

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA  
HELD AT  
270 Washington St., S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia  
March 20-21, 2007**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, March 20, 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 10:10 a.m. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Vigil, were 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, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Willis J. Potts, Benjamin J. Tarbuton, III, and Richard L. Tucker.

Chair Vigil called the first day of the March meeting of the Board of Regents to order. He then took a moment to congratulate the University System of Georgia Foundation, Inc. chair, Regent Richard Tucker, the staff, the Board, and everyone who was responsible for the Regents' Awards for Excellence Gala which occurred on March 3, 2007.

Chair Vigil stated that the event was a tremendous success and that the almost 260,000 students and the more than 9,800 Faculty of the System directly benefited from the success of the Gala. The Regents gave a round of applause for Regent Tucker.

**INVOCATION**

Regent James A. Bishop gave the following invocation.

*“As a recently appointed Regent, I am amazed at the incredible complexity of this system and the profound responsibilities that we undertake every day. So, as we begin this morning, I am reminded that our work as Regents is not first about institutions and their governance, but first and foremost about the people we serve, the students who learn and those who will be inspired to make a difference. The world as we know it will become a better place, because of our devotion to making the University System a place that changes lives and thereby literally rewrites human history. I ask you to pause with me to express our gratitude to our God for being a part of this high calling.*

*Our most gracious and loving heavenly Father, we ask that you enable us to see more clearly and to understand more fully the high calling and the sacred responsibility of serving this great system of learning. We are grateful to serve these institutions, but even more grateful to serve the people they serve. We believe that lives will be changed. We also believe that history might take a different turn*

## **INVOCATION**

*because someone's life has been touched in an unnoticed classroom. Teach us, O God, that the real heroes of our work are the thousands of persons, each with a name and a face, that teach and study and conduct research in our colleges and universities. While we oversee these programs, grant that we may see that our highest and most enduring responsibility will be to encourage hope, to make dreams come true, and to open the windows for the light of a new day.*

*Grant us understanding and purpose in our deliberations today and may our work as Regents ultimately serve your high and holy purposes. In your most holy name, we pray. Amen."*

## **SAFETY BRIEFING**

The Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Compliance Policy, Mark Demyanek, gave the Regents and audience a briefing of basic safety information in the event of an emergency.

## **ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, by Secretary Julia M. Murphy, who announced that Regent Rodwell had asked for and been given permission to arrive later on that day. All other Regents were in attendance.

## **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on February 13, 2007, were unanimously approved as distributed.

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

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

*"Thank you Mr. Chairman. We are, of course, back to our two-day meeting schedule with this month's meeting. As usual, we have a very full agenda for your discussion and action. Before I turn to the agenda, however, I want to highlight some other, significant activities. The first happens to be the Foundation Gala. I want to join the Chairman in thanking all of you for your support and participation, which was one of the many highlights of our very successful event, held on March 3, 2007. Regent Tucker, as chair of the Foundation, was excellent in his role as the impresario extraordinaire. He was also backed up by the excellent work of the Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives and Executive Director of the Foundation, Jan Kettlewell, Senior Executive Director for P-16 Operations and Initiatives, Sara Connor, and some outstanding support from Georgia State University ("GSU"), University of Georgia ("UGA"), University of West Georgia ("UWG") and Kennesaw State University ("KSU") as well. Let me also thank members of the Foundation Board.*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*I notice that Gita Hendessi is here. She was very instrumental in helping us raise a lot of the corporate sponsorships. So, thank you Gita for that.*

*Governor Zell Miller was an outstanding and worthy recipient of the Elridge McMillan Lifetime Achievement Award, as were the other outstanding faculty and alumni who were honored at the event. Governor Perdue's comments resonated well with the more than 1,100 in the audience. I did note in his comments that he has adopted our focus on the "transformative power of the University System" and what we do here. He did mention that a number of times, and that power was certainly in evidence at the Gala from the students who performed or assisted, to our presidents, faculty, staff and alumni who were present. The event netted approximately \$750,000 for student scholarships and faculty awards. So, it was a successful evening that truly portrayed the best of the System. Additionally, everyone walked away with a souvenir. I am referring to our 75th anniversary lapel pins. In case you mislaid yours, we have another in your place today. I am also pleased to note that the crowd did heed my admonition and I have seen very few for sale on eBay so far.*

*I will wear mine with great pride, particularly as I continue my campus visits in the up-coming months. Between the last meeting and this one I managed to visit only one institution and that was Albany State University. However, my executive assistant, Ms. Demetra Morgan, has assured me that she has set a very demanding schedule with four visits each month for the next several months. So, I will be pleased to report back at our next meeting on those visits. Those visits could get compromised, however, by what is seemingly now an ever-changing legislative calendar. The General Assembly has recessed once to allow time for the PeachCare issue to be addressed, and again we are entering a phase where many of our staff, including myself, need to be on call to the legislature. On March 23, however, I will be at Fort Valley to participate in the inauguration of President Larry Rivers. You should have already received your invitation to this event and you should feel free to join us. I am sure a good time will be had by all in Fort Valley.*

*On a more serious note, consistent with what Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Compliance Policy, Mark Demyanek, mentioned in his opening remarks, just two weeks ago on March 1, one of our campuses, Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSWU") in Americus, stood in the path of a category F-3 tornado. We have, in fact, been doing Systemwide emergency planning, and this was a true test, unfortunately, of that university's emergency plan. The primary impact zone of the tornado was approximately one mile north of campus. Thankfully, no students, faculty or staff were injured and there was no significant structural damage to the campus. They did, however, lose the baseball field dugouts and the landscaping took a major pounding. The institution canceled classes the day after the storms, which occurred on a Thursday and again on Monday and Tuesday due to a countywide closing of all schools. But while the campus escaped serious damage, the city of Americus, unfortunately, did not. It will take years for that city to recover, but our people in our institution and our teams there have reached out to the community both immediately after the event and on an ongoing basis.*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*For example: Our soccer fields served as emergency landing areas for National Guard helicopters the day following the event. The Student Success Center and residence halls housed a number of electrical crews and other relief personnel for a number of days, acting as a staging point to help bring the community back and to restore power and vital services to the community. Student groups continue to volunteer to help clean up downed trees and yard debris. Additionally, faculty and staff with Red Cross training have been volunteering with the relief effort.*

*The Student Success Center also was used for emergency meetings of the Sumter Regional Hospital staff. That hospital was rendered uninhabitable by the tornado in the short term. Also, our public access channel there (GSW-TV) is now being used to post recovery information for the community. While we certainly sympathize with those who have suffered as a result of this act of nature, this also demonstrates the ability of our campuses to shift resources quickly to come to the direct aid of their surrounding communities. Again, I am pleased that one of the issues that was identified and that we are working on, on a System-wide basis, is emergency planning. This unfortunate event just re-emphasizes the need to do a better job in that area.*

*Turning to another subject, as you are aware from the extensive media coverage, our plans to expand physician training in the Athens area under the direction of the Medical College of Georgia have generated some considerable interest, particularly in the community of Augusta as well as in the legislature. On March 2, Dr. Rahn and I met with the Augusta mayor and commissioners, along with the area's state legislative delegation to listen to and respond to their concerns. The point that we tried to reinforce in that visit and in subsequent public pronouncements was that Georgia has an acute need for increased graduates in many medical professions, including physicians. We are the 9th largest state in this nation, yet we rank 37th in terms of physicians per capita. We also stressed that the Medical College of Georgia was, through Dr. Rahn's role here at the System office, in the forefront of statewide planning to meet the medical needs of the state. The college is going to remain a leader in that effort. We also tried to explain that there are logistical constraints to producing more physicians in the Augusta area, most critically, the shortage of clinical rotation opportunities in that area. Right now, one in five rotations already have to take place outside of the Augusta area. This is with junior and senior classes of 180 students. So, we are already doing 20% of our rotations outside of the area. Because of this publicity, we have had offers of additional rotation sites, but we are also planning to expand in Augusta, expanding the graduating class from 180 to 200. Therefore our 10% expansion there is going to absorb most of the resources that have come forth recently. One of the challenges I think we are having is that people do not particularly understand, or we have not done a good job, should I say, of getting them to understand the magnitude of what we are attempting to do in our expansion. If I were to put it context, we are trying to expand at the Medical College of Georgia, the equivalent of Mercer University, today. So we are trying to add 60 medical students per year and that is, in fact, the entirety of what Mercer University graduates today. We simply cannot accommodate that size of increase in Augusta. The question for us in our planning was: how do we meet the physician need given the logistical constraints and the reality that we do not have unlimited budgets or unlimited resources. The answer, of course, that we have chosen, is to*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*use existing strengths, and that is what a System is about, leveraging your existing strengths. We have great strengths in biology and in science at UGA. The acquisition of the classroom-ready naval school property only makes that shift more attractive and cost effective to us.*

*While we do understand the many sensitivities of our various constituents, we continue to conclude that expansion in Athens is a necessary step if we are to meet our statewide mission. It is our leadership responsibility to ensure everyone has the facts that they need so that we can generate the buy-in and support necessary to move this process along. This will not happen overnight. We will continue to work to create the right environment for success. However, the statistics that I indicated to you are compelling and it is our view that we need to get moving on this. Even with our ambitious and aggressive plans, we will not be able to take the first medical student until 2009; they will not graduate until 2013. They will then go to internships and residencies, and it will be 2015-2017 before they are able to practice. Given what we are doing today, if we stay on course, we will not see additional physicians until 2015-2017, depending upon their degree of training. This is in a state where we already rank 37th in terms of physicians per capita and in a state that continues to be the 6th fastest growing in the nation. Therefore, we have challenges in this. We have medical challenges, but now we have some political challenges that we need to overcome, as well. We are trying to work through those issues.*

*Before I turn to this month's meeting, I need to say a few words about future meetings. Our April meeting is going to be both traditional and non-traditional. It will be traditional in the sense that we will be meeting on a campus, this time at Georgia Southern University ("GSOU") in Statesboro. It will be non-traditional because, normally, at the April meeting we discuss tuition and campus budget allocations. Because the General Assembly will not have completed its work in a time that will allow us to then complete our work, we will be unable to do that at the April meeting. This means we will have to call a special Board meeting. We have surveyed most of the dates on your calendar and the one that is most responsive is May 2. We have tentatively scheduled a one day meeting for that date.*

*Now, let me finally turn to the agenda and tee-up a number of significant items. You need to slightly modify the order of the Committee meetings in Track II. Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, has been asked to meet with House Appropriations Vice-Chair, Representative Bob Smith, over the lunch hour. President Daniel W. Rahn of the Medical College of Georgia, President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia, and I met with Representative Smith's committee for the second time yesterday to discuss our medical expansion plans. In order to accommodate this change, I will ask the Finance and Business Operations Committee to start the track, followed by Audit and then by Real Estate and Facilities, which will allow Ms. Daniels to attend her meeting with Representative Smith.*

*This month, you will hear from our Chief Operating Officer, Rob Watts, on the status of our strategic plan. This process is rolling out a bit more slowly than originally expected, but we will*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*complete our strategic planning in time to impact our Fiscal Year 2008 budget allocations and our Fiscal Year 2009 planning. This is a complex process, which is to be expected for an organization of this size and complexity. I certainly appreciate the hard work Mr. Watts and his team are doing on this planning.*

*Last month, we initiated a discussion of changes in our approvals and authorities processes and policies, with the goal of placing accountability at the most appropriate level. We have listened closely to your discussion last month as well as your comments on the feedback form and other follow-up comments. The Chief Audit Officer and Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, is going to come before you this month with additional items, but in a format that I believe, or I hope, is more responsive to your needs. A lot of great work has gone into these changes and a lot of hard work, primarily led by eight presidents in four task forces. So it is not our goal to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory because of the way we present these items to you. Therefore, what we are going to do is introduce items as information items this month and allow you a full month to comment on the items. Then, we will bring them back to you in a subsequent month. I appreciate that this is a complex subject, with many layers, but these changes are critical to our efforts to streamline our processes and to build a stronger, more responsive University System. I, again, appreciate your dedication and your patience as we work through what is admittedly a very difficult and challenging project.*

*Another important item you will see this month is our recommendation on the Regents' Test. It is making its long awaited appearance here at the Board. Our staff, under the fine direction of the Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, has worked with our campuses very long and very hard on this important accountability measure. I think that we have a sound set of recommendations to bring before you. Let me make just one point about these recommendations, however. They reflect a desire on our part to move beyond putting a process in place and then abandoning our responsibility for outcomes, particularly for negative outcomes and outcomes of failure.*

*Instead, through these recommendations, hopefully you will see that we recognize our System responsibility to work with those who have, in fact, failed the Regents' Test repeatedly to ensure they are prepared not just to pass the test, but also to complete college and become productive citizens within our society. This is a difficult issue; it is a tough call on our part, but I believe, through these recommendations, we have struck the appropriate balance between individual and institutional accountability.*

*This month, you also will hear from Mr. Stark on institutional audit findings for the year ending June of 2006. I am not sure this is as timely as we would like, and again, we are going to look at that as we move forward. We are going to take greater responsibility here at the System Office to help campuses develop plans of action, particularly those with poor findings. I believe that is part of the leadership role we have to play here. We just cannot sit here, point to findings and say: 'there's a*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*hole in your end of the boat; fix it.’ We cannot do that. Our job here is to make sure leadership at institutions has the capacity and capability to get done what needs to be done. We do not want to do their jobs for them, nor do they want us to do their jobs for them, but it is our role here to make sure that they have the capacity and the capability to do that. So we are going to take a much more aggressive role moving forward, helping to develop responses to negative audit findings.*

*Another key initiative that seeks to encourage a more holistic look at the System is our System-level projects effort, which is headed by Dr. Carlton Brown. Dr. Brown will be bringing you a very thorough update on the progress to date on our first 10 projects. We have much work to do, but the progress has been significant. You will see that the work has been comprehensive, and, I think you will find, impressive. Those presidents assigned leadership roles in these 10 areas have done an excellent job, and I want to thank them, in bringing together their respective teams and moving to recommendations to achieve results.*

*You also will be asked this month to accept the transfer of the Georgia Aviation Technical College (‘GAVTC’) in Eastman from the Department of Technical and Adult Education (‘DTAE’). The DTAE board approved the transfer in January of this year. Now you are being asked to close the deal. I note as I look around the table that there are a number of Regents who were not involved in the earlier discussion when we started the planning process for the merger and the transfer. We have not discussed it at this level since, because we charted a path and now we have completed that journey. Dr. Federinko will be joining us in a moment to discuss that process and the outcome. We are very pleased with the result. It merges the aviation school in Eastman with Middle Georgia College (‘MGC’) and in so doing, creates a comprehensive aviation college for the state. Students can now pursue a certificate, associate and, thanks to you, a bachelor’s degree as well at one location. In recent years, we note that the aviation industry is increasingly calling for graduates with baccalaureate degrees, so this positions Georgia, again, to be very competitive in the national landscape. As I noted, President Federinko will give you an overview of this project and its potential for the state and the System.*

*Finally, I’m pleased to report that we have been able to meet your wishes to maintain control of the valuable Georgia State University “Olympic Dorms” property next to the Georgia Institute of Technology (‘GIT’) campus. We communicated to you earlier the fact that the transfer of the dorms from GSU to GIT had been finalized. At this meeting, you will be asked to approve the needed actions related to this transfer. Again, this is one of those issues where the public relations has probably gotten out in front of your approvals and I apologize for that. Our urgency in making this transfer public knowledge is based upon the deadlines faced by both Georgia Institute of Technology and Georgia State University to make their students aware of the housing options that will be available for them this fall. We believed it appropriate to do that, particularly, given the publicity associated with the unmet housing needs at GIT at the beginning of the school year fall 2006.*

## **REMARKS FROM THE CHANCELLOR**

*Let me close, as always, by thanking you for your hard work in these meetings. I also want to urge you to complete the feedback form. We continue to fine-tune our processes and your feedback is very important in that effort. Mr. Chairman, that concludes my report. I certainly will be happy to respond to any questions on any of the topics I mentioned or did not mention at this time."*

There were no questions.

## **PRESENTATION: MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE**

At this time, the Chancellor introduced President Richard J. Federinko of Middle Georgia College ("MGC") to talk to the Board about what would be achieved in the transfer of the Eastman school to Middle Georgia and what it means not only for the System, but for the state.

Dr. Federinko thanked Chancellor Davis and addressed Chair Vigil and the distinguished members of the Board, thanking them for the opportunity to give a brief overview of the merger process. Dr. Federinko stated that his presentation would give the Regents a little information about what has occurred to date with the merger and what is left to accomplish. He added that it would also demonstrate what is going to be brought into the System through the merger process.

Before starting, Dr. Federinko introduced two colleagues that he brought with him, explaining that they are important to the process and the success of aviation education in the future. He first introduced Dr. Julie Clark and asked her to stand. Dr. Clark came to MGC from Delta State University in Cleveland, Mississippi, where she spent 13 years teaching aviation at the higher education level. He explained that Dr. Clark will be over MGC's baccalaureate programs and will Chair the Aviation Management Department. Next, Dr. Federinko introduced the Interim President of Georgia Aviation and Technical College ("GAVTC"), Mr. Larry Calhoun. Mr. Calhoun, stated Dr. Federinko, has served as the Vice President of Instructional Services at GAVTC for the past nine years and has 30 years experience in the Air Force. Mr. Calhoun, he further stated, would be over the technical programs of the college in the future and would serve as MGC's Chair of Aviation Technology. Dr. Federinko added that he brought them to answer any technical questions that the Board might have.

Dr. Federinko called the Regents' attention to the information that they were given in their Board books, prefacing his presentation by saying that there was probably more information than could be covered in his allotted time. Still, he thought the information might be valuable to the Regents during their Committee meetings when they would consider the issues relative to the merger.

Dr. Federinko highlighted several events that have occurred in the last few years that he thought were of importance. He began by stating that since GAVTC was established in 1996, GAVTC and MGC have had a strong relationship, and there has been no duplication in their program offerings. MGC, he said, has offered the academic courses and has worked with the GAVTC to provide library

## **PRESENTATION: MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE**

services to the students while GAVTC offered the technical training. As a result of this close relationship, MGC became more and more aware of the need for more education (academic coursework) in the aviation industry. Consequently, MGC came to the Board to ask to be approved for state college status and the approval to offer two baccalaureate degrees in aviation. As MGC went through these processes, it became more and more evident that its relationship with GAVTC had to become closer. The Chancellor and the Commissioner of the Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”) established a transitional committee for the study of merger, which led to the DTAE vote in January which approved the merger on their half. Dr. Federinko stated that hopefully the Board of Regents in the next few days would make a similar approval.

In preparation for the merger, Dr. Federinko stated that MGC had already notified the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (“SACS”), and submitted the appropriate paperwork to them. He said that he was happy to report that MGC is in very good shape at this point in the accreditation process, adding that there are still a lot of important actions left to complete through the year 2010 to be a well established, comprehensive aviation program. He stated that the merger would take place July 1, 2007 and that the transition of the technical college from quarter system to semester is underway. The conversion of GAVTC’s administrative and academic applications from DTAE’s process to University System of Georgia’s is underway, he added. If the Board approved this merger, Dr. Federinko said, the process changes would go full steam beginning the very next day.

Dr. Federinko informed the Board that MGC has four accreditation processes that would take place between now through the year 2010, which was the most important item that he needed to report to the Regents. He emphasized that the merger and adding the bachelor degrees in aviation is a very accreditation driven process. He further stated that MGC would have “substantive change” visits for both the merger and for the level changes in offering baccalaureate degrees. Both of those visits are slated to occur in January 2008. In fall of 2008, Dr. Federinko stated that MGC would have a reaffirmation visit, and then, hopefully by the year 2010, MGC would receive program accreditation from the Aviation Accreditation Board International (“AABI”). Those are the important processes that we have left to complete over the next three years.

Dr. Federinko then began his PowerPoint presentation, stating that he wanted to give the Regents some basic information about what the merger will bring into the System. He stated that the merger will, of course, bring another campus into the System that will be located in Eastman, twenty miles from Cochran. The Eastman location, he said, would not only serve as the aviation technology center for the college, but will also serve as another campus where the System can reach out and provide more access to students in rural Georgia. GAVTC is located at the heart of Georgia Regional Airport in Eastman. Dr. Federinko referred to slides showing the properties of the GAVTC. He stated that there were a total of 183,000 square feet of classrooms, hangars, and laboratory facilities.

## **PRESENTATION: MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE**

The airport, he continued, is publicly owned by Heart of Georgia Regional Airport and has a 6,500 foot runway. Dr. Federinko stated that people might ask why MGC chose to merge with the aviation college in Eastman. He stated that MGC thinks it is a great location with slow air traffic. It is very safe and flat with plenty of fields for pilots, such as him, to land in case of emergency situations. More importantly, he stated, it is the geographic center of the state and provides access to students across the state.

Referring to another slide in his presentation, Dr. Federinko stated that the aviation college in Eastman will be bringing \$17 million worth of net assets into the System. The college has a total budget of \$4.8 million, of that \$3.6 million is state appropriation and their payroll is \$2.2 million. When comparing student demographics between the two schools, he noted that there are few similarities. Dr. Federinko did, however, point out that GAVTC is a smaller school with 248 students, most of whom are local commuters. The only true similar characteristic for the schools, he said, is that virtually all the students are Georgia residents. Dr. Federinko also noted in his presentation that GAVTC has a smaller percentage of female and minority students than MGC. Additionally, GAVTC has a higher percentage of non-traditional students and consequently, less received the Pell grant.

Dr. Federinko then showed a slide with two drawings of the state divided by counties, which he used to show how the students are dispersed throughout Georgia. He noted that MGC has students drawn from 189 counties whereas GAVTC has students drawn from 55 counties across the state. He added that he and his staff believe that MGC's history of attracting students from across the state because of its residential mission will carry over to bring more students into the aviation program.

Dr. Federinko reiterated the Chancellor's earlier remark about the Board's previous approval for the Bachelor of Science in aviation management and the Bachelor of Applied Science in flight management, both of which are offered in Cochran. He then stressed that in Eastman the six associate degrees and 20 certificate programs that are already in place will continue to be offered. He further highlighted the flight program as the major program within the institution because both the technical as well as the academic division will be offering flight programs. He then showed pictures of students in the classroom, ground school settings and a dispatch area.

In his next slide, which contained a picture of the Chancellor in the C-90 flight simulator, Dr. Federinko stated that they do welcome visitors to the college. He remarked that the reason the Chancellor was smiling so broadly in the picture was because he was successful in landing the virtual aircraft. He then extended an invitation to the Regents to visit the campus.

Dr. Federinko explained that the air traffic program is an outstanding program with tremendous growth potential with over 18,000 job openings in the field that will occur in the next decade. He stated that GAVTC currently has the best technology. The control tower is one of only two college operated control towers in the nation. The control tower simulator is also one of two in the

## **PRESENTATION: MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE**

nation at the college level where this type of technology exists; and the radar simulator is the only one of its kind at a college facility. Currently, they can only be found with the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”). This complete package makes the technology that exists in air traffic control at GAVTC without peers. Those three laboratories alone, he stated, represent an investment of well over \$2 million.

There are a number of technology programs at the college to support the flight program and the other programs at the institution. Referring to a slide of students working in various technology programs, Dr. Federinko pointed out that the facilities are spotless and noted that the pictures showed students working in engines, sheet metal, and avionics.

Dr. Federinko then moved on to a slide that showed aviation academic support resources at the college, stating that they were phenomenal. According to Dr. Federinko’s chart, there are 17 aircraft, 2 helicopters, and 6 simulators for the flight program as well as additional laboratories. The total investment in academic resources is over \$13 million. As far as capacity, Dr. Federinko stated that by fall 2007, with the introduction of the baccalaureate degree programs, the flight program will be at near capacity in using aircraft. By fall 2008 it will probably be at capacity. Concerning simulators, Dr. Federinko stated that there are issues with some of the more advanced simulators such as the C-90 and the Citation I, which offer advance training in the instrument area. He stated that the college would be working to improve those numbers. In the labs, specifically the airplane maintenance area, the college has 68 open slots for students. He then noted that it is important that the college maintain a 100% placement rate in the technology programs in the laboratory areas. This is currently the case and they want to maintain that, but he added that there is room to grow in the program by adding additional faculty and attracting students from across the state who are willing to relocate. As far as the local region, the school is already at capacity.

For the future, simply put, MGC wants to have the finest aviation higher education program that can exist anywhere. MGC is not interested in quantity, but rather quality, creating jobs and attracting new industry to the state of Georgia. With that statement, Dr. Federinko concluded his presentation and asked for questions.

Regent Robert F. Hatcher stated that the pilots who flew the planes into the World Trade Towers were trained in a flight center. He asked what the administration does to try to keep that from happening out of the college.

Dr. Federinko called upon Mr. Calhoun to answer the question. Mr. Calhoun stated that the Transportation Security Agency (“TSA”) has set up a fairly rigorous process to vet all of the foreign applicants. He added that currently, the college does not sponsor visas, which is an issue that will need to be addressed in further detail. Currently, however, it has not been a problem. Occasionally, the school will get a student who is in the country for some other program who is eligible to participate, but even those students still have to go through about a three month process which

## **PRESENTATION: MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE**

includes finger printing and background checks almost as rigorous as getting a security clearance in the military. The TSA, Mr. Calhoun concluded, has done a great job of ensuring that the college is not training any “bad guys.”

Regent Tarbutton then inquired about the job placement of the 248 students who are currently enrolled, specifically the type of jobs graduates are going into. Mr. Calhoun answered that it is some what of a “mixed bag.” All of the students, he stated, are in high demand. The flight students who graduate, because they need to build experience, work in flight schools around the state. Some work with the college while most come to the Atlanta area to flight instruct, he said. The shortage in airline pilots, which is expected to be 30,000 over the next 10 years, is so critical that the industry has already started to push down its minimum time requirements. Six months ago a pilot needed 2,000 hours of flight time to be an Atlantic Southeast Airlines (“ASA”) co-pilot; now, the requirement is 500 hours. This means, Mr. Calhoun continued, that more people will begin to move directly from college into the workforce. GAVTC signed an agreement with ASA, resulting in guaranteed interviews for graduates once they reach 850 hours.

