment for facilities (either to acquire or to operate) within the next three fiscal years is subject to administrative review and approval by the Chancellor.
- Any off-campus instructional location that requires or anticipates a capital investment for facilities (either to acquire or to operate) within the next three fiscal years must be reviewed and approved by the Board of Regents.
- In all cases, the proposal shall be reviewed in accordance with the External Instruction in the University System of Georgia: Policies and Procedures, as adopted by the Board of Regents on February 2, 2005, and as thereafter amended. Institutions must adhere to the guidelines, criteria, and nomenclature contained in that document. The designation of an off-campus instructional location as a campus, center, or consortium requires approval by the Board of Regents through its Committee on Academic Affairs.
- The University System Office's review shall be coordinated by the **University System chief academic officer** in consultation with the **University System chief facilities officer**, and if the proposal anticipates the creation of a new location or significant expansion of an existing location, it shall be presented to the Board of Regents for approval. (BR Minutes, February 2005.)

904 PROJECT AUTHORIZATION

904.01 AUTHORIZATION BY BOARD OF REGENTS *(OLD SECTION 902 partial)*

All new buildings, major renovation, rehabilitation, or other projects, except routine maintenance, involving the campus or buildings of a unit of the University System using funds from any source shall require authorization by the Board of Regents and shall be implemented in accord with established Board procedures under the direction of the **University System** chief facilities officer. (~~For Construction Contracts, see section 709.01).~~

Consider proposed NEW PARAGRAPH to clarify Chief Facilities Officer's delegated authority.

The University System chief facilities officer is authorized to act, without prior approval of the Board of Regents, in the authorization of projects on behalf of the Board of Regents, with authority to act for the Board in the authorization of projects that are in accordance with the

accepted campus master plan, provided, however, that the authority so delegated shall be for projects that do not exceed the sum of \$1,000,000 in initial construction cost.

Consider proposed NEW PARAGRAPH below on further delegation of authority to institutions to authorize projects under \$1 million that are in accord with the accepted campus master plan on file with the Board of Regents.

The University System chief facilities officer may delegate any or all of the above authority, to authorize projects, to individual institution presidents in the University System based upon an evaluation by the Chancellor or University System chief facilities officer of the ability of an institution to properly administer the delegated authority. Such delegation of authority shall be administered in accordance with Board of Regents policies, procedures and guidelines. Delegated authority may be withdrawn at the discretion of the Chancellor or the University System chief facilities officer.

904.02 ANNUAL PLAN FOR CAPITAL IMPLEMENTATION *(OLD SECTION 902 partial)*

The Board of Regents shall establish on an annual basis the projects to be included in the University System building program upon the recommendation of the Chancellor who shall take into consideration the funds available and the requests of the presidents of the institutions.

904.03 EMERGENCY AND OTHER PROJECTS OUTSIDE ANNUAL PLAN

ADD NEW SECTION on Board approval of “opportunity” and emergency projects which may arise outside the Annual Capital Implementation Plan

905 CAPITAL PROGRAM PROCUREMENT

905.01 PROJECT DELIVERY

The Board of Regents shall use appropriate construction delivery methods in accord with current industry practices and under procedures and guidelines developed by the University System chief facilities officer. *(Take procedures to the Board when the new State Construction Manual is available—SCM anticipated in July.)*

905.02 PROFESSIONAL SERVICES *(EXISTING SECTIONS 908.02 & 903)*

When any institution of the University System of Georgia requires professional advice in laying out long-range plans for campus and plant development, the **University System** chief facilities officer may authorize the employment of a competent professional to gather necessary information and render needed services. The **University System** chief facilities officer shall inform the Board periodically of the progress of campus planning efforts (BR Minutes, May 1995).

Facilities related consultants, including but not limited to architects, engineers, landscape architects, interior designers, **program managers**, and facilities planners, shall be procured in accordance with **Board of Regents** procedures developed by the Chief Facilities Officer, recommended by the Chancellor, and approved by the Board (BR Minutes, September 1997).

905.03 CONSTRUCTION SERVICES

POSSIBLE NEW PARAGRAPH on bidding (Take procedures to the Board when the new State Construction Manual (SMC) is available—SCM anticipated in July.)

POSSIBLE NEW PARAGRAPH on qualifications-based selection of Construction Managers (Take procedures to the Board when the new SCM is available—SCM anticipated in July.)

905.05 FURNITURE, FIXTURES, AND EQUIPMENT

THIS OLD SECTION 905 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED:

In connection with the development of a new facility at an institution of the University System of Georgia the cost of the purchase of essential furniture required to place the facility in operation shall be included in the total project budget of the facility. Such furniture shall be that required in addition to existing furniture which is suitable for moving into the new facility.

The purchase of instructional, administrative, operational or maintenance equipment for use in a new facility shall be the responsibility of the institution. The Chancellor and his/her staff will cooperate with and assist the institution in securing whatever assistance in the purchase of equipment that may be available through special or restricted funds included in the total funds of the project other than bond funds (BR Minutes, 1950-51, p. 199; 1950, p. 415; 1951-52, p. 10; 1952-53, pp. 4-5).

~~The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia acknowledges that title to any equipment purchased for the Georgia Education Authority (University) and/or the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission by the Board of Regents or any of its institutions or branches through the facilities of the State Purchasing Department is vested in the Georgia Education Authority (University) and/or the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, provided that the Georgia Education Authority (University) and/or the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission will issue a letter of instructions and offer to reimburse for equipment within a specific specification on a specific project, and that the Board of Regents acknowledges by letter from the Chief Facilities Officer that it is proceeding to procure the equipment in accordance with the letter of instructions (BR Minutes, 1975-76, pp. 240-241).~~

906 CONTRACTING

906.01 CONTRACTING AUTHORITY *EXISTING SECTION 709.01 B*

Unless otherwise provided by these policies, major construction contracts **and related professional service contracts** entered into by the Board of Regents shall require prior approval by the Board.

The University System chief facilities officer is authorized to act, on behalf of the Board of Regents, without prior approval of the Board of Regents, in a bid award of previously authorized construction projects.

EXISTING SECTION 709.01 C, 709.01 D TO BE MOVED INTO PROCEDURES MANUAL

~~Construction contracts which involve expenditures of \$25,000 or more shall require certification by the contractor that a drug free workplace is provided to the contractor's and subcontractor's employees in accordance with laws of the State of Georgia (BR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 387). All such construction contracts shall contain a certification that the contractor will not engage in the unlawful manufacture, sale, distribution, dispensation, possession, or use of a controlled substance or marijuana during the performance of the contract (BR Minutes, 1989-90, p. 387).~~

(EXISTING SECTION 102 & 906 increase \$1m limit to \$5m)

The Chancellor or the **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to act, without prior approval of the Board of Regents, **in the qualifications-based selection of professionals** and as the contracting officer for and on behalf of the Board of Regents, with authority to act for the Board in the execution of construction contracts/contract change orders, ~~to construction contracts,~~ professional service contracts/**contract amendments, including but not limited to** and the selection of architects and engineers and execution of architectural/engineering contracts for the preparation of plans for new buildings or engineering projects, major remodeling, ~~rehabilitation funds~~ and other projects, ~~except routine maintenance~~ in the University System of Georgia, provided, however, that the authority so delegated shall not exceed the sum of **\$5,000,000** for any one contractual obligation.

The Chancellor or the **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to delegate any or all of the above authority, **in qualifications-based selections and** to act as contracting officer, to individual institutions in the University System of Georgia based upon an evaluation by the Chancellor or **University System** chief facilities officer of the ability of an institution to properly administer the delegated authority. Such delegation of authority shall be administered in accordance with **Board** policies, and procedures and guidelines. ~~approved by the Chancellor or Chief Facilities Officer.~~ **Delegated authority may be withdrawn at the discretion of the Chancellor or the University System chief facilities officer.** (BR Minutes, 1991-92, pp. 319-320).

The Chancellor and the **University System** chief facilities officer shall be authorized and empowered, in the name and on behalf of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, to take or cause to be taken any and all such other and further action as, in the judgment of such officials, may be necessary, proper, convenient or required in connection with the execution and delivery of such instruments, documents or writings in order to carry out the intent of authority delegated (BR Minutes, March, 1981).

906.02 REQUIRED REPORTING

NEW SECTION ON REQUIREMENT FOR ANNUAL REPORT ON CONTRACTING (including Qualifications-Based Selections) TO THE BOARD

The University System chief facilities officer shall inform the Board periodically on the volume, scope, and progress of capital projects. An annual report on Board of Regents facilities design and construction related contracting, including information on levels of authority delegated to institutions, and qualifications-based selections, shall be provided to the Board at the first Board meeting following the end of the calendar year.

906.03 DEBARMENT *(EXISTING SECTION 918)*

A design professional, consultant, or contractor may be debarred from performing any work, in any capacity, for the Board of Regents for a period of time up to five years from the date of determination. This sanction may be imposed by the Chancellor as the final agency decision based on the recommendation by a hearing panel comprised of the **University System** chief facilities officer or his/her designee and two other members appointed by the **University System** chief facilities officer. Cause for debarment will include commission of a criminal act in obtaining or attempting to obtain a contract or in the performance of a contract, any act indicating a lack of business integrity or business honesty, violation of state or Federal antitrust statutes, deliberate failure without good cause to perform under the terms of a contract with the Board of Regents, unsatisfactory performance under the terms of a contract with the Board of Regents, any violation of the conflict of interest statutes of the State of Georgia, or any other cause so serious and compelling as to affect the responsibility of the design professional, consultant, or contractor.