Mr. Calhoun further stated that over the next five years, the industry would need 55,000 mechanics nationwide to replace retirements. The aviation colleges nationwide, however, are only training 25,000 combined. For this reason, the airframe and power plant mechanic students at GAVTC go to work for places like Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation, Robbins Air Force Base, Lockheed Martin Corporation, and The Boeing Company. The structural technology students, the people who build airplanes, are also in very high demand, he stated. Those graduates go to work with many of the same corporations as well as Cessna Aircraft Company and aircraft manufacturers around the state.

To date, the college has not graduated any airport managers or any air traffic controllers. However, Mr. Calhoun stated the demand for these graduates is very high. He explained that when the air traffic controllers went on strike back in the early 1980s, President Ronald Reagan fired all of them. Since air traffic controllers have to go to work before they are 31 years old, a lot of 20-somethings were hired to take their places, all of whom are coming up on retirement. Mr. Calhoun said that there are 14 colleges that currently train air traffic controllers. Over the last 10 years, they have trained 3,300. They think they can ramp up to about 4,500, maybe 5,000 maximum, but the need is 18,000 over the next 10 years. Therefore, Mr. Calhoun concluded, all of the programs being offered by the college are very timely and in demand in Georgia, in the southeast and the nation.

As there were no other questions, Chair Vigil thanked Dr. Federinko for his excellent presentation and advised the Board members that the merger will be discussed in Committee meetings. He further stated that the Committee considerations and actions will come forward in the Committee Reports on the following day. The total of these separate Committee actions, he added, would comprise the Board’s final acceptance of the transfer.

## **COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: COMMITTEE ON AUDIT AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

On behalf of the Chair of the Audit Committee, Regent Leebern, and on behalf of the Chair of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations, Regent Hatcher, Chair Vigil asked for a motion to convene a joint Committee of the Whole for both Committees to consider recommendations of the staff on approvals and authorities. With motion properly made and seconded, the Committees of the Whole Combined were convened. Chair Vigil turned the Committees of the Whole Combined over to Chair Leebern.

Chair Leebern asked Chair Hatcher to convene the Committee on Finance and Business Operations. Chair Hatcher, however, deferred to Chair Leebern and the Committee on Audit to begin the combined Committee meeting. Chair Leebern convened the Committee, then turned the floor over to the Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark.

Mr. Stark thanked Chair Leebern and said, as the Chancellor mentioned earlier, that the University System Office staff would be using a different approach in presenting approvals and authorities to the Board. The volume and complexity of the changes, he added, necessitated this change. The future approvals and authorities presentations will cover sections of the Board Policy Manual such that individual topic areas can be covered. In February, Mr. Stark stated, the staff covered a “potpourri” of policies. This month, he explained, the new process will be used whereby the staff will bring changes from several sections 100, 200, and 700 before the Board. Sections 100 and 200 deal with Board and institutional governance, and Section 700 deals with Finance and Business Operations. He explained that these changes would be covered as information items.

*“Further, since the presidents’ suggestions in the other areas are more complex, the staff will be offering more group meetings similar to what Linda Daniels had when the Board was looking at changing the processes for determination construction. Following the information presentations and solicitation of the Regents’ input, staff will make the appropriate changes, and bring the recommendations for Board approval at the next Board meeting.”*

Mr. Stark started his PowerPoint presentation with a recap of what was done during the February meeting to reinforce why the approvals and authorities process is necessary. He said, *“First, we need to properly balance governance with management. We need to evaluate the appropriateness of past changes to ensure that they are still appropriate. We need to determine if decisions are made at the appropriate level and that the dollar value or significance level has kept up with inflation.”*

*“Now that you know why we are doing it, you need to know what and how. First, we are listening to the presidents. They have spent many hours in their committees trying to decide what they believe should be the appropriate changes. Second, we have had several meetings, two to four hours each, where we are discussing who should be doing what and at what level they have the authority to execute. Next, we are doing housekeeping, which I will speak about later.”*

## **COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: COMMITTEE ON AUDIT AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

*“First, let us make sure we understand the new process. Policies will be segmented into three areas: finance, facilities, and academics. Finance will be presented as an information item today. Facilities and Academics will be set up with the Regents for review on an ad hoc basis. One functional area will be brought to the Board as an informational item each Board meeting. You will get a chance to review the changes before you meet when we send out the Board materials. After receiving your input, we will finalize these changes and then bring them back to you for approval the following month.”*

*“Now, let us discuss today’s proposed changes. There are several generic or minor changes that we will be talking about in Sections 100 and 200. Our proposals will eliminate unnecessary verbiage. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, J. Burns Newsome, and I have gone through a lot of it, as well as other members of the Chancellor’s Cabinet, and have been eliminating the unnecessary verbiage. We will move responsibilities, approvals, and authorities to the section to which it applies. If you’ll look through the agenda item starting on page 2, you can see in the bottom two paragraphs that we are saying, ‘Move this policy to section 300.’ So, we are going to be moving things to the area where it is most appropriate. There is a lot of repetition. There are some things that are in Section 100 that are also in Section 200 and 700 and various things like that. What we are trying to do is make it both easy for everyone to understand and make it so that if someone wants to know what they should do in a financial area they should not have to look under three sections. They ought to be able to look under the finance section. So, we are moving policies to the area in which it most applies.”*

*“We also want to ensure consistency in the descriptions. So, there will be some word changes and consistency of descriptions. Fourth, we want to eliminate the sections in gifts in section 102C and Section 204F, leaving it in Section 700. The Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business Operations, William Bowes, will be talking about that later.”*

*“In Section 100, there are really only two notably significant changes in this area. On page three, we are changing the policy to add, ‘the Chancellor’s designee.’ Prior, it said, ‘the Chancellor is authorized . . .’ Now we are changing it so that the Chancellor and/or his designee is authorized to be a member of all faculties and other academic bodies of the University System. This is done primarily to recognize the Chancellor’s current organizational structure with the Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, and the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, having responsibilities for the four-year and two-year colleges [respectively].”*

*“If you have any discussion or questions, let us cover them as we go through these please. On page 5, Regent Jenkins brought to our attention last month that the policy does not require the Board to accept or reject appointments of administrative officers. This change in Section 102, last paragraph, simplifies the wording and adds Regent Jenkins’ recommendation. We appreciate that, Regent*

**COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: COMMITTEE ON AUDIT AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

*Jenkins. It now reads that ‘The Chancellor shall recommend the appointment of administrative officers to the extent that officers are required to be approved and the Board shall promptly accept or reject recommendations of administrative officers.’”*

*“Section 200, page 11: Section 202G provides the right of the Special Regents’ Search Committees to interview and select persons not screened by the Campus Presidential Search and Screening Committee. It allows them to select people other than the people who have been recommended by the campus committee. So, it gives the Board’s presidential search committee more authority in making the final decision for campus presidents and interviewing candidates.”*

*“Also as recommended by Regent Jenkins, the proposed change on Section 202H requires the Board to actually elect presidents. In the past we have had ‘The Chancellor recommends . . .’ but we have never required them to actually be elected. Now there is a requirement that the Board shall elect president of the subject institution.”*

*“The next change is on page 14, Section 204D, which eliminates the requirement for the University System to execute all settlement agreements. This change is being proposed to coincide with a change made previously that gives campus presidents the authority to settle agreements of \$100,000 or less. We have changed it to allow the Chancellor up to \$300,000 and the campus presidents up to \$100,000, but we did not change this piece, so this just brings that in line.”*

*“The next change is back to page 12. This section describes the breadth of the Chancellor’s discretionary powers. ‘The president’s discretionary powers shall be broad enough to enable him/her to discharge these responsibilities’ that are described in this section. ‘He/she shall decide all questions of jurisdiction, not otherwise defined by the Chancellor or the several councils, faculties, and officers. The president shall have the right to call meetings of any council, faculty, or committee at his/her institution at any time. The president shall have the power to veto any act of any council, faculty, or committee of his/her institution 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 Chancellor.’”*

*“The next area is Section 700, starting on page 18. I will let Mr. Bowes describe these changes.”*

At this time Regent Jenkins pointed out that the highlighted portions were not showing up on the document, only the strike-through text. As a corrective measure, the Regents were told that they would receive color copies of the paperwork in an upcoming mailing at the end of the week.

Mr. Bowes stated that the changes he would be talking about began on page 18 and the actual policy appears on pages 19 and 20. *“First of all, this concerns our gifts and donations policy. The*

**COMMITTEES OF THE WHOLE COMBINED: COMMITTEE ON AUDIT AND COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

*recommendation is that we allow presidents to accept gifts and donations except for real property. In essence, what this does is eliminate the requirement that the Board give prior approval of any gift having a value in excess of \$100,000. Any gifts of real property would continue to require prior approval of the Board. Part of the reason for that is that real property has some additional issues that may be associated with it that really need to have the Board's endorsement to accept. In exchange for moving the authority to the presidential level, we're also moving the responsibility to the presidents to ensure that gifts that are accepted do not violate state law or conflict with Board policy. Also, the presidents must confirm that the gifts do not have additional costs that they cannot manage within their current resources. For example, we do not want presidents to accept gifts where there is a quid pro quo, such as starting a program or naming a facility. There are other Board policies that govern those activities. An example of a gift that would require additional costs that cannot be managed within the current resources might be accepting a software package that carries a maintenance cost associated with it that the campus cannot support through existing resources. Gifts or donations that would require additional costs that cannot be met within current budgets will require prior approval of the Board."*

*"The last part of this is that we are going to require that an annual summary report be provided to the Board on gifts and donations to institutions and their cooperative organizations. This is a change from existing policy only that we are adding to the annual summary report the cooperative organization. The expectation here is that it will be at a very fairly high level in terms of the information that we are receiving from the foundations and the other component units."*

Mr. Bowes then yielded the floor back to Mr. Stark.

Mr. Stark said, *"As we mentioned, we want to bring this back to you as an approval item next month. We would appreciate any comments that you have. Email me, send me a memo, or call me. If you have any recommended changes we will attempt to have those changes implemented and discuss with the Chancellor's cabinet and get back to whomever made the recommendation to make sure that we are clear and that we have taken the appropriate action."*

Mr. Stark then asked if there were comments or questions.

Regent McMillan asked Mr. Stark if there were suggestions that were not referenced in any of items whether or not the Regents could just mention them to him at some time. Mr. Stark answered yes and stated that he would appreciate that.

As there were no further questions, Chair Leebern asked for a motion to adjourn the Audit and Finance and Business Operation Committees of the Whole. As the motion was properly made and variously seconded, the Regents adjourned for lunch.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Vigil reconvened the Board meeting for the afternoon session at approximately 12:35 p.m.

He asked the Regents to remember, as the Chancellor mentioned this morning, the order of the Track II Committee meetings had changed so Ms. Daniels would have a chance to meet with the House Appropriations Vice Chair, Representative Bob Smith. He stated that the Committee on Finance and Business Operations would start the Track, followed by the Committee on Audit, then Real Estate and Facilities.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Chair Vigil turned the floor over to Regent Doreen Poitevint, the Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs, to convene that Committee as a Committee of the Whole. Regent Poitevint thanked Chair Vigil and introduced the Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, to talk about the Regents' Test.

Dr. Sethna thanked Regent Poitevint and Chair Vigil and began his presentation by summarizing what he termed 'the guts' of the PowerPoint presentation he had prepared. Dr. Sethna stated that the University System Office staff, after very considerable study, believe that the Regents' Test measures such a fundamental and basic skill that they hope that the Regents will want that skill to be assured in every student. Having said that, he further stated that the staff recognizes that there are things that they should be doing differently to ensure that students who have a problem passing the test get all of the assistance that they need. Dr. Sethna advised the Regents that 'this is not your father's Oldsmobile or Regents' Test.' He explained that the test itself is the same, but the staff is changing almost everything around it including the timing, testing, and the types of test that might be administered for exception.

Next, Dr. Sethna laid out the scope of his presentation, stating that he would first provide background on the test including why it was created and its original purpose. Second he would provide the Regents with the staff's recommendation and rationale. Third, he would talk about all of the changes that the staff would be proposing in terms of implementation such that students would be able to demonstrate the type of skills which the staff believes are essential.

The test was proposed in 1972 as a 'rising junior assessment.' Currently, however, students are expected to take the test before they reach 45 semester hours. The test was first developed and instituted by the Board in order to test what the students were learning from the core curriculum. The test was a response to reports from employers regarding the poor performance of graduates on the job. Additionally, there were expressions of concern from Georgia's legislators and government officials about basic skills.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

The Regents' Test is made up of two separate tests. One is a reading and comprehensive test where students are given one hour to read nine passages and answer 54 questions. Dr. Sethna added that a sample Regents' Test is on the web. He explained that the test is 30 minutes long and that no identifying information such as the test taker's name or social security number is taken, adding that the scores are not reported to anyone.

Dr. Sethna stated that if someone were to look at the Regents' Test they would find that the questions are fairly basic, designed to see whether or not the student understood what he or she read. He further stated that as the test taker answers the questions, the passage is still available so that he or she may refer back to it.

An SAT of 510 exempts a person from having to take the reading portion of the test. According to Dr. Sethna, 40% of University System of Georgia students are exempted in this way. He added that 75% of non-exempted students pass on the first attempt. Since 1980, only 5% of students taking the test, including those who eventually dropped out, do not pass the test. In raw numbers, 791 students have taken the reading test more than 10 times; of those students, 66% eventually passed. Dr. Sethna emphasized that 791 students relative to a denominator of approximately 930,000 is .085%, less than one-tenth of a percent. He reiterated that even of that small number, 66% eventually passed.

On the essay test, the test taker has one hour to write on one of four topics. The topics, Dr. Sethna stated, are fairly 'real world.' Students are not asked to write an exposition on Shakespeare or anything of that nature. An example of one of the topics would be 'what are the problems that teenagers face today.' Topics are chosen that students can relate to. The essays are graded by System teachers, typically teachers of English. Examples of problems that might lead to failure of the essay test include: inability to develop a central idea, lack of clear organizational plan, underdeveloped points, and repetitious and/or illogical point development.

An SAT score of 560 allows students to exempt the essay portion of the Regents' Test. Dr. Sethna stated that 39% of students exempt in this way. At the first attempt, 85% of non-exempt students pass the test, and, since 1980, only 5% have not eventually passed. This percentage includes those who have dropped out. Of the 219 students who have taken the tests more than 10 times, 75% eventually passed.

In terms of remediation, the System currently provides that for students who have not passed the Regents' Test by the time they reach 45 semester hours, they must take the Reading Skills or Writing Skills course, depending upon which section they failed. These skilled courses are specifically designed to improve that particular subset of reading and writing skills. Students taking the skills course take the Regents' Test as the final exam. Students continue to take the course until they pass the exam, so the skills course is intended to help them pass the test.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

As an additional piece of background information before moving into the recommendation and rationale portion of the Report was very critical of the skills with which high school graduates enter college. The Report also stated that as college graduates, many of the students still do not have basic skills. According to the Report, ‘over the passed decade, literacy among college students has declined. Unacceptable numbers of college graduates enter the work force without the skills that employers say that they need. They have not mastered the reading, writing, thinking skills that are expected of college students.’

Dr. Sethna said that the recommendation of the University System Office staff is that the System retain the Regents’ Test with one proposed change. That policy change would allow a small number of exceptions. The staff believes that the Regents’ Test should be retained because basic reading and writing abilities are so fundamental to what the System does, as well as fundamental to the perception of System graduates among the public that it is necessary to ensure that all graduates have these basic competencies. Dr. Sethna stated that the other aspect of the staff’s rationale for keeping the test is that it is the only Systemwide assessment measure currently in use by the System. Of all of the things that the System does, the only two things that it requires every student to do is pass those two skills courses, which are passed by passing the Regents’ Test. Dr. Sethna clarified that not everyone has to take the skills course because some can pass the test without the course. Nevertheless, these are the only two things that are Systemwide.

As the System moves ahead, perhaps in the next several years, a lot of performance-based measures will be added, but currently, the Regents’ Test is the only performance based measure the System has. The University System Office staff believes that deleting the measure currently in use would send the wrong message to the various constituencies that the System serves, most importantly the students and their parents.

Having recommended that the System retain the Regents’ Test, Dr. Sethna provided the following summary of recommendations for the test.

*“We are recommending that we change a lot of things around it with the idea that we want to get a lot more students through. We want to develop these skills and, so, get these people through. We are proposing changes in timing, and, therefore, the reporting of results; changes in the methods of teaching for those who need more assistance and changes in the method of testing that applies to a limited number of cases. Thus changing the three ‘T’s’ around Regents’ Test.”*

*“Timing: Currently we require that you take the test before you complete 45 hours of testing. If you don’t, that’s not the end of the world, you just now have to take the skills course. In our various iterations in the Academic Affairs Committee, Regent McMillan has been very strong on this, and I think with good reason, that we need to encourage students to take the Regents’ Test earlier so that the results may be used as a diagnostic tool. Other Regents have also been strong on this point. There is a strong subpart to this. Today, since we currently report first time pass rates, institutions*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*have an incentive to suggest to students that they take it later. What we are saying is, that we want to change the reporting structure as well because published University System reports should reflect the pass rates at 45 semester hours. If you report just first time pass rates, it would incentive for an institution to say, take it later. This way, a student can take the test several times before reaching 45 hours and if their results are better so be it. Our cut off is still going to be the 45 hour reporting requirement, but an encouragement to take the exam perhaps as early as the second semester. If there are students ready to take it in their first semester, so be it.”*

*Dr. Sethna’s next topic was teaching methods for those who need more assistance. He stated, “Here, I am going to credit the Chancellor with this idea and also Dr. Leslie Caldwell. For those of you who do not know Leslie Caldwell, he is the person I will call upon to answer really tough questions when you ask. Leslie knows more about the Regents’ Test than any human being alive; he is the testing coordinator. The Chancellor asked us to talk to students who had failed the test multiple times, and Leslie went and spoke with them. This was sort of the ‘Aha’ moment that occurred. In the Regents’ Skills Course, if the person fails the Regents’ Test after the 45-hour mark, they go through the Regents’ Skills Course. If they fail it twice, they go through the same course. If they fail it five times, they are going through the same course in the same room as people who have failed it one time. And the students said I wish I had a different kind of experience because I am in the same room with people who have failed it only once. And so we said, what we need to do is have a different kind of teaching method for students who have multiple failures. That is the essence of this recommendation. For a student who has taken the test four times and has twice completed the regular remediation course, we want a specialized, more individualized remediation course. So for that student who obviously needs additional help, we are going to provide it. So we are not just saying, ‘here is the bar, you can either sink or swim,’ we are saying, ‘alright I’m bending down, now you stand on my back so you can reach that bar.’ We are not just bending down, but we are providing help for that student to reach that high bar, particularly for the student who needs help.”*

*“For a student who has taken it five times or more and has completed the remediation course three times, we are recommending even more individualized instruction, maybe just one or two people. Obviously these courses would be more expensive because you would be having fewer students, but we believe it would be worth the effort for someone who really needs the help. Along with that recommendation, we would strongly encourage or require these students to get tested at one of the Regents’ Centers for Learning Disorders (‘RCLD’) for a specific learning or reading disability. We have four of these across the state. So, we have that included as well.”*

*“Finally, the third ‘T’ is the method of testing. In all of this, if none of this is still working then and the student has gone through the individualized instruction and still can’t pass the test, then an institution can make a case that the test that you are giving is probably not applicable to this student. An institution may ask for appeal of no greater than 0.1% of test takers or one student, whichever is more. So every institution will have at least one student that they could send up for this different method of testing. I will explain what those methods are. This exception is still expected to*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*lead to about 80 to 100 exceptions Systemwide. The institution would decide which students would be allowed to appeal at its own discretion. Each institution would need to have its own process and inform the System Office of that process and apply the process consistently. Students with a successful appeal would not be exempted from taking the Regents' Test, but would be able to go through an alternative assessment process. If after talking with students who have been monitored through multiple failures of the standard Regents' Test, the institution and student believes that an alternative method would be helpful in testing these skills, then the institution would appeal to the System Office on behalf of the student. The institution would not decide the method. So, what are some of these methods?"*

*"Instead of using the standard one-hour essay test that I spoke of earlier, the alternative method would be a composition that is written over several days, which would more accurately reflect the process of developing something, go away, cogitate, think about it, come back, improve it, and enhance it more. The criteria for these would be developed by the Testing Committee of the Academic Committee on English, which is currently Committee charged with such activities. They are well versed in these testing methodologies. Students would be required to write essays of sufficient length and complexity to ensure that they are not getting outside help."*

*"Reading would be tested using an open-ended constructed response version of the current Reading Test. Instead of checking 'a, b, c, d' the System Appeal Committee will develop several readings and a series of prompts, questions, comments, guides to see whether the student has really understood the passage. So again, this will be far more individual testing as well. Oral responses would be transcribed so that if a person has a learning disability that inhibits that person from checking the right answer, that will even be taken care of. These prompts and grading keys will be developed by inspecting reading analyses of the readings from a selection of typical, competent college students. That would be the standard bar."*

*Finally, the grading is based on the quality of the student's understanding. In the Reading Test we are not going to test their technical writing skills because that is tested in the Writing Test.*

*"So, these are the several kinds of alternatives that we will allow for students who are having problems. Some notes: all of these appeals are appeals for a different form of assessment. We are not going to say that you don't have to demonstrate any reading or writing. The Board of Regents may, in exceptional circumstance, consider waivers if there are documentable medical conditions after matriculation. If there is something that happens to a student that renders all forms of testing inapplicable, then you will still have the right – maybe one or two exceptions in the whole year across the entire System – you will still have the right to allow someone to exempt all forms of testing."*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*“These alternatives represent a completely new process, so we would like the option to review, revise, and enhance these methods as time goes on. The current exemptions will continue with one change. Currently, a score of 560 on the SAT writing sample exempts the test essay instead of the English 1101 exemption. This will exempt, as I said before, 39% of students, and institutions will be strongly encouraged to cross check their 1101 and 1102 pass rates with Regents’ Test pass rates. This is in response to the concern expressed by many Regents, rightfully pointed out. ‘How can someone fail the Regents’ Test when they have passed or done well in 1101 and 1102?’ We simply have not been good at providing that feedback to each institution, saying for this institution there is X percentage who are getting C’s or better or B’s or better in 1101 and 1102 and failing the Regents’ Test.”*

*“Finally, there probably will be a need for some funding support because these approaches, the different methods of teaching, the different methods of testing, are far more expensive than the standard kinds of methods that we have been using. We should, as a System, be prepared to consider those increased costs.”*

*“All of this is subject to a ‘sunset provision.’ I believe very strongly, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Board, that this will make a difference in the pass rate. However, if I am wrong, you will have the option of looking at this data three years from now and review this issue all over again. I think it is important that all such new methods have a sunset provision that we come back and present the data saying, this is what we predicted, this is what we believed, and it did work or it didn’t work, and then you decide what you want to do.”*

*“The summary of our recommendations is that we retain the Regents’ Test. We modify the timing, method of teaching, method of testing, and we have a sunset provision. These, in essence, are our recommendations.”*

*“In our conversations with you, we have identified four substantive and major questions that you have raised. I will just touch on these. One is ‘is the Regents’ Test completely unusual?’ That is to say, is Georgia the only state that is doing this?’ We have studied this and found that no, it is not. For example, New York and California state university systems do this and are encouraged by their results. Florida State University is exploring this. It is not all over the nation, but the trend is for more documentation, for more assessment in reading and writing. Assessment of competence in reading and writing is on the increase rather than the decrease. In fact, we have had Department of Technical and Adult Education (“DTAE”) institutions come to us and talk about their students also being able to take the Regents’ Test. We are currently administering it for the Georgia Military College. So, even in Georgia, we are by no means alone.”*

*“A second question is that because there are a number of students who are reported to have failed this many times, how is it possible that you finished the coursework and you still have not passed the test? We heard these horror stories. Actually, the record is 37 times that someone took the test. He*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*ultimately did pass the test. If you look not at the anecdotes, but at the raw numbers, at the end of the day, this is it. Less than 0.1% have failed it 10 times. So if you think of this as a process, any process that has a failure rate of 0.1% is what, in today's world, is called a Three Sigma limit. It is not quite Six Sigma, but Three Sigma is pretty good. That means that there is a reason to improve the process. That does not necessarily mean that the process is so bad that it has to be discarded."*

*"The third question that we have heard from you is, how do we handle students with learning disabilities? I believe we do a fairly good job. We allow extended time, a separate room, and access to a machine that will read the Reading Test to them. They can circle answers rather than shading in the bubbles. On the essay test, they get extended time, permission to use a computer with spell-check. All of these processes are currently in place and will continue."*

*"Finally, the tough question that we've touched on is, how can a student pass or do reasonably well on 1101/1102 and yet fail the Regents' Test? That is probably the toughest question to answer. The best answer that I can give is that they are different kinds of reading and writing skills that we test. One of the skills that you expect your employees to have is the ability to write something, revise it, revise it again, read it, and write a final great report. That is the kind of skill that we develop in 1101/1102. The opportunity to take your essay home, to think about it and to do more work, to revise it and come with a final good product. You all want someone who has that ability and we do that in 1101/1102."*

*"The Regents' Test measures a different kind of ability: the ability to write something that is intelligent, cogent, and coherent in the first draft. You want someone with that ability also, because in the real world of business, we don't always have the opportunity to take six days to write a memo, or a paper, or a draft. Sometimes you have to dash off a memo to a boss or a customer within a half hour. You have to do that, and that is the kind of skill that the Regents' Test attempts to assess."*

*"So, they are different skills. We need to have both; we develop both. And it probably is too much to expect that every course examines or assesses or develops all of these skills. Is the Regents' Test perfect? No, it is not. Are we working toward a better success rate? Yes, we are. This is what we present to you with the idea that we do have the opportunity to look it again after a period of time and evaluate whether or not these predictions are, in fact, going to come true. I will be happy to answer any additional questions that you may have. Thank you very much."*

Regent Hatcher asked whether or Dr. Sethna had estimated the cost and where the money will come from.