907 FACILITIES AND CAMPUS GROUNDS DEVELOPMENT

907.01 SUSTAINABLE DESIGN AND LIFE CYCLE COSTING *(EXISTING SECTION 908.03 & 908.03.01)*

USG buildings and grounds shall be planned and developed to provide long-term lifecycle benefits, and each campus's individual architectural character and landscape shall be maintained in a coordinated and consistent manner. In order to ensure that this intent is achieved:

Each campus shall employ design and construction concepts to allow for adaptive reuse, appropriate infrastructure, and flexibility to accommodate evolving technology. State-funded educational buildings shall be designed and constructed to provide quality service for 50 or more years, ultimately serving the citizens of Georgia by achieving long-term life cycle benefits (a positive cost-to-benefit return on the initial investment) (BR Minutes, September 2002).

907.02 BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS *(EXISTING SECTION 908.03.02)*

Each campus shall develop standards that establish basic aesthetic expectations for construction. These standards shall be founded on and complementary to the University System of Georgia's

preplanning guidelines. Campus standards shall establish the campus's architectural theme and provide specificity sufficient to guide future construction activities to achieve harmony with the existing facilities while providing modern teaching and learning spaces. These standards shall ensure that the exterior architectural character of each building conveys the college/university character in a cohesive, attractive, and timeless manner. Each campus shall develop an "architectural palette" (list of materials) to guide the selection of exterior materials for construction projects. Enduring and easily maintained materials shall form the basis of these design standards. Although various products may be used as incidental or accent points, typically more traditional and durable materials, such as masonry, shall form the basis of each campus's selection of materials (BR Minutes, September 2002).

907.03 MODULAR/TEMPORARY BUILDINGS (EXISTING SECTION 915.02)

The renting, leasing, or purchase of modular or other type temporary buildings and trailers is prohibited. Modular or other temporary buildings and trailers currently being rented or leased for or owned by an institution in the University System are exempt from this policy (BR Minutes, 1993-94, p. 153).

907.04 CAMPUS GROUNDS AND LANDSCAPE STANDARDS (EXISTING SECTION 908.03.03)

Each campus shall develop standards that establish basic expectations for landscaping and grounds. These standards shall be founded on and complementary to the University System of Georgia's preplanning guidelines. Campus standards shall establish the campus's landscape plan and provide specificity sufficient to guide the planning and development of outdoor common space, including landscape and signage, to achieve a cohesive and sustainable campus. These standards shall ensure that the campus grounds convey an attractive and inviting college/university character. Each campus shall establish material and plant lists to guide the development of public green spaces, and plantings shall be predominantly indigenous, maintainable, and diverse (BR Minutes, September 2002).

(EXISTING SECTION 910)

Each institution shall have installed on its campus, and on each existing off-campus facility, if any, an appropriate number of properly designed and constructed exterior signs containing the name of the institution and identification of the institution as a part of the University System of Georgia. Such signs shall be architecturally proper and structurally sound, and they shall be kept in good repair. Each of these signs shall be made and situated so that it can be readily seen and quickly read from nearby public street(s) and/or public highway(s) (BR Minutes, May, 1981).

(EXISTING SECTION 913)

Each institution shall fly the flag of the United States and the flag of Georgia from a building or flag pole on the campus of the institution (BR Minutes, 1956-57, p. 98).

907.05 PLAQUES (EXISTING SECTION 917)

A plaque of bronze cast metal or other appropriate material will be installed in all major construction projects including new buildings, additions, and renovations, noting the year completed, the Governor and members of the Board at the time of completion and other Regents serving since the project was first approved, the architect and the contractor.

If deemed appropriate by the president of the institution, major contributor(s) may be recognized by inclusion on the plaque or a separate plaque (BR Minutes, February, 1995, p. 18).

908 PUBLIC PRIVATE VENTURES

Add New Section on Public Private Ventures.

HOUSING FACILITIES (THIS OLD SECTION 909 MUST BE REVIEWED FOR APPLICABILITY)

For policy concerning student housing comprehensive plans and financial statements, see [Section 711.0701](#). (*verify this reference based on policy updates*)

PRIVATE HOUSING (THIS OLD SECTION 909.01 MUST BE REVIEWED FOR APPLICABILITY)

The following policies shall govern off-campus private housing:

- A. No private housing and/or attendant facilities shall be constructed on properties of the University System without the expressed written consent of the Board of Regents (BR Minutes, 1984-85, pp. 119-20).
- B. Board of Regents reserves the right to construct housing and other student service facilities in any or all of the institutions of the University System at any time.
- C. For sound educational reasons, a president may require students to live on campus (BR Minutes, 1984-85, pp. 119-20).
- D. Agreements may be entered into, with the approval of the Regents, between institutions and private housing operators to establish and make clear the terms and conditions upon which students are housed in the off-campus facilities, provided no financial or other restricting obligations, expressed or implied, are made on the part of the institutions of the Regents.
- ~~E. All institutions will cooperate in supplying information on their current overall housing situation and outlook to possible private housing financiers.~~
- F. All institutions will cooperate with owners of private housing by providing complete information concerning facilities available to all students.

- G. Subject to the above, the Board of Regents, in view of the wide interest in private housing and the possibility of saving public funds, favors the construction of privately owned, privately financed and privately operated off-campus housing facilities (BR Minutes, 1968-69, pp. 182-183).

909 REAL PROPERTY OWNERSHIP AND ASSET MANAGEMENT

909.01 PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL EXPERTISE

ADD PARAGRAPH ON PROCUREMENT OF PROFESSIONAL REAL ESTATE EXPERTISE

909.02 ACQUISITION *(OLD SECTION 701.01 and 102 B expanded and limits of authority increased from \$100,000 to \$250,000)*

The Chancellor and/or the **University System** chief facilities officer are authorized and empowered to execute, accept, and deliver for, on behalf of, and in the name of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and under its SEAL, and without prior approval by the Board, any and all contracts, agreements, deeds, licenses, or other instruments related to the purchase or gift of real property (other than property acquired by condemnation) at a purchase price not to exceed the average of three separate appraisals made by independent and licensed real estate appraisers and where the purchase price (or gift value) of the real property does not exceed the sum of **\$250,000, provided the acquisition is in accordance with the campus master plan on file and shall not be subject to any reversions, restrictions, covenants, or adverse easements.**

909.03 DISPOSITION *(DEVELOP NEW SECTION ON DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY and include existing old sections below)*

SALE OF PROPERTY *(DEVELOP NEW PARAGRAPH)*

CONVEYANCES FOR ROAD IMPROVEMENTS *(OLD SECTION 919 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)*

The Chancellor or **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to declare, without further approval of the Board, that unimproved real property is no longer advantageously useful to any University System institution but only for the purpose of conveying title for public road improvements provided that less than one acre of real property is to be conveyed.

The Chancellor or the **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to request, without further authorization of the Board, that the Governor execute a deed without warranty, quitclaim deed, or other deed of conveyance for unimproved real property for the purpose of conveying title for public road improvements provided that less than one acre of real property is conveyed.

DEMOLITION *(OLD SECTION 906.01 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)*

The Chancellor or **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to declare, without further approval of the Board, that a building, structure, or other improvement on the real property of the Board of Regents is no longer advantageously useful to any unit of the University System of Georgia but only for the purpose of authorizing demolition, provided that such building, structure, or other improvement is not a candidate for a national or state historic register and either:

1. is vacant, and has been vacant, for an extended period of time,
2. a cursory examination represents that it is not a cost-effective candidate for repair,
3. is obsolete and no longer necessary to provide support for which it was constructed and no longer needed to support academic programs, or
4. is consistent with the campus physical master plan and a Regents-approved capital improvement project.

The Chancellor or the **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to request, without further approval of the Board, that the Governor issue an executive order authorizing the demolition of any building, structure or other improvement on the real property of the Board of Regents, provided that such building, structure or other improvement is not a candidate for a national or state historic register and either:

1. is vacant, and has been vacant, for an extended period of time,
2. a cursory examination represents that it is not a cost-effective candidate for repair,
3. is obsolete and no longer necessary to provide support for which it was constructed and no longer needed to support academic programs, or
4. is consistent with the campus physical master plan and a Regents-approved capital improvement project.

909.04 EASEMENTS *(OLD SECTION 907 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)*

The **University System** chief facilities officer or his/her designee shall approve the execution and delivery of easements or revocable license agreements or permits for the installation of electrical power lines, cables, and duct banks; gas lines; domestic water lines, sanitary and storm sewers; communications lines; steam, hot water and chilled water mains; and other such utilities and appurtenances to the above, across Regents' property to buildings and improvements at the various institutions of the University System, by any entity and/or by private or public utility companies, and provided in each case a license agreement shall contain the following paragraph:

This agreement does not confer upon the Licensee any rights, title, estate or interest in said licensed premises, nor does this license agreement confer upon the Licensee a license coupled with an interest or an easement. This agreement merely gives to the Licensee, and to the Licensee only, a revocable personal privilege, it being expressly understood and agreed by Licensee that regardless of any and all improvements and investments made, expenses and harm incurred or encountered by Licensee, this agreement may be revoked and terminated by Licensor, either in toto or pro tanto, upon thirty (30) days written notice to Licensee. After expiration of such thirty (30) day period, this license agreement shall stand as revoked and terminated (BR Minutes, 1972-73, p. 504).

909.05 TIMBER SALES *(OLD SECTION 911 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)*

The Georgia Forestry Commission has consented to assist the University System and its institutions in the efficient and timely disposal of timber and timber products growing or produced on lands of the System. The Commission will designate and prepare for sale those timber products which should be harvested on property of the University System. The timber products so designated are hereby declared to be surplus property which can no longer be advantageously used in the University System and the sale of all such timber products is declared to be in the best interest of the University System.

The **University System** chief facilities officer shall act as the liaison between the Board of Regents and the Georgia Forestry Commission in the management, sale and disposition of timber and its by products.

The proceeds from such timber sales, after deducting the cost and expenses thereof, shall be paid to the Board for distribution to the institution having jurisdiction of the lands from which the timber was cut. All such sales shall be reported to the Board as information items at the meeting of the Board following the sale thereof.

All timber harvests and sales shall be contingent upon the completion of a Georgia Environmental Policy Act (GEPA) evaluation finding no significant adverse environmental impact.

On those lands of the University System which are under the management of the School of Forest Resources at the University of Georgia, the foresters of said school will designate and approve all sales of timber products and prepare the same for sale in keeping with sound and efficient forest management practices. All such sales shall be reported to the Board as aforesaid (Georgia Laws, 1974, Section 43-206.1, p. 458; BR Minutes, 1972-73, pp. 145-47).

910 USE OF BOARD OF REGENTS PROPERTY *(REVIEW AND COORDINATION OF ALL SUBSECTIONS HEREIN IS NEEDED)*

910.01 LEASING AUTHORITY AS LANDLORD *(NEW SECTION NEEDED)*

910.02 WHEN TO LEASE AS LANDLORD *(NEW SECTION FOR CONSIDERATION)*

It is the intention of the Board of Regents to insure that owned space within the University System is utilized with the greatest efficiency. The Board of Regents will allow campuses to lease space to others when it is appropriate to do so. When leasing to others is appropriate, the Board of Regents wants to assure the rental rates are fair and equitable

910.03 LEASE OF RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES *(OLD SECTIONS 909.03 & 915.03)*

THIS EXISTING SECTION (909.03) NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED:

The Chancellor is authorized to lease housing to groups external to the University System of Georgia for a maximum term of one year under the following conditions. Any option periods or extensions beyond one year will require specific approval by the Board. Housing facilities will only be leased to outside parties when it has been determined that there is sufficient excess capacity and when such lease will not impact the ability to house all institutional students desiring housing during the term of the lease. Any lease to outside parties should be contemplated only after a good faith effort has been made to fill housing with University System students.

Any lease of housing must be compatible with the mission of the institution and must not be disruptive to the institution's students occupying housing. Leases for other than an institution's own students will only be considered in priority order for cooperative interns, college students, education institutions, or not-for-profit education institutions. Leases to individuals or groups not in these categories will not be considered. The lease rate will be at market rates for comparable housing in the vicinity and in no case will be less than the rate being charged to the institutional students for similar accommodations. Payment for the lease will be made in full prior to the commencement of the term of the lease (BR Minutes, 1996-97).

THIS EXISTING SECTION (excerpts 915.03) NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED:

The president of each institution may recommend to the Chancellor or the **University System** chief facilities officer the leasing of residential facilities up to 2,000 square feet owned by the University System for fair market value rent and for a period of time up to two years at such times when such facilities are not in use by the institution. The president shall certify that such proposed lease of residential facilities does not adversely affect or impact the institution. Any revenues generated by such proposed lease of residential facilities will be used only for maintenance of the residential facility. Such leases shall be in writing and shall be consistent with guidelines promulgated from time to time by the Chancellor.

910.04 LEASE OF RESEARCH FACILITIES (EXCERPTS OLD SECTION 915.01)

THIS EXISTING SECTION (915.01) NEEDS TO BE STUDIED BY A TASK FORCE PRIOR TO RECONSIDERATION BY THE BOARD:

The following policies shall govern the leasing of laboratory and research facilities:

- A. The president of each institution may recommend to the Chancellor the leasing of laboratory and research facilities owned by the University System to private businesses, companies and corporations for the purpose of small business and economic development during times when such laboratory and research facilities are not in use by the institution as authorized by Georgia laws 1987, pp. 848 and 1020.
- B. The president shall certify that the proposed lease of such laboratories and/or facilities does not adversely affect or impact on the institutional or research programs at the institution, or conflict with the academic and service mission of the institution.

- C. Such leases shall be in writing and shall be consistent with guidelines promulgated from time to time by the Chancellor (BR Minutes, 1987-88, p. 139).

910.05 PRESIDENTS' HOMES (EXISTING SECTION 909.02 previously edited to delete reference to Chancellor's Home. NEEDS TO BE FURTHER REVIEWED AND UPDATED)

The policy of the Board regarding presidents' homes shall be as follows:

- A. Presidents of research universities will be required to live, without charge, in university housing unless an exception is granted by the Chancellor. Existing presidential housing at other institutions will be phased out as rapidly as possible, and no additional presidents' houses shall be purchased or constructed for those institutions. Presidents who are currently furnished housing shall continue to occupy that housing during their tenure as president (BR Minutes, 1984-85, p. 114; BR Minutes, 1985-86, p. 53-54).
- B. The institutions shall be responsible for the repair and upkeep of the buildings and grounds of the homes furnished for presidents.
- C. The institutions shall be responsible for furnishing utilities, including local telephone service.
- D. No food, food service or other services shall be provided for the presidents and their families (BR Minutes, 1967-68, pp. 416, 645).
- E. Any proposed project for improvement of a president's home, other than routine and necessary maintenance, shall be submitted for review and approval by the Chancellor and the Board of Regents. Any subsequent changes in the scope of the project or budget shall be similarly submitted for review and approval (BR Minutes, 1990-91, p. 385).

910.06 IN POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS (OLD SECTION 914.01 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)

The president of each institution may authorize the use of institution facilities for political speeches. However, such use shall be limited to meetings sponsored by recognized organizations of the institution and shall be held only at places designated by the president.

The use of System materials, supplies, equipment, machinery, or vehicles in political campaigns is forbidden (BR Minutes, 1976-77, p. 257).

910.07 BY AFFILIATED ORGANIZATIONS

Add New Section on use by affiliated organizations (Athletic Associations, Foundations, etc.) possibly requiring that a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) be in place

910.08 BY UNAFFILIATED OUTSIDE PARTIES (OLD SECTION 914.03 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)

When an outside party requests permission to use a campus facility for an event which is not contrary to the mission of the institution but which holds a potential for harm to the participants as a result of which a liability could be incurred, the president of the institution shall require the completion of a license agreement including a properly executed indemnification and liability insurance agreement (an approved form of License Agreement may be from the Chancellor's Office).

(THE EXISTING SECOND PARAGRAPH in this section was moved to the end of SECTION 911 .02

910.09 FOR PERSONAL USE (OLD SECTION 914.02 needs to be updated and may need to be moved to 700 section or other)

Personal property owned by an institution shall be used only for institutional purposes. No employees in the University System shall permit such property to be removed from the campus of an institution for use on either a rental or loan basis for personal use (BR Minutes, 1949-50, p. 109).

911 USE OF NON BOARD OF REGENTS PROPERTY (REVIEW AND COORDINATION OF ALL SUBSECTIONS HEREIN IS NEEDED)

911.01 LEASING AUTHORITY AS TENANT (EXCERPTS OLD SECTION 102 A increases University System chief facilities officer delegated authority to \$20,000.)

The Chancellor and/or the **University System** chief facilities officer are authorized and empowered to execute, accept, and deliver for, on behalf of, and in the name of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia and under its SEAL, and without prior approval by the Board, any and all rental agreements, supplemental agreements, and subrental agreements in which the Board of Regents is named as the landlord of the property rented and where the total rent to be paid to the Board does not exceed the sum of **\$20,000** per month.

911.02 LEASING AS TENANT (EXCERPTS OLD SECTION 915.01 and SECTION 914.03 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)

It is the intention of the Board of Regents to insure that currently owned space within the University System is utilized with the greatest efficiency. The Board of Regents wants to assure that campuses lease space only when it is appropriate to do so given the nature of the space needed, location of programs and the space demands on the campus. When leasing is required, the Board of Regents also wants to assure the rental rates are cost/beneficial.

As campuses have primary responsibility for space management, it is incumbent on campuses to assure adequate review of each leasing decision. Campuses are to establish review procedures which assure that all available space on campus is utilized to maximum benefit and that leased space is sought only when there is no appropriate space available on campus; when the program requires an off-campus site; when it is more economical to lease than build additional space; when no other campus has appropriate space which may be used; or when there are other extraordinary circumstance which require leasing.

Property to which title is held by the Building Authority of the State of Georgia and which is leased to the University System cannot be subleased or rented. It is permissible to license an outside party to use it for a purpose consistent with the mission of the institution in return for out-of-pocket costs for utilities and custodial services.

(EXCERPTS OLD SECTION 915.01)

Campuses are charged with assuring they obtain the best rental rates in the area where leasing is to occur and to negotiate multiple year renewal options when possible.

911.03 REPORTING OF LEASES AS TENANT *(EXCERPTS OLD SECTION 915.01 NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED)*

Campuses are to report annually on all leased space to the Office of Facilities, the Board of Regents which will exercise oversight on leasing activity. The report should be submitted in conjunction with the submittal of capital budget request.

912 MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS

912.01 SUSTAINABILITY, EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Possible New Section encouraging accountability in efficiency and effectiveness of management and operations of facilities

912.02 MAINTENANCE AND UPKEEP

Possible New Section on preventive, routine and deferred maintenance

912.03 MAJOR REPAIRS AND REHABILITATION *(PARTIAL EXCERPT OF EXISTING SECTION 102, modified to increase authority of Chancellor to \$500,000 and University System Chief Facilities Officer to \$250,000)*

Expand EXISTING Section on Major Repairs and Rehabilitation

The Chancellor is authorized to allocate to System institutions, without prior approval of the Board, capital outlay appropriations - rehabilitation funds (cash or bonds), in amounts not to exceed **\$500,000** for any one project. The **University System** chief facilities officer is authorized to allocate

to System institutions, without prior approval of the Board, capital outlay appropriations - rehabilitation funds (cash or bonds), in amounts not to exceed **\$250,000** for any one project. The actions taken under the authority of this paragraph shall be reported annually to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities.