Dr. Sethna replied, *"No I do not have an exact estimate of what it will cost. I am pretty sure it will cost more. Where the money will come from? I'm sure some will come from institutional resources and we hope that as we get more formula money, because this is an important thing for the System,*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*that there will be some allocation given to institutions. Particularly institutions that have high numbers of individuals who need that help.”*

Regent Hatcher asked whether or not they had any thought about adding a test for math. Dr. Sethna answered “yes,” and stated that when he was at the System Office seven years ago, they actually had one developed. They did not go forward with it, and he believes he left the central office before the final decision was made, but he suspects they would be having a much more severe discussion at this time, had they gone forward with it.

Dr. Sethna stated that the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs & Associate Director for Higher Education and the PRISM Initiative, Dorothy Zinsmeister, was also involved with it. Regent Hatcher asked why we did not go forward with it. Dr. Sethna asked Dr. Zinsmeister to explain.

Dr. Zinsmeister replied, *“In actuality, I think, institutions were given the option of using it if they wanted to. We did not go forward with it because of changes in leadership.”*

Chancellor Davis said, *“Let me point out something going forward with respect to this test. If you remember one of the features we said is to come back and visit this in three years. I think you also have to take that in context with what we are planning to do with the core curriculum in the strategic plan. What we are talking about there, and, Regent Hatcher, we will get to your questions as well, is a competency-based set of changes so that you will have to demonstrate math competencies, reading competencies, comprehension competencies, and so on. Depending on where we are in three years on the development of that curriculum, we may well in fact come back to you and say eliminate this test at that time, but not at this point in time. The competencies that we are measuring will, in fact, be measured in the context of the curriculum going forward. This may really just be a timing issue as opposed to a fundamental issue of whether we should keep this test or not. We are recommending doing it at this point in time, but I would suggest to you in three years and suggesting that we remove the exam.”*

Dr. Sethna added, *“Right, because we are testing those and other competencies in other ways.”*

Regent Leebern said that he felt that the Regents’ Test was an appropriate test for the two-year college level, but not at the higher sector levels of the System. *“Not at the University of Georgia, not at Georgia State University, not at the Georgia Institute of Technology, certainly not at the Medical College of Georgia, he said. All the money from there could be transferred to the two-year schools. To me, that’s where the focus should be, in the two-year schools where we almost have open admission, not Systemwide. He said, “I would really like to see us transfer the cost for the four-year schools to the two-year schools. There you have captured your money, formula-wise or any other, for the financial part of it.”* His objection is that all 260,000 of the composition of our students and customers do not need such a test.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Regent McMillan said, *“I had promised a few people that I was going to be quiet today. Then I said it to the Chancellor and to Beheruz. The Chancellor said, ‘hardly.’ And, I was going to remain quiet, but when I started reading all the materials I received over the weekend, a lot of the material conjured up a lot of the bugaboos about the ‘Rising Junior’ or the Regents’ Test that I have had for a long time. I decided to spend the weekend just trying to jot down one or two things that I felt were important enough to talk about.”*

*“Now I should say early on that I am not against testing. I really am not. I think if I had to categorize my problem with testing, especially high-stakes tests such as the Regents’ Test is, I am more against what tests are used for. Whenever we use tests to label or to allocate opportunity, then it seems to me that we get on pretty shaky ground. I will not take as long as Dr. Sethna, so I ask for your indulgence. Some of what I have here, Regent Leebern has said. He did not see my notes, but he said some things that I have in here. So, what I did over the weekend was just sit down and jot some things that I am going to read. Now, admittedly, if this were to be my essay on the Regents’ Test, I would not pass because it does not follow any structure or any form. It is just stuff that came out of my mind over a period of time. And I am going to read it, if I can read my own writing. I have not read it since I wrote it, but let me just start.”*

*“Listening for so many years to the raison d’etre for the Regents’ Test, I have concluded that it is akin to the Holy Grail, or that it is the sine qua non of academic accountability. Personally, I do not think that it is either, nor do I think that the University System of Georgia would be on a ‘slippery slope to hell’ if the test were to be discontinued.”*

*“When the then dreaded ‘Rising Junior Test’ was first implemented some 35 years ago, the University of System Georgia was an exceedingly different entity than it is today. One System official, who later became Chancellor, allegedly said, trying to justify the Regents’ Test or the Rising Junior Test, whichever, that ‘something had to be put in place to be certain that our students knew how to read and write before graduating.’ Now, that is a sad commentary to be sure. Indeed, the stellar reputation that this System enjoys throughout the region and the nation today certainly, I think, is not attributive to the Regents’ Test. Rather, it is attributive to many variables, not the least of which is the stellar caliber of faculty and students that the System has been able to attract.”*

*“It is noteworthy to observe that the overwhelming majority of our peer systems and institutions in the Southern Regional Education Board (‘SREB’) states, as well as nationally for that matter, do not have a high stakes ‘do or die’ type test. Now, you referenced to California State University (‘Cal State’). In a conversation with the former head of Cal State, I was told that Cal State has a systemwide mandate that everybody has to do something, but it does not require that everyone has its reading test. It proffers it as a possibility, but you do not have to do it. I was told further that almost no one is kept back because they fail whatever it is that they give. But in all fairness, let me hasten to add that most institutions, including some of the highly selective ones, have some form of academic accountability in place.”*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*“This leads me to wonder aloud then, and this is what Regent Leebern mentioned, why it is necessary for our research institutions to have the Regents’ Test as a requirement. Why would any of our institutions that have impressive SAT averages be so required? Now I have a little matrix that I worked up using the figures that came from within the System for the year 2004-2005. This is the completion/passage rate for sophomores reaching 45 semester hours. Now, I warn you that at Columbia University, I made a B- in statistics, so this just might not be all right, but it makes my point. For instance, in this year, we have 8,100 plus students at the research universities taking the Regents’ Test. According to our figures, 98% passed the reading portion the first time or at least when it was reported at the end of 45 semester hours. Approximately 95% passed the essay portion, giving a combined total of approximately 94% of the students, collectively, at the research universities who passed. Now if you go down to the regional universities, according to our figures, we had 3,600 completing at 45 semester hours. Ninety-three percent of them passed the reading portion, 92% passed the essay portion, for a combined total of, this looks a little funny, it says 89%, that might be one of the reasons I got the B-, but at any rate, that’s there. If you want to break it out from racial and ethnic postures, of those numbers, 5,891 white students took the test at the research universities. Of those students almost 99% passed the reading and about 96% passed the essay, for a combined total of approximately 96%. That might not be completely right either. Now going forward in that same research university line, you had 994 black students in that cohort, 91.5% of them passed the reading part and 89% passed the essay test for a combined figure of close to 90%. There were 753 Asian students. They did 97% on the reading portion and 95% on the essay, and you can extrapolate what that combined score would be. The point I am trying to make is that for the System as a whole, if you just did it for the System, we still had the high 80 percentile of students passing the combined parts of the Regents’ Test.”*

*“I am going to put that aside. It seems to me, at least from my perspective, there is no compelling evidence that the Regents’ Test passage rates are a determinant factor in assessing individual or collective institutional quality. Again, I submit that accountability should not rest upon a single reading/writing test. It seems to me that the use of a single test score minimizes the complexity and rigor associated with the attainment of a post-secondary education degree. This test is not a fair representation, in my mind, of the institutions nor of the students.”*

*“Now, what forms of accountability and assessment do we have in place for the other skills that our graduates need? Are there students among the Regents’ Test failures who do well or make passing grades in math or science, or in the arts, or in other content areas? These are important questions because when the various institutions admit students, they take into account other variables such as special talents in music or in the arts or leadership potential, athletic prowess, etc. Now, we make the assertion that among those who fail the test the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, and fiftieth time, the majority eventually pass. So, the number of complete failures is almost infinitesimal when placed within a population of over a quarter of a million. Why then, do we still need the Regents’ Test to validate what we do?”*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*“As a former English teacher, long before I forgot classical English as I have now because of what I hear on TV and other places, I know the importance of writing and reading; and I still cringe when I hear so many educated folks make glaring grammatical errors. I could give some common examples, but then that would touch most of us in the room, so I won’t. I fear that long term, emailing and text messaging are going to get us even further and further from acceptable standards of English. Some would argue that if people are able to speak, regardless of how poorly, and they get their points across, correctness pales in that light. I am not one of those. I often have said, in here and in other places, quoting Shakespeare, that the devil can cite scripture for his purposes. Now, I might be devilish, but I am not the devil. When I was doing my daily reading of the Bible over the weekend, it was a fortuitous happenstance I’m sure, but I happened to be in I Corinthians 14: 10 and it happened to say something that made me think about the essay portion of the Regents’ Test. It says ‘There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and none of them is without significance.’ I will go along with what anybody says about the Regents’ Test. You will not hear from me again on it whichever way it goes, but I just had to, again, restate some of my thoughts about the Regents’ Test. I am sorry it was so long.”*

Regent Jenkins asked a question about the present exemption versus the proposed exemption. He said, *“I just want to understand what the present exemption is. There is a slight change in the proposed exemption and I want to make sure that we understand them. There are two different tests, and I understand that there are two different sets of exemptions for the two tests.”*

Dr. Sethna answered, stating that the proposed exemption is not something they are proposing here because the Board has already delegated that authority downward. Of course, the Board may overrule anything that a lower-level staff member has done, but that the 560 SAT Score change has in effect, already taken place. He asked Dr. Leslie Caldwell to confirm. Dr. Caldwell stated that the research had been done, but not formal changes had been made to date.

Regent Jenkins interjected and asked if the Board would be voting on something today.

Dr. Sethna stated that the only thing that the Board is being asked to vote on is the highlighted phrase that read, *‘The Board of Regents may allow waivers of the Regents’ Skill requirement in very rare circumstances, estimated at no more than one or two a year Systemwide when after enrollment, students develop documentable medical conditions that make all testing methods inapplicable. Guidelines for implementing this waiver will we issued by the Chancellor.’* *“Right now, no waivers are in effect. Today, by Regents’ policy itself, you have disallowed waivers given by Regents. This says that the Regents can give a couple of waivers a year. That is all that you are being asked to vote on today.”*

Regent Jenkins then asked if someone wanted to support the two speakers here, referring to Regents Leebern and McMillan, who are basically opposed to the Regents’ Test, is there anyway to do that? Dr. Sethna stated that he could do anything he wanted. The Chancellor stated that it would take a motion from the floor.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Regent Jenkins then asked Dr. Caldwell to go back to the exemptions question he initially asked.

Dr. Caldwell said, *“Just to clarify, the reason why you are only asked to vote on the highlighted information is because all of the other details are just in procedure. They are in the Academic Affairs handbook, and they are not in the Board Policy Manual. Dr. Sethna is presenting these things as information to guide your discussion for whatever motions you care to make.”*

He then addressed Regent Jenkins’ question saying that there are a number of exemptions. A score of 510 or higher out of 800 on the verbal portion of the SAT would exempt a student from the Reading Test. Moving forward, Dr. Caldwell stated that staff would use the written portion of the SAT as an additional exemption for the Writing Test. Currently, the exemptions used for the Writing Test, primarily at the University of Georgia (“UGA”), are in the form of AP and SAT II exemptions. The staff plans to use the SAT writing sample for all students with a score of 560.

For clarification, Regent Jenkins stated that there is a new section of the SAT, another 800 points that makes the total possible score 2400. He asked whether or not it was the case that on this new section where students write out something and are graded, if a score of 560 exempted them from taking the Writing Test.

Dr. Caldwell stated that would be true after today. Regent Jenkins then asked what test students had to score a 560 on before in order to be exempt. Dr. Caldwell answered that there was not one. He stated that the staff had only recently gotten data to use the SAT writing sample test. Regent Jenkins then asked if the Writing Test could be exempted at all in anyway. Dr. Caldwell stated that by getting an “A” or “B” in the English core courses as well as a 530 or a 590 on the SAT verbal exam. He stated that the reasoning behind this exemption for the Writing Test was because the research on those persons who received an A in 1101 and did get 530 on the SAT verbal, 95% of those students passed the Regent’s Writing Test on the first attempt.

Regent Pittard stated that if he had a quality control test in his company that 99.18% are going to pass, he would say he needed another test because that is not going to identify any quality. He said the two reasons he wants to have the test are: 1) because it is the only thing that Regents have Systemwide.; 2) it is the only thing that the Regents have that has their name on it. He further stated that their name should imply some type of gravity. He said that the Regents’ Test is looked at by most campuses as an incredible diversion and irritant, not as a quality control test that identifies real problems. If this test was diagnostic and not pass/fail for proceeding in one’s education, there would be a better argument for it. Regent Pittard stated that he does not see any problem with the changes that the staff wants the Board to approve today if the System is going to continue with the test. However, there is a bigger problem. He stated that the staff needs to have an open forum on whether or not the test is necessary. Further, he stated that *“The vote should be, do these Regents think that we should continue to have a Regents’ Test or do these Regents not think that; and that’s not what we are voting on today.”*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Chair Vigil commented, saying that was not necessarily the case as they could vote on whatever they wanted.

Chancellor Davis asked Chair Poitevint if he could address that issue. He reiterated that the staff *“is working to work in a curriculum to eliminate the test to demonstrate all the competencies we need demonstrated within the context of the courses and programs themselves. The point I was making is that while we recommend keeping it as opposed to launching into a time-consuming or maybe not time-consuming if you do it today, debate on whether the test should or should not be kept, we decided not to recommend eliminating it because we are moving to eliminate it and expect it to be out of here in a number of years.”*

Dr. Sethna responded to Regent Pittard’s earlier statement. Dr. Sethna said, *“Regent Pittard, you said that if there is an element of quality control that would in effect pass 99% that you would not have the element. But our objective is to say that this is a minimal bar that we believe all our students should have. Our objective is not make it a bar that most students cannot jump. Our objective is to create an environment such that students will pass it. And so, the objective of an educational institution is to try and get everyone up to the level so that they can pass.”*

Regent Pittard asked Dr. Sethna, *“When you were president of the University of West Georgia, and you had a teacher who all the students in that class made 99.15 on their course, would you not ask whether that teacher was being rigorous?”*

Dr. Sethna said that Regent Pittard was correct. He then said that he understood Regent Pittard’s point but did not believe that it is the same question that is being asked about the Regents’ Test. He said, *“There are some Regents who believe we are failing too many students. You are saying that 99% is making the bar too low.”*

Regent Pittard stated that *“Over the years, the criteria that we feel that someone should have in reading, writing, and composition has, in fact, been handled through the curriculum. It is not being handled through a test anymore because we show in the test that 99.1% of them pass. So why do we continue to have the test if you know that you’re doing that well. For example, in my class, I do not ask a question on the test that I know 100% of my students are going to get right.”*

Chancellor Davis asked what the first time pass rate was stating that 99.9% is the eventual pass rate. Dr. Caldwell answered that between 40% and 50% exempt and about 80% pass the first time. He stated that the 99.9% is several years down the road. Chancellor Davis stated that there has been some remediation taking place to get to that number.

Dr. Sethna said his point was that *“Our objective is to work toward 100% because we are saying this is such a minimal level. This is not a weeding out process; this is saying that we expect all of our students to be at this level, and we will try 10 times, 20 times with appropriate remediation such that*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*everyone gets through. This is not the equivalent of an instructor saying, 'Everyone who comes into my class must get an A,' and 99.9% of students get an A. This is such a basic, fundamental skill that we want 100% of our students to get through it, and for that small proportion who do not, we are going to try, and try, and try harder as many times as it takes, to get them through. So, the objective here is to make sure that everyone has that minimal level of skill."*

Regent Jennings addressed Dr. Sethna saying, "You keep saying that this is a minimal bar, but you do not bother to try to teach it. Why haven't we taught them?" Dr. Sethna answered that the students are taught these skills in the Skills Course. Regent Jennings then said that they obviously did not pass it. They pass the course but they can't pass the Regents' Test. Dr. Sethna responded saying that the only way to pass the Skills Course is to pass the Regents' Test. Regent Jennings asked, "Again, why haven't we taught it in the classroom. If this is so important then why aren't we teaching it?"

Dr. Sethna said, "This is the same philosophy that we are talking about, competence-based testing. Let us say, removing the Regents' Test from the discussion, that you believe, as Regents, or industry folk or whatever say that the minimal level of communication ability is thus and such. We could have three courses to bring you up to that level, but if a student comes in through the door and is able to demonstrate that minimal level of math competency or minimal level of whatever competency, you want to allow for that. So what we are saying is, this is the bar, and there are some students who don't need the skills course to demonstrate that minimal level."

Regent Jennings said that he understood that and that we are not concerned about those people. He said, "We are concerned about those who can't meet the minimal standards, and we have purportedly let them pass an exam that covered the minimum standards in the coursework." Dr. Sethna stated that he believed they were talking about two different things again. He said that Regent Jennings was talking about 1101/1102 English courses and he was talking about the Skills Course. Dr. Sethna stated that the students who do not pass the Regents' Test do not pass the Skills Course. Regent Jennings stated, "I think we're into semantics and you're avoiding recognizing that we are not teaching what they need to know to pass the Regents' Test." Dr. Sethna responded that "We're not teaching that in 1101/1102; we are teaching that in the Skills Course." Regent Jennings then said, "Maybe we should be teaching it in 1101/1102."

Chair Poitevint said, "I believe that we are talking about different things because so much of our discussion in our Committee before has really been focused on how we create safety nets in this test, and what we do so that we will be able to show that we have attained a certain standard in one thing and another. I really feel like the things that we have incorporated from these months and months and months of discussions have really helped. We haven't changed the test, but the things that are now built into the test. So I see different things going on in our discussion."

As a point of clarity, Regent Jenkins asked whether or not the Academic Affairs Committee had already voted on this issue and was now recommending it to the full Board. Chair Poitevint stated

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

that the Committee had not voted on the issue, at which time Dr. Sethna stated that this was the Committee meeting convened as a Whole.

Regent Leebern said that for a student to go into the 1001/1102 courses and receive a B and then go in to take the Regents' Test and fail creates a stumbling block. He then asked whether or not the staff had thought about exempting all System institutions except for the two-year schools. Dr. Sethna stated that as it is the Regents' Test, they could do whatever they liked. Regent Leebern said, that they could *"exempt the four-year colleges and universities from the current administrated Regents' Test and then focus on the two-year institutions. To Regent Pittard's point, it is a "Regents' Test" and it certainly has the University System of Georgia Regents applied to it, but what are we doing that all of the other states aren't doing? What are we missing? What are they missing? Why don't other states have it? I am not trying to say that we should or shouldn't keep the test. We are missing something somewhere or those other states are definitely missing something."*

Regent McMillan addressed Dr. Sethna saying, *"You used Cal State as an example. From my understanding of what Cal State has done is that it said that every institution has to have in place, something that is acceptable that will demonstrate that the students who leave can do some things. My further understanding is that it says 'This is our System suggestion. You don't have to use it, but if you don't use it, you have to demonstrate to us what you have in place that is going to be satisfactory.' I have far less problems with that kind of approach because I don't think that one size fits all. I have not heard, in a collective fashion, from the universities and the people out there on what their druthers are. I don't want to give anybody the impression that I am suggesting that we just threw out the baby with the bathwater. You have to have certain forms of accountability. You have to be able to ensure that people can do what they do. However, I would be much more comfortable to hear what Georgia Institute of Technology, the University of Georgia, Albany State University, Savannah State University and Fort Valley State University say. They know what the situation is. Everybody reads the figures. The Chancellor's point is well taken about the core curriculum, but that is down the road and may not happen for another five years. We are in the here and now. How many people will fall through the cracks between now and the time when all of that gets in place? We talked just a few moments ago about accountability being at the appropriate level. I think that same thing ought to prevail in the Regents' Test that our people in the institutions should have much more involvement and input. It may be that they want it. They may say that they want to keep it forever. I would grudgingly shut up and go along with them because I respect their opinion."*

Dr. Sethna said, *"There is vast variation between the 1101/1102 pass rates versus the Regents' Test pass rates across the University System."* Regent McMillan replied that there are vast differences in the students across-the-board. He then restated his point that one size does not fit all.

Dr. Sethna then said, *"The question that I have to ask the members of the Board of Regents is, given what you see about the Regents' Test, ask yourself 'is this a basic skill, the ability to write in an hours time on one of these four topics, is that a skill I expect every student who graduates from the*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*University System of Georgia to have or is it not?” Regent McMillan said that he would have to agree with that statement. “But, when you get down to the grading of it,” he said, “it is so subjective. What one grader does with an essay is not necessarily what two other graders might do.”*

Dr. Sethna stated that those checks and balances are already in place. He said, *“Two people grade the test. If they disagree then a third one comes in. So it is not a random one grader kind of thing. He asked Dr. Caldwell if this statement was correct.”*

Dr. Caldwell stated that, currently, the test is graded by three people, and it takes the agreement of two to pass. Also, any paper that fails can go to a campus appeals committee. If the campus appeals committee believes that it should pass it comes back up to another System’s committee in which three more people can grade it. *“So,” he said, “you have at least nine people for every single essay. Additionally, people can exempt it by doing well on the SAT, but they can also take it several times before the Skills Course even takes place. So if you start taking the test in the first semester and you take the usual numbers of courses, you’ll have at least three chances to take the test. That is 27 people who have judged a performance as inadequate before the Skills Course even kicks in. Even when the Skills Course kicks in there is still no real liability. It is just a course that teaches you, specifically, how to pass that test.”*

Dr. Caldwell then asked if he could comment on the Cal State comments. He said, *“The information that I read about six months ago said that even though there is not a specific requirement on a specific test, on a specific test, most of that system’s institutions use the test that is developed by the central office.”*

Regent McMillan stated that although that may be the case, it is not required.

Dr. Caldwell stated that some form of testing is required and most of the institutions use it. Additionally, in a survey that was done by the presidents there, their estimation was that up to 5% of students were denied diplomas, specifically because of the test.

Dr. Caldwell then commented about the impression that the colleges have about the Regents’ Test. He stated, *“I have, of course, not talked to presidents about this, but at last year’s Academic Committee on English, which includes English department heads from all of the System institutions, they passed a resolution which said that they believe that the Regents’ Test is an important measure and that it is also measured at the appropriate level. They also said that they would appreciate input in making changes. And so, that is what we have been doing over the last year and can be doing more of over the next three years. So, I think, at least at that level, academics see a value in the test.”*

Regent McMillan asked whether or not they addressed the caliber of instruction in 1101 and 1102 because accountability is double-edged. He stated, *“There is accountability on students and also an accountability on faculty. Since they are the ones who are saying grace over it, it seems that they ought to have something to say about what appears to be a deficit in the 1101/1102 courses.”*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

Regent Jolly stated, *“As a member of the Academic Affairs Committee, I would like to speak for a moment in favor of retaining of Regents’ Test. As the Chancellor goes and represents all of us and System, he talks about he three A’s. He talks about accessibility, affordability and accountability. I am really not concerned with any other states. I’m just concerned with this stated. Granted we may be far better shape—let’s hope that we are—than when this was instituted 35 years ago, but still it’s one measure of accountability. If we have trouble determining whether or not this is a good test or a good method, I don’t know how we are going to move from a core based curriculum to a competency based one because all that is exemptions and accountability with outcomes. I think it is something we need to look long and hard at. I think it is somewhat diagnostic. By and large, these are skills that we are really expecting incoming freshman to have. These are skills that should be there from high school. They are not there, and that’s part of what we are dealing with. We are not really teaching to give those competencies and then test to make sure that we’ve got them. However, as we move the testing back earlier, I think that will help us to get there. I think it is something that we need to retain and that we need to keep that accountability. I feel like the tweaking that we are talking about doing as far as the timing and testing and the remedial work or Skills Courses is to take the students who are struggling with this and make them competent so that they can succeed. That is where we end up with the 99%, but we are far from that when we start out.”*

Dr. Sethna drew a parallel to Regent Pittard’s earlier question. He said, *“You’re thinking of this as a grading kind of thing. I am not. I am thinking of it as a production process where you want every widget of yours to meet the standard. We are only at Three Sigma now. The objective is to get to a much lower failure rate. So in this particular case, we are trying to remove the failure rate and bring it as close to zero as we can, not to set a high bar that 33% fail. That is not the objective of this particular test. This is an improvement process. It is an education process.”*

Regent Pittard said to Dr. Sethna, *“Well I am moved by your comments and Regent Jolly made some good points which also moderate my position somewhat. However, the only thing that I would say is that if we accept a student in our System, to prevent them from continuing on in their education when they have received acceptable scores from their faculty, to me, seems indefensible. It means that somewhere this student has been failed, either in the admissions process or in the instruction process. If we were to, in fact, give them a test, like this one and if, in fact, we give them the opportunity to take the test time and time again through remediation and they still didn’t pass, I would think that the curriculum they should follow from that point should be much more basic, almost remedial in nature in order to help this student. Therefore, I would rather have the test not as a pass/fail, continue or not continue basis, but to have it as a diagnostic and a curriculum decision basis. In that case I could more support this kind of test. Now in what you have done with your adjustments is kind of meet that half-way.”*

Dr. Sethna said, that this is exactly why the staff is making the changes. He stated, *“We are recognizing that what we have been doing is inadequate and imperfect. So we are trying to move closer to exactly what you are talking about.”* Regent Pittard stated, *“But I do wonder, how much*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*time, effort, and expense is directed toward this. I cannot imagine giving the same test 35 times. I can't imagine giving it 10 times or 5 times or 4 times. I think at some point in time you have spotted a problem or you haven't.*"

Chancellor Davis said, *"I think you are perfectly correct. We are trying to balance our responsibility to those students who fail with our responsibility to the public and to the institution to graduate people who meet a minimally acceptable standard. In the past, I think, we have not shown any responsibility for those who have failed. We said 'if you fail, go take a course, go take it again, go take it again, go take it again.' Now what we are saying is, after you have failed it a couple of times, we are acknowledging there is a problem. We want to take you offline and put you in more focused remediation because we still believe in a standard. And if you continue to fail we will give you even more focused remediation. I think we are trying to balance our commitment to the public to graduate students who meet minimally acceptable standards with our responsibility to those who fail. No test is perfect, but I want to stress that we are working to get rid of this. It is our goal to get rid of this test, but we are not recommending to do it right now"*.