912.04 ENVIRONMENTAL *(OLD SECTION 916)*

THIS OLD SECTION (916) NEEDS TO BE REVIEWED AND UPDATED:

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia is strongly committed to protecting the environment and human health and safety in all of its operations. ~~In working to meet this commitment, the Board of Regents recognizes that pro-active efforts must be made to ensure that sound environmental, health and safety planning is integrated into every level of University System decision-making.~~

Effective environmental, health and safety performance is important to the Board of Regents and its institutions in relationships with students, faculty, staff, community neighbors, legislators, regulatory agencies and the general public. To assist the institutions of the University System of Georgia in living up to the ideals of this policy, the following requirements are hereby established:

Each institution within the University System of Georgia shall:

- A. Comply with all applicable environmental, health and safety laws and regulations. In the absence of specific laws or regulations, good management practices shall be followed;
- B. Develop, follow and continuously improve environmental, health and safety programs, including emergency action plans, for all facilities and operations;
- C. Perform periodic environmental, health and safety reviews of facilities and programs to correct deficiencies, establish goals and identify funding priorities;
- D. Designate a specific individual to coordinate environmental, health and safety affairs for the institution. This individual shall be a key member of each institution's administrative leadership team and shall be supported with appropriate resources;
- E. Promote environmental, health and safety awareness among all faculty, staff and students by providing administrative support and appropriate resources for training and program implementation;
- F. Design, construct and operate all facilities in a manner that protects the health and safety of the occupants and the environment. Environmental, health and safety factors shall be an integral part of each institution's master planning efforts;
- G. Practice waste minimization and pollution prevention by adopting recycling programs for all appropriate materials, purchasing recycled products, substituting less hazardous materials and establishing micro-scale chemistry operations;

- H. Recognize the relationship between energy and the environment and implement strategies such as energy-efficient facility lighting and equipment upgrades and alternative fuel vehicles, where appropriate;
- I. Work cooperatively with government, industry and other organizations in developing reasonable and cost-effective environmental, health and safety legislation and regulations which protect the environment and human health; and
- J. Serve as environmentally responsible neighbors and promote sustainable development on campus properties and in local communities (BR Minutes, March, 1994, p. 20).

912.05 HEALTH & SAFETY

Possible New Section

912.06 SECURITY

Possible New Section

912.07 EMERGENCY PLANNING AND PREPAREDNESS

Add New Section on emergency preparedness

End of Policy Section 900

USG PLACE NAMING PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

USG PLACE NAMING PROCEDURES

Before a president submits a formal naming proposal to the Board of Regents, he/she shall inform, in person or via telephone call, the University System chief facilities officer. This notification should occur at least three months prior to the Board meeting at which the institution wishes to have the Board consider the approval. The University System chief facilities officer will notify the Chancellor and USG senior staff of the proposal. As necessary and appropriate, the University System chief facilities officer, or the Chancellor's designee, will personally contact the members of the Board of Regents to discuss the proposal.

At the appropriate time, the University System chief facilities officer will request that the institution provide a formal written proposal and any other information necessary in relation to the naming proposal. The University System chief facilities officer will forward the information to the appropriate senior staff for review and comment. Upon completion of the vetting process, the University System chief facilities officer will notify the president of the recommendation and timing of possible inclusion on the agenda of the Board of Regents Real Estate and Facilities Committee.

A ceremony or event celebrating the naming of a Facility shall be handled in accord with appropriate protocol for the University and the Board of Regents and shall not occur prior to Board approval of the naming. The Board of Regents and the Chancellor shall have sufficient prior notice of such events so that they may attend.

USG TEMPLATE

College/University Place Naming Guidelines

Introduction

College/University considers the naming of a University System facility, including buildings and grounds, in honor of an individual, corporation, foundation or organization to be one of the highest distinctions it can bestow. In light of the importance and magnitude of this honor, the following guidelines and procedures shall apply to all place naming on all property owned or leased by the Board of Regents under the auspices of College/University.

The term “facilities” includes buildings of all types, as well as campus grounds and athletic venues. It includes all outdoor areas of the institution including streets, entrances, gates, and landscape features, such as quadrangles, gardens, lakes, fountains, ~~recreation~~ fields, and such.

The term “facilities” does not include interior spaces such as rooms, hallways, etc., within buildings. The President of College/University has the authority to name such interior spaces. The President of College/University will notify the University System chief facilities officer on a timely basis, for informational purposes only, any such interior space naming.

The act of naming a College/University facility is the conferral of not only a high honor but also a conspicuous honor. It publicly exhibits the judgment and standards of the College/University as well as the Board of Regents and signifies lasting approval of the actions of the honoree.

The President may establish an (ad hoc or standing) Advisory Committee to make naming recommendations to the President. The President of College/University is the final arbiter of all decisions related to naming at the College/University.

Establishing Place Names

Authority to name facilities, buildings, streets and other areas on the College/University’s campus rests with the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia. The following policy applies to the naming of all physical areas on all of College/ University’s campus. The term “facility” is intended to include buildings of all types, sports venues, streets, plazas, gardens and other physical areas of the campus. (See BOR Policy.)

In order for the individual being honored by a naming to enjoy and take part in the honor when it is bestowed, facilities may be named after a living individual if the person to be honored has provided outstanding service to the institution, to the nation, or to society, and has served with distinction. When a naming is to honor a person for outstanding and distinguished service as a public servant, that person must have been disassociated from employment by the University System or from state or federal employment for at least two years prior to the naming. In the event that the individual being honored is no longer living, the standards listed above will still apply, however, the two year waiting period may be waived.

“Outstanding service” as used in this document is intended to be a flexible standard. It is the policy of College/University to judge each naming situation on its own merits after taking into consideration the facts that are relevant to the person/entity being honored and the naming opportunity involved. The President of College/University will endeavor to ensure that the proposed naming is consistent with the interests of the institution and the University System and that the value of the service warrants the action proposed.

The naming of facilities and grounds of the campus will endure only for the useful life of the facility or feature and not in perpetuity. As a practical matter, campus facilities and spaces must change as the College/University’s needs change. If a building or area is demolished, destroyed, developed or substantially changed, a named building or area may no longer exist. The Advisory Committee may determine if the transfer of a name to a new area is appropriate. The Advisory Committee’s determination will be communicated to the President for his ultimate determination as to the validity or invalidity of maintaining said name and seeking Board approval if appropriate.

Process for Place Naming

When the desire for a naming is apparent and/or it appears that a contribution (gift) to benefit College/University will result in a naming request for a donor or other individual, the University’s Office of Institutional Advancement must be notified and provided with a profile of the donor or individual being honored, the area of interest along with any proposed stipulations, and information about how the contribution (gift) will be paid.

After review by the Office of Institutional Advancement, the information will be forwarded to the President for his consideration. The President will submit the naming recommendation to the Board of Regents. The President of the College/University has the final authority to approve these recommendations at the local level before the request is forwarded to the Board of Regents.

Before the President submits a formal naming proposal to the Board of Regents, he/she shall inform, in person or via telephone call, the University System chief facilities officer. This notification should occur at least three months prior to the Board meeting at which the institution wishes to have the Board consider the approval. The University System chief facilities officer will notify the Chancellor and USG senior staff of the proposal. As necessary

and appropriate, the University System chief facilities officer, or the Chancellor's designee, will personally contact the members of the Board of Regents to discuss the proposal.

At the appropriate time, the University System chief facilities officer will request that the institution provide a formal written proposal and any other information necessary in relation to the naming proposal. The University System chief facilities officer will forward the information to the appropriate senior staff for review and comment. Upon completion of the vetting process, the University System chief facilities officer will notify the president of the recommendation and timing of possible inclusion on the agenda of the Board of Regents Real Estate and Facilities Committee.

A ceremony or event celebrating the naming of a Facility shall be handled in accord with appropriate protocol for the College/University and the Board of Regents and shall not occur prior to Board approval of the naming. The Board of Regents and the Chancellor shall have sufficient prior notice of such events so that they may attend.

In order to assure institution-wide coordination at naming ceremonies, such events typically are planned through the Office of the President and/or the Office of Public Information and/or the Office of Institutional Advancement of College/University in coordination with the associated USG offices.

Signage

All signage to be affixed on or adjacent to any, building, facility or interior space shall be approved by the President of College/University in consultation with the donor. All signage shall be consistent with College/University's master plan and design criteria. No signage shall be approved, and/or erected that is in contravention of Board of Regents policy.

Contribution Guidelines

When the naming of a facility at College/University is based on a monetary contribution, the following guidelines apply:

BUILDING: Any person or entity desirous of having a building at College/University named after him/her/it shall be able to do so as long as the gift amount is 35% of the cost to construct or of the estimated value for existing buildings. The gift must be secured at least six months prior to the announcement of the naming ceremony and may only occur in accord with approval of the Board of Regents.

STREET: Any person or entity desirous of having a street at College/University named after him/her/it shall be able to do so if the aspirant makes a financial contribution of at least 5 million dollars (\$5,000,000), secured at least six months prior to the announcement of the naming ceremony and with approval of the Board of Regents.

INTERIOR: Any person or entity desirous of having an interior space such as rooms, hallways, etc., at College/University named after him/her/it shall be able to do so if the aspirant

makes a financial contribution of at least \$250,000 dollars, secured at least six months prior to the announcement of the naming ceremony and with approval of the president.

At the discretion of the President, there may be reasonable exceptions to the above.

An ongoing discussion is underway with an Institutional Advancement task force to understand and recommend the best language to address the Board's interest in obtaining reliable financial commitments without unduly limiting the efforts of fund raising is underway and the language below will be adjusted accordingly.

The gift, or a signed pledge for the gift, must have been received by the institution before the naming is completed. Any deferred or estate gifts preferred to be irrevocable and defined in writing.

Any gift, for the naming of a building, shall be irrevocable, paid over a period of no longer than five years, and outlined in writing in a commitment signed by the donor. All other gifts for streets and interiors must be paid over three years. Unless the gift is necessary to fund the immediate construction of the facility to be named, the gift may be used to establish a program endowment restricted to a department or program selected by the donor.

Deferred gifts such as bequests, charitable gift annuities, charitable trusts, and life insurance policies may or may not be appropriate for current naming opportunities. Naming opportunities may be more appropriate when the gift is actually received by the institution. These options should be discussed with the donors and at the discretion of the President, there may be reasonable exceptions to the above.

It is the policy of College/University to forward the formal naming request to the Board of Regents only after at least 50% of the gift has been received by the College/University.

Removal of Names

From time to time, situations may occur which would warrant the removal of a name from a building or other place on the campuses of College/University. When the naming authority lies with the Board of Regents, so does the authority and responsibility to remove a name when appropriate. Circumstances may dictate that the parameters under which a place name was bestowed at the institution have changed to the extent that consideration must be given to removing the name. These circumstances may include, but are not limited to the following circumstances:

The honoree does not follow through on a financial commitment;

The honoree fails to maintain the high standards of the College/University or the Board of Regents; and/or

The honoree, person or entity, engages in conduct that constitutes an act of moral turpitude or for other appropriate reasons.

Upon the demolition of a building, the College/University makes no assurances that the naming will remain beyond the useful life of the building.

It is the policy of College/University to judge each situation individually on its own merits. No decision will be made without taking into account all of the facts that are relevant to the decision. The President of College/University will endeavor to ensure that the removal of a name is consistent with the interests of College/University and the University System of Georgia.

Procedures for the Removal of Names

When it becomes apparent that there may be a reason to consider the removal of a name from a facility at College/University, the Vice President for Institutional Advancement shall be supplied with the original naming history and all salient circumstances surrounding the removal recommendation.

The Vice President for Institutional Advancement presents the naming history to the President who shall make a determination as to whether a name shall be removed. If the naming was within the President's delegated authority, his/her ruling is final. If the naming is outside the President's delegated authority and the President approves the name removal, then the President will submit the proposal for removal of the name of said Facility to the University System chief facilities officer basically in the the same process called for in naming.

The removal of a name from a room or other interior space(s) of a facility may be approved by the President upon the recommendation of the Advisory Committee.

Periodic Review of Naming Policy

The President of College/University and the campus Advisory Committee shall review this policy on a regular and recurring schedule in order to assure that it continues to be in compliance with the campus master plan and the policies of the Board of Regents.

COMMITTEE ON INTERNAL AUDIT

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, at approximately 6:02 p.m. in the Board room. Committee members in attendance were the Committee Vice-Chair Felton Jenkins, and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III and Richard L. Tucker. Board Chair Allan Vigil and the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy were also present. Vice Chair Jenkins reported to the full Board that the Committee had reviewed one item, which required no action.

1. Information Item: Audit Plan for Fiscal Year 2008

Each year, the Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, prepares an audit plan for the University System of Georgia. The plan is developed by requesting input from the Regents, University System Office manager, and the institutions. A matrix of the responses from all parties is prepared, risk factors are determined, and institutions are selected to be audited. The scope of the audit coverage is determined using a risk-evaluation process. Audit resources are then allocated based upon coverage provided by the Georgia Department of Audits and Accounts and the audit plan of the 14 institutions with internal audit departments. The campus-based auditors prepare their audit plan based upon an institutional risk-assessment process. Mr. Stark and the respective institution's president approve each campus audit plan.

At this meeting, Mr. Stark presented the full audit plan for the University System of Georgia for fiscal year 2008, including coverage provided by the Board of Regents audit staff, senior administration, and the campus-based auditors.

The meeting adjourned at 6:14 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007 at approximately 4:47 p.m.

in room 7019. Committee members in attendance were Chair James R. Jolly, Vice Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., Elridge McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Jr., and Wanda Yancey Rodwell. The Vice Chair of the Board, William H. Cleveland, was also present. Chair Jolly reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee reviewed four items, all of which required action. Item 4 included sixteen applications for review; twelve of these were denied, one was settled, one was continued for further discussion, and two were deemed inappropriate for Committee consideration and therefore, not reviewed. In accordance with O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4, an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of the Armstrong Atlantic State University Mutual Aid Agreement with the City of Savannah

Approved: The Board approved the following mutual aid agreement between Armstrong Atlantic State University and the City of Savannah, effective June 13, 2007.

Background: Armstrong Atlantic State University has reached an agreement with the City of Savannah to provide for the rendering of extraterritorial assistance as defined in Georgia Code 36-69-2 (local emergency) and under the conditions established in Georgia Code 36-69-3 (extraterritorial cooperation and assistance to local law enforcement agencies or fire departments; commander of operations). The mutual aid agreement follows a statutory format and has been approved by the Office of Legal Affairs.

2. Approval of the Albany State University Mutual Aid Agreement with Dougherty County

Approved: The Board approved the following mutual aid agreement between Albany State University and Dougherty County, effective June 13, 2007.

Background: Albany State University has reached an agreement with Dougherty County to provide for the rendering of extraterritorial assistance as defined in Georgia Code 36-69-2 (local emergency) and under the conditions established in Georgia Code 36-69-3 (extraterritorial cooperation and assistance to local law enforcement agencies or fire departments; commander of operations). The mutual aid agreement follows a statutory format and has been approved by the Office of Legal Affairs.

3. Approval of the Albany State University Mutual Aid Agreement with the City of Albany

Approved: The Board approved the following mutual aid agreement between Albany State University and the City of Albany, effective June 13, 2007.

Background: Albany State University has reached an agreement with the City of Albany to provide for the rendering of extraterritorial assistance as defined in Georgia Code 36-69-2 (local emergency)

and under the conditions established in Georgia Code 36-69-3 (extraterritorial cooperation and assistance to local law enforcement agencies or fire departments; commander of operations). The mutual aid agreement follows a statutory format and has been approved by the Office of Legal Affairs

4. Applications for Review

At approximately 4:45 p.m. on Tuesday, April 17, 2007, 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 Committee members who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Regents W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Jr., Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., and Elridge McMillan. The Vice Chair of the Board, William H. Cleveland, was also present. Also in attendance were the Associate Vice Chancellors for Legal Affairs, Elizabeth E. Neely and J. Burns Newsome, Dr. Sandra Stone Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Programs, and Dr. Beheruz N. Sethna, Interim Chief Academic Officer & Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. In accordance with O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4, an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 5:05 p.m., Chair Jolly reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that the following actions were taken in Executive Session:

- a. In the matter of Mr. Vic Rachel, at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning his demotion and salary decrease, the application for review has been denied.
- b. In the matter of file no. 1887, at Georgia Perimeter College, concerning dismissal, the institution has reached settlement.
- c. In the matter of Ms. Mary Gervin, at Albany State University, concerning denial of promotion, the application for review has been denied.
- d. In the matter of Dr. Steve Morris, at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, concerning his termination, the application for review has been denied
- e. In the matter of Mr. Richard W. Clarke, at Georgia Southern University, concerning non-renewal of his employee contract, the application for review has been denied.
- f. In the matter of file no. 1905, at North Georgia College and State University, concerning alleged violation of NGCSU's Student Code of Conduct (Article V., Section 13), the application for review has been denied.

- g. In the matter of Dr. Gerald W. Burgess, at Albany State University, concerning the decision not to issue a tenure track contract for the 2006-2007 term, the application for review has been denied.
- h. In the matter of file no. 1907, at North Georgia College & State University, concerning alleged violation of NGCSU's Academic Integrity Code, the application for review has been denied.
- i. In the matter of Dr. Melissa Wiedenfeld, at Dalton State College, concerning non-renewal of her employee contract, the application for review has been denied.
- j. In the matter of Mr. Bobby Dawson, at the University of Georgia, concerning alleged unwarranted employment actions, the application for review has been denied.
- k. In the matter of file no. 1910, at Georgia Southern University, concerning imposition of disciplinary sanctions, the application for review has been denied.
- l. In the matter of Dr. Regis Gougis, at Savannah State University, concerning non-renewal of his employee contract, the application for review has been continued.
- m. The Committee refused to hear file no. 1912, at Georgia State University, concerning impediments to progress in the clinical component of the student's academic program at GSU.
- n. In the matter of Raven Harris c/o Mike and Ruby Harris, at Fort Valley State University, concerning the alleged failure of FVSVU to readmit their daughter (Raven Harris) to the school's CDEP Program, the application for review has been denied.
- o. In the matter of file no. 1925, at Georgia College & State University, concerning a request to substitute the core math requirement because of a learning disability, the application for review has been denied. The whole matter of course substitution is under review. Math is an essential part of a degree program.
- p. In the matter of Ms. Charlene Portee, at North Georgia College & State University, concerning a Request for Reconsideration, the Board refused to consider the request.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 5:48 p.m.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007 at approximately 3:59 p.m. Committee members in attendance were Chair Richard L. Tucker and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, and Benjamin J. Tarbuton, III. Board Chair Allan Vigil and Secretary Julia M. Murphy were also in attendance. Chair Tucker reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 20 items, 17 of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Acquisition of Real Property, 1504 North Oak Street, Valdosta, Valdosta State University**

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.412 acre of improved real property located at 1504 North Oak Street, Valdosta, from Valdosta State University Foundation, Inc. (the "Foundation") for \$182,263 for the use and benefit of Valdosta State University ("VSU").

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

Understandings: Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the VSU master plan.

This real property is improved with a duplex, wood frame, single story residence, built in 1967, in generally good condition.

If acquired, the building will be used for administrative support space.

This real property was acquired by the Foundation in April, 2005 for \$185,000.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
R. Bryan Almand, MAI, Valdosta	\$225,000	
G. Alan Sutton, MAI, Valdosta	\$203,000	\$194,667
Greg F. Crumley, MAI, Tifton	\$156,000	

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

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

Funding for the purchase is from VSU general funds.