Regent Pittard said, *"To Regent Leebern's point, the change here, the 560 on the SAT and the 510 on the SAT, those additions, if you take, UGA, GIT, and MCG, everybody is going to have those scores because the average SAT at UGA is 1250, at GIT it is 1350 and it is about the same at MCG. So those students are going to exempt. So that basically does, in fact, eliminate these tests there and pushes them down to the regional and the two-year institutions."*

Chancellor Davis stated that Regent Pittard made an excellent point.

Dr. Sethna stressed that while that would be the case for most students, all of the students would not be at that level.

Regent Tucker asked, *"Are we able to quantify what administering a Regents' Test costs on an annual basis?"* Dr. Sethna replied, *"Yes. Each of the reading comprehension tests costs approximately \$6 per person. The essay test costs about \$9 per person."* Regent Tucker then asked what it costs the System total on an annual basis, inquiring how many people take the test each year. Dr. Caldwell stated that about 30,000 take the Reading Test and about 35,000 take the Essay Test. Regent Tucker asked if that price took into account the three people who have to grade the written essay. Dr. Caldwell stated that while the price did include the graders, it does not count the administration costs on campus. *"It does not factor in the day that a testing professional is paid."*

Regent Tucker said that the reason for his question was certainly not to put the staff on the spot about what something costs. He said, *"As we look at the overall program and the overall project, how best can we utilize the resources that we have for remediation where it is necessary? If we were going to vote on whether or not to move the test forward, and I understand that is not the purpose of today, but I was hoping it was going to be the purpose of today, we need more information. You almost*

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

*need a checklist: this good, this is a pro, this is a con, these are some alternatives to the test, whether it be an institutionally driven or System-driven. I don't have anywhere close to the information I would need to say we need to move forward or not to move forward."*

Chair Vigil said, *"It looks like, to me, we are moving in the right direction on these recommendations that the Committee has made or brought forward. So let's take a look at the recommendations and then maybe table the discussion on whether we should keep the Regents' Test or not. I don't think we're ready to make that decision today."* He then suggested that the Board adopt the recommendations made by the staff, that move them closer to what they want, and then look at whether or not they want to keep the Regents' Test at a later date.

Dr. Sethna stated that he would be comfortable with Chair Vigil's suggestion and agreed that the broader discussion could be moved to another day. He addressed the Regents saying, "It is up to you. If you tell us what information you want that will be helpful to you to make that decision."

Chair Poitevint said, *"I think, first of all, we ought to go over again what we asking again."*

Dr. Sethna stated, "We came before you, understanding full well that the discussion would be on the merits of the Regents' Test, but we came to you with one change which simply allowed you more flexibility to make the exceptions. That is the only change that we came to you with. It simply gives you more flexibility to make some exceptions. In the process of doing that, we told you things that we would like to do, that do not rise to your level, but give you a sense of confidence that we are not just keeping everything the same and just giving you one or two exceptions. We wanted to show that we are doing many things in the background."

Chancellor Davis reread the policy change that was submitted for approval stating that *"right now there are no exemptions for people who are required to take the test."*

Regent Jolly made a motion to approve the recommendation. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Board voted approved the policy change.

In regards to the larger question as to whether or not the Regents' Test should be retained, Chancellor Davis suggested that the staff poll the members of the Board, individually, to see what information they believe they need on which to base a reasoned decision. He said that staff would then pull all of that information together and bring it back to the Academic Affairs Committee at which time they could tee-up the question again. He also stated that he wanted to make sure that when the question is brought back before the Board, people have, at their fingertips, the information they believe is relevant to making that decision.

At approximately 2:00 p.m., Chair Vigil adjourned the Regents into their regular Committee meetings.

## **CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Wednesday, March 21, 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 9:00 a.m. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Vigil, were Vice Chair William H. Cleveland and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. Regent Wanda Yancey Rodwell arrived later in the day.

Chair Vigil called the second day of the March meeting of the Board of Regents to order. He stated that late on the evening before the House of Representatives approved the Fiscal year 2007 Amended Budget. He further stated that the Chancellor's letter regarding this could be found in their Board books.

## **SAFETY BRIEFING**

The Assistant Vice Chancellor for Administration and Compliance Policy, Mark Demyanek, gave the Regents and audience a briefing of basic safety information in the event of an emergency.

## **INVOCATION**

Regent James A. Bishop gave the following invocation.

We live in a world that is known today for its mounting conflict and therefore the need for learning and reason, for understanding and respect, are becoming increasingly more important. So, as we conduct our work as Regents, I believe that it is important to keep in mind the larger human good which we serve. We are educating an emerging generation of new leaders. Our graduates will become teachers and physicians, accountants and engineers, laypersons and public servants. Our work as Regents is to become architects of hope for this new generation. I ask you to join me as we ask for God's blessing on today's meeting.

Our most gracious and loving heavenly Father, we thank you for the opportunity to serve. We ask you for guidance and direction this morning in order that we as your stewards may become instruments of hope and light to a new generation of leaders. May the challenges we face and the decisions we make become the pivotal basis upon which this new generation learns to conduct their lives and their work with discipline and imagination, with respect, hope and with civility. Encourage us dear, God, that through your spirit we will provide leadership and example that will help build a world where learning and understanding engender within us all a greater capacity to become people of wisdom and compassion. To that holy purpose we covenant together, commit our work and ask your rich blessing. In your most holy name, we pray. Amen.

## **ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, March 21, 2007 by Secretary Julia M. Murphy, who announced that Regent Hatcher had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day. She also announced that Regent Rodwell would arrive later in the day.

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

Chair Vigil informed Chancellor Davis that at this time the Board was ready to hear from the Chancellor and his staff about the System-level Projects for Presidents.

Chancellor Davis thanked Chair Vigil and took that opportunity to welcome everyone to the first day of spring. He then stated that the Board would now hear a presentation from the Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Carlton Brown. He stated that one of the things that he wanted to implement early on was a series of projects that were Systemwide in areas of significance to us where we wanted to achieve Systemwide excellence at every institution. The areas were identified and the projects were difficult to manage. For this reason, Chancellor Davis asked Dr. Brown to join him at the System Office to manage these projects. He agreed to do that and hit the ground running and imposed upon these projects some consistency discipline, structure of management and leadership. *“He is doing an outstanding job and I am very pleased. This morning he will give you a sense of not only what he has done with providing structure and leadership but also what progress we are making on a selected number these projects.”*

Chancellor Davis then turned the floor over to Dr. Brown.

Dr. Brown greeted the Board and stated that it was a pleasure for him to come before them to present the first report on the progress of the System-level projects.

*“We are talking about Systemwide projects and presidential leadership. This idea originated as you know with the Chancellor. The idea was that each president be able to provide leadership beyond his or her own campus, and while there were many good and model programs in the System that were absolutely excellent, we have not been systematic about sharing our expertise and about moving good practices throughout the System. And the Chancellor wants to see if we can move the System to operate more like a system and not like a loose confederation.*

*Part of the set of issues here is to try to build a continuous improvement culture around these issues. That we begin to be more systematic in our problem solving; find ways to apply internal knowledge Systemwide; find ways to improve alignment of institutional aspirations and System priorities; and make sure that the solutions that we develop are implementable solutions.*

*Any good large corporation applies its best knowledge to any segment of the enterprise regardless of where the best knowledge is found. Diversity of institutions helps to meet the diverse needs of the state of Georgia, but the system as a whole serves the state of Georgia and must therefore align its*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*institutions with its priorities. All of these projects will be charged to develop implementation processes which are scalable, sustainable, and consequential. We have identified the work to be done here through a variety of means. The following suggested functions came from a number of places. Presidents, of course, were consulted. Other campus level officials including Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs and Chief Business Officers and System Office staff members were also consulted. The Chancellor also sought input from the Regents and discussed with other state officials, students and community leaders as he made campus visits.*

*There were over 70 functions submitted for consideration. Functions were divided into 17 areas:*

- |                                          |                                                   |
|------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| ■ <i>Academic Affairs</i>                | ■ <i>Information and Instructional Technology</i> |
| ■ <i>Business Operations</i>             | ■ <i>Policy And Procedures</i>                    |
| ■ <i>Counseling Service</i>              | ■ <i>Real Estate And Facilities</i>               |
| ■ <i>Customer Service Initiative</i>     | ■ <i>Research</i>                                 |
| ■ <i>Economic Development</i>            | ■ <i>Risk Management</i>                          |
| ■ <i>Environmental Health And Safety</i> | ■ <i>Student Services</i>                         |
| ■ <i>Health Service</i>                  | ■ <i>Support Services</i>                         |
| ■ <i>Library</i>                         | ■ <i>Training</i>                                 |
| ■ <i>Mentoring Program</i>               |                                                   |

*Obviously, we cannot carry out 70 quality projects. Through a fairly detailed process, these were crunched down into about 30 projects by combining and looking at the implications of one functional area for another. We have gone about the business of implementing the first ten. As you'll see by the list of projects, each one is led by a president. We sought leadership from presidents at every level, every region of the state, and every institutional type. You can see the full range of the kinds of projects we are engaged in.*

- *Improving Enrollment Capacity and Management*  
*President Randy Pierce*
- *Improving Retention, Progression and Graduation Rates*  
*President Bruce Grube*
- *Improving Health Professions*  
*President Dan Rahn*
- *Enhanced Advising Processes*  
*President Ronald Zaccari*
- *Emergency Operations Initiative*  
*President Everrette Freeman*
- *Energy Management Initiative*  
*President Michael Adams*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

- *Training and Professional Development*  
*President Wayne Clough*
- *Early Outreach for At-Risk Middle School Students*  
*President Martha Nesbitt*
- *African American Male Initiative-Middle School*  
*President Dorothy Lord*
- *K-12 Math, Science and Engineering Initiative*  
*President Carl Patton*

*The teams are Systemwide and operative from every level. Each team has personnel from institutions, faculty, staff and administration, as well as, personnel from the System Office. In phase one, the project goals are to be defined. The assessment of State and System needs and conditions will be carried out. Whether we discover them inside or outside of the System, or through direct borrowing from industry and other service activities, the teams search for the most effective practices. They have also been charged to develop scalable, innovative approaches. We want Phase One to end with either a scalable model of exactly what ought to happen at each institution or a set of principles of practice that are accountable, accessible, and implementable at each institution. We want them to define some measurable outcomes and then move to implementation strategies.*

*Now part of the accountability of this process is the president who leads Phase One will also lead and be responsible for phase two which is the Systemwide implementation of these processes. Phase One projects will culminate in a report with strategy or directional goal recommendations in March to May 2007. We have some coming in now, which I will share with you in just a moment. We will approve and allocate resources at whatever level is required depending upon the recommendations that come forward. We will then build the president-led implementation team. Goals, timelines, success measures and accountability for implementation will be put in place for each institution. And while we may not ramp all things up to every institution right away, it will be scalable and the expectation is that these outcomes will impact every institution.*

*There will be some cost for some of our projects that are important enough and significant enough, there will be significant cost, however it is also the case that each institution, for several projects, will have to reallocate or re-direct some of their internal resources. It is also the case that we are anticipating that some of these projects will come up with implementable recommendations that will make significant change in our System at little or no cost.*

*Here are some of the things that are occurring and some of our expectations. As we have moved forward we have discovered that some of these projects have some significant overlap. They are pursuing their goals and they begin to talk about things in some of the same sectors. For example, the project on retention, progression, and graduation, necessarily, also talks about advising. So at some point in the next two weeks we will have those two teams actually begin to communicate with each other to make sure that we're on the same page as we move these projects forward. Not that we*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*are going to eliminate or merge but they need to be on the same page moving the initiatives forward. Another very obvious one is the science, technology, engineering and math ('STEM') initiative which also has some significant overlap with the middle school at-risk students and the African-American Male Initiative. One of the issues in the sciences, for example, is the extent to which we are increasing the number of minority personnel which are prepared. So again we will engage in some cross-pollination.*

*Some examples of what you can expect in the next few weeks in terms of the outcomes of phase one. Three of our projects are really coming to fruition right now, although I am not going to present to you final goals as they are still deliberating and refining those. All of them are going very well and I, frankly, am pleased with what our staff and the president leadership has come up with in all of our initiatives. These three are of particular note.*

*The first project, creating K-12 interest and strength in the STEM disciplines, is led by President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University. The second one, professional training and leadership development, is led by President G. Wayne Clough, Georgia Institute of Technology, and the third is the enhanced advising processes, which is led by President Ronald M. Zaccari of Valdosta State University.*

*All projects must end phase one with fully scalable and implementable models or accountable principles of practice. Again, these are not in final form, but these are three which I think are noteworthy to give you a real sense of where we are going with these. In the STEM area, they will do their work in three sectors.*

*The will work directly and continuously with the Department Of Education ('DOE') and school systems around the state to raise expectations and to improve teaching and learning in these several disciplines. Much of this work will be a continuation and expansion of what we've already done with the Partnership for Reform in Science and Mathematics ('PRISM') initiative, which I know you received some great reports on. We're one of the few systems that has actually impacted, in a measurable way, the attention of our schools systems to science and math. We have, in fact, made an impact on the number minority personnel who are beginning to be prepared in those areas.*

*Secondly, we are going to work across all System institutions to improve our own teaching. We don't always do as well as we can with those students that we do enroll in these disciplines. Historically, introductory courses in the sciences and math, whether they are for the general majors or for 'Gate-keeper' courses. The code has been, 'how many people do we blow out in the process of building the next generation of scientists and mathematicians?' What we want to move to is 'Gate-way' courses. These will be the courses where if we apply our best teaching and best support, tutoring, technology, etc., we will actually increase the number of people who find their way through those course and who continue to succeed in the disciplines.*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*Thirdly, we are working with System institutions and DOE to radically increase the production of teachers in mathematics and the sciences. This is a critical area for our System.*

*Let me show you some data that I think makes the problem very clear. On this graph, the first column of numbers is the estimate of new teachers needed in Georgia by 2010. The next column is our current level of production in 2006. You see some grave discrepancies in our inability to be prepared. The third column is if we do everything that we are already proposing to do, literally doubling our production, we are still far behind by 2013 on the targets that we have to meet in 2010. Georgia is already a major importer of teacher talent. One of the problems in our public schools is the inability of systems to get people teaching within disciplines of their preparation, which in turn, impacts the quality of instruction and the quality of outcomes, which then further limits the number of scientists that we prepare and then further limits the number of science, math, and technology teachers that we can prepare. So, this one is absolutely critical. If parsed out those numbers in terms of minority personnel, you would see an even more exacerbated difference.*

*The second area that we want to talk about is training and personnel development. As a learning organization, we have concluded that we do not do our very best in training and developing our own personnel. So as this team as examined our issues here, they are suggesting, at this point, that we look into establishing a designated officer at the System level and on each campus responsible for training and professional development. We found, for example, that even in areas where we have to have certified training that we have not always been consistent in that regard. Secondly, to establish a training and professional development workgroup to work with that person to ensure the best thing to service our personnel throughout the System. Finally, we have an enormous amount of undeveloped talent within our System that sometimes leaves our System and does great leadership in other places. So the team is saying that it is time for us to do a little home-grown activity to begin to talk about how we develop our own personnel. How we utilize our System for interning new personnel and administration, how we get young faculty into research roles, how we take persons from a masters level professional activity and prepare them for faculty roles and that sort of thing. We are also talking about systematizing customer service training and really ratcheting up our role in the Governor's Customer Service Initiative ('CSI'). This is another area of overlap. I am talking to personnel now who are involved in that initiative and clearly, there has to be some communication across those lines. We are pleased with where they are progressing at this point. They have done some tremendous work.*

*The final one that I want to bring to your attention is the enhanced advising processes. Now, I have mentioned before that the focus of these projects is on developing models or implementable and accountable principles of practice for each and every set of structures to be implemented throughout the System. We will want some of these things to look exactly the same on every single campus. Advising is not one of those things. Advising, we have found through their work, and they have done some stellar research in terms of codifying and documenting the successful models of advising that we already have in our System and talking about how those systems of advising connect to the*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*culture of the institution, what we want to be able to do is provide our institutions with the kind of support that will enable each and every one of them to do the very best service for their particular student body and to establish the kinds of systems, uniformities, and accountabilities that will work there. Now clearly there will be some cost here because part of accountability for advising will involve some new applications of technology and our ability to document every interaction and every move and to be able to do degree audits as we move and eliminate some of the misadvising that may occur in some of our systems.*

*These projects are a high priority and each and every one of them must be completed and carried through implementation. In many instances, the ones that we have particularly highlighted here today can make key changes in how our System operates. We have the possibility, for example, with the STEM initiative to literally be that system in the country that significantly impacts the quality of math, science, and technology in our System and with our school system. We want to take full advantage of that. We are aware that the approach that we are taking creates some changes in how we work and we are working through those things as we go. For some of our faster moving projects, I think we are staying about two and a half steps in ahead of them in terms of preparing the way and making sure that we are communicating across sectors to pursue good implementation. For our other projects, we are providing them with a lot of support. We also have to work more intensely with our education partners and communities to carry out some of these functions. The relationship between the University System of Georgia and the Department of Education is the most critical one in terms of our ability to work together across sectors and to help them improve what happens from middle school, particularly, on up as our way of increasing the quality of our pipeline.*

*Finally, we know that part of what we are after here is engineering a utilization of expertise and knowledge across all campuses and sectors. It does very little good to have expertise to have one institution that makes it great, for example we have a couple of institutions that have just really hit the top in terms of their ability to retain students, but not have a mechanism to make sure that expertise, knowledge and experience gets to every other campus to see what we can do to improve the same factor there.*

*So that is where we stand right now. Again, I am very excited to be in position to help usher some of these to fruition. There is a lot of great stuff going on, and I must say that the University System of Georgia has some great people working within it. I do not find any slackness or reluctance on any of these teams.”*

At this time, Dr. Brown concluded his report and asked if there were any questions or comments.

Chancellor Davis thanked Dr. Brown for not only an excellent presentation, but also for his leadership in this area. He then commented that the Regents should not assume by any stretch of the imagination that this is the first time that people have come together in this System to talk about a particular function and what works and what doesn't work. *“We have had a number of best method*

## **PRESENTATION: SYSTEM-LEVEL PROJECTS**

*forums and we continue to convene them and people go on an ongoing basis. The seminal difference is that we are making it clear that getting better is not optional any longer. Once we have identified a certain level of measurable excellence, we are going to achieve that level of excellence across-the-board. I want to reinforce the point that Dr. Brown made about Phase Two. In Phase Two, the presidential leadership which has put structure and substance around the project is also the leadership that is going to monitor progress throughout the System and in fact will have accountability to me or to my designee for making sure that we achieve excellence across-the-board. So, we are not only going to identify what works and what's good, but we are going to make sure that it gets implemented as well. With respect to funding, you will see some of these come back to you as we discuss budget allocations. Unfortunately, it will not be next month, but the month after."*

As there were no other questions or comments, Dr. Brown left the podium.

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: STRATEGIC PLANNING**

At this time Chair Vigil asked Vice Chair Cleveland, the Chair of the Committee on Strategic Planning to begin the Strategic Planning Committee of the Whole. Chair Cleveland called on the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts to bring a brief status report on the strategic planning process.

Mr. Watts thanked Regent Cleveland and began his presentation by discussing the latest iteration of the staff as presented by Chancellor Davis. Mr. Watts reminded the Regents of the process that has been followed so far. Late last fall in September or so, the Chancellor sent out some preliminary planning thoughts on which he received input from the Regents, presidents, and state policy makers. Based on that input, he then commissioned five planning teams led by presidents with institutional representation across the System. Those planning teams worked until about early December and reported back to the Chancellor. The reports of those planning teams were the basis of the Regents' discussion in January at their strategic planning retreat at Clayton State University. The Chancellor has been directing the staff since that time to flush out those thoughts and put some timelines and metrics to those.

*"We have come from about the 30,000 foot level to about the 10,000 foot level. We are not at the granular level yet. I admit I never used the word 'granular' in a sentence before I met the Chancellor. I had only seen it on an SAT test, but it a word now that we use a lot around here. We are getting very granular. Next month I hope to have a more finished product back to you with metrics, timelines, and fiscal year 2008 objectives that you will have in time to make resource allocation decisions both money decisions in May and facilities decisions next August."*

Mr. Watts then referred to the document on strategic planning found in the Regents' materials. He stated that it had become a much more ambitious agenda, and it does have the capacity, if this is the direction the Regents want to go, to transform students, to transform the System, and potentially,

## **COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE: STRATEGIC PLANNING**

transform the state looking forward. *“If you restructure the core curriculum, reemphasizing excellence in undergraduate education, you will position this System as a leader. President Dorothy Leland of Georgia College & State University is here and she will be taking that on with some of the System Office staff and her faculty and staff colleagues around the state. If you take this on and create the capacity for 100,000 new students by 2020, and not in a random fashion, but emphasize an aggressive use of access institutions and build a second tier of comprehensive institutions that are destinations for students who want a full college, traditional experience and want to stay in Georgia, that will change the face of the System.*

*If you position our research universities among the leaders in research and development, raising their level by \$100 million or so until they get to the top 10 or top 12 among the nation; if you position our System as a good partner to K-12, as Dr. Brown was just saying, so much depends on that; and if we do take advantage of some of these efficiencies in the System, we will have the money to do some of these other things.*

*This is a very ambitious plan going forward today. What I and the Chancellor need from you is your sense of whether or not we are capturing where you were headed in January. ‘Are we headed in the right direction; are we missing something; is there something else we need to think about between now and April when we bring some more finished thoughts back to you.’”*

Mr. Watts then concluded his report and turned the floor back over to Chair Cleveland who asked if there were any questions. There were none.

## **COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Chair Vigil announced that the Board would now proceed with the Committee Reports He stated that the merger of the Georgia Aviation Technical College and Middle Georgia College Committee actions would come forward in the Committee Reports. Further, he pointed out again, that it is the total of these separate Committee actions that would make up the Board’s final acceptance of this transfer.

## **EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE**

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at approximately 9:05 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, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Doreen Stiles Poitevint. Chair Vigil reported to the Board that the Committee met and reviewed three items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

## **EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE**

### **1. Approval of Appointment of Board of Regents' Representative to the Capitol Art Standards Commission**

Approved: The Board approved the appointment of Dr. Jonathan M. Bryant, Associate Professor of History, Georgia Southern University, as the representative of the Board of Regents to the Capitol Art Standards Commission, as provided for in H.B. 978, passed by the General Assembly in the 2006 legislative session. The appointment would be effective through July 1, 2008.

Background: Dr. Jonathan M. Bryant was recommended by President Bruce Grube of Georgia Southern University. Dr. Bryant received his M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from the University of Georgia, his J.D. degree from Mercer University and his B.A. from the University of Virginia. He is an Associate Professor of History at Georgia Southern University, and teaches classes in U.S. History, Georgia History, Constitutional History, Destruction of Slavery, and also a variety of graduate-level courses and seminars. Dr. Bryant is a widely published book author, a contributor to articles and book chapters and a presenter of scholarly papers pertaining to the history of Georgia.

### **2. Information Item: Policy Issues**

University System Office staff briefed the Committee on staff efforts to examine policies that will be brought to the Board for full discussion at a future meeting.

### **3. Information Item: Executive Session**

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, to discuss personnel and compensation matters and real estate matters. Materials were distributed in Executive Session.

Chair 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 Robert F. Hatcher, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Richard L. Tucker. Also in attendance were Chancellor Erroll B. Davis, Jr.; the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts; the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, Thomas E. Daniel; the Interim Chief Academic Officer, Beheruz N. Sethna; Chief Information Officer, Thomas L. Maier, the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William Bowes, Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, Associate Vice Chair of Legal Affairs, Elizabeth E. Neely, and the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy. 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 10:00 a.m., Chair Vigil reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. The Committee adjourned at approximately 10:03 a.m.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

The Committee on Academic Affairs met on March 20, 2007, at approximately 3:45 p.m. in room 6041. Committee members in attendance were Chair Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents 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 had reviewed 21 items including one walk-on item, 19 of which required action. Additionally, 65 regular faculty appointments and personnel issues were reviewed and recommended for approval. Of the total requests, 58 actions involved faculty appointments with the remainder involving leaves of absence and mid-year salary increases. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole)**

Approved: The Board approved the revised Regents' Test policy and guidelines, effective, March 21, 2007.

## **PREFACE**

The Regents' Test was established in all system institutions to provide information on the status of student knowledge in the areas of reading and writing as a means to establish minimum levels of competence. In 1973 the test became a requirement for graduation from undergraduate degree programs. In 1987, the policy was changed to exempt students earning a career associate degree. A new approach has been developed with regard to the Regents' Test that changes the time at which the test is first administered to the second semester of a student's matriculation, changes System reports to reflect institutional pass rates at 45 hours instead of first-time pass rates, institutes specialized remediation at each University System Of Georgia institution, allows each campus to appeal the results of the Regents' Test for no greater than 0.1 percent of test takers and allows for waivers of the requirement when certain medical conditions develop after matriculation.

### **Approved Recommendations for the Regents' Test**

The following details represent the approved recommendations on how the Regents' Test will be revised to ascertain student progress and be used as a diagnostic tool of reading and writing competence:

1. Retain the Regents' Test. There are multiple reasons to do so, the top two of which are mentioned below:
2. Assessment of basic reading and writing abilities is so fundamental to what we do, and so fundamental to the perception of our graduates by the business community, that we must be prepared to ensure these basic competencies in each and every one of our graduates\*.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole) (Continued)**

3. It is the only System-wide assessment measure the University System of Georgia currently uses. In a climate of national scrutiny and increased emphasis on assessment, deletion of such a requirement would be the wrong message to send to national and state constituencies, and more significantly to students and their parents.
4. Strongly encourage students to take the Regents' Test in their second semester, so that the results may be used as a diagnostic tool; and correspondingly change published System reports to reflect institutional pass rates at 45 hours rather than first-time pass rates.
5. Institute specialized remediation for students who have taken the test multiple times:
  - a. For a student who has already taken the test four times, and has twice completed the regular remediation course to the satisfaction of the instructors, there will be a specialized remediation section with more personalized instruction than is currently afforded in the regular skills courses, in which the primary activity is reading and/or writing under the direct supervision and guidance of the instructor.
  - b. For a student who has already taken the test five times or more and has completed the remediation course at least three times to the satisfaction of the instructors, an even more individualized course is under consideration. Initial ideas suggest an independent study section of the Skills course. The course might be structured as a lab course in which the primary activity is reading and/or writing under the direct supervision and guidance of the instructor who has background in the specific remedial subject. All students enrolled in the course should be strongly encouraged or required to get evaluated at a Regents' Center for Learning Disorder (RCLD) or a similar campus facility for specific reading and writing impediments.
6. Allow each campus to appeal the results of the Regents' Test for no greater than 0.1 percent (one-tenth of one percent) of test-takers (or one student, whichever is more). This exception rate is still expected to lead to 80-100 exceptions System-wide. Which students are allowed to appeal is to be decided at the discretion of the institution through a process reported to the University System Office. Students appealing will not be exempted from the skills requirement, but will be able to go through an alternative assessment process such as that outlined on the following page.

## COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

### 1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole) (Continued)

7. Re-visit and re-evaluate this new approach after three years to examine what aspects of it are working and which ones are not, and to examine if the success rate of multiple test takers has improved. Extra funding for the increased costs of these new approaches may need to be considered.

*\* The Board of Regents may allow hardship waivers of the Regents' Test in very rare circumstances (no more than 1-2 a year, System-wide) when, after enrollment, students develop documentable medical conditions that make all testing methods inapplicable.*

### Writing Appeals

For writing appeals, a student's work will first go through the current appeal process of the Testing Subcommittee of the Academic Committee on English. If the appeal is not approved by that group, the institution may appeal to the System level appeal committee. The alternate assessment for writing for a student who appeals will be a composition developed by the student over several days. The work will be done in a secure setting; students will not be allowed to take materials out of the testing environment. The criteria for evaluating these works will be developed by the Testing Subcommittee of the Academic Committee on English. Students will be required to write compositions of sufficient length and complexity to ensure that they have acquired the level of writing ability established by the Regents' Writing Skill requirement.

### Reading Appeals

For reading appeals, a standardized version of an Informal Reading Assessment will be developed. The System appeal committee will prepare several readings for a student who appeals and a series of prompts (comments, questions and guides) related to the readings will require the student show, in writing, his or her understanding of the material (oral responses would be transcribed). The prompts given to students and the grading keys will be developed by inspecting written analyses of the readings from a selection of typical, competent college students. Grading will be based on the quality of a student's understanding, not technical writing skill.

### Notes:

Note that the appeals on this page refer to appeals for an alternative form of assessment, rather than for a waiver from demonstration of these competencies.

The philosophy which directs the offering of these alternatives is that after a series of unsuccessful performances, some students may profit from a change in structure of the assessment. It will be the

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole) (Continued)**

goal of the alternatives to measure skill at the same level as the regular assessment; only the nature of the assessment will change. Since the alternatives represent an entirely new process, they will be subject to review and enhancement.

Current exemptions of the Regents' Test will continue, with one change. We will use 560 on the SAT writing sample to exempt the Regents' essay, instead of the English 1101 exemption. This will exempt 39% of students.

Institutions should closely and periodically examine data on the relationship between English 1101 / 1102 grades and RT pass rates.

Extra funding for the increased costs of these new approaches may need to be considered.

### **POLICY REVISION**

Understandings: The proposed policy, section 307, contains only one addition (**highlighted** below), since all but one of the proposed changes are at the level of procedure and practice. Proposed revisions follow. Please note that the highlighted texts represent additions.

#### ***Current Policy***

### **307 REGENTS' WRITING AND READING SKILLS REQUIREMENT**

The formulation and administration of the Regents' Test and the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement shall be as determined by the Chancellor and prescribed in the Academic Affairs Handbook. (BR Minutes, August 2004)

Each institution of the University System of Georgia shall ensure that students obtaining a degree from a System institution possess certain minimum skills of reading and writing, hereinafter called Regents' Writing and Reading Skills. The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement has been developed to help attain this goal. The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement will ensure students have competence, at a minimum System wide level, in reading and writing.

Students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs leading to the baccalaureate degree will be required to complete the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement as a requirement for graduation.

The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement is not a requirement for an associate of applied science degree or an associate of science degree in an allied health field, although institutions may choose to require it for these degrees. (BR Minutes, 1986-87, p. 371, 1987-88, pp. 129-30).

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole) (Continued)**

A student holding a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education will not be required to complete the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement in order to receive a degree from a University System institution (BR Minutes, 1987-88, pp. 129-30).

There shall be two System-mandated courses in writing and in reading that represent a vehicle for meeting the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement.

There will be Systemwide tests administered in reading and in writing. These tests will be referred to collectively as the Regents' Test. The Regents' Test is designed to provide an additional method for satisfying the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement.

The formulation and administration of the Regents' Test and the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement shall be as determined by the Chancellor and prescribed in the Academic Affairs Handbook. (BR Minutes, August 2004)

#### ***Proposed Policy***

### **307 REGENTS' WRITING AND READING SKILLS REQUIREMENT**

The formulation and administration of the Regents' Test and the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement shall be as determined by the Chancellor and prescribed in the Academic Affairs Handbook. (BR Minutes, August 2004)

Each institution of the University System of Georgia shall ensure that students obtaining a degree from a System institution possess certain minimum skills of reading and writing, hereinafter called Regents' Writing and Reading Skills. The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement has been developed to help attain this goal. The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement will ensure students have competence, at a minimum System wide level, in reading and writing.

Students enrolled in undergraduate degree programs leading to the baccalaureate degree will be required to complete the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement as a requirement for graduation.

The Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement is not a requirement for an associate of applied science degree or an associate of science degree in an allied health field, although institutions may choose to require it for these degrees. (BR Minutes, 1986-87, p. 371, 1987-88, pp. 129-30).

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **1. Revised Regents' Test Policy and Guidelines (Addressed by a Committee of the Whole) (Continued)**

A student holding a baccalaureate or higher degree from a regionally accredited institution of higher education will not be required to complete the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement in order to receive a degree from a University System institution (BR Minutes, 1987-88, pp. 129-30). The Board of Regents' may allow waivers of the Regents' Skills Requirement in very rare circumstances (estimated at no more than 1-2 a year, Systemwide) when, after enrollment, students develop documentable medical conditions that make all testing methods inapplicable. Guidelines for implementing this waiver will be issued by the Chancellor.

There shall be two System-mandated courses in writing and in reading that represent a vehicle for meeting the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement.

There will be System wide tests administered in reading and in writing. These tests will be referred to collectively as the Regents' Test. The Regents' Test is designed to provide an additional method for satisfying the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement.

The formulation and administration of the Regents' Test and the Regents' Writing and Reading Skills requirement shall be as determined by the Chancellor and prescribed in the Academic Affairs Handbook. (BR Minutes, August 2004).

### **2. Merger of Georgia Aviation and Technical College with Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ('MGC') be authorized to merge academic programs and operations with those offered by Georgia Aviation and Technical College, effective July 1, 2007.

Further, the Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ('MGC') be authorized to revise its institutional mission statement with the assumption of the operations of Georgia Aviation and Technical College, effective July 1, 2007.

Additionally, the Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ('MGC') be authorized to establish the following six academic programs and convert them from the quarter system to the semester system: Associate of Applied Science in Aircraft Structural Technology, Associate of Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance Technology, Associate of Applied Science in Air Traffic Management Technology, Associate of Applied Science in Airport Management, Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Airplane, and Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Rotorcraft Helicopter, effective July 1, 2007.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2. Merger of Georgia Aviation and Technical College with Middle Georgia College (Continued)**

Further, the Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ('MGC') be authorized to assume the operations of Georgia Aviation and Technical College inclusive of faculty appointments and other personnel appointments, an institutional reorganization, and the naming of the newly merged college "Middle Georgia College" with the main campus reflected as the location in Cochran and approval to designate the Eastman campus as under the sole purview of Middle Georgia College, effective, July 1, 2007.

The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ("MGC") be authorized to assume the academic instructional responsibility of current Georgia Aviation and Technical College students and to accept all students as Middle Georgia College students with the initial enrollment date at Georgia Aviation and Technical College used as their University System and Middle Georgia College enrollment date, effective July 1, 2007.

President Federinko provided an overview of the entire merger and assumption of responsibilities to the full Board with a discussion of several elements of the consolidation of Georgia Aviation and Technical College, a unit of the Department of Technical and Adult Education located in Eastman, Georgia.

#### **2a. Revised Institutional Mission Statement, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College ("MGC") be authorized to revise its institutional mission statement with the assumption of the operations of Georgia Aviation and Technical College, effective July 1, 2007.

#### ***Current Mission Statement***

Middle Georgia College is a unit of the University System of Georgia dedicated to providing a caring, dynamic, learning-centered, and technologically advanced environment of excellence. As a comprehensive and residential institution, the College pursues innovative opportunities to provide services to its traditional and non-traditional students primarily from rural areas of south central Georgia and will maintain a recognized legacy of affordable higher education and community support services of the highest quality.

The College provides a main campus in Cochran serving commuting and residential students. Its Dublin Center and other off-campus sites provide educational opportunities for those commuting students from central Georgia. These facilities meet the associate-degree and targeted baccalaureate degree level program needs throughout the regional service area. The state college provides access to higher education and undergraduate degrees that will address the economic development needs of Georgia's heartland, and, in limited cases, the economic development of the state at large.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2a. Revised Institutional Mission Statement, Middle Georgia College (Continued)**

Middle Georgia College, in order to fulfill its vision and mission, will commit to providing the following:

- A campus-wide commitment to student learning that is embedded in course and program design, teaching, achievement, and student development activities.
- The highest quality classroom and advanced distance learning instruction in all programs at all levels.
- A welcoming campus community that invites and nurtures students from throughout Georgia's heartland and beyond and leads to a diverse student body.
- A continued offering of programs of excellence leading to certificate programs and associate degrees to prepare students for immediate employment and/or acceptance to baccalaureate degrees at Middle Georgia College or to other colleges or universities.
- Computer-assisted resources, services, and learning activities that enhance student learning, facilitate student success, and promote personal enrichment.
- A signature four-track program that is the only public curriculum in Georgia leading to selected baccalaureate degrees in aviation and flight management preparing students for careers or graduate work in that field.
- The only four-year aviation degree program that collaborates with Commission on Colleges accredited technical college aviation programs, allowing those students to receive a baccalaureate of applied science degree in aviation.

### ***Proposed Mission Statement***

Middle Georgia College (MGC) is a state college unit of the University System of Georgia with a focus on providing constituents access to certificate, associate, and select baccalaureate programs in academic transfer or occupation related programs of study. The College is dedicated to providing a dynamic, learning-centered, caring and technically advanced environment of excellence. As a multi-campus, residential institution, the College pursues innovative opportunities to provide services to its traditional and non-traditional students primarily from rural areas of south central Georgia and will maintain a recognized legacy of affordable higher education and community support services of the highest quality. The College also serves as the only higher education institution of aviation for the State of Georgia.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2a. Revised Institutional Mission Statement, Middle Georgia College (Continued)**

The College's historic main campus in Cochran offers academic programs of study through the baccalaureate degree for commuting and residential students. The institution's Georgia Aviation campus in Eastman provides aviation specific technical education for the State while supporting the main campus' Bachelor of Science in Aviation Management degree program. The Dublin Center provides educational opportunities for central Georgia commuting students. Selected certificate and associate degree programs, as well as additional advanced higher education opportunities, are offered online and in collaboration with participating four-year institutions. In addition, MGC provides undergraduate education addressing the economic development needs of Georgia's heartland and the state's aviation industry.

To accomplish its mission, MGC commits to the following goals:

- Promoting a campus-wide commitment to student learning that is embedded in course and program design, teaching, achievement, and student development activities.
- Providing the highest quality classroom and/or advanced distance learning instruction that enriches and challenges learners in all programs at all levels.
- Creating a welcoming campus community that nurtures a culturally and ethnically diverse student body.
- Offering programs of excellence leading to certificates and associate degrees to prepare students for immediate employment and/or acceptance to baccalaureate degrees at Middle Georgia College or other colleges and universities.
- Offering a signature aviation program that is the only public curriculum in Georgia leading to select baccalaureate degrees in aviation management as well as certificate and associate programs in flight and aviation technology specialties which prepare students for immediate employment, careers, and further study in aviation.
- Providing the Georgia Academy of Mathematics, Engineering, and Sciences (GAMES) program which challenges gifted students to experience the rigors of higher education at an earlier entrance.
- Providing the support resources, services, and learning activities that enhance student learning, facilitate student success, and promote personal enrichment.
- Providing and supporting an adaptive, effective, and efficient human and physical infrastructure which maintains and supports the learning environment.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2b. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Aircraft Structural Technology, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Aircraft Structural Technology, effective July 1, 2007.

Abstract: The Aircraft Structural Technology degree combines aircraft sheet metal theory and skills with practical experience to prepare the graduate for successful entry-level employment, job retention, and advancement in the manufacture and repair fields. Precision measurement, pneumatic drilling, riveting and repairing aircraft structures, inspecting and diagnosing aircraft damage, cutting and forming aircraft metals, fabricating and repairing flight control components, fiberglass, metal bonded, and honeycomb structures, as well as advanced composites are covered in this program of study.

Need: The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

Objectives: The objective of the Aircraft Structural Technology program is to provide educational opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of Aircraft Structural Technology.

Curriculum: The 67-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Basic Blueprint Reading, Aircraft Blueprint Reading, Structural Layout and Fabrication, Aircraft Structural Aerodynamics, Structural Fundamentals, Aircraft Metallurgy, and Principles of Aerospace Quality Control.

Projected Enrollment: The program currently has an enrollment of 12 students.

Funding: Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2c. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance Technology, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Aviation Maintenance Technology, effective July 1, 2007.

Abstract: The Aviation Maintenance Technology degree program prepares students for careers in aircraft maintenance and repair. The program philosophy stresses a combination of knowledge, skills, and practical experience in accordance with Federal Aviation Regulations. Upon successful completion, a student will be prepared for Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) oral, practical, and written examinations. Once certification from the FAA has been obtained by the graduate, she/he is qualified to perform the duties and responsibilities of an Airframe and Powerplant mechanic.

Need: The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

Objectives: The objective of the Aviation Maintenance Technology program is to provide educational opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of aviation maintenance technology.

Curriculum: The 108-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Aircraft Electricity and Electronics, Airframe Assembly and Rigging, Airframe Inspection, Aircraft Landing Gear Systems, Airframe Welding, Aircraft Environmental Control Systems, Gas Turbine Powerplants, Aircraft Engine Inspections, Aircraft Engine Fuel and Fuel Metering Systems, Reciprocating Engine Powerplants, and Aircraft Engine Electrical, Ignition, and Starting.

Projected Enrollment: The program currently has an enrollment of 4 students.

Funding: Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2d. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Air Traffic Management Technology, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Air Traffic Management Technology, effective July 1, 2007.

Abstract: The Air Traffic Management degree program provides training in the application of non-radar/radar air traffic control procedures as well as control tower operator training and experience. One of few, if not the only institution with a student-operated control tower, the program provides the opportunity for control certification and facility ratings, which meet Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) hiring qualifications.

Need: The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

Objectives: The objective of the Air Traffic Management program is to provide education opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of Air Traffic Control and Management. Graduates of this program may look forward to a career as an air traffic control specialist with the federal government, private industry, or military services. Additional opportunities exist in the expanding areas of general and commercial aviation.

Curriculum: The 65-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Introduction to Air Traffic Management, Aviation Safety and Security, Fundamentals of Private Pilot Flight Operations, Aviation Regulations, ATC Tower Operations, Advanced Air Traffic Management, Aviation Law and Insurance, Fundamentals of Instrument Pilot Flight Operations, and Enroute and Terminal Operations.

Projected Enrollment: The program currently has an enrollment of 9 students.

Funding: Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2e. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Airport Management, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Airport Management, effective July 1, 2007.

Abstract: The Associate of Applied Science in Airport Management is relevant for persons interested in careers in airport or airline management, airport consulting, and governmental organizations involved in the management and/or regulation of airports. The program provides foundation courses in business and management appropriate for careers in air commerce and airport management.

Need: The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

Objectives: The objective of the Airport Management program is to provide education opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of airport commerce and management.

Curriculum: The 66-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Introduction to Aviation, Aviation Safety and Security, Business Communication, Aviation Regulations, Airport management, Aviation Service Center Operations, and Aviation Law and Insurance.

Projected Enrollment: The program currently has no students enrolled. Enrollments in this program are projected to increase when MGC’s existing Bachelor of Science in Aviation Management with an option in Flight admits its first cohort in fall 2007.

Funding: Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2f. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Airplane, Middle Georgia College**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Airplane, effective July 1, 2007.

**Abstract:** The Flight Technology (“Airplane”) associate degree program is intended to provide instruction in the occupational area of commercial flight as currently understood and practiced by the Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) commercial pilot certificate holders. In addition to technical expertise, program graduates will be competent in the areas of humanities or fine arts, social or behavioral sciences, and natural sciences or mathematics. Students are trained in the areas of flight navigation, aviation meteorology, and aviation regulation.

**Need:** The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

**Objectives:** The objective of the Airplane program is to provide educational opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of commercial flight. Program graduates are expected to obtain the following certificates: FAA Commercial Pilot certificate with Instrument Airplane and Multi-Engine rating and the Airplane Flight Instructor certificate with Single-Engine privileges.

**Curriculum:** The 66-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Computer Literacy, Fundamentals of Private Pilot Flight Operations, Flight Navigation, Aerodynamics, Aviation Regulations, Commercial Pilot Flight Operations, Fundamentals of Instrument Pilot Flight Operations, and Flight Instruction Methods.

**Projected Enrollment:** The program currently has an enrollment of 3 students.

**Funding:** Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

**Assessment:** The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **2g. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Rotorcraft Helicopter, Middle Georgia College**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Richard J. Federinko that Middle Georgia College (“MGC”) be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Flight Technology: Rotorcraft Helicopter, effective July 1, 2007.

**Abstract:** The Flight Technology (“Rotorcraft Helicopter”) associate degree is intended to provide instruction in the occupational area of Federal Aviation Administration (“FAA”) commercial helicopter flight. Students will receive instruction in specific areas of flight navigation, aviation meteorology, aerodynamics, aviation regulation, instrument navigation, and flight instructional methods. In addition to technical expertise, program graduates are expected to exhibit understanding and knowledge of general education areas inclusive of the humanities or fine arts, social or behavioral sciences, and natural sciences or mathematics.

**Need:** The program, although not new but rather the assumption of an existing degree, meets needs in the areas of aviation maintenance, technology, and expertise in specific aspects of air transportation conducive to the economic development needs of the state.

**Objectives:** The objective of the Rotorcraft Helicopter program is to provide educational opportunities to individuals that will enable them to obtain the knowledge, skills, and experiences necessary to succeed in the field of commercial flight. Program graduates are expected to obtain the FAA Commercial Pilot Rotorcraft Helicopter certificate and the Rotorcraft Helicopter Flight Instructor certificate.

**Curriculum:** The 67-semester hour curriculum includes, but is not limited to, the following courses: Fundamentals of Helicopter Flight Operations, Flight Navigation, Aviation Meteorology, Flight Instruction Methods, Fundamentals of Instrument Pilot Flight Operations, Commercial/Instrument Pilot Helicopter Flight Operations, and Aviation Regulations.

**Projected Enrollment:** The program currently has an enrollment of 2 students.

**Funding:** Operation and responsibility for the program has been assumed by Middle Georgia College. According to MGC, the Department of Technical and Adult Education budget allocation for the institution will be transferred to the Board of Regents. President Federinko has provided reverification that continuing the program can be accommodated within funds available as a result of the merger.

**Assessment:** The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **3. Establishment of a Bachelor of Arts with a Major in History (with an opportunity for teacher certification), Macon State College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell that Macon State College (“MSC”) be authorized to establish a Bachelor of Arts with a major in History (with an opportunity for teacher certification), effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: MSC proposed to meet an identified need in central Georgia by offering a baccalaureate degree with a major in history with tracks in history and history education. The degree specifically targets students who are planning 1) to pursue a career in a history-related profession such as museum or archival work, public history, and historical interpretation; 2) to attend professional and graduate schools in history and related majors; or 3) to teach history in secondary schools.

Need: According to MSC, preparation of history teachers will meet both a regional and state need for new teachers.

Objectives: One of the primary objectives of the program is to prepare graduates for careers in secondary history education. In addition, the program will produce graduates who have a sound general knowledge of American and other histories and who are competent in applying this information in the workplace.

Curriculum: The baccalaureate program in history is comprised of two tracks: history, which requires 122 hours, and history education, which requires 128 hours. A waiver to degree credit hour length is included in the program.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 40, 70, and 100 students during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program has been developed with new courses. President Bell has provided reverification that establishing the program can be accommodated within funds presently available.

Assessment: The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **4. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Systems Engineering, Southern Polytechnic State University**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Lisa A. Rossbacher that Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”) be authorized to establish a Bachelor of Science in Systems Engineering, effective March 21, 2007.

**Abstract:** SPSU proposed to establish a Bachelor of Science in Systems Engineering. The proposed baccalaureate degree is complementary to the institution’s existing Master of Science in Systems Engineering. In addition to engineering technology, SPSU currently offers the following engineering programs: Master of Science in Software Engineering, Bachelor of Science with a major in Mechatronics Engineering, Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering, Bachelor of Science in Software Engineering, and certificates both in Software Engineering and Systems Engineering. The primary objective of the multidisciplinary degree is to meet industry requirements for graduates with the knowledge and skills necessary to engineering large and complex systems. Systems Engineering has emerged as a new profession that manages the complexity and change of technology-enabled enterprises over their life cycle.

**Need:** According to SPSU, a strong demand exists for engineers who have a mix of theoretical and practical experiences. As reported by the National Science Board, a critical shortage exists of students enrolled in science and engineering fields. The Board reports that the number of U.S. jobs requiring science and engineering skills grows approximately 5% per year, compared to 1% growth for the rest of the labor force.

**Objectives:** The objectives of the proposed program are to provide engineering graduates who 1) understand the multidisciplinary fundamentals of engineering; 2) have strong skills to solve complex problems that cross disciplinary boundaries; and 3) understand the principles of research, design, development, deployment, operation, maintenance and disposition of complex engineered systems and processes enabled by the integration of mechanical, electrical, electronic, computer, construction, industrial, and software engineering technologies.

**Curriculum:** The 128-semester hour program requires the completion of such courses as Fundamentals of Engineering of Electrical Engineering, Principles of Systems Engineering, System Architectures, Human Machine Systems, Configuration Management, Logistics, and System Reliability. A waiver to degree credit hour length is included in the program.

**Projected Enrollment:** The institution anticipates enrollments of 40, 80, and 130 students during the first three years of the program.

**Funding:** The program has been developed with new courses. President Rossbacher has provided reverification that establishing the program can be accommodated within funds presently available.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **4. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Systems Engineering, Southern Polytechnic State University (Continued)**

**Assessment:** The Office of Academics and Fiscal 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 Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, University of Georgia**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish a dual degree offering of the existing Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Philosophy degree ("D.V.M./Ph.D."), effective March 21, 2007.

**Abstract:** UGA proposed to establish a dual degree offering of the existing Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Philosophy degree. The proposed pairing of degrees is based on the expansion and cross-research activities associated with such disciplines as biotechnology and veterinary medicine. The degree represents the cross between academic research and veterinary medicine. The proposed dual degree program is modeled after other dual degree programs involving Doctor of Philosophy ("Ph.D.") degrees offered with Doctor of Veterinary Medicine ("D.V.M.") or Doctor of Medicine ("M.D.") programs. The individual degree objectives and course/credit requirements of the Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Philosophy degrees will not change with the development of the dual degree program. Students may obtain such a dual degree as long as the Doctor of Philosophy program is offered through UGA's Graduate School.

**Need:** Formalization of this program will facilitate the early recruitment of students with research interests and provide the educational structure for veterinary students to pursue a Ph.D. degree upon admission to both programs or early in training. UGA anticipates that upon completion, graduates will be well-positioned to meet a burgeoning need for biomedical researchers with a veterinary medical background in academia, industry, and federally sponsored research. The dual degree was further developed as a companion to the institution's Veterinary Medical Scientist Training program. The philosophy of this program is "one medicine" whereby veterinary medicine interacts with basic research to contribute to the advancement of biomedical research.

**Objectives:** The dual degree program seeks to offer graduate students a broader species perspective and clinical training that will encourage a culture of research within the context of veterinary medicine. The program combination will also strengthen and enhance the institution's competitiveness for training and grant opportunities associated with the National Institutes of Health and other agencies.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **5. Establishment of a Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and the Doctor of Philosophy Degree, University of Georgia (Continued)**

**Curriculum:** UGA does not prescribe a new curriculum as both Doctor of Veterinary Medicine and Doctor of Philosophy course requirements remain unchanged. The dual degree formalizes the opportunity to accommodate admissions, registration, advisement, and academic credit procedures offered by the College of Veterinary Medicine and the Graduate School. It is anticipated that students will complete the clinical phase of study and follow with the terminal stages of Doctor of Philosophy studies.

Examples of programs that will likely be selected by students who choose this curricular framework will include such majors as Toxicology, Neuroscience, Ecology, Genetics, Microbiology, Animal and Dairy Science, Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Animal and Dairy Science, Cell Biology, Poultry Science, and Biochemistry and Molecular Biology.

**Projected Enrollment:** The institution anticipates enrollments of 6 to 10 students during the first three years of the program.

**Funding:** The dual degree program has been developed with existing courses. Financial aid has been earmarked by the College of Veterinary Medicine to provide support to students and encourage application for the Ph.D. degree. President Adams has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

### **6. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Management, Coastal Georgia Community College**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President Dorothy L. Lord that Coastal Georgia Community College ("CGCC") be authorized to establish an Associate of Applied Science in Management, effective March 21, 2007.

**Abstract:** In January 2007, the Board approved the termination of CGCC's Associate of Applied Science in Marketing and Management. At that time, CGCC had reached the end of a three-year phase-out agreement with the Department of Technical and Adult Education regarding the stand-alone associate's degree in Marketing and Management. In order to provide students with viable options at the associate-degree level, CGCC requests approval to replace the terminated degree with an Associate of Applied Science in Management. CGCC, in essence, has converted the former marketing and management program to simply a management program with the introduction of

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **6. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Management, Coastal Georgia Community College (Continued)**

additional management, business, and related courses. According to CGCC, the phase-out of the aforementioned marketing program was due to the fact that the availability of jobs in-field was meager for students graduating with lower division courses in marketing. Currently, Darton College and Middle Georgia College are the only other system institutions that offer a stand-alone career associate's degree in management.

Need: The replacement program will provide associate degree-seeking students with an option to pursue a management program that will lead to entry level opportunities in local and regional employment ranging from industrial and commercial settings to retail, information, and service industries.

Objectives: The program is not designed for students who seek a four-year degree in Business Administration. Graduates of the stand-alone associate degree program would have acquired the skills to understand the introductory principles of accounting, management, economics, labor relations, business communication, and the fundamentals of computer applications.

Curriculum: The 62-semester hour curriculum provides students a balanced foundation of general education courses coupled with specific business courses.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 25 to 30 students.

Funding: President Lord has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

### **7. Establishment of an External, Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science with the University of Trento (Italy), Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish an external, dual degree offering of the existing Master of Science in Computer Science with the University of Trento (Italy), effective March 21, 2007.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **7. Establishment of an External, Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science with the University of Trento (Italy), Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)**

Abstract: GIT proposed to offer its existing Master of Science in Computer Science as an external, dual degree in collaboration with the University of Trento, Italy. The dual degree program arrangement will enable students to obtain, in this case, two master's degrees from two different universities. The dual degree program will be offered between the University of Trento's Computer Science Department and GIT's College of Computing. Students will take courses at both the University of Trento and GIT towards their Master of Science in Computer Science degrees. The acceleration of globalization has increased student demand and employer expectations for substantive preparation in an international environment. Many corporate employers are either multinational companies or compete internationally and require a globally competitive work force that easily live and work in overseas environments.

Program Administration: The admission requirements of both universities will be maintained. Students must meet the admission requirements of each degree-granting institution. Students will not be allowed to duplicate courses between the two programs. Students from the University of Trento will attend GIT for at least two semesters to gain sufficient credit hours for the Master of Science in Computer Science awarded by GIT. Students from the University of Trento will also be allowed to transfer up to 9-semester credit hours of courses into their GIT program. Students from GIT will attend the University of Trento in Trento, Italy as part of their GIT degree program. A similar number of courses will be transferable to the University of Trento to enable conferral of the degree from the overseas institution. Courses will be taught on the home campus of each institution and no distance education courses are planned as part of this dual degree offering.

### **8. Establishment of an External, Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science with Korea University (Seoul, South Korea), Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish an external, dual degree offering of the existing Master of Science in Computer Science with Korea University (Seoul, South Korea), effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: GIT sought approval to offer the existing Master of Science in Computer Science as an external degree with Korea University located in Seoul, South Korea. The program allows graduate students from Korea University to simultaneously pursue the Master of Science in Computer Science with embedded software specialization from GIT and the Master of Science in Computer Science degree from Korea University.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **8. Establishment of an External, Dual Degree Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science with Korea University (Seoul, South Korea), Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)**

**Program Administration:** The program requires four semesters to complete both degrees. Korea University and GIT will accept transfer semester credit hours obtained by a student in the other institution towards the degree awarded by the home institution subject to their internal rules and regulations. Both institutions will agree to a study plan for the participating students before the commencement of studies. The study plan will be reviewed and adapted in cooperation between the student, Korea University, and GIT. The purpose of the study plan is to ensure that courses taken at one institution can be transferred to the other institution.

According to the proposed plan, Korea University will transfer up to 12-semester credit hours for courses taken at GIT into their curriculum, which requires up to 32-semester credit hours. GIT, in turn, will transfer up to 9-semester credit hours taken at Korea University into the Master of Science in Computer Science curriculum which requires 36-semester credit hours. GIT and Korea University will process applications of students concurrently and will synchronize admission activities for both universities prior to November 15, after November 15, and prior to December 15. A student may not participate in this dual degree program unless they have secured admission to both universities. Schedule dates are approximate. The exchange students will be fully registered at the receiving institution and remain registered at the sending institution. The courses of the dual degree programs will be taught by faculty from GIT and Korea University in concert with the transfer requirements of both universities. The program requires students to take courses in a core area and two areas of specialization from the following array: robotics, telematics, mobile phone, and set top box. The robotics and telematics specializations will be taught by GIT faculty and the mobile phone and set top box specializations will be taught by Korea University faculty. GIT will teach a total of 33-semester credit hours or 11 courses per year. In addition, students will take 3-semester credit hours of special problems at GIT for their final project. A total of six courses will be taught on-site and the remaining five will be taught through distance education technologies.

### **9. Establishment of a Collaborative Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science and Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering with Nanyang Technological University (Singapore), Georgia Institute of Technology**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish a collaborative offering of the existing Master of Science in Computer Science and Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering with Nanyang Technological University (Singapore), effective March 21, 2007.

## COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

### 9. Establishment of a Collaborative Offering of the Existing Master of Science in Computer Science and Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering with Nanyang Technological University (Singapore), Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Abstract: GIT sought approval to offer its existing Master of Science in Computer Science and Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering with Nanyang Technological University in Singapore. In both programs, participating students may earn their respective Bachelor of Science degree through Nanyang Technological University and then earn either master's level degree through GIT. Top students at Nanyang Technological University will be recruited to participate in this program and will be provided opportunities to earn their master's degrees in Atlanta at the GIT campus after meeting admission requirements and acceptance to the university. The additional offering of two master's degrees at Nanyang Technological University further strengthens GIT's ties with the overseas institution and provides international students an opportunity to study abroad in Atlanta.

### 10. Establishment of the Existing Master of Science in Industrial Engineering and Master of Science in Operations Research as External, Dual Degree Programs with Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai, China), Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish the existing Master of Science in Industrial Engineering and the Master of Science in Operations Research as external, dual degree programs with Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai, China), effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: GIT sought approval to offer its existing Master of Science in Industrial Engineering and Master of Science in Operations Research as external, dual degree programs with Shanghai Jiao Tong University located in Shanghai, China. GIT currently offers a dual, Master of Science in Electrical and Computer Engineering cooperatively with Shanghai Jiao Tong University that was approved by the Board in January 2006. GIT has chosen to collaborate with Shanghai Jiao Tong University due to China's logistical and business center and its large and fast growing economy.

Program Administration: Students will receive a non-thesis Master of Science degree from GIT and a thesis Master of Science degree from Shanghai Jiao Tong University. The same admission and degree requirements that apply to GIT in Atlanta will apply to GIT in Shanghai. Courses will be taught in English by GIT faculty or GIT approved adjunct faculty. GIT – Atlanta students will have an opportunity to study in Shanghai in order to become immersed in the language, culture and experience the learning global economy while matriculating toward degree completion.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **10. Establishment of the Existing Master of Science in Industrial Engineering and Master of Science in Operations Research as External, Dual Degree Programs with Shanghai Jiao Tong University (Shanghai, China), Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)**

GIT's Division of Professional Practice in cooperation with Shanghai Jiao Tong University will provide assistance to students to obtain internship or co-op positions in China. GIT will rotate a small number of faculty members to teach in Shanghai during the summer and fall semesters each year. Shanghai Jiao Tong University will provide the classrooms, other educational facilities, and office space necessary for running the dual Master of Science degree programs. A program-specific tuition rate in addition to minimal facility costs will enable tuition income to cover direct GIT costs. In summary, the proposed administration of the existing program, according to GIT, will enhance the institution's global leadership in engineering education and research and support GIT's strategic interests.

### **11. Reclassification of the Existing Specialist in Education with a Major in Instructional Technology as an External Degree Offered via Distance Education Technologies, Valdosta State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Ronald M. Zaccari that Valdosta State University ("VSU") be authorized to reclassify the existing Specialist in Education with a major in Instructional Technology as an external degree offered via distance technologies, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: VSU sought approval to reclassify its existing Specialist in Education (Ed.S.) with a major in Instructional Technology as an external degree to be offered via various types of distance education technologies. The degree was originally approved by the Board of Regents in 1996 for on-campus delivery; however, over time this degree has become a distance education degree. Early in the implementation of the program, it became apparent that a delivery strategy that was responsive to time and location constraints of working professionals would be more suitable for the target audiences of media specialists, technology coordinators, and teacher leaders in technology. As technology tools became available, VSU faculty began to restructure courses to require less campus visitations such that today the degree is fully available at a distance.

Program Administration: Sufficient numbers of faculty experienced in online course development and delivery are on staff at VSU to maintain and deliver the program. The program has met both the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) and Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (SACS) review standards. With the exception of orientation sessions, all other activities are conducted with the students and instructors connecting via technologies. Student diversity is a major strength of the program. Students vary greatly in geographic location, gender, ethnicity, subject matter expertise, teaching experience,

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **11. Reclassification of the Existing Specialist in Education with a Major in Instructional Technology as an External Degree Offered via Distance Education Technologies, Valdosta State University (Continued)**

teaching levels, and types of governance of employing schools. Program participation is strong with 78 active students at various points in their programs of study. Approximately 20 to 25 students are admitted each fall and spring semester.

### **12. Establishment of the Existing Master of Education with a Major in Special Education as a Master of Arts in Teaching with a Major in Special Education, Georgia College & State University**

Approved The Board approved the request of President Dorothy Leland that Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) be authorized to establish the existing Master of Education with a major in Special Education as a Master of Arts in Teaching with a major in Special Education, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: GCSU requested approval to establish the Master of Arts in Teaching with a major in Special Education based on a consensus definition of the Master of Arts in Teaching (“M.A.T.”) 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 existing Master of Education with a major in Special Education will continue to be offered as an advanced certification degree program.

### **13. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Information Technology as a Replacement of the Existing Bachelor of Applied Science with a Major in Information Technology Management, Georgia Gwinnett College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel J. Kaufman that Georgia Gwinnett College (“GGC”) be authorized to establish a Bachelor of Science in Information Technology as a replacement for the existing Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Information Technology, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: The addition of a new major in information technology will broaden the scope of the technology program at GGC to accompany the existing cell biology and biotechnology concentration in the Biology major. The new major will support the mission of the School of Science and Technology by offering practical and applied learning experiences that prepare students for positions of responsibility in business and government sectors.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **13. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Information Technology as a Replacement of the Existing Bachelor of Applied Science with a Major in Information Technology Management, Georgia Gwinnett College (Continued)**

**Degree Replacement:** The institution was approved, in concept, to offer a Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Information Technology Management along with six other academic programs by the Board in November 2005. The other six academic programs are the following: Bachelor of Science with a major in Biology, Bachelor of Science with a major in Psychology, Bachelor of Science in Education with a major in Early Childhood Education, Bachelor of Business Administration with a major in General Business, Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Technology, and Bachelor of Science in Nursing. According to the November 2005 Board approval, each of the programs was to be implemented only after review by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs and final approval by the Chancellor. President Kaufman has indicated that the existing Bachelor of Applied Science program will not be developed for student matriculation and seeks approval to remove the program from the institution and replace it with the proposed Bachelor of Science in Information Technology. Should this recommendation be acted upon, the existing Bachelor of Applied Science with a major in Information Technology will be terminated and removed from the institution's array of degrees and majors.

**Need:** The Bureau of Labor Statistics projects rapid rates of employment growth for information technology occupations including computer engineers, database administrators, computer support specialists, systems analysts, and computer programmers. Employment opportunities for graduating students are extensive and include such positions as website developer/manager, software developer, computer operator, data mining specialist, database administrator/ or designer, systems administrator/operator/ or programmer, network administrator/architect/engineer/ or installer, project manager, and telecommunications manager. Most employers will be in the business sector; however, numerous opportunities exist in government and education sectors.

**Objectives:** The objective of the information technology major is to be a multidisciplinary program for students interested in the full range information technology professions. As information technology plays an increasingly important role in business, employers search for skilled workers with experience in handling information technology hardware and software. The broad information technology field allows students to bring their general computer knowledge into a variety of specialized niches.

**Curriculum:** The 120-semester hour program includes concentrations in the following areas: systems and security, software development, and business. Required courses, include but are not limited to, Information Security, Introduction to Networks, Introduction to Databases, Systems Analysis and Design, and Digital Media.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **13. Establishment of a Bachelor of Science in Information Technology as a Replacement of the Existing Bachelor of Applied Science with a Major in Information Technology Management, Georgia Gwinnett College (Continued)**

**Projected Enrollment:** The institution anticipates enrollments of 150, 200, and 250 students during the first three years of the program.

**Funding:** The program has been developed with new courses. President Kaufman has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

### **14. Establishment of the Existing Master of Business Administration at the Newnan Center, University of West Georgia**

**Approved:** The Board approved the request of Acting President Thomas J. Hynes, Jr. that University of West Georgia ("UWG") be authorized to establish its existing Master of Business Administration as a degree offered at the Newnan Center, effective March 21, 2007.

**Abstract:** UWG sought approval to offer its existing Master of Business Administration degree at the Newnan Center. The degree would be the only accredited business program offered in Coweta, Fayette, and Heard counties. All requirements for admission to the program will be equivalent to the program offered on UWG's main campus in Carrollton. The curriculum and criteria for electives or substitutions for specific requirements will also be equivalent at both locations.

Through a cooperative effort by the University of West Georgia, the Newnan-Coweta Chamber of Commerce, Coweta County Board of Education, and other business, civic and educational leaders in Newnan and Coweta County, the Newnan Center was established and approved by the Board of Regents in August 1988. The Center offers college courses to those students in the Newnan area who would like to begin and/or continue their education locally. Georgia Perimeter College is a cooperating institution with the University of West Georgia in the delivery of courses and/or programs at the Center.

Administration of the Master of Business Administration degree at the Newnan Center will use existing faculty resources on the UWG main campus. Faculty resources will be made available through restructuring the sequence of elective courses.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

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

The administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by the Chair of the Committee on Academic Affairs.

### **16. Termination of the Major in Applied Economics under the existing Bachelor of Business Administration, Georgia College & State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Dorothy Leland that Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”) be authorized to terminate the major in Applied Economics under the existing Bachelor of Business Administration degree, effective August 15, 2007.

Abstract: GCSU sought approval to terminate the major in Economics offered under the Bachelor of Business Administration degree. The major was deactivated in August 2005 and currently no students are enrolled in the program. During the two year period, GCSU analyzed and discussed the viability of the program with faculty and students. With the full approval of governing bodies at the institution, GCSU now seeks termination of the program. Neither students nor faculty will be adversely impacted with the termination of this major. Students who seek to obtain the Bachelor of Business Administration degree may choose from the following existing majors to complete their studies: General Business, Management, Accounting, International Business, Marketing, and Management Information Systems.

### **17. Establishment of the SunTrust Professorship in Capital Markets, Georgia State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to establish the SunTrust Professorship in Capital Markets, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: GSU sought approval to establish the SunTrust Professorship in Capital Markets in the J. Mack Robinson College of Business. The SunTrust Professorship in Capital markets will be a cornerstone for the university’s finance department. The SunTrust 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 SunTrust Professor will benefit the Atlanta investment community.

President Patton has verified that \$253,187 is on deposit with the Georgia State University Foundation. The spending allocation from the endowed funds will be used to support the SunTrust Professorship in Capital Markets. The source of funds for the endowment came from SunTrust and various individual contributions of friends of Georgia State University.

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**18. Establishment of the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Clinical Translational Science, Medical College of Georgia**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Clinical Translational Science, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: MCG requested approval to establish the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Clinical Translational Science. The Medical College of Georgia Foundation has on deposit \$1.5 million in an endowment for the special faculty position. One of MCG’s goals, as stated in its strategic plan, is to focus research activities in specific key areas. MCG has identified the area of Clinical Translational Science as a key area. The establishment of the eminent scholar and subsequent recruitment of a high quality investigator for the position will help MCG enhance its role as a premier health sciences research university.

President Rahn has verified that funds are on deposit with the Medical College of Georgia Foundation and will serve as the basis for the special faculty position.

**19. Information Item: Service Agreements**

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

**Georgia State University**

Georgia Department of Human Resources Contribute to improved outcomes for children and families in Fulton and DeKalb counties and provide the court and the public accurate and unbiased assessments of progress.	1/12/07- 12/31/07	\$65,820
Georgia Student Finance Commission Provide an opportunity for Georgia public postsecondary institutions to participate in Peer Financial Counseling Program to enable students to better understand money management, credit and debt, student loans, and savings.	8/8/06- 5/15/07	\$5,000
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Produce an orientation video about Kolomoki Mounds State Historic Park.	11/1/06- 11/1/07	\$60,000
Georgia Cancer Coalition Train young researchers and create economic growth opportunities in Georgia by attracting federal grant funding and developing patents.	10/1/06- 10/31/10	\$50,000

**COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

**19. Information Item: Service Agreements (Continued)**

**Georgia Southern University**

Evans County Board of Health Evaluate Best Babies perinatal health program	9/25/06 – 4/30/07	\$13,353
Georgia Cancer Coalition Support South Georgia Cancer Assessment Project	11/1/06 – 10/31/07	\$11,000

<b>TOTAL AMOUNT – MARCH 2007</b>	<b>\$ 205,173</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2007 TO DATE</b>	<b>\$21,274,361</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2006 TO MARCH</b>	<b>\$25,591,166</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2006</b>	<b>\$ 33,452,938</b>

**20. Information Item: Promotion Guidelines and Operational Aspects of the Revised Policy Manual, Section 803.07**

The Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, addressed the Committee on Academic Affairs concerning the operational aspects of the February 2007 revisions to the Policy Manual with regard to “Evaluation of Faculty” in terms of promotion. Now that promotions will no longer be recommended for Board approval, a discussion will take place concerning whether the Regents will still want to review reports.

**21. Establishment of the A. G. Steer Professorship in Goethe Studies, 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 A. G. Steer Professorship in Goethe Studies, effective March 21, 2007.

Abstract: UGA sought approval to establish the A. G. Steer Professorship in Goethe Studies within the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences. The A. G. Steer Professorship requires that nominees hold the rank of full or associate professor and have an outstanding national reputation. The holder must teach one course per year on Goethe’s life and work after 1809 and also be engaged in teaching, research, public service, or a combination of such duties.

Biographical Sketch: Alfred G. Steer, Jr. received his Master of Arts degree from Duke University in 1938 and his Doctor of Philosophy degree from the University of Pennsylvania in 1954. Dr. Steer had a distinguished naval career during World War II and in 1945 he was appointed Chief of the Interpreters and Translators of the Nuremberg trials in Germany. His contributions to military history and his role at Nuremberg have been documented in many books and articles.

## **COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS**

### **21. Establishment of the A. G. Steer Professorship in Goethe Studies, University of Georgia (Continued)**

Dr. Steer came to the University of Georgia in 1967 to head the newly formed Department of Germanic and Slavic Languages. He transformed a two-person unit into a department of 14 professors and many teaching assistants before retiring in 1983. He served as the University of Georgia's first Studies Abroad Director in 1970. Dr. Steer was a specialist on Goethe and published many books and articles. Dr. Steer passed away in 2003 and a gift was received from his estate to establish a Professorship in Goethe Studies within the Franklin College of Arts and Sciences.

President Adams has verified that \$288,356 is on deposit with the University of Georgia Foundation.

## **COMMITTEE ON AUDIT**

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at approximately 2:54 p.m. in the Board room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Donald M. Leebern Jr., Vice Chair Felton Jenkins, and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III and Richard L. Tucker. Chair Leebern reported to the full Board that the Committee had reviewed two items, none of which required action, and one of which was addressed in a joint meeting with the Committee on Finance and Business Operations. Those items were as follows:

### **1. Information Item: Presentation of the University System of Georgia Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Financial Report (Joint Meeting with Committee of Finance and Business Operations)**

The Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, the Vice Chancellor for Business and Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, and the Executive Director for Business Services and Financial Affairs, Debra J. Lasher, presented the fiscal year end annual financial report for the University System of Georgia.

### **2. Information Item: Fiscal Year-End 2006 Financial Audit Ratings**

Annually, the Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, evaluates audit findings and reports the overall rating of each institution's audit. The process rates each audit completed by the State Department of Audits and Accounts a Code 1 through a Code 5 rating. Mr. Stark presented the institutional ratings at this meeting. For Fiscal Year 2006 Savannah State University was rated a code 5 and Fort Valley State University was rated a code 4.

Regent Hatcher suggested that President Everette Freeman of Albany State University receive a letter of commendation for a job well done by bringing the institution's Code rating from a Code 5 to a Code 3 in the short time he has been in office.

## **COMMITTEE ON AUDIT**

At the end of the report and discussion, Chair Leebern thanked Mr. Stark for another excellent presentation and complimented Ms. Erika Triplett, Administrative Assistant II in the Office of Internal Audit on a job well done.

The meeting was then adjourned at 3:19 p.m.

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at approximately 2:05 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Robert F. Hatcher, Vice Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., and Regents James A. Bishop, Felton Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. Board Chair Allan Vigil was also in attendance. Vice Chair Hatcher reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed five items, three of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees**

Approved: The Board approved revisions to the Policy Manual, Section 704, The Guaranteed Tuition Plan, as provided below.

Background: The recommended policy changes clarify the tuition rates to be paid by non-University System of Georgia transfer students, jointly-enrolled students and transient students. The recommended policy language:

- Affirms that non-University System of Georgia transfer students (i.e., those students that begin their academic career outside the state or in a non-University System of Georgia institution within the state) will have only a one-time guaranteed tuition for two years (six consecutive semesters).
- Allows transient and non-degree seeking students to gain the benefit of the guaranteed tuition rates based on their year of entry into the University System of Georgia.
- Stipulates that jointly-enrolled students shall pay the prevailing guaranteed tuition rate during the period of time they are jointly enrolled, but than be treated as new students if they enroll in a University System of Georgia institution and receive the full benefit of the guaranteed tuition rate as provided under current policy.

Please note that the strike-through texts represent deletions from the current version and the highlighted texts represent additions.

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

### 1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees (Continued)

#### **704 TUITION AND FEES**

#### **704.01 TUITION**

#### **704.011 DEFINITIONS**

A. Tuition shall be defined as payment required for credit-based instruction and related services and shall be charged to all students. Tuition rates for all University System of Georgia institutions and programs shall be approved annually no later than the May meeting by the Board of Regents to become effective the following fall semester. Exceptions to this requirement may be granted upon recommendation of the Chancellor and approval by the Board of Regents. Tuition for both undergraduate and graduate students enrolled at an institution within the University System of Georgia shall be charged at the full rate for students enrolled for 12 credit hours or more and at a per credit hour rate for students enrolled for less than 12 credit hours. Distance education courses and programs as defined in Section 704.016 may be exempted from this policy and charged on a per credit hour basis.

B. In-state tuition shall be defined as the rate paid by students who meet the residency status requirements as provided in Section 403 of The Policy Manual.

C. Out-of-state tuition shall be defined as the rate paid by students who do not meet the residency status requirements as provided in Section 403 of The Policy Manual. Out-of-state tuition at all University System institutions shall be established at a rate that is at least four times the tuition rate charged to Georgia residents. University System of Georgia research universities may request increases in out-of-state tuition rates based upon the tuition levels of peer or comparable institutions.

D. The Guaranteed Tuition Rate shall be defined as the rate paid by students enrolled in a University System of Georgia undergraduate program who entered the System for the first time as new students or as transfer students in fall 2006 or later. The guaranteed tuition rate shall be held constant for each new student or transfer student (except those that may be classified as current and continuing students under Section 704.011 paragraph H) for a period of time as described in Section 704.012.

E. The ~~Nonguaranteed~~ **Continuing** Tuition Rate shall be defined as the rate paid by students enrolled in a University System of Georgia undergraduate program who entered the System for the first time as new students or as transfer students prior to fall 2006.

F. New Students shall be defined for the purposes of this section as students enrolled in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia institution for the first time in fall 2006 or later, and who have not previously earned academic credits at a postsecondary institution except as

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

### **1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees (Continued)**

students jointly (or dually) enrolled in a Georgia high school and a University System of Georgia postsecondary education institution or through advanced placement credit.

G. Non-University System of Georgia Transfer students shall be defined as students who after high school graduation entered as a first time freshman to a Non-USG postsecondary institution and earned academic credit. ~~for the purposes of this section as students enrolled in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia institution who were previously enrolled at another postsecondary education institution and have earned academic credits.~~

H. Current and Continuing Students shall be defined for the purposes of this section as students who entered the University System of Georgia for the first time as new students or as transfer students prior to fall 2006.

I. Semester shall be defined for the purposes of this section as the standard term of instruction for each institution in the University System of Georgia for fall, spring, and summer. The summer semester shall be defined as the combined terms of instruction provided by University System of Georgia institutions which begin after the completion of the spring semester and end prior to the start of the fall semester (BR Minutes, October 2006).

### **704.012 THE GUARANTEED TUITION PLAN**

A. Pursuant to Section 704.011, the Board of Regents shall annually approve guaranteed tuition rates for each of the institutions comprising the University System of Georgia.

B. New students enrolled in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia research, regional or state university shall be charged the approved guaranteed tuition rates for these institutions, which shall be fixed for new students for a period of four years (12 consecutive semesters, including fall, spring, and summer).

C. New students enrolled in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia two-year college shall be charged the approved guaranteed tuition rates for these institutions, which shall be fixed for new students for a period of three years (nine consecutive semesters, including fall, spring, and summer).

D. New students enrolled in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia state college shall be charged the approved guaranteed tuition rates for these institutions as follows:

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

### **1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees (Continued)**

1. For new S students enrolled in lower-division programs, the lower-division guaranteed tuition rate shall be charged and fixed for these new students for a period of three years (nine consecutive semesters including fall, spring, and summer).
2. For new S students enrolled in upper-division programs, the upper-division guaranteed tuition rate shall be charged and fixed for these new students for a period of two years (six consecutive semesters including fall, spring, and summer).

E. New students enrolled initially in the university college programs at Armstrong Atlantic State University's Liberty Center, Augusta State University, Columbus State University, and Savannah State University who progress to the regular undergraduate programs offered by these institutions shall be charged the approved guaranteed tuition rates which shall be fixed for a period of five years (15 consecutive semesters) including fall, spring, and summer. New students who enter the regular undergraduate program at these institutions shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate for four years (12 consecutive semesters) as provided for under Section 704.012 paragraph B.

F. New students enrolling in the summer semester.

1. New students enrolling in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia institution in summer 2006 may be charged either the nonguaranteed tuition rate approved by the Board of Regents effective fall 2005, or the guaranteed tuition rate approved by the Board of Regents effective fall 2006 pursuant to the policy established by each University System of Georgia institution and subject to:
  - a. If charged the nonguaranteed tuition rate for summer 2006, new students shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate beginning fall 2006, which shall be fixed as provided under Section 704.012 paragraphs B through E.
  - b. If charged the guaranteed tuition rate for summer 2006, new students shall continue to be charged the same guaranteed tuition rate beginning fall 2006, which shall be fixed at that rate beginning with fall 2006 as provided under Section 704.012 paragraphs B through E.
2. New students enrolling in an undergraduate program at a University System of Georgia institution for the first time in summer 2007 and any summer thereafter shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate approved by the Board of Regents for the year in which that summer occurs, and be charged the new fall guaranteed tuition rate as provided under Section 704.012 paragraphs B through E.

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

### 1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees (Continued)

#### G. Transfer students

1. Transfer students from non-University System of Georgia institutions shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate effective the year in which they transferred, which shall be fixed for two years (six consecutive semesters). This policy shall become effective for such students beginning with spring semester 2007.
2. Transfer students from University System of Georgia institutions who first entered the System in fall 2006 or thereafter shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate at their new institution that was approved for the year in which they first entered the University System, if that year does not precede the year of transfer by more than the period of time as described in Section 704.012, paragraphs B through D ~~four years. Students will retain that guaranteed tuition rate for the balance of four years.~~ This provision, however, shall not apply to students who transfer to the Medical College of Georgia's health profession programs as third-year students. These students shall pay the guaranteed tuition rate in effect in the year they transfer and shall retain that guaranteed tuition rate for no more than two years (six consecutive semesters).
- ~~3. Transfer students who enroll during summer shall be subject to the same rules as apply to new students (paragraph F subparagraphs i and ii) except that the guaranteed tuition rate will be fixed only for two years (six consecutive semesters).~~
- ~~4. Students who are entering the University System of Georgia for the first time but choose to attend one System institution during the summer and enter a second System institution in the fall shall be treated as a new student at the second institution pursuant to Section 704.011 paragraph F if the number of academic credits earned during the summer is 12 credits or less. If the number of credits earned is greater than 12, the student shall be treated as a transfer student.~~

H. Students enrolled in programs requiring more than four years to complete. University System of Georgia research, regional, and state universities may, under limited circumstances, extend the guaranteed tuition rate up to ~~two~~ **three** additional consecutive semesters for certain selected programs that require more than four years to complete. A list of these programs must be provided to the Board of Regents annually.

I. **Students jointly enrolled in high school and a University System institution. Students jointly enrolled in high school and a University System institution should be charged the prevailing guaranteed tuition rate. The period of time is not fixed.** Students who graduate from a **Georgia** high school with college credit are eligible for the guaranteed tuition rate as new students **as provided**

## COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

### 1. Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 704, Tuition and Fees (Continued)

under Section 704.11 paragraph F. Students in the two academies (the Georgia Academy for Mathematics and Engineering at Middle Georgia College and the Advanced Academy of Georgia at the University of West Georgia) are treated as new students when they first enter the University System of Georgia (i.e., they are eligible for the tuition rate prevailing when they start their program for a period of 12 consecutive semesters).

J. Students called to active military duty. A student eligible to received the guaranteed tuition rate as provide under sections 704.011 and 704.012 who is called to active duty will receive an extended guarantee for the period of service up to two years (six consecutive semesters).

K. Transient and non-degree-seeking students. University System of Georgia Transient and non-degree-seeking students who enrolled at a University System of Georgia institution in fall 2006 or later and who are assigned a guaranteed rate shall be charged the guaranteed tuition rate at the assigned rate at the institution they attend, as approved by the Board of Regents for that year. New non-University System of Georgia transient students enrolling at a USG institution should be assessed the same rates applicable for non-USG transfer students and have the benefit of maintaining that rate for two years (six consecutive semesters.)

L. Expiration of the guaranteed tuition rate. The guaranteed tuition rate for new and transfer students will expire at the end of the periods described under this section. Students shall be charged the prevailing guaranteed tuition rates established for the next semester in which they enroll at the same a University System of Georgia institution and be charged the new guaranteed tuition rates established each year by the Board of Regents.

M. Appeal process. Each University System of Georgia institution shall establish a process to allow students to appeal their eligibility for the guaranteed tuition rate based upon extenuating circumstances. Each institution shall have the final decision on any appeal.

N. The provisions of section 704.012 shall not apply to courses offered as distance learning courses or to undergraduate programs for which differential rates have been approved, except that the provisions shall apply to the undergraduate programs in Landscape Architecture and Forestry and Natural Resources at the University of Georgia (BR Minutes, October 2006).

#### **704.013 ~~NONGUARANTEED~~ CONTINUING TUITION RATE**

The ~~non-guaranteed~~ Continuing tuition rates as defined in Section 704.011 paragraph E shall be charged to all students classified as current and continuing students.

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

### **2. Approval to Extend Middle Georgia College Employee Benefits to Georgia Aviation and Technical College Faculty and Staff**

Approved: The Board approved extending Middle Georgia College employee benefits to Georgia Aviation and Technical College (“GAVTC”) faculty and staff, with exceptions as described below, to include:

- Vacation/Annual Leave (BOR Policy 802.0801)
- Sick Leave w/Pay (BOR Policy 802.0802)
- University System of Georgia Retiree/Eligibility for Retirement (BOR Policy 802.0902)
- Disabled Employee Insurance (BOR Policy 802.1005)
- Group Health and Life Insurance to Dependents of Deceased Employees, Disabled Employees or Retirees University System of Georgia Career Employee (BOR Policy 802.1006)
- Acceptance of Leave from a State of Georgia Agency by the University System of Georgia (BOR Policy 802.0809)
- Career Employee (BOR Policy 802.0904)

#### Background:

The Georgia Aviation and Technical College (GAVCTC) will be merged with Middle Georgia College, effective July 1, 2007, with governance responsibilities shifted to the Board of Regents. As part of this merger, current employees of the GAVTC will be transferred to Middle Georgia College. Section 20-3-39 (c) of the O.C.G.A. states that the compensation and benefits of employees transferred to the Board of Regents are not to be reduced as a result of the transfer. To limit the reduction of benefits for GAVTC employees, certain exceptions to the following Board of Regents policies are recommended for transferred employees (employees hired on or prior to June 30, 2007 by GAVTC):

- That the transferred employees’ service time with the Department of Technical and Adult Education be considered service time with the University System of Georgia to determine the years of continuous service that are used to determine the rate of annual leave accrual,
- That the transferred employees continue to accumulate sick leave at the rate of 10 hours (1.25 working days) per calendar month of service,
- That the full balance of sick and annual leave as of the transition date of July 1, 2007 be accepted for the employees that are transferred to the University System of Georgia, and;

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

**2. Approval to Extend Middle Georgia College Employee Benefits to Georgia Aviation and Technical College Faculty and Staff (Continued)**

- That the transferred employees’ service time with the Department of Technical and Adult Education be considered service time with the University System of Georgia for the purpose of determining retirement eligibility.

**3. Acceptance of Gifts for the Georgia Institute of Technology**

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

<b>Company</b>	<b>Value</b>	<b>Items</b>	<b>Department</b>
Vanguard Software Corporation	\$158,400	Two-year subscription (license) to the Vanguard Department System modeling and simulation software package	School of Industrial & Systems Engineering

Background: The Vanguard Software Corporation’s donation consists of a two-year subscription to the Vanguard Department System modeling and simulation software package to the School of Industrial & Systems Engineering to enhance student learning regarding advanced decision analysis concepts and their application in the latest software tools available, and to aid in faculty research.

Board policy requires that any gift, including declarations of trust, to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents. GIT has advised that no material costs are associated with the acceptance of these gifts.

**4. Information Item: Approval and Authorities Revision of The Policy Manual, Section 700, Finance and Business (Committees of The Whole – Finance and Audit)**

The Vice Chancellor for Business and Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, and the Chief Audit Officer and Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, presented the recommended policy language revisions to the Policy Manual, Section 700, Finance and Business. The data was presented on the agenda for the Committees of the Whole for the Committees on Audit and Finance and Business Operations: Approvals and Authorities.

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

### **5. Information Item: Presentation of the University System of Georgia Fiscal Year 2006 Annual Financial Report (Joint Meeting with Audit Committee)**

The Vice Chancellor for Business and Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes presented the fiscal year 2006 annual financial report for the University System of Georgia. The full report is on file in the Office of Fiscal Affairs.

During the course of the Regents' discussion, Chair Hatcher stated that the numbers that the Regents were reviewing were for the fiscal year ending last June for the whole System, all 35 institutions plus the System Office. He continued, stating, that in a recent conversation, he and Mr. Bowes had the opportunity to look through the System Office audit. He stated that the last two years actually show reductions in net assets for the System Office. He asked Mr. Bowes to address this issue with the Committee at this meeting so that the Regents would be informed regarding the System Office finances and understand the way these reductions occurred.

Mr. Bowes stated he was not sure if all of the Regents or only Committee Chairs received the report on the University System Office to which Chair Hatcher referred. He later stated that if anyone would like a copy of the report he would be sure to get one to them. Mr. Bowes then began his comments on that report. In 2005, he reminded the Board, the System had a mid-year budget reduction of approximately \$64 million. He stated that the decision was made at that time that the System Office would recoup a portion of that loss by using reserve funds that from the System's health insurance program. At that time, he stated, there was approximately \$63 million in that fund, although not all of that was reserve. The decision was made to make a one time only withdrawal of approximately \$35 million to help System institutions to deal with the mid-year budget reduction.

He further explained that the problem was that the amount of money removed reduced balances needed to meet the IBNR. The result was a negative \$1.9 million in unrestricted net assets in University System Office. That situation, he explained, is expected to turn around now that the System Office would not be taking any more money out of the reserve and the premiums were also adjusted in the last year to address the issue.

Chair Hatcher reiterated that if there was anyone who did not have the report Mr. Bowes would be sure to get them a copy. He then stated, although the funds that flow through exceed \$400 million, since the total net assets at the end of the year were \$24 million, losing \$1.9 million, the loss of \$1.9 million in assets against total assets of \$24 million becomes very significant. He further stated that he wanted to make sure that the minutes reflected this portion of the discussion.

Mr. Bowes, then said that the point he wanted to make is that the reduction was a purposeful reduction to cover budget reductions for our institutions.

There being no further questions for Mr. Bowes. Chair Hatcher adjourned the meeting.

## **COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY**

The Committee on Information and Instructional Technology met on March 20, 2007, at approximately 300 p.m. in room 6041. Committee members in attendance were Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Vice Chair Patrick S. Pittard, and Regents James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan Doreen Stiles Poitevint, and Willis J. Potts. The Vice Chair of the Board, Regent William H. Cleveland, was also present. Chair Jennings reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 2 items, none of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Information Item: Status Report on the Office of Information and Instructional Technology Reorganization**

At the November 2006 meeting of the Committee, the Chief Information Officer and Interim Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology, Thomas L. Maier, provided an update on the Office of Information and Instructional Technology. At that time, Dr. Maier indicated that an organizational assessment was to be conducted that would serve as the basis for changes in the organizational structure. At this meeting, Dr. Maier presented the findings from that assessment conducted by Gartner, Inc. and general directions for reorganization of this division of the Office of Academic Affairs.

### **2. Information Item: Information Security Update**

The importance of information security and the difficulties in achieving and maintaining a secure environment at our institutions continue to grow. Protecting the assets and information in the complex environments at our universities, whose culture and mission are to be open and sharing, continues to present significant challenges. This has been highlighted most recently by two publicized security breaches at the University of Georgia and the Georgia Institute of Technology. Analysis of both events reveals some common themes that all University System institutions should be addressing.

The Chief Information Officer and Interim Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology, Thomas L. Maier, began the presentation by discussing what the System Office is doing to ensure information security. Following Dr. Maier, the Information Technology Audit Manager, Scott C. Woodison, outlined trends that he has observed during his audits of University System institutions. Next, Chief Information Officer and Associate Provost for the University of Georgia, Barbara A. White and the Associate Vice President/Associate Vice Provost for Information Technology and Chief Information Officer for Georgia Institute of Technology, John K. Mullin, outlined lessons learned regarding their recent incidents and what their respective institutions are doing to minimize the risk for future events.

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007, at approximately 2:05 p.m. in room 7019. Committee members in attendance were Chair James R. Jolly, Vice Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., and Regents Elridge McMillan, Patrick S. Pittard, Doreen Stiles Poitevint and Willis J. Potts, Jr. The Vice Chair of the Board, Regent William H. Cleveland, was also present. Chair Jolly reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee reviewed three items, one of which required action. Item 1 included eight applications for review; eight of these six were denied; one was voluntarily withdrawn; one was continued for further review. Item 3 was a walk-on information item. 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. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Applications for Review**

At approximately 2:10 p.m. on Tuesday, March 20, 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 listed above. Also in attendance were the Associate Vice Chancellors for Legal Affairs, Elizabeth E. Neely, and J. Burns Newsome, and the Senior Associate for Academic Affairs, Dorothy D. Zinsmeister.

At approximately 2:35 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 file no. 1887, at Georgia Perimeter College, concerning dismissal of a student, the application for review has been continued.
- b. In the matter of Ms. Brenda Gail Pitts, at Georgia State University, concerning imposition of sanctions, the application for review has been denied.
- c. In the matter Mr. Tab Hunter, at the University of Georgia, concerning allegations of unwarranted employment action, the application for review has been denied.
- d. In the matter of file no. 1892, at Savannah State University, concerning suspension, the application for review has been denied.
- e. In the matter of file no. 1893, at Kennesaw State University, concerning academic dismissal, the application for review has been denied.

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

### **1. Applications for Review (Continued)**

- f. In the matter of Mr. Steven Daubs, at Dalton State College, concerning allegations of harassment and discrimination, the application for review has been voluntarily withdrawn by appellant.
- g. In the matter of Ms. Charlene Portee, at North Georgia College & State University, concerning her allegations of forced resignation, the application for review has been denied.
- h. In the matter of Ms. Ruth Mays, at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning her termination from the position of staff nurse, the application for review has been denied.

### **2. Information Item: Revision of the Board of Regents Bylaws, Section IV, Officers and Their Duties**

**Recommended:** That the Board amend Bylaw IV.7 to substitute “on an annual basis” for “at its regular May meeting” concerning the election of the Chancellor.

**Background:** Current language provides that the Chancellor be elected in May. With changes in the Regents’ meeting schedule, revised language permits flexibility in determining dates related to the contractual relationship.

#### ***Current Board of Regents Bylaws with Proposed Revisions, (Section IV.7)***

## **IV OFFICERS AND THEIR DUTIES**

### **IV.1 Officers**

The officers of the Board of Regents shall be the Chair, the Vice Chair, the Chancellor, the Secretary to the Board, and the Treasurer.

### **IV.2 Election and Term of Office**

The Chair and the Vice Chair shall be elected at the June monthly meeting and shall hold their offices for a minimum of one year. The Chancellor shall hold office at the pleasure of the Board. Except as provided in Section 11 of Article IV of these Bylaws, no one person shall hold more than one office.

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

### **2. Information Item: Revision of the Board of Regents Bylaws, Section IV, Officers and Their Duties (Continued)**

#### **IV.3 Removal of Officers**

Officers may be removed at any time by the Board by the affirmative vote of a majority of the Board.

#### **IV.4 Vacancies**

Vacancies shall be filled by the Board as soon as practicable.

#### **IV.5 Chair**

The Chair shall be a member of the Board, shall preside at the meetings of the Board with the authority to vote, shall appoint members of all committees, and shall designate the chair of each committee. The Chair shall be an ex officio member of all committees with the authority to vote. The Chair, upon the authority of the Board and in the name of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, may execute all notes, bonds, deeds, contracts, and other documents requiring the Seal. The Chair shall submit the annual report of the Board of Regents to the Governor.

#### **IV.6 Vice Chair**

The Vice Chair shall be a member of the Board and shall perform the duties and have the powers of the Chair during the absence or disability of the Chair.

#### ***Current Board of Regents Bylaws with Proposed Revisions (Section IV.7)***

#### **IV.7 Chancellor**

The Board of Regents shall elect the Chancellor ~~at its May meeting~~ **on an annual basis**. 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 administrative officer of the University System as well as the chief executive officer of the Board of Regents and, as such, shall perform all of those duties that are prescribed by the Board.

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

### **2. Revision of the Board of Regents Bylaws, Section IV, Officers and Their Duties (Continued)**

#### **IV.8 Secretary to the Board of Regents**

The Secretary to the Board shall be elected by the Board, upon the recommendation of the Chancellor, and shall not be a member thereof. The Secretary to the Board shall perform those duties as determined by the Board and as set forth in these Bylaws or in The Policy Manual of the Board.

#### **IV.9 Treasurer**

The Treasurer shall perform such duties and have such powers as the Board may authorize or as may be assigned to him or her by the Chancellor and as set forth in these Bylaws or in The Policy Manual of the Board.

#### **IV.10 Other Officers**

The Board of Regents may establish or abolish from time to time such offices and positions as may be necessary to carry out the functions of the Board.

#### **IV.11 Delegation of Duties of Officers**

Notwithstanding any other provision of these Bylaws, in case of the absence of any officers of the Board of Regents, or for any other reason that the Board may deem sufficient, the Board of Regents may delegate the powers or duties of such officers to any member of the Board, provided a majority of the Board concurs therein.

### **3. Information Item: Discussion of the Office of Legal Affairs Report on Preventative Legal Activities (Walk-On)**

The Committee discussed a report by the Office of Legal Affairs concerning preventative legal activities which was received at the February meeting. Committee members made helpful suggestions to staff regarding ways to assist new presidents and their senior staff.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, March 20, 2007 at approximately 3:20 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Richard L. Tucker and Regents James A. Bishop, Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Robert F. Hatcher, Felton Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Benjamin J. Tarbutton III. Board Chair Allan Vigil and Chancellor Erroll B. Davis Jr. were also in attendance. Chair Tucker reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed eight items, with motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Acquisition of Real Property, 71 Airport Road, Eastman, Middle Georgia College**

Approved: The Board authorized the acquisition of approximately 21.546 acres of improved real property located at 71 Airport Road, Eastman, from the State of Georgia for the use and benefit of Middle Georgia College ("MGC").

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

Understandings: At this Board meeting, the Committee on Academic Affairs received information concerning the transfer of operations of the Georgia Aviation Technical College ("GAVTC") Campus to MGC.

The GAVTC real property is improved by four facilities. 1) a 42,000-square-foot classroom/office/dry lab building; 2) a 44,300-square-foot classroom/office/dry lab building; 3) a 61,400-square-foot classroom /office/library building. (Note: These facilities comprise one larger building that was built in three separate phases.); and 4) a 12,200-square-foot terminal/classroom/office building. Facilities condition assessments are being conducted, but the transfer is not contingent on the findings. If acquired, the facilities will be used by MGC to provide technical programs that are currently offered at this location.

Transfer of this GAVTC real property has been approved by the Board of the Department of Technical and Adult Education, and they have authorized the State Properties Commission to transfer title to the University System of Georgia upon Board of Regents approval.

An environmental site assessment is being conducted, but since this real property is being acquired from the State of Georgia the transfer is not contingent on the findings in the report.

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

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **2. Gift of Real Property, 6 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Columbus, Columbus State University**

Approved: The Board accepted a gift of approximately 1.23 acres of improved real property located at 6 West 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Columbus, from Foundation Properties, Inc. (the “Foundation”) for the use and benefit of Columbus State University (“CSU”).

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

Understandings: The property contains an approximately 66,581-square-foot brick building that has undergone complete interior renovation.

At its February 2007 meeting, the Board approved the rental of this building. The Board was informed that further action would be requested to accept a gift of this real property upon satisfactory completion of due diligence.

This real property was acquired by the Foundation in November 2004 as part of a \$1.25 million acquisition of the former Pillowtex Warehouse. The Foundation has invested \$12.2 million to complete renovation of the facility.

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

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

This real property will be used to provide classroom, studio and office space for the art department.

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

### **3. Authorization of Project, Data Center Platform Expansion, Augusta, Medical College of Georgia**

Approved: The Board authorized Project No. BR-40-0701, “Data Center Platform Expansion,” Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) with a total project budget of \$3,906,500.

Understandings: The proposed new construction/renovation, approximately 4,925 square feet, is to upgrade the existing data center reliability and infrastructure in the Annex Building and increase the floor and support space.

The current data center was originally designed and constructed as part of the Annex building second

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

**3. Authorization of Project, Data Center Platform Expansion, Augusta, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)**

floor renovation in 1992. This data center is the primary data center for both MCG and MCG Health System. It supports all the campus and hospital-related IT functions. Both MCG and MCG Health System have experienced sizeable growth in the existing 2,925 square feet data

center. This expansion is required to meet projected space and IT equipment growth needs over the next five years.

The project will be funded with institutional and matching MCG Health System funds.

The project is consistent with MCG's master plan.

If authorized by the Board, the University System Office staff and MCG will proceed with the selection of appropriate professionals in accordance with Board of Regents procedures.

**4. Authorization of Project Budget Modification, Project J-90, Schuster Student Success and Leadership Center, Columbus, Columbus State University**

Approved: The Board modified the budget of Project J-90 "Student Success and Leadership Center," Columbus State University ("CSU"), to increase the total project budget from \$6.5 million to \$9.7 million.

Understandings: The Student Success and Leadership Center was presented to the Board in June 2004 for approval as a minor capital project in the fiscal year 2005 budget. The project was not included in the final budget approved by the legislature that year. However, funding was approved in the fiscal year 2006 budget. The total project cost was initially approved at \$6.5 million. This total project cost consisted of \$4.5 million in state bond funds and \$2 million in institutional auxiliary reserve funds. This project will provide CSU with a quality environment dedicated solely to fully integrating programs designed to enhance and facilitate student retention and success.

After project funding was approved by the legislature in 2006, recent rapid inflation, general construction cost increases due to Hurricane Katrina and program expansion have contributed to an overall cost increase for this project. The CSU Foundation has committed to contribute \$500,000 and CSU will add a total of \$4.7 million in institutional auxiliary reserve funds to meet the construction budget for this project.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **4. Authorization of Project Budget Modification, Project J-90, Schuster Student Success and Leadership Center, Columbus, Columbus State University (Continued)**

The state-funded amount for this project remains the same at \$4.5 million. The total project cost will increase from \$6.5 million to \$9.7 million with the CSU and CSU Foundation's commitment.

New Total Project Cost	\$9,700,000
New Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$7,672,425

### **5. Demolition of Buildings: 104 Georgia Avenue, 114 Georgia Avenue, and White Warehouse, Valdosta, Valdosta State University**

Approved: The Board declared buildings 104 Georgia Avenue, 114 Georgia Avenue and White Warehouse, located on the campus of Valdosta State University ("VSU"), Valdosta, Georgia, to be no longer advantageously useful to VSU or any units of the University System of Georgia and authorize demolition and removal of these buildings.

The Board requested the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of these buildings from the campus of VSU.

Understandings: The facility located at 104 Georgia Avenue was previously used for Housing and Residence Life administrative offices, but is currently vacant. It is a one-story wood-frame structure with a shingle roof and wood siding. The size of the structure is approximately 2,600 square feet. The facility, which has an estimated construction date of 1948, is in poor condition. The interior has sustained significant water damage over the years, and the structural integrity is diminished.

The facility located at 114 Georgia Avenue is currently used as administrative office space for VSU's Parking and Transportation functions. It is a one-story ranch-style structure with a cement and brick veneer. The size of the structure is approximately 1,780 square feet. The facility, which has an estimated construction date of 1951, is in poor condition and is not a viable candidate for renovation or improvement.

The facility, known as the White Warehouse, has been vacant for an extended period of time. It is a one-story wood-frame structure with a shingle roof and wood siding. The size of the structure is approximately 5,449 square feet. The facility, which has an estimated construction date of 1948, has been sealed-off due to structural safety concerns, is in extremely poor condition, and is not a viable candidate for renovation or improvement.

The demolition of these buildings is consistent with VSU's master plan and campus historic preservation plan.

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

**5. Demolition of Buildings: 104 Georgia Avenue, 114 Georgia Avenue, and White Warehouse, Valdosta, Valdosta State University (Continued)**

Georgia Environmental Policy Act evaluations and environmental site assessment reports have been completed for each of the structures and indicate no adverse environmental conditions other than minor amounts of asbestos. The asbestos-containing materials will be removed and disposed of in accordance with federal and state regulations prior to demolition.

**6. Appointment of Construction Management Firm, Project No. BR-10-0703, Health Center Expansion, Athens, University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board appointed the first-named construction management firm listed below for the identified project and authorized the execution of a contract with the identified firm. Should it not be possible to execute a contract with the top-ranked firm, staff will then attempt to execute a contract with the other listed firms in rank order.

Following public advertisement, a qualifications-based selection process for a construction management firm was held in accordance with Board of Regents procedures. The following recommendation is made:

**Project No. BR-10-0703, Health Center Expansion  
University of Georgia (“UGA”)**

Project Description: This project was authorized by the Board in November 2006 and is anticipated to consist of 27,500 square feet of new construction and 7,000 square feet of renovation within the 81,000-square-foot existing building as well as 99 additional patient, handicapped, and staff parking spaces. The project is anticipated to be fully funded from UGA Health Center reserve funds.

Total Project Cost:	\$17,000,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation):	\$12,292,500

Number of construction management firms that applied for this commission: 8

Recommended firms in rank order:

- 1) Brasfield & Gorrie General Contractors, Atlanta
- 2) McCarthy Building Companies, Inc., Atlanta
- 3) Holder Construction Company, Atlanta

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

**7. Resolution 2007A and 2007B General Obligation Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia**

Approved: The Board adopted the Resolution prepared by the Revenue Division of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 2007A and 2007B General Obligation Bonds (“G. O. Bonds”) by the State of Georgia through the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission for use in funding projects for the University System of Georgia.

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution (Appendix I) to cover the sale of 2007A G. O. Bonds for the following project:

GRA-0249 National Center of Nanotechnology Excellence (Equipment) Georgia Research Alliance	\$ 5,000,000
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--------------

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution (Appendix II) to cover the sale of 2007B G. O. Bonds for the following projects:

J-45 Teaching Laboratory Building Georgia State University	\$ 27,500,000
J-93 Renovation of Administration Bldg/School of Business Clayton State University	\$ 3,295,000
J-107 Infrastructure Improvements Coastal Georgia Community College	\$ 4,355,000
J-108 Campus Infrastructure Upgrades University of Georgia	\$ 4,400,000
J-109 Central Energy Plant Expansion Augusta State University	\$ 2,600,000
J-114 Marine Research Building Skidaway Institute of Oceanography	\$ 4,475,000
J-115 Addition to Building “A” Waycross College	\$ 2,100,000
J-116 Addition to Burnett Hall Armstrong Atlantic State University	\$ 4,475,000

**COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

**7. Resolution 2007A and 2007B General Obligation Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia (Continued)**

J-117	New Building at Whitfield Career Academy Dalton State College	\$ 4,275,000
J-118	Herty Hall Addition Georgia College & State University	\$ 4,350,000
J-119	Animal and Dairy Livestock Facility, Oglethorpe County University of Georgia	\$ 4,475,000
J-120	Nursing & Health Sciences Building Darton College	\$ 5,000,000
J-121	Student Center Renovations and Addition Gainesville College	\$ 4,475,000
J-122	Renovations to Social Science, Library, & Wilson Bldgs. Kennesaw State University	\$ 4,375,000
J-123	Renovation of Dillard Hall Middle Georgia College	\$ 4,175,000
GPL-16R	Ephesus Public Library, Heard County Georgia Public Library System	\$ 650,000
GPL-17R	East Central Georgia Regional Library Hqtrs. Richmond County Georgia Public Library System	\$ 2,000,000
GPL-19R	Hamilton Mill Branch Library, Gwinnett County Georgia Public Library System	\$ 2,000,000
GPL-21R	Mountainview Library Georgia Public Library System	\$ 325,000
GPL-22R	Chicamauga Public Library Georgia Public Library System	\$ 600,000
GPL-23R	Live Oak Public Libraries, Chatham County Georgia Public Library System	<u>\$ 2,000,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$91,900,000

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **8. Conceptual Approval of Ground Lease and Rental Agreement for University Village Student Housing Complex, Atlanta, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board authorized in concept the execution of a ground lease between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc., Lessee, for the tract of improved real property known as University Village Student Housing Complex.

The Board authorized in concept the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for the tract of improved real property known as University Village Student Housing Complex.

The authorization of the ground lease and rental agreement is subject to the approval of Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (“GSFIC”) of any and all remedial steps to be taken as part of the transaction in connection with any private business use, as defined by the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended, and the regulations issued thereunder.

Understandings: In October 2006 and January 2007 information was provided to the Board on potential opportunities for the University Village Student Housing Complex. This conceptual approval is consistent with that information.

Funding for the development of the University Village Student Housing Complex included 1992B, 1992D, 1993D, 1993F, 1994B, 1995B, and 1995C State bonds. Additional Georgia Institute of Technology Olympic student housing was developed including Eight Street Apartments and Chiller Plant, 6<sup>th</sup> Street Apartments, Center Street Apartments, Hemphill Apartments, and 4<sup>th</sup> Street Houses utilizing 1993D and 2001B State bonds.

Further action will be required by the Board to approve the terms of the ground lease and rental agreement as soon as complete due diligence has been reviewed.

### **9. Information Item: The Policy Manual, Section 912, The Naming of Facilities or Streets**

The Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, presented a brief discussion regarding reviewing and revising the Board of Regents naming policy. Ms. Daniels solicited clarification from the members of the Board for recommendations. Ms. Daniels stated she will reconstitute and reconvene the 2004 naming task force to ensure that recommendations on a new policy are in alignment with the Regents’ wishes. The task force will then bring back the recommended changes for an update of the naming of facilities policy.

## **CABINET REPORTS**

Chair Vigil asked Chancellor Davis if he would like to introduce his senior cabinet members for the Cabinet Report.

Chancellor Davis stated last month, in lieu of hearing from him, members of his cabinet discussed the activities occurring in their respective areas. He further stated that the Regents were asked on their feedback forms to advise him whether or not they would like to continue to hear from the cabinet members or from the Chancellor himself. Based on their expressions of interest, Chancellor Davis said that the Board would hear from the cabinet members again this month. He then said that he would like the Regents to continually give feedback as to whether the reports are too detailed, not detailed enough or too broad. The cabinet members, he stated, have been asked to focus on key activities that are happening in their areas to give the Regents a sense of the types of things the University System staff are managing. Chancellor Davis then introduced the Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts.

### **CABINET REPORT: MR. ROBERT E. WATTS**

The Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, announced that there has been a lot going on in the Administrative and Fiscal Affairs area in March. Mr. Watts thanked the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Dorothy Roberts, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, Elizabeth Neely, for their work on what is becoming the first University System of Georgia Human Resources manual. Mr. Watts stated that the draft is currently being edited and that he believes it will address some of the issues Regent Jolly brought up during his Committee Report for the Committee on Organization and Law. The new manual will be distributed to institutional Human Resources officers on April 23rd. Following that, he added, intensive training facilitated by Ms. Neely, Ms. Roberts, and their colleagues will begin. Mr. Watts stated that this is a big step forward for the Human Resources operation of the University System in standardizing its policies and procedures.

Mr. Watts next noted the recognition of the University of West Georgia in the February issue of *Business Officer Magazine* for its work in continuous process improvement in its business and finance area. He credited the good leadership of the university's business operations staff with the success. Mr. Watts added that, as Dr. Brown said in his earlier presentation on System-level Projects, the System has excellent things going on at many of its institutions, and the goal is to spread that across all of the institutions. The University of West Georgia, he reiterated, is certainly a model in the business area.

Then Mr. Watts expressed his appreciation for the work of Vice Chancellor for Finance and Business Operations William Bowes and his colleagues for their work on the benchmarking project in cooperation with the Commission of a New Georgia task force. In this project, Mr. Watts explained, the System Office staff is trying to capture transaction costs of the System's finance and payroll operations, data which will be valuable to the Board for planning System efficiency improvements in

### **CABINET REPORT: MR. ROBERT E. WATTS**

those operations in the future. Mr. Bowes will bring that information to the Board at a later date in a report. Mr. Watts commented that current state policy limits state agencies to one-year leases and forbids performance based contracts on energy management. He stated that several people on the staff of the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, including the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Real Estate and Administration, Peter J. Hickey, and the Program Manager for Environmental and Health Safety, Sandra Neuse, are working on a project chaired by the Director of the Office of Planning and Budget, Shelley Nickel, through the Commission for a New Georgia. Mr. Watts stated that this project will review the legal issues surrounding multi-year leases and performance based energy contracts.

Additionally, Mr. Watts announced that the Facilities staff and all of the System institutions would be participating in the coming year or years in the Self-Audit process of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”). EPA Regions 1, 2, and 3 have already gone through the self-audit process. The System office has received a letter to all of the colleges and universities, public and private, in Region 4, asking each institution to do an EPA self-audit for environmental compliance. According to Mr. Watts, this process will require significant institutional effort as well as resource support. Ms. Daniels and her staff will be coordinating these efforts, sending out guidelines, and possibly enlisting some outside consulting help. This will be both a time intense and resource-intensive process.

Finally, Mr. Watts reported that the Georgia Public Library Service was engaging in its own strategic planning process. He added that during the April meeting the Board would meet one of the Georgia librarians who has been named one of the Top 21 Librarians of the Year by the *New York Times*.

With this last statement, Mr. Watts concluded his report. There were no questions.

#### **CABINET REPORT: DR. BEHERUZ N. SETHNA**

The Interim Chief Academic Officer and Executive Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, Beheruz N. Sethna, began his report by complimenting his colleagues in the Academic Affairs Division for their active and diligent work on preparing several of the projects that came before the Board during the March meeting. He informed the Board that other projects will be presented at subsequent meetings.

As part of this year’s transition, he had approved the request of the Chief Information Officer and Interim Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology, Thomas L. Maier, for an organizational assessment of OIIT. Those results He noted that the Track I Committee of the Regents heard a presentation of the Office of Information and Instructional Technology’s (“OIIT”) reorganization and on IT security and other important matters the day before. Dr. Sethna further stated that Dr. Maier did a wonderful job of presenting the reorganization and explaining the process

## **CABINET REPORT: DR. BEHERUZ N. SETHNA**

used to choose a number of technology based services on the previous day. He then thanked Dr. Maier and the entire OIIT staff who worked with the consultant to bring it to fruition.

Dr. Sethna stated that there are similar reorganization efforts going on in the rest Academic Affairs that would come before the Board later as information items. The Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Programs, Sandra Stone, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, are working on these reorganization projects. with Dr. Sethna. He continued, stating that Dr. Hudson, Dr. Stone, and several other Academic Affairs staff also have been very active in bringing to fruition some of the Approvals and Authorities projects that were presented to the Board during the March and February meetings, as well as some that will be presented in the future.

Dr. Sethna prefaced his next set of accolades, by jokingly stating that the recipients of his esteem may not wish to be associated with that particular project. Nevertheless, he credited the Director of the Regents' Testing Center at Georgia State University, Dr. Leslie J. Caldwell, Dr. Hudson, Dr. Stone, and the former Vice Chancellor for Academic, Faculty, and Student Affairs, Frank A. Butler, for their work on the Regents' Test, emphasizing that they did excellent work.

Another noteworthy point for the Academic Affairs Division directly related to the presentation was made by the Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Carlton Brown. Dr. Brown presented several System-level task forces, 7 out of the 10 of which are in the area of Academic Affairs and all of which involve a considerable amount of staff work and liaisons with the operations of Dr. Hudson, Dr. Stone, and Dr. Maier.

Looking ahead to the April Meeting, Dr. Sethna stated that the Board would have a couple of exciting presentations, one of which would be on the Customer Service Initiative, headed by the Special Assistant to the Chief Information Officer, Jim Flowers. He also informed the Regents that they would hear a presentation on a Lean Six Sigma which addresses graduate programs in the field of education. Dr. Sethna explained that from 2002 to 2006, there has been about an 80% increase in the number of teachers with a bachelor's degree who are seeking a master's degree. There are approximately 5,000 such individuals in the market. The University System will work toward getting a larger share of that market. To this end, the Special Assistant to the Associate Vice Chancellor for P-16 Initiatives, Tonya Kilpatrick, is working on very exciting Lean Six Sigma Black Belt project. Ms. Kilpatrick and deans from across the University System are working as a collaborative and will be facilitating trainings and other means of putting this Lean Six Sigma project to practical use. The institutions that form this collaborative are as follows: Albany State University, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Augusta State University, Columbus State University, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, Kennesaw State University, North Georgia College & State University, Valdosta State University, and University of West Georgia.

## **CABINET REPORT: DR. BEHERUZ N. SETHNA**

Dr. Sethna said that the Academic Affairs program staff, under the leadership of Dr. Stone, would be working with the Governor's Biotechnology Workforce Development group to implement their strategic plan to develop a concentration of biotechnology research, development, and industry in the corridor between Atlanta and Athens. As this is an ongoing project, Dr. Sethna stated that the Regents would hear more about it as time progresses. Dr. Sethna informed that Board that Dr. Stone spent several days with this task force discussing the project, emphasizing that the University System of Georgia would play a significant role in its development.

In addition to all of the other projects, the Academic Affairs Division is also working on comprehensive program review, which is the way that the staff reviews programs that the Board has already approved to see whether they are meeting certain criteria. Dr. Sethna explained that following the review process, feedback is then sent to the campuses identifying low enrollment programs, with the message that such programs must be made viable or discontinued.. He added that it is a very intensive process.

Finally, Dr. Sethna wanted to make the Regents aware that Bill Gates wrote an article in the *Washington Post* on February 21, 2007, "How to Keep America Competitive." In it he mentions several items in terms of retaining American competitive leadership. Dr. Sethna stated that in order to convey all of the things that Mr. Gates mentions, the Regents would have to invite him back for a twenty minute presentation. So as not to bore them with the details, Dr. Sethna simply stated that Mr. Gates revealed many things in the article that have very significant ties to the work that his colleagues at the staff level in Academic Affairs are doing here, but far more importantly to the wonderful work that is going on in the 35 institutions across the University System of Georgia.

Dr. Sethna then thanked Chancellor Davis and Chair Vigil and concluded his report. Chancellor Davis apologized for the lack of an introduction for Dr. Sethna.

Regent Jenkins stated that he had a question, but was not sure if it should be posed to Dr. Sethna or not. Regent Jenkins prefaced his question by stating that last year and maybe some years prior to that, Academic Affairs prepared an institutional profile with all of the schools and colleges in a notebook that had a lot of great information about population, SAT test scores, graduation and so forth. Regent Jenkins asked if that would be done again this year, explaining that the profiles are very helpful in that they provide all of the information in one spot. Dr. Cathie Mayes Hudson responded that the Regents would be provided with this information again and that the profiles were in the proofing stages now.

Regent James R. Jolly then asked Dr. Sethna to share the Bill Gates article with the Board. He responded that he would.

There being no more questions, Dr. Sethna left the podium.

## **CABINET REPORT: MR. THOMAS E. DANIEL**

Chancellor Davis introduced the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Affairs, Thomas E. Daniel, stating that this is the time of year when Mr. Daniel does not sleep. Although since the legislature went out of session for a couple, weeks, he was able to sleep for that time, but not during the day. Mr. Daniel, the Chancellor continued, has been described as *“the hardest working man in show business and he lives up to that reputation every year.”* He then stated that Mr. Daniel would give a legislative update as well as share information about other parts of his operations.

Mr. Daniel thanked and Chancellor for the introduction and launched into his report.

He stated that Tuesday, March 20 was the 29th legislative day and that it was a productive day for the University System of Georgia. Mr. Daniel said that the University System of Georgia owes a salute of thanks to the following legislators: Senator Seth Harp and the members of the Senate Higher Education Committee who signed and voted for Senate Bill 111 (“SB111”) in committee and on the floor; Senator Jack Hill and Senator Tommie Williams, who helped perfect the legislation; Senator Don Balfour, who guided the bill through the Senate Rules Committee; Lieutenant Governor Casey Cagle, who gave the legislation his seal of approval; Mr. Brad Alexander, the Lieutenant Governor’s chief of staff, who offered his counsel; and Mr. Kevin Fillion, of the Senate Budget and Evaluation Office who provided his expertise. Thanks to their efforts and the Board’s support, SB111, the Tuition Carry Forward Legislation, was adopted by the Senate on Tuesday, March 20 to a vote of 52–0. This legislation will play an important role in the Board’s successful fixed-for-four tuition initiative.

Mr. Daniel stated that he was pleased to inform the Board that the Governor’s Chief Financial Officer, Thomas Hills, the Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Celeste Osborn, have met with Chief Operating Officer, Robert E. Watts, the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William Bowes, and the Interim Associate Vice Chancellor for Human Resources, Dorothy Roberts, and reached agreement on the language for the Optional Retirement Plan legislation. Mr. Daniel stated that the legislation would be introduced when the General Assembly returns, explaining that since this bill has a fiscal impact it would be studied by the retirement committees during the interim and hopefully will be adopted by the 2008 General Assembly.

Regarding post employment benefits, Mr. Daniel stated that Mr. Hills and Ms. Osborn have worked with Mr. Bowes and the Chief Audit Officer and Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, and have reached agreement on the needed language the Governor’s Office would like to have. Mr. Daniel further stated that there are at least three existing pieces of legislation which the System will try to attach its language to as an amendment. The Board will be kept informed of the progress.

## **CABINET REPORT: MR. THOMAS E. DANIEL**

Another piece of legislation that has come to the attention of Mr. Daniel's office that needs immediate attention concerns the Middle Georgia College ("MGC")/Georgia Aviation Technical College ("GAVTC") merger. Some of GAVTC's current employees are members of the Employees Retirement System and they need to move to the Teachers Retirement System. Mr. Daniel stated that this would be a non-fiscal bill, which his office will hopefully find a vehicle to amend this Session.

Regarding the bills on intellectual property, Mr. Daniel commented that we have reasons to be pleased about the current turn of events. A House Study Committee on Intellectual Property has been introduced. The two House Bills are being held in Higher Education Committee by Representative Bill Hembree. Mr. Daniel expressed his gratitude for that turn of events.

Representative Bob Smith has introduced a Joint Study Committee on the funding formula. Mr. Daniel reported that he has pledged his cooperation on behalf of the Board to Representative Smith and his colleagues to work on this important subject.

Mr. Daniel asked the Regents to recall how passionate Representative Ben Harbin was when he addressed the Board last month regarding students with disabilities participating in athletic events and sporting activities in the University System. Mr. Daniel was pleased to report that Representative Harbin has since introduced a joint study committee. Mr. Daniel has, again, pledged to work earnestly with him over the summer and hopes to have some recommendation to bring back to the Board at a later date.

At this time, Mr. Daniel complimented the Vice Chancellor for Academic Planning and Programs, Sandra Stone, and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs, Tonya Lam, for responding with great professionalism in putting together a wonderful package of information which the Special Assistant to the Chief Information Officer, Jim Flowers, used at a committee meeting. At that meeting the senate bill introduced by Senator J. B. Powell, Senate Bill 74 ("SB74"), which would grant any Georgia resident who is a veteran automatic admission into any of the System institutions was discussed. Mr. Daniel stated that while we are all ready to praise and help our veterans, the System staff obviously had some issues about the automatic admission to any institution. There was a hearing on that bill, continued Mr. Daniel, during which the System staff presented their facts. After the hearing, Senator Seth Harp graciously agreed to allow Mr. Daniel and his office to work with Senator Powell. In the interim, Mr. Daniel and his staff will likely bring a few "tweaks" back to the Board to continue to let it be known how supportive the System is of veterans.

Mr. Daniel noted that, as mentioned by Regent Allan Vigil, the Regents were given a copy of the Chancellor's memo regarding the action of the House of Representatives on the Fiscal Year 2007 Amended Budget. He then informed the Board that although the amended budget was approved by the House of Representatives on Tuesday, March 20, later that evening State Representative Ben Harbin made a motion to have a reconsideration vote on the Fiscal Year 2007 Amended Budget. Mr. Daniel noted that this is a rare occurrence which means that the next legislative day, March 27

## **CABINET REPORT: MR. THOMAS E. DANIEL**

would prove to be an interesting 30th day of action in the State Capitol. Mr. Daniel stated that his office would keep the Board informed of the developments.

Mr. Daniel credited Regent James A. Bishop with giving him a great connection in his invocation when he mentioned the “larger human need.” Regent Bishop’s comment, he said, reminded him of the important meeting on Monday, March 19 when President Daniel W. Rahn, of the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”), President Michael F. Adams of the University of Georgia (“UGA”) and the Chancellor met with Representative Bob Smith and members of his subcommittee to discuss the Medical College of Georgia/University of Georgia recommendations of the Governor. Mr. Daniel stated that they did a magnificent job. As an aside, Mr. Daniel mentioned that it had always struck him as a little bit of an irony how many of their meetings are called “hearings” when all they do once they arrive is talk. He then added that there was a great amount of listening at the meeting as those in attendance had a very intense discussion about the Governor’s recommendation on the MCG initiative into Athens. Mr. Daniel stated that there was a wonderful exchange of information and called it one of the most impressive meetings that he had witnessed on an intense subject like that. He added that he was delighted with the results and outcomes and that they will continue to keep the Board posted.

Since, day 37 of the General Assembly will be on April 17, Mr. Daniel expressed his appreciation for the Board’s understanding of his planned absence from the upcoming Board meeting. He added that the Chancellor would continue to keep the Board updated as the issues he covered develop further.

Regent James R. Jolly asked Mr. Daniel to explain what the budget reconsideration might mean for the System in laymen’s language. Mr. Daniel answered that the budget is a piece of legislation, and when the General Assembly, whether it be the House or the Senate votes on a piece of legislation, there is a parliamentary procedure called reconsideration. That means if a representative is opposed to the outcome whether the bill was passed or defeated, that representative has the right to make a motion for reconsideration. Mr. Daniel stated that while it is very unusual to have that happen with the budget, it technically means that the bill is being brought back into the House of Representatives. The speaker then has the option of referring it back to the Appropriations Committee. If the committee wishes to, with the House’s consent, it could amend the bill. So representatives are sending the signal in response to messages that they have received that the house is not yet ready to release the budget to the Senate. They have not transmitted the budget. The House is basically saying to the Senate, we still have the budget.

As a follow-up question, Regent Jolly asked whether or not the budget had passed by a good margin. Mr. Daniel replied that it had.

## **CABINET REPORT: MR. THOMAS E. DANIEL**

As a point of clarity, Regent Felton Jenkins commented that the pass was only with respect to the Fiscal Year 2007 Amended Budget and the motion for reconsideration was also regarding only the amended budget. Mr. Daniel confirmed that the issue was the Fiscal Year 2007 amended budget. Regent Jenkins then asked where the Fiscal Year 2008 budget stood in the process. Mr. Daniel's answered that the Fiscal Year 2008 budget was still in the House Appropriations Committee. He further explained that the subcommittee chairs are still having meetings and discussions, emphasizing that the House of Representatives has taken no action on the Fiscal Year 2008 budget.

There being no other questions, Mr. Daniel thanked the Board and left the podium.

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

As provided for in the Bylaws, Chair Vigil stated that he had put together a nominating committee for the positions of Chair and Vice Chair of the Board of Regents for Fiscal Year 2008. He stated that Regents Leebern, Hatcher, and Tarbutton will serve on this Nominating Committee. He then charged the Regents on this newly formed Nominating Committee to announce their recommendations for those offices at the next meeting of the Executive Committee. As further provided for in the Bylaws, Chair Vigil stated, the Executive Committee would then be responsible for forwarding to the full Board, at the June 2007 meeting, the nominations for these offices. He then stated that the election would be held at the June meeting, and the floor would be open for further nominations at that time. Chair Vigil asked if there was any other unfinished business. There being none, he moved on to the next item, New Business.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

After being called upon by the Chair, Secretary Murphy stated that there was new business and asked for Chair Vigil's permission to proceed.

She advised the Regents that they had seen the resume and the honorary degree proposal from the President and the University Honorary Degree Committee. The request was from Georgia Southern University. President Bruce Grube had requested the Board's approval for an Honorary Doctor of Letters to be awarded to Ms. Hala Moddelmog at the May commencement ceremony of the university. Secretary Murphy informed the Board that the staff in the System Office had reviewed the proposal carefully, and were recommending it for approval with enthusiasm.

Chair Vigil called for a motion to approve the proposal. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the award of an Honorary Doctor of Letters to be awarded to Ms. Hala Moddelmog at the May commencement ceremony of Georgia Southern University.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At approximately 10:30 a.m. on Wednesday, March 21, 2007, Chair 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., Felton Jenkins, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Doreen Stiles Poitevint, Benjamin J. Tarbutton, III, and Richard L. Tucker. Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy was also present during the Executive Session. Chancellor Davis was present during part of the session. 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 11:53 a.m., Chair Vigil reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that in no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

## **PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Chair Vigil asked the Secretary to the Board, Julia M. Murphy to discuss the petitions and communications.

Secretary Murphy thanked Chair Vigil and began by assuring the Regents that the University System of Georgia website continues to be under review by the staff for currency and accuracy.

She also reminded them that the next meeting of the Board of Regents will be in Statesboro, Georgia at Georgia Southern University on April 17-18, 2007. President Grube and his staff look forward to welcoming the Board to the university, especially as they are celebrating their Centennial year.

Secretary Murphy informed the Regents that information regarding scheduled upcoming regional meetings that would be conducted by the System Office staff is under Tab 29. She asked them to please be sure to take that information with them. She also stated that they would find additional important communications information under Tab 29.

Finally, she said that they would find their Feedback forms in the left hand side of their Board books, and expressed that the staff always looks forward to receiving these back from the Regents. Also, to assist the Regents in any additional feedback that they might like to share, Secretary Murphy stated that she would email feedback forms to them again that evening.

**ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 12:05 p.m. on March 21, 2007.

s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Julia M. Murphy  
Secretary, Board of Regents  
University System of Georgia

s/\_\_\_\_\_  
Allan Vigil  
Chair, Board of Regents