2. Acquisition of Real Property, 199 Third Street, Cochran, Middle Georgia College

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 0.96 acre of improved real property located at 199 Third Street, Cochran, from Hardy Swinson and Connie Swinson (the “Swinsons”) for \$200,000 for the use and benefit of Middle Georgia College (“MGC”).

Acquisition of this real property is subject to completion of an environmental assessment of the real property indicating no significant problems or, if environmental problems are indicated, said problems be mitigated before the real property is acquired.

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

Understandings: Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the MGC master plan.

This real property is improved with a 2,567-square-foot, one story brick residence built in 1965 in generally good condition.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Gary Yawn, Eastman	\$ 200,000	
Shelly Bennyhill, Hawkinsville	\$200,000	\$201,667
Barry H. Jones, Cochran	\$205,000	

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

Funding for the purchase is from institutional funds.

3. Acquisition of Real Property, 95 Piedmont Avenue (a.k.a. 75 Piedmont Avenue), Atlanta, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of approximately 2.1959 acres of improved real property located at 95 Piedmont Avenue (a.k.a. 75 Piedmont Avenue), Atlanta, from 75 Piedmont

Avenue, LLC (the “LLC”) for \$12,000,000 for the use and benefit of Georgia State University (“GSU”).

Acquisition of this real property is subject to completion of an environmental assessment of the real property indicating no significant problems or, if environmental problems are indicated, said problems be mitigated before the real property is acquired.

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

Understandings: Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the GSU master plan.

This real property is improved with a 177,175-square-foot, twelve story office building currently known as the Citizens Trust Building, built in 1969, in generally good condition, and a 438 space parking garage.

If acquired, the building will be used to meet long term academic and administrative space needs of GSU. Currently the building is 40% occupied by long term commercial tenants. Half of these leases expire in 2011, and the remainder expire no later than 2017. Initially, \$1.1 million in rent revenue will be available with a net cash flow of \$558,000. It is not anticipated that there will be unrelated business income tax (“UBIT”) after allocation of depreciation and overhead.

Three independent appraisals of the real property are as follows:

<u>Appraiser</u>	<u>Appraised Value</u>	<u>Average</u>
Harris B. Simpson, MAI, CRE, Atlanta	\$20,300,000	
Quentin Ball, MAI, Tucker (Cost Basis)	\$25,000,000	\$21,666,667
James W. Mock, Jr., MAI, Marietta (Cost Basis)	\$19,700,000	

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

Funding for the purchase is proposed from GSU general funds. However, there is a possibility that a portion of the ground lease advanced rental payment for the North Avenue Apartment transaction approved by the Board at the April 2007 meeting may be used for the cost of acquiring the Citizens Trust Building.

4. Gift of Real Property, Georgia Highway 178, Toombs County, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board accepted a gift of approximately 142.4 acres of real property located on Georgia Highway 178, Toombs County and known as the Page Nursery from the Georgia Forestry Commission (“Forestry”) for the use and benefit of the University of Georgia (“UGA”).

Acquisition of this real property is subject to completion of an environmental review of the real property indicating no significant problems or, if environmental problems are indicated, said problems be mitigated before the real property is acquired.

The acquisition of this real property is subject to a retained easement by Forestry to approximately 50 acres of this real property, with access rights to this 50 acres, for a period not to exceed 5 years.

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

Understandings: The property, used by the UGA College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences as the Vidalia Onion and Vegetable Research Center, contains two brick single story dwellings totaling 3,037 square feet, one concrete block building of 484 square feet, and five metal buildings totaling 16,188 square feet, all built in the late 1950's and all in generally good condition.

Acquisition of this real property is consistent with the UGA master plan related to research and extension in Toombs County. The property value is estimated to be \$356,000.

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

5. Sub-Rental Agreement, 305 Fifth Avenue, Quantico, Virginia, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a sub-rental agreement between Georgia Tech Research Corporation, Sub-Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Sub-Tenant, for approximately 2,640 square feet of research and administrative support space located at 305 Fifth Avenue, Quantico, Virginia, for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, at a monthly rent of \$5,093.55 (\$61,122.60 per year annualized/\$23.15 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for two consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing 5% per year, for the use of Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT").

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

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

Understandings: In May 2005, the Board authorized rental of 5,280 square feet in this facility with four option periods. GIT has been able to reduce the space by 50% by transferring research projects to a project director on campus.

This space will be used by the Georgia Tech Research Institute ("GTRI") to offer a variety of services to the customers in the vicinity of the U.S. Marine Corps Base in Quantico, Virginia. The GTRI Quantico field office houses research activities, including the Realistic Operational

Communication Scenarios capability developed by GTRI.

Operating expenses, including utilities, janitorial services, and trash removal, are estimated to be \$12,600 per year annualized.

6. Rental Agreement, 125 Pine Avenue, Albany, Albany State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between TUFF AgServ LLC (the “LLC”), Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 6,494 square feet of research and administrative support space located at 125 Pine Avenue, Albany, for the period July 1, 2007, through June 30, 2008, at a monthly rent of \$5,000 (\$60,000 per year annualized/\$9.24 per square foot per year) with no options to renew, for the use of Albany State University (“ASU”).

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

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

Understandings: This space will be used by the Georgia Water Planning and Policy Center for a consortium of water policy researchers providing leadership in the study, design and implementation of policies affecting water use in Georgia.

The Georgia Water Planning and Policy Center has been located in this facility since April 2002. Prior funding was through the State Soil and Water Conservation Commission and through the Flint River Regional Water Council. Funding has now been obtained through a competitive soil and water contract obtained with ASU.

The rent rate is reduced from the rent rate of previous agreements. Consideration for this is the option of the Landlord to cancel the agreement on 30 days written notice.

All operating expenses are included in the rent rate.

7. Non-exclusive Easement, DeKalb County, Georgia State University and Georgia Perimeter College

Approved: The Board declared a 25-foot-wide strip of land totaling approximately 3.191 acres of unimproved real property located in DeKalb County, on the campuses of Georgia State University (“GSU”) and Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”), to be no longer advantageously useful to GSU or GPC or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of granting a non-exclusive easement to DeKalb County (the “County”) for use as a biking, jogging, walking trail.

The Board authorized the execution of a non-exclusive easement with the County for the above-referenced tract of real property.

The Board declared a 12 ½-foot-wide strip on either side of the non-exclusive easement area totaling

approximately 3.191 acres of unimproved real property located in DeKalb County, on the campuses of GSU and GPC, to be no longer advantageously useful to GSU or GPC or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of granting a temporary construction easement to the County for construction of a biking, jogging, walking trail.

The Board authorized the execution of a temporary construction easement with the County for the above-referenced tract of real property.

The terms of this non-exclusive easement and temporary construction easement are subject to review and legal approval by the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings: The County has received a Federal Transportation Enhancement grant to construct a biking, jogging, walking trail from Bouldercrest Road to Panthersville Road in the County to be known as the South River Greenway Trail.

A part of the trail will cross the GSU athletic complex and the GPC Decatur Campus near Panthersville Road.

The trail will be a 10 to 12-foot-wide concrete trail built to PATH Foundation standards and include signage, trash receptacles and a new American Disability Act (“ADA”) compliant bridge over Doolittle Creek. The temporary construction easement will provide access to clear sufficient property for enhanced safety.

Consideration for granting this non-exclusive easement are the improvements to be made at no cost to GSU or GPC, and the improved non-motorized access to these GSU and GPC locations.

8. Renewal of Lease for Athletic Facilities, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a renewal to the lease agreement between the Board of Regents, as Lessor, and the Georgia Tech Athletic Association (the “Association”), as Lessee, covering the use by the Association of certain athletic facilities located on the campus of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) for a period of two months.

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

Understandings: In April 1997, the Board of Regents renewed the lease agreement for a period of ten years.

This renewal is requested until the August Board meeting.

9. Renewal of Lease for Athletic Facilities, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a renewal to the lease agreement between the Board of Regents, as Lessor, and the University of Georgia Athletic Association, as Lessee, covering the use by the Association of certain athletic facilities located on the campus of the University of

Georgia (“UGA”) for a period of two months.

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

Understandings: In May 1999 the Board of Regents renewed the lease agreement for a period of seven years.

This renewal is requested until the August Board meeting.

10. Resolution for Transfer of Surplus Federal Property, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board adopted a resolution (Appendix I) for the transfer of improved real property from the Department of Education to the Board of Regents.

Authorization to execute this resolution was delegated to the Chancellor.

Understandings: In April 2007, the Board was informed of a potential transfer of the U.S. Army Reserve Center in Columbus to the Board of Regents from the Department of Education. This facility consists of two brick buildings totaling approximately 11,000 square feet located on approximately 2.2 acres of real property on Macon Road, Columbus.

The Department of Education has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution (Appendix I) for the transfer of these assets.

11. Rental Agreement, Athletic Fieldhouse, Valdosta, Valdosta State

Approved: That the Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the Valdosta State University Foundation, Inc. (the “Foundation”), Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for an Athletic Fieldhouse (the “Fieldhouse”) containing approximately 40,780 square feet of space located on 9.729 acres of real property on West Mary Street, for the period beginning on the first day of the first month after the Foundation obtains a Certificate of Occupancy but not earlier than August 1, 2008 through June 30, 2009, at a monthly rent not to exceed \$35,500 (\$426,000 per year annualized) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 20 consecutive one-year periods (the last option period ending no later than September 1, 2028), with rent increasing no more than 3% for each option period exercised for the use of Valdosta State University (“VSU”).

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

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

Understandings: In February 2007, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, and President Ronald Zaccari presented to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, as an information item, the need to construct an athletic fieldhouse at VSU through a privatization process, as well as the sequencing of construction and need to construct a student union at VSU through a privatization process.

In April 2006, the Board approved a \$20 increase in the Student Center and Multi Use Stadium Fee for VSU which will be used for the rental payments for the Fieldhouse.

The Fieldhouse will contain five classrooms, two computer labs, men's and women's locker rooms, weight training area, and offices. The practice fields will be located on the 9.729 acre site and funded by the Foundation through donations of \$3,000,000.

Completion of the Fieldhouse will permit relocation of VSU's football facilities from the old gym which is part of the proposed site of the new student union. The student union transaction will be presented to the Board for consideration at an upcoming meeting.

It is the intent of the Foundation to donate the real property, all improvements, and any accumulated capital reserves to the Board of Regents no later than September 1, 2028.

12. Ground Leases and Rental Agreements, Student Housing and Student Activity Center, Morrow, Clayton State University

Approved: The Board declared approximately 3.49 acres of real property on the campus of Clayton State University ("CLSU") no longer advantageously useful to CLSU or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this real property to be leased to CLSU Foundation Real Estate I, LLC (the "LLC") for the purpose of constructing and owning housing facilities containing approximately 451 student housing beds and site amenities.

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease, including necessary access, use, and construction easements and encroachments, between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and the LLC, Lessee, for the above-referenced approximately 3.49 acres of real property for a period not to exceed 32 years (not to exceed 30 years from the date the LLC obtains a certificate of occupancy and providing a construction period of not more than two years), with an option to renew for up to an additional five years should there be debt outstanding at the end of the original ground lease term, for the purpose of constructing and owning housing facilities containing approximately 451 student housing beds and site amenities.

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the LLC, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for the above-referenced housing facilities and associated site amenities for the period commencing on the first day of the first month after the LLC obtains a certificate of occupancy but not earlier than August 1, 2008, and ending the following June 30 at a monthly rent

not to exceed \$108,000 (\$1,296,000 per year annualized) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 30 consecutive one-year periods (the total not to exceed 30 years from the date of the certificate of occupancy) with rent increasing no more than 3% for each option period exercised.

The Board declared approximately 4.201 acres of real property on the campus of CLSU no longer advantageously useful to CLSU or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this real property to be leased to the LLC for the purpose of constructing and owning a Student Activity Center containing approximately 62,000 square feet of building space and site amenities.

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease, including necessary access, use, and construction easements and encroachments, between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and the LLC, Lessee, for the above-referenced approximately 4.201 acres of real property for a period not to exceed 32 years (not to exceed 30 years from the date the LLC obtains a certificate of occupancy and providing a construction period of not more than two years), with an option to renew for up to an additional five years should there be debt outstanding at the end of the original ground lease term, for the purpose of constructing a student activity center containing approximately 62,000 square feet of building space, and site amenities.

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the LLC, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for the above referenced student activity center and site amenities for the period commencing on the first day of the first month after the LLC obtains a certificate of occupancy but not earlier than August 1, 2008, and ending the following June 30 at a monthly rent not to exceed \$93,000 (\$1,116,000 per year annualized) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 30 consecutive one-year periods (the total not to exceed 30 years from the date of the certificate of occupancy) with rent increasing no more than 3% for each option period exercised.

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

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

Understandings: In October 1997, the Board passed a student housing policy that requires the preparation of a comprehensive plan for student housing together with a financial plan to support housing program objectives. CLSU has developed a comprehensive plan that is consistent with the policy.

In February 2007, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, and President Thomas Harden presented to the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, as an information item, the need to construct student housing facilities and a student activity center at CLSU through a privatization process.

In May, 2007, the Board approved a \$75 Student Activity Center Fee for CLSU.

The Student Activity Center will contain two basketball courts, fitness area, two multi-purpose rooms, locker rooms, event and meeting space, student organization offices, game room and café.

At the end of the term of the ground leases, the real property, all improvements, and any accumulated capital reserves will become the property of the Board of Regents.

13. Authorization of Project, Project No. BR-10-0704, Fine Arts Building Renovation, Phase I, Athens, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-10-0704, “Fine Arts Building Renovation, Phase I,” University of Georgia (“UGA”), with a total project budget of \$3,000,000 to be funded from fiscal year (“FY”) 2006 and FY 2007 Major Repair and Renovation (“MRR”) Allocations.

Understandings: UGA’s Fine Arts Building was designed and constructed in 1939-1940 as a Federal Works Project Administration (“WPA”) project. The Neoclassical style building was originally designed to house the drama, music, dance, and visual arts programs. Currently, the building supports the programs of the UGA Performing Arts Division and Drama Department.

This project will provide American Disability Act (“ADA”) accessible restrooms in the lobby and replace and relocate the mechanical equipment to improve both efficiency and the acoustical quality of the theater.

Further renovation projects will be needed in the future to fully bring this historic building up to modern standards and will be proposed as funds become available.

The construction cost for the project is estimated at \$2,300,000.

If authorized by the Board, the UGA will proceed with the design and construction of this renovation project in accordance with Board of Regents’ procedures.

14. Authorization of Project, Holland Electric Boiler Installation, Atlanta, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized the project, “Holland Electric Boiler Installation,” Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), with a total project budget of \$4,740,000 to be funded from Institutional funds.

Understandings: The project includes the purchase and installation of a new electric boiler within the Holland Plant and purchase and install 20kv power feeders to connect the boiler to the power grid. This replacement will meet GIT’s increased need for heat, and provide GIT with a less expensive alternative to natural gas when the price of natural gas is high. These improvements to the Holland Plant are necessary to sustain campus growth and maintain a modern and reliable infrastructure to support GIT’s instruction and research mission.

The cost of this new boiler installation is estimated to be recovered in full within four to five years.

The construction cost for the project is estimated at \$3,734,701.

If approved by the Board, GIT will proceed with the design and construction of this project in accordance with Board of Regents' procedures.

15. Authorization of Project Budget Modification, Project BR-30-0501, Business Continuity and Data Center, Atlanta, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board modified the budget of Project BR-30-0501, "Business Continuity Data Center," Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT"), to increase the total project budget from \$4.6 million to \$5.75 million.

Understandings: Execution of the Business Continuity Data Center ("BCDC") project, approved by the Board in August 2004, was delayed due to budget reductions that resulted in no discretionary institutional resources being available to implement the project. Rapid inflation and general construction cost increases due to Hurricane Katrina have caused addition cost increases for this project.

Funding of this project (including the cost increase of \$1.15 million) will be GIT institution funds.

	<u>August 2004</u>	<u>Now</u>
Total Project Cost	\$4,600,000	\$5,750,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$3,138,750	\$5,080,895

16. Authorization of Project Budget Modification, Project J-121, Student Center Renovation and Addition, Gainesville State College

Approved: The Board modified the budget of Project J-121, "Student Center Renovation and Addition," Gainesville State College ("GVSC"), to increase the total project budget from \$7 million to \$9.6 million.

Understandings: The Student Center Renovation and Addition project was approved by the Board in April 2005 as a minor project in the fiscal year (FY) 2007 budget.

The project is currently in design. Cost estimates indicate that project costs will exceed the available budget due to construction cost increases resulting from the Gulf Coast hurricanes, material cost increases, and inflation.

The state-funded amount remains the same at \$5 million, and GVSC’s commitment has increased from \$2 million (\$1,000,000 institutional, \$1,000,000 Gainesville State College Foundation) to \$4.6 million (\$445,000 FY 2008 Major, Repair, and Renovation, \$700,000 auxiliary, \$2,455,000 institutional, \$1,000,000 Gainesville State College Foundation).

	<u>April 2005</u>	<u>Now</u>
Total Project Cost	\$7,000,000	\$9,600,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$5,540,000	\$8,000,000

17. Approval of 2008 Major Repair and Renovation Funds

Approved: The Board authorized distribution of Major Repair and Renovation (“MRR”) funds in accordance with staff recommendations.

Understandings: Major Repair and Renovation funds in the amount of \$60 million are in the Fiscal Year 2008 budget; 17.5 million will be a cash appropriation and \$42.5 million in bonds will be available after the appropriate bond sale takes place.

The University System Office of Facilities staff has reviewed project requests from each institution for appropriateness, quality and cost. The staff’s recommendations generally follow institutional priorities; however, all must meet the test of efficiency, effectiveness, and return on investment.

Guidelines are used to screen the institutions’ requests for MRR project funding. MRR funds are not used for new construction or land acquisitions. These funds are not used for projects in auxiliary facilities, such as dormitories or dining halls, unless there are bona fide critical conditions that the campus’ own auxiliary reserves cannot cover.

Institutions are expected to perform routine general and preventive maintenance and upkeep of their facilities. MRR funding is intended to provide for significant non-routine expenditures. Priority is given to building systems and building integrity projects; such as roof replacements and the upgrade of mechanical and electrical systems over programmatic renovations.

MRR Project Category Codes in Priority Order

- “X” Critical Life Safety or Code Compliance Issue
- “A” Structural and Building Envelope Stabilization (roof replacement, waterproofing or glazing systems, retooling and pointing masonry, etc.)
- “B” Utility and Building Systems Replacement and Upgrades
- “C” General Renovations and Rehabilitation
- “D” Regulatory Projects (building safety code issues, energy/environmental requirements, American Disability Act, and other regulatory issues).
- “E” Other
- “F” Not Eligible for MRR Funds*

*Some campus requests do not meet the definitional requirements

for use of MRR proceeds and are not recommended for MRR funding.

18. Information Item: Approvals and Authorities, Internal Audit, Academic Affairs, and Real Estate and Facilities Committees of the Whole

The Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, presented information concerning Real Estate and Facilities-related approvals and authorities to the Internal Audit, Academic Affairs, and Real Estate and Facilities Committees, which met as Committees of the Whole. (Please see pages)

19. Information Item: Update on the University System of Georgia Strategic Capital Allocation Model

The Director of Planning, Alan Travis, presented information to the Board on the status and implementation of the University System of Georgia Strategic Capital Allocation Model. Mr. Travis discussed this new approach in conjunction with the key element of the Board's strategic plan, which is currently being developed.

Mr. Travis also discussed several issues and considerations involved in the allocation of the General Obligation (GO) funding set aside for strategic implementation. The presentation displayed the next steps in the process of the strategic program in accordance with the new principles for capital allocation and the system strategic plan.

Mr. Travis stated that this new approach is more refined and a consistent focus on outcome. It reflects the amount of capital investment that is expected to increase the System's instruction, research, and service product, as well as the instructional quality of institutions. This will allow the System Office to look more carefully at the projected operational performance and efficiency of its investment. Mr. Travis said that the benefit of the programming approach is that institutions are encouraged to project the outcome of a given investment strategy and encouraged to reconsider how well the project inputs actually accomplish the desired mission. The strategic program will consist of three phases and six elements that allow the inputs to be refined during the programming and planning process to produce an optimal outcome.

20. Information Item: Executive Session, Potential Acquisition of Real Property

The Real Estate and Facilities Committee met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, to discuss the potential acquisition of real property. At approximately 4:50 p.m., the Committee voted to go into executive session. Regents in Attendance were James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, Chair Richard L. Tucker, and Board Chair Allan Vigil. System Office staff also present during part of the executive session included Linda Daniels, Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Peter Hickey, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Robert E. Watts, Chief Operating Officer, Daryl Griswold, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, Marty Nance, Executive Director for Real Estate Ventures and Julia Murphy, Secretary to the Board. Institutional representatives who were present for a part of the executive session included Dr. Daniel J. Kaufman, President of Georgia Gwinnett College, Eddie Beauchamp, Georgia Gwinnett College, Vice

President for Business and Finance, Dr. Gordon Harrison, Georgia Gwinnett College, Vice President for Institutional Advancement, and Dr. Bill Megathlin, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Assistant to President for Strategic Initiatives.

The Committee voted to end the executive session approximately 5:25 p.m. Chairman Tucker reconvened the Committee in its regular session and reported that the Committee took no action in the executive session.

The Committee adjourned at approximately 5:30 p.m.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE

The Strategic Planning Committee met on Tuesday, June 12, 2007, in the Board room at approximately 9:08 a.m. Those in attendance included Committee Chair William H. Cleveland, Board Chair, Allan Vigil and Regents Kenneth R. Bernard, Jr., James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. Chair Cleveland announced to the Board that the Committee reviewed one item, which did not require action.

1. Information Item: Goal Two of the Strategic Plan—Creating Capacity

The Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, and the President of Georgia Highlands College, Randy Pierce, provided information to the Strategic Planning Committee of the Whole on the second strategic planning goal, creating capacity. The University System of Georgia projects an enrollment increase of approximately 100,000 students by 2020.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was none.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Vigil asked Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy, to present the honorary degree recommendations. With the Chair's permission, Ms. Murphy said that the Regents had already seen the candidates' resumes and the Honorary Degree proposals from the respective institution presidents and the university Honorary Degree Committees. She then announced the following requests.

- Georgia State University: President Carl Patton requested Board approval for the award of an Honorary Doctor of Philosophy to be awarded to Mr. Charles Loudermilk at the December, 2007 commencement.
- Georgia Institute of Technology: President Wayne Clough requested Board approval to award Honorary Doctor of Philosophy degrees to Senator Samuel A. Nunn, Professor Dame

Julia Higgins and Dr. Robert H. Grubbs, at their various commencements in the coming academic year.

- The University of Georgia: President Mike Adams requested Board approval to award at the August 4, 2007 Summer Commencement exercise, an honorary Doctor of Humane Letters to Gerald Grinstein, Chief Executive Officer of Delta Airlines.
- Armstrong Atlantic State University: President Tom Jones requested Board approval to award a posthumous honorary Doctor of Humane Letters to Mr. Nick John Mamalakis at the December 2007 Commencement exercise of the university.

Ms. Murphy noted that the staff in the System Office had reviewed these proposals carefully, and recommended them all to the Board with enthusiasm. Chair Vigil thanked Secretary Murphy, and with motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the honorary degree recommendations.

Next, Chair Vigil stated that he did not believe the press of business would make a July Board meeting necessary. For that reason he asked for a motion and second to authorize the Chancellor to take any actions necessary between the June and August meetings on behalf of the Board, with such actions to be ratified by the Board in August.

With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the Chancellor's authority to take necessary actions on behalf of the Board until the August Board of Regents meeting at which time those actions would come before the Board for ratification.

An additional item of new business was the election of the Board officers (Chair and Vice Chair) for the next fiscal year, July 1, 2007 through June 30, 2008. Chair Vigil stated that in March, he asked Regent Leebern to chair a Nominating Committee to present candidates for Chair and Vice Chair. The Nominating Committee also included Regents Hatcher and Tarbutton. Chair Vigil asked Regent Hatcher, on behalf of the Nominating Committee to make a motion, open the floor for discussion and then call for a vote.

Regent Hatcher stated that in April, Regent Leebern, on behalf of the Nominating Committee, nominated the existing slate of officers for continuance of the leadership positions they hold for the coming year. As laid out in the Bylaws, the Executive Committee heard that nomination and furthered it to the full Board for its consideration. Regent Hatcher said that at this time he would like to offer a motion to that effect: that the Board elect Chair Allan Vigil as Chair for the fiscal year beginning on July 1, 2007 and continuing through June 30, 2008, and that it also elect Dr. William Cleveland as the Vice-Chair during the stated year.

With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the officers for fiscal year 2008 with Regent Allan Vigil serving as Chair and Regent William H. Cleveland serving as Vice Chair.

REMARKS FROM THE CHAIRMAN

“First, let me express my thanks to this Board for your support and your work over the past year. Not

only are your efforts appreciated, they were critical. Let me also express my appreciation for the support of Regent Cleveland, as Vice Chair. I appreciate your hard work, Bill. Finally, I would like to offer my appreciation to Chancellor Davis and his staff for all of the fine work that the staff does.

It has been a tradition for the outgoing Chair to provide a review of the year. However, since this Board has decided that I will continue as Chair, I will defer my comments until the August Board meeting. At that time, I will combine a “where we have been” with a “where we are going” address. But let me just close by thanking you for your continued expression of support for myself and Vice Chairman Cleveland. I will continue to work with each of you and the Chancellor to justify your confidence in me.”

It is a pleasure and an honor to serve this System and this great state. Thank you.”

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Chair Vigil asked the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy, to discuss the petitions and communications.

Secretary Murphy informed the Regents where the proposed meeting schedule for the Board of Regents through December 2008 could be found in their Board materials. She then explained that there were two venue changes. In honor of their 50th anniversary year, it was proposed that the April 2008 meeting be held at Columbus State University, moving the North Georgia College & State University site to October of 2008. She reported that both presidents were in favor of this proposal. She said that this proposal would come before the Board for a vote at the August meeting, and asked that all questions and concerns with the dates be referred to the Office of the Secretary.

Next, Secretary Murphy announced that there would be a Student Advisory Council (“SAC”) Retreat on August 1-3 at Brasstown Valley Resort. She announced that the SAC would like to invite Regent participation and that Regent Potts had already committed to an appearance. She asked those Regents who would be available to attend for any part of the meeting to please let her know.

Additionally, Ms. Murphy announced that following the Wednesday August Board meeting, there would be an event to celebrate the 75th Anniversary of the Board of Regents, as part of the ongoing celebration this year. The event, she said, would begin at 12:30 and involve brief comments from the Board Chair and Chancellor. Guests would include University System institutional presidents and others from System institutions, community partners, students and future students, elected officials, former Regents, and other individuals. She asked everyone to please mark their calendars for a little additional time at the August meeting to celebrate the System’s heritage and its future in this 75th Anniversary year.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION

At approximately 10:37 a.m. on Wednesday, June 13, 2007, Chair Allan Vigil 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 Vigil, Vice Chair William H. Cleveland and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. 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. Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr., the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, the Interim Chief Academic Officer and Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, and the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy, were present for part of the Executive Session.

At approximately 12:25 p.m., Chair Vigil reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session to report and vote on the actions taken in Executive Session. Two regents had to depart the meeting before the return to open session.

Upon the recommendation of the Special Regents Presidential Search Committee, the Chancellor recommended that the Board of Regents waive Regents Policy 201 (C) regarding the prohibition against a person serving as acting president of a University System institution from being a candidate for the president of that institution, so as to allow the Committee and the Board to consider the candidacy of the current Interim President of Georgia Southwestern State University. With motion properly made, seconded, and adopted, with one Regent dissenting and three absent, the Board approved the waiver of Policy 201 (C).

With the approval of the waiver and the recommendation of the Special Regents Presidential Search Committee, Chancellor Davis recommended that the Board elect Dr. Kendall A. Blanchard, the Interim President of Georgia Southwestern State University, as the President of Georgia Southwestern State University. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and adopted, the Board approved the presidential appointment of Dr. Kendall A. Blanchard as President of Georgia Southwestern State University.

Additionally, the Chancellor recommended that the presidential salaries as submitted in closed session be approved. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and adopted, the Board approved the presidential salaries for FY 2008.

The Chancellor also recommended that the salary for the Chancellor and the Secretary to the Board be approved as submitted in closed session. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and adopted, the Board approved the salaries for the Chancellor and Secretary to the Board for FY 2008.

Following the reporting and approval of the items discussed in Executive Session, Dr. Carlton Brown discussed Policy 203: Presidential Transitions as an information item.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:33 p.m. on Wednesday, June 13, 2007.

s/_____
Julia M. Murphy
Secretary, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia

s/_____
Allan Vigil
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia