

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
November 18 and 19, 2003**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, November 18 and Wednesday, November 19, 2003, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Joe Frank Harris, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:10 p.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, immediately following the swearing in of new Regent James R. Jolly. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Harris, were Vice Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr. and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Patrick S. Pittard, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Allan Vigil, and Glenn S. White.

Chair Harris greeted Regent Jolly and welcomed him to his first meeting with the Board of Regents.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent William H. Cleveland had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on October 7 and 8, 2003, were unanimously approved as distributed. The minutes of the meeting of the Executive and Compensation Committee held on October 27, 2003, and of the special meeting of the Board of Regents held on October 29, 2003, were also unanimously approved as distributed.

SPECIAL TRIBUTE TO PAST REGENT GEORGE M. D. (JOHN) HUNT III

Chair Harris invited Chancellor Meredith and Regent Julie Hunt to join him at the podium. He stated that Regent George M. D. (John) Hunt III was appointed by Governor Zell Miller to begin his service as a member of the Board of Regents in 1997. He loved serving on the Board. He also loved Tifton and Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, the University of Georgia, and Valdosta State University. In fact, he loved all of the institutions in the University System of Georgia. Most of all,

he loved Julie Hunt, his children, his grandchildren, and his extended family, friends, and colleagues. Regent John Hunt simply loved life, and this was apparent to anyone in his presence. His untimely death saddened everyone on the Board and in the University System Office. The Regents were very pleased when Governor Sonny Perdue appointed Julie Hunt to continue Regent John Hunt's term of service on the Board. At the time of his death, Regent John Hunt was continuing his chairmanship of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, a perfect fit for both his interests and talents. He wanted everything built with the best material but also with the utmost efficiency, and he was a superb Chair during his tenure. Regent John Hunt, with Julie at his side, was always very generous. He loved sharing what he had with others, and he simply loved people. Chair Harris said that it was a privilege for the Regents to have served with Regent John Hunt. Therefore, the Regents were presenting to Regent Julie Hunt a Brumby rocking chair as a tribute to the memory of Regent John Hunt and in appreciation for his service to the Board. On behalf of the Regents, Chair Harris said they missed Regent John Hunt and wanted Julie Hunt to know how much he was loved and appreciated.

Regent Julie Hunt thanked Chair Harris and the Regents. She said that she would put the rocker in a special place as a reminder of the love Regent John Hunt had for the Regents and the University System of Georgia. She thanked the Regents again and said that she would treasure it.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 1:20 p.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, Chair Joe Frank Harris called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing the appointment of the president at Georgia College & State University ("GCSU"). 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 Harris, Vice Chancellor Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Patrick S. Pittard, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Allan Vigil, and Glenn S. White. Also in attendance were Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith; and the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 1:25 p.m., Chair Harris reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then moved that the Board approve the recommendation of the Special Regents' Committee for the Georgia College & State University Presidential Search that Dr. Dorothy Leland be named President of GCSU. Motion properly made and variously seconded, the Board unanimously approved the motion.

At approximately 1:30 p.m., Chair Harris adjourned the Regents into their regular Committee meetings.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, November 19, 2003, in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Chair of the Board, Regent Joe Frank Harris, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Harris, were Vice Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr. and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Michael J. Coles, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Patrick S. Pittard, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Allan Vigil, and Glenn S. White.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, November 19, 2003, by Regent Michael J. Coles.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, November 19, 2003, by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Connie Cater and William H. Cleveland had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

COMMITTEE ON INFORMATION AND INSTRUCTIONAL TECHNOLOGY

The Committee on Information and Instructional Technology met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 10:30 a.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Michael J. Coles, Vice Chair W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr. and Wanda Yancey Rodwell. Regents J. Timothy Shelnut and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. and Chancellor Meredith were also in attendance. Chair Coles reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. The item was as follows:

1. Information Item: Preliminary Report of a Feasibility Study for Consolidation of Banner Hosting Services

At its September 2003 meeting, the Board endorsed a study of the feasibility of consolidating Banner hosting services. The producer of the Banner student information system, Systems & Computer Technology Corporation (“SCT”), collaborated with the Office of Information and Instructional Technology in this feasibility study. At this meeting, the Senior Program Director for Global Education Solutions at SCT, Andrew G. Nagorski, presented the preliminary findings of this study, including possible recommendations for further study and subsequent action.

The findings in the report indicate that the single site model is a likely solution. This conclusion is further supported by the fact that other single-site System applications, such as PeopleSoft, Georgia

Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”), and the WebCT™ course management system, are working well and that other university systems are using a single site solution for Banner successfully.

The Vice Chancellor for Information and Instructional Technology and Chief Information Officer, Randall A. Thursby, indicated that next steps would include sharing the report with institutions to get their feedback and developing a draft of a project plan with clearly stated benefits, costs, and timelines with the objective of presenting a proposal for consideration by the Committee next spring.

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 11:15 a.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Connie Cater and Regents Julie Hunt, W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., Martin W. NeSmith, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Chair White reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed three items, none of which required action. Those items were as follows:

1. Information Item: Update on Implementation Status for All Systemwide Audit Findings

In August 2003, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, presented to the Committee a new process that would be implemented to more closely monitor open audit findings and to provide follow-up on significant and major findings. Since that time, the new process has been fully implemented. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith sent a report of the August 2003 status of all open findings to the presidents and asked them to update this status. At this meeting, Mr. Stark updated the Committee on the progress of this effort. Open audit findings for the State Department of Audits and Accounts, campus-based audits, and Board of Regents internal audits decreased 51%, 58%, and 70%, respectively, during the quarter ended September 30, 2003.

2. Information Item: Year-to-Date Status of Fiscal Year 2004 Audit Plan

The Associate Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit, Ronald B. Stark, evaluates the status of the University System audit plan each quarter. The campus-based auditors submit quarterly reports showing the status of their individual plans and their resource utilization. The information is then consolidated with information from the Board of Regents Internal Audit Department. At this meeting, Mr. Stark presented the overall status of the fiscal year 2004 audit plan as of September 30, 2003. He reported that 26 audits were completed up to that point.

3. Information Item: Improving Campus Processes Through Self-Assessment – A “Best in Class” Tool Implemented by Georgia Institute of Technology Internal Audit Department

Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) Department of Internal Auditing staff developed a process to improve internal controls and encourage compliance with applicable laws, policies, and procedures. This process was presented at the national conference of the Association of College and University Auditors (“ACUA”) in September 2003 and is considered by ACUA to be a “best in class” process. At this meeting, GIT’s Director of Internal Auditing, Robert N. Clark, Jr., presented GIT’s new process to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 1:30 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Julie Hunt, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Martin W. NeSmith, Patrick S. Pittard, J. Timothy Shelnut, and Glenn S. White. Chair Carter reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, one of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Acceptance of Gifts for the Georgia Institute of Technology

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

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Items</u>	<u>Department</u>
Hewlett-Packard Company	\$274,519	Various computer workstations, components, and software	College of Computing

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

2. Information Item: University System of Georgia Fiscal Year 2003 Financial Position Report

The Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, presented to the Committee the fourth quarter financial report for the University System of Georgia for the period ending June 30, 2003, which is on file with the Office of Fiscal Affairs. The report provides tables comparing actual and budgeted revenues and expenditures through June 2003 for educational and general funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, and student activity funds. In addition, the report contains charts that compare June 2003 financial data with data from June 2002.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 1:45 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Martin W. NeSmith, Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Julie Hunt, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Patrick S. Pittard, and Glenn S. White. Chancellor Meredith was also in attendance. Chair NeSmith reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 8 of which required action. Item 12 was a walk-on item. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Gift of Real Property, 166 Fifth Street, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board accepted a gift of approximately 0.1702 acre of real property known as the Heffernan House at 166 Fifth Street, N.W., Atlanta, Georgia, from the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc., for the use and benefit of Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”).

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

Understandings The Heffernan House is a one-story brick house with a finished basement originally constructed in 1927. This house has approximately 2,108 square feet on the main floor and approximately 1,120 square feet in the finished basement. The house is in overall good condition.

Professor P. M. Heffernan, Director of the School of Architecture at GIT from 1956 to 1976, purchased the 1927 house in 1946 and renovated/redesigned the house in the 1970s. The house holds historical and architectural significance for GIT and Atlanta. It provides important support for the College of Architecture in terms of design archives and the scholarship of design, as well as its international/globalization objectives.

The property is currently leased to the Board of Regents for use by GIT’s College of Architecture, and its use will remain the same after acquisition. The house is the center for the design archives for the College of Architecture and houses the papers and drawings of P. M. Heffernan and the drawings of the most distinctive architecture graduates of GIT dating back to 1918.

A Phase I environmental site assessment has been completed and indicates no significant adverse environmental issues.

There are no restrictions on the acquisition, and there are no known easements, reversions, or restrictions on the property.

The appraised value of this property is \$220,000. The estimated annual operating expenses are \$19,000.

2. Rental Agreement, 13040 Abercorn Street, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Educational Properties, Inc. (the “Foundation”), Landlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Tenant, covering approximately 98,088 square feet at 13040 Abercorn Street, Savannah, Georgia, currently known as the Publix and Shops at Savannah Mall, for the period July 1, 2004, through June 30, 2005, at a monthly rent of \$89,505.30 (\$1,074,063.60 per year/\$10.95 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for 24 consecutive one-year periods at the same rent rate for the use of Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”).

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

The rental is subject to completion of an environmental site assessment indicating no adverse environmental conditions associated with the subject property.

The terms of this agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings: AASU will initially rent approximately 65,000 square feet, of which 15,000 square feet will be used for AASU’s Plant Operations and 50,000 square feet will be used by AASU’s College of Arts and Sciences. These departments and programs are currently located in modular units, which will be removed as they are vacated, and other buildings across campus.

As the existing retail tenants’ leases expire, AASU will lease these additional spaces.

All operating costs are included in the rent rate. Funding for the lease will be through AASU operating funds.

The Foundation intends to gift the entire property to AASU in 25 years or earlier.

This transaction is in accordance with the AASU’s master plan.

3. Subrental Agreement, 135 Edgewood Avenue, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a subrental agreement between University Lofts, LLC, Sublandlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Subtenant, for approximately 231 apartments containing approximately 397 bedrooms and approximately 362 parking spaces located at 135 Edgewood Avenue, Atlanta, Georgia, for the period January 1, 2004,

through June 30, 2004, at a monthly rent of \$266,000 (\$3,192,000 per 12 months) with the option to renew on a year-to-year basis for nine consecutive one-year periods for the use of Georgia State University (“GSU”) with rent increasing 1% per year for each option period exercised.

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

The terms of this subrental agreement are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings: Renting of this facility will permit the consolidation of housing available for GSU students into a single operating system and single accounting system, will enhance management, and will improve cost-efficiency of the overall operation.

This housing will primarily be used by married students, graduate students, and international students.

Operating expenses are estimated to cost \$1,405,000 per year.

At the September 2003 meeting, President Carl V. Patton provided, as an information item, an update on the GSU housing plan. This subrental agreement is the first action to implement the GSU housing plan. Planning is currently in progress by the Georgia State University Foundation, Inc. to develop the Piedmont Ellis property for GSU student housing. In spring 2004, a second action item for a rental agreement for as many as 2,000 student housing beds and associated parking to be constructed on the Piedmont Ellis property will be requested to further implement the GSU housing plan.

4. Easement to Bartow County, Georgia Institute of Genetics

Approved: The Board declared approximately 0.166 acre of real property on the Georgia Institute of Genetics (“Genetics”) property no longer advantageously useful to the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of granting a non-exclusive easement to Bartow County for installation of a water main and access road.

The Board authorized the execution of a non-exclusive easement with Bartow County for the above-referenced tract of land.

The terms of this non-exclusive easement are subject to review and legal approval by the Office of the Attorney General.

Understandings: Bartow County has requested a non-exclusive easement for the purpose of installing a water main and access road to a water tower to be built on adjacent property, which will

be used to serve future growth in this area of Bartow County.

Consideration for this easement is the ensurance of adequate water service for the development of the Genetics property, including Floyd College's Bartow Center.

This easement is consistent with the land use plan for the Genetics property and does not adversely impact future development of the parcel of land where it will reside.

5. Amendment to Phase II Housing Ground Lease, Demolition, Ground Lease, and Rental Agreement, Kennesaw State University

Approved: The Board authorized an amendment to the ground lease agreement approved by the Board at its June 11, 2003, meeting for Student Housing Phase II between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and Kennesaw State University Foundation, Inc. (the "Foundation"), Lessee, for the purpose of constructing 850 additional beds.

The Board declared approximately 3.0 acres of land located on the campus of Kennesaw State University ("KSU"), Kennesaw, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to KSU or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this real property to be leased to the Foundation for the purpose of constructing and owning a parking deck with approximately 2,000 spaces.

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and the Foundation, Lessee, for the above-referenced approximate 3.0 acres of real property on the campus of KSU, Kennesaw, Georgia, at an annual rent of \$197,600 for a period not to exceed 27 years (including a term of 25 years and up to 2 years for construction) for the purpose of constructing and owning a parking deck with approximately 2,000 spaces.

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between the Foundation, Lessor, and Board of Regents, Lessee, for approximately 41,600 square feet in the Chastain Pointe office complex for the period commencing on the first day after the first month the Foundation obtains a certificate of occupancy for improvements through the following June 30 at a monthly rent of \$16,466.66 (\$ 197,600 per year / \$ 4.75 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 25 consecutive one-year periods.

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

The Board declared the following buildings on the campus of KSU to be no longer advantageously useful to KSU of other units of the University System of Georgia and authorize the demolition and removal of these buildings:

<u>Building Number</u>	<u>Building Name</u>	<u>Gross Square Feet</u>	<u>Year Constructed</u>
0037	Welding Arts	952	1990
0055	Plant Operations	13,154	1978
0056	Warehouse	14,041	1974
0057	Grounds Maintenance	8,140	1974

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

The demolition of these buildings is subject to satisfactory completion of a Georgia Environmental Policy Act review and an environmental site assessment indicating no adverse environmental effects or conditions prior to issuance of an Executive Order.

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

Understandings: In June 2003, the Board authorized execution of a ground lease for the purpose of providing an additional 750 student housing beds for KSU.

The rental of property at Chastain Pointe will provide space for KSU Plant Operations. The existing site of KSU Plant Operations is a portion of the real property to be ground leased for construction of a parking deck to serve the residents of student housing.

Chastain Pointe contains approximately 200,211 square feet. KSU will be offered the opportunity to rent additional space, as space is vacated, at market rent. It is the intent of the Foundation to gift the entire Chastain Pointe parcel, consisting of approximately 13.0 acres, to KSU in 27 years or earlier.

6. Authorization of Project, Ground Lease, and Demolition Approval for Molecular Material Sciences and Engineering Building, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized a project for the “Molecular/Material Science and Engineering”(“MMSE”) building, Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), with a total project budget of approximately \$60.0 million.

Modification: This item was modified prior to the Committee meeting. Additions are noted in bold, while deletions are stricken.

The Board declared approximately 10.0 acres of real property on the campus of GIT, Atlanta, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this real property to be leased to Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc. (“GTF”) for the purpose of constructing and owning an academic research facility of approximately 250,000 gross square feet.

The Board authorized the execution of a ground lease between the Board of Regents, Lessor, and GTF, Lessee, for approximately 10.0 acres of real property on the campus of GIT for a period not to exceed 33 years (including a term of 30 years and up to 3 years for construction) for the purpose of constructing and owning an academic research facility of approximately 250,000 gross square feet.

The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Georgia Tech Facilities, Inc. (“GTFAC”), Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for an academic research facility of approximately 250,000 gross square feet for the period commencing within 15 days after GTFAC obtains a certificate of occupancy for the improvements and ending the following June 30 at a monthly rent of \$416,667 (\$5,000,000 per year / \$20 per square foot per year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for up to 30 consecutive one-year periods (the total not to exceed 30 years) at the same rent.

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

The terms of ~~this agreement~~ **these agreements** are subject to review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

The Board declared the King Building (Building No. 83), King Plant Operations Division (“POD”) Addition (Building No. 83A), and Steam Shop (Building No. 83B) at GIT to be no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorize the demolition and removal of these buildings.

The Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of the King Building, King POD Addition, and Steam Shop from the campus of GIT.

The demolition of these buildings is subject to satisfactory completion of a Georgia Environmental Policy Act review and an environmental site assessment indicating no adverse environmental effects or conditions prior to issuance of an Executive Order.

Understandings: In September 1997, the Board received information on the bioengineering/ bioscience program plan and the development of the Bioengineering/ Bioscience, Environmental Science and Technology, and Molecular/Material Sciences and Technology Complex (the “BEM Complex”). In October 2003, the Board received information on the MMSE building.

The MMSE building is the fourth phase of the BEM Complex devoted to interdisciplinary instruction and research in biotechnology and biosciences, environmental sciences and technology, and biomedical engineering. The MMSE building will add space for research and instruction in molecular and materials sciences and engineering and will complete the four-building complex as called for in the campus master plan.

The MMSE building will be designed to accommodate academic and laboratory research space, supporting faculty from the Colleges of Engineering and Science. In addition, a small amount of modern classroom **and** additional support functions will be housed in MMSE building to support the overall BEM Complex.

The source of funds for the rental agreement will be from GIT funds, including private donor gifts funding is private donor gifts and private bond financing. GIT anticipates between \$20.0 million and \$40.0 million in private donor gifts. For example, if \$20.0 million in private donor gifts is obtained, then the portion of rent to be paid from GIT institution funds will be \$2,825,000 per year with \$2,175,000 from investment earnings on the private donor gift amount. If \$40.0 million in private donor gifts is obtained, then the portion of rent to be paid from GIT institution funds will be \$925,000 per year with \$4,075,000 from investment earnings on the private donor gift amount. Rent includes a capital reserve.

~~If authorized by the Board, the University System Office staff and GIT will proceed with the selection of an architectural firm.~~

~~The Board will rent the MMSE building by separate agreement on a year-to-year basis from GTF for up to 30 years at an annual rent which will be based on the amount of private funds raised. The rent will provide sufficient funds to cover debt and capital reserve accumulation. Approval of the rental agreement will be requested of the Board at such time as the construction is complete.~~

7. Authorization of Project and Demolition Approval for Nanotechnology Research Center, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized project “Nanotechnology Research Center” (“NRC”), Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”), with a total project budget of approximately \$80.0 million.

The Board declared the Electronic Research Building (Building No. 79) and Neely Nuclear Research Center (Building No. 87) at GIT to be no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorize the demolition and removal of these buildings.

The Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of the Electronic Research Building and Neely Nuclear Research Center from the campus

of GIT.

The demolition of these buildings is subject to satisfactory completion of a Georgia Environmental Policy Act review and an environmental site assessment indicating no adverse environmental effects or conditions prior to issuance of an Executive Order.

Understandings: The NRC (formerly known as the Advanced Clean Room Building) was presented to the Board by President Clough in June 2002 and added to the University System of Georgia major capital project list. The Board indicated at the time an appreciation for the potential economic value of the project to the State of Georgia. The total project cost was estimated at \$80 million and was proposed to be funded from \$35 million in private funds and \$45 million in state funds. An anonymous donor has agreed to provide \$36 million to fund the private portion of the total project cost. The Governor recently announced the project and indicated his willingness to propose funding the state portion of the total cost. Both the Governor and the donor have indicated a strong desire to move the project to completion as fast as possible in view of the importance bringing it on line before other similar efforts being considered by peer institutions.

A significant portion of the private funding is available to facilitate an early start for project design, development, relocation, demolition, and other time-sensitive activities.

Anticipated funding for the project is \$36 million in gift funds to the Georgia Tech Foundation from an anonymous donor and \$45 million of state funds.

University System Office staff and GIT will proceed with the selection of appropriate professional consultants.

8. Executive Session, Property Acquisitions

At approximately 2:45 p.m. on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, Chair Martin W. NeSmith called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing future acquisitions of property. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Committee members who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Committee members were as follows: Chair NeSmith, Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Julie Hunt, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Glenn S. White. Also in attendance for the Executive Session were Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith; the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Activities and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel; the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels; the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Facilities (Real Property and Administration), Peter J. Hickey; the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs (Contracts), Robyn A. Crittenden; the Director of Administration and Compliance Policy, Mark Demyanek; President Bruce F. Grube of Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”); and University Attorney Lee Davis, also of GSOU. President Lisa A. Rossbacher of Southern Polytechnic State University was in attendance for part

of the Executive Session. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 3:55 p.m., Chair NeSmith reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. He then called for a motion that the Committee authorize an acquisition of property by eminent domain. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Committee approved this motion.

9. Information Item: Privatization Update

The Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, presented to the Committee an update on privatization projects within the University System of Georgia. She explained that pursuant to the Board's charge, she and the Chancellor had been championing the move to maximize the potential of private projects. Because of the urgency of moving forward the two previous agenda items, she had not made as much progress on finalizing the staffing requirements to further facilitate this effort. She said that she had been studying the concept and options for charging an administrative type fee for privatized projects that the Board authorizes. For example, a single sample project with a transaction value of \$10,000,000 would have an up-front fee of \$25,000, or .25% of the transaction cost, and an annual fee of \$10,000, making the total fee \$35,000. The annual fee for 25 years would be \$250,000 and the total up-front and annual fee would be \$275,000. Specifically needed is an amount to pay for help in the Attorney General's office, which is a critical piece of this effort. She concluded that it does not help to clean up the System's facilities pipeline just to bottleneck in the Office of the Attorney General.

10. Information Item: Housing Plan Update, Georgia College & State University

Interim President David G. Brown presented Georgia College & State University's ("GCSU") updated housing plan. An updated plan became necessary due to increasing enrollments and the university's evolving liberal arts mission. Dr. Brown reported that the average SAT scores have consistently risen for GCSU incoming students. A much greater percentage of students come from statewide, national, or international areas (75%) rather than the local area (25%), and a much greater percentage of students now desire to live on campus: 31% in 2003 compared with 21% in 1996. In addition, GCSU plans to implement a mandatory freshman residency requirement.

In January 2000, the Board approved a housing plan for GCSU that included 2,000 beds. Phase I of the housing project provided 1,777 beds. Phase II of the project will provide an additional 472 new beds and will involve the renovation of 180 beds in historic Bell Hall. All current on-campus housing is rented with a waiting list, and 99% of the available off-campus housing is filled. A byproduct of the housing plan will be the preservation of the historic Milledgeville area.

Dr. Brown informed the Board that GCSU will follow a development model similar to the strategy

employed for the phase I housing project in which all facilities will revert to the Board at the end of the lease term.

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

President Beheruz N. Sethna presented the update of the State University of West Georgia (“UWG”) master plan. Sasaki Associates prepared the update in conjunction with UWG’s master planning committee and Board of Regents staff. President Sethna noted the significant University System of Georgia enrollment growth projected by the systemwide capacity study and the great potential for enrollment growth at UWG based on student growth in the Atlanta metropolitan region. He explained the current physical context of UWG and discussed the current UWG capital program emphasizing a significant shortfall in campus center space.

President Sethna then discussed strategic imperatives for long-range campus development. He noted that of the current 394-acre campus, 138 acres are undevelopable due to environmental and regulatory restraints; 87% of the remaining acreage is either developed or committed. He expressed a desire to develop facilities to accommodate the expected and potential enrollment growth while retaining and enhancing the attractive character of the campus, enhancing pedestrian accessibility and safety, and preserving appropriate buffers adjacent to nearby neighborhoods. He showed the Committee the plan option for such development on the current campus holdings and explained the limitations of that approach.

President Sethna then showed the Committee the preferred development option, which contained an additional 200 acres of adjacent property owned by the City of Carrollton. An agreement has been reached that would allow for the transfer of this land to the Board of Regents in return for a \$5 million capital investment in infrastructure to enhance the property. This expenditure has been endorsed by the Regents in the form of a fiscal year 2004 minor capital project that is up for consideration by the Governor and General Assembly in the upcoming session.

This option has been determined to be superior for a variety of reasons, both functional and aesthetic. Specifically, it accommodates the campus program requirements while providing for surface commuter parking (with dual use for the adjacent proposed stadium), a recreation complex, a pedestrian connection and transitway to the main campus, and significantly improved vehicular access to campus from the north. This option also provides for enhanced pedestrian safety and preserves the desired buffers against adjacent low-intensity land uses.

12. Information Item: Rental of Life University Campus, Southern Polytechnic State University

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

President Lisa A. Rossbacher of Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”) presented a conceptual plan to the Board which would involve the SPSU foundation assuming the outstanding principle amount of bonded debt, estimated to be \$30,730,000 on the campus of Life University (“Life”) in Marietta, Georgia, for the purpose of using land and facilities for the benefit of SPSU.

This plan would help address several critical needs at SPSU, including quality space for instruction and development (fund raising), more architectural studio space, more continuing education space, more student support space, and additional land for outdoor recreation and expansion. The Life campus is comprised of 89 acres of land directly adjacent to SPSU and has approximately 433,000 square feet of building space and several indoor and outdoor athletic facilities. The 2002 appraised value of the existing land and structures of Life is estimated at \$52 million.

The plan would involve SPSU’s undertaking a phased-in approach to assuming the use of the Life facilities. Initially, SPSU would use approximately one-half of the Life facilities, with approximately one-half leased back by Life. Life’s lease payments would cover a percentage of the debt service remaining on the facilities. After five years, Life would have to decide whether to repurchase the facilities, which would trigger a mandatory \$1 million nonrefundable security deposit, or vacate the premises.

COMMITTEE ON ACADEMIC AFFAIRS

The Committee on Academic Affairs met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 1:35 p.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Wanda Yancey Rodwell and Regents W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Elridge W. McMillan, Allan Vigil, and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Board Chair Joe Frank Harris was also in attendance. Vice Chair Rodwell reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 14 items, 13 of which required action. Item 1 was withdrawn. Additionally, 142 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. **Revision to The Policy Manual, Section 403.02 Classification of Students for Tuition Purposes**

Withdrawn: This item was withdrawn.

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

Approved: The administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by the Chair of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension and approved by the Board. The full list of

approved appointments is on file with the Office of Faculty Affairs in the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

3. Establishment of the Associate of Science in Diagnostic Medical Sonography, Darton College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Peter J. Sireno that Darton College (“DC”) be authorized to establish the Associate of Science in Diagnostic Medical Sonography, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: DC sought approval to offer the Associate of Science in Diagnostic Medical Sonography based on a community needs assessment of the projected shortfall of healthcare professionals in Southwest Georgia. The southern region of the State of Georgia lacks a diagnostic medical sonography program.

Need: The latest U.S. Department of Labor Statistics reveal a need to increase the number of Diagnostic Medical Sonographers by 21% to 35% from the present to 2010. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that allied health jobs in Georgia are expected to increase by over 13,000 by 2006, a 45% increase.

Objectives: The main objective of the program is for students to perform noninvasive procedures using ultrasound equipment and to prepare ultrasound study reports to assist physicians in the diagnosis of patient conditions. Working in cooperation with a radiologist and clinical physician, sonographers use high-frequency sound waves to create cross-sectional images of a patient’s anatomy.

Curriculum: The curriculum will include courses in diagnostic medical imaging, medical terminology, sonographic orientation and technique, sonography instrumentation, and clinical experience.

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

Funding: The program will build upon and reconfigure existing courses that are currently offered by the institution in addition to establishing new courses. Title III funds will be used to offset extra expenses associated with the program. Equipment for the program is already available and has been donated from a regional hospital. President Sireno has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

4. Establishment of the Five-Year Bachelor of Science/Master of Science in Materials Science and Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish a five-year Bachelor of Science/Master of Science in Materials Science and Engineering, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: GIT proposed to offer a five-year Bachelor of Science/Master of Science in Materials Science and Engineering as a mechanism for providing academically strong students with opportunities to move more rapidly to master’s level competencies in this field. The key components of the program are twofold: 1) intense interaction among students and faculty to include mentoring and research experience and 2) careful advising and course planning to enable students to begin graduate course work in their fourth year of study. Separate degrees at the undergraduate and graduate levels already exist for the materials science and engineering discipline. Undergraduate students are eligible to apply for admission. Admission of undergraduate students into the graduate program is contingent upon the completion of 30 semester credit hours at GIT (i.e., end of freshman year) and prior to the completion of 75 semester credit hours, including advanced placement and transfer credit (i.e., middle of junior year). A grade point average of 3.2 is required. The applicant must submit an application, an essay, and two letters of recommendation from GIT faculty members. Students must maintain a 3.0 grade point average to continue in the program.

5. Establishment of the Major in International Affairs Under the Bachelor of Arts, 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 major in International Affairs under the Bachelor of Arts, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: UGA proposed to offer a major in International Affairs under the Bachelor of Arts in order to provide a workforce that is prepared to participate in a global economy. The process of globalization, driven by advances in information and communication technologies, has led to increases in foreign direct investment and capital flows, cross-border trade, and international migration. These developments, along with the importance of international organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the European Union, present opportunities for graduates.

Need: Faculty in the new Department of International Affairs, established by the Board in August 2002, have tracked the need for graduates in such a degree program and observed the interests of the university’s students. In addition, the department has close ties with the Center for International Trade and Security and the Center for the Study of Global Issues in the new School of Public and International Affairs, established by the Board in June 2001.

Objectives: The objectives of the program are 1) to contribute to the learning environment in the area of international affairs, 2) to facilitate student and faculty research on issues of globalization and world affairs, and 3) to prepare students to compete in the global economy.

Curriculum: The curriculum will include courses in international law, international political economy, comparative political institutions, post-industrial democracies, labor, class and politics, and globalization and distributive justice. The curriculum has been divided according to domain areas, including security, prosperity, community, international relations, and comparative politics.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 50, 60, and 75 during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will build upon and reconfigure existing courses that are currently offered by the institution in addition to establishing new courses. President Adams has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

6. Degree Designation Change of the Doctor of Public Administration to the Major in Public Administration Under the Doctor of Philosophy, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to change the title of the Doctor of Public Administration to the major in Public Administration under the Doctor of Philosophy, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: UGA proposed a degree designation change of the existing Doctor of Public Administration to the Doctor of Philosophy with a major in Public Administration. UGA will deactivate the Doctor of Public Administration and terminate the degree by or before June 2004. The degree designation change was proposed because for several years, students have completed requirements equivalent to those required by the major under the Doctor of Philosophy degree. Faculty of the School of Public and International Affairs, which administers this degree, support this title change because it conforms to standards in the field. The Doctor of Public Administration has historically focused on applied aspects of public administration, but the UGA program has evolved into a research-based degree appropriate to designation as a Doctor of Philosophy degree.

Conversion of the degree designation is deemed necessary in order for the doctoral program to remain competitive nationally. The change in degree name will assist graduates in the placement process at major research institutions. Because the major under the existing Doctor of Philosophy degree will

have the same curriculum and faculty as the Doctor of Public Administration, the major will be established without additional cost to UGA.

7. Establishment of the Major in German Under the Bachelor of Arts, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Beheruz N. Sethna that State University of West Georgia (“UWG”) be authorized to establish the major in German under the Bachelor of Arts, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: UWG proposed to offer a major in German in order to support the institution’s commitment to the humanities and liberal arts. Practical benefits include the study of German as it relates to economic relations among world nations and German investment in the United States. In addition, the program will reinforce the institutional and System commitment to internationalization of the curriculum.

Need: The Department of Foreign Languages and Literature supports the development of a German major. The number of students who have pursued a German minor has tripled since 1997. In addition to being a vital component of learning communities and study experiences offered by UWG, the German major aids other departments on campus. German majors would be encouraged and, in some cases, required to take appropriate courses in history, philosophy, English, music, and art.

Objectives: The objectives of the program are 1) to increase understanding of the German language, literature, and culture; 2) to support diversity, personal enrichment, cultural tradition, and philosophical competence; and 3) to fulfill the institutional commitment of internationalizing the curriculum through intellectual rigor.

Curriculum: The 120-semester-hour curriculum will include courses in German conversation and composition and history, as well as introductory course work in a third language and the completion of an internship or language program in a German-speaking country.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates enrollments of 10, 13, and 16 during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will build upon and reconfigure existing courses that are currently offered by the institution in addition to establishing new courses. President Sethna has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

8. Establishment of the Associate of Science in Nursing, Bainbridge College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Clifford M. Brock that Bainbridge College (“BC”) be authorized to establish the Associate of Science in Nursing, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: BC proposed the establishment of an Associate of Science in Nursing in order to meet the increased need for nursing graduates in its geographic area. The associate’s level nursing program offered by Darton College as an external degree on the campus of Bainbridge College is scheduled to cease admitting new cohorts of students in January 2004.

Need: The Georgia Department of Labor’s “Georgia Occupational Trends in Brief” forecasts that the field of registered nursing will experience an increase of 15,520 jobs from 1998 to 2008. The BC program will allow graduates to enter the workforce directly as registered nurses. Locally, Bainbridge Memorial Hospital and Manor administrators have approached BC about the possibility of developing a nursing program. Medical facilities in neighboring counties have expressed that needs exist to fill the shortage of nursing personnel.

Objectives: It is projected that graduates of the program will be able to 1) demonstrate knowledge of nursing practice necessary for performance as a registered nurse, 2) demonstrate the ability to function in the various roles of the associate degree nurse, 3) demonstrate critical thinking skills in the utilization of the nursing process to meet the needs of culturally diverse clients, and 4) demonstrate the ability to practice in a variety of healthcare settings.

Curriculum: The 74-semester-hour curriculum will require courses in pharmacology, psychiatric nursing, human anatomy and physiology, and general microbiology as part of the courses related to the program of study. The program will be developed, implemented, and evaluated according to the rules and regulations of the Georgia Board of Nursing. Regular site visits will be conducted by Georgia Board of Nursing representatives during development and initiative and periodically after the first nursing class is accepted into the program.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates an enrollment of 60 students during each of the first three years of the program.

Funding: The program will build upon and reconfigure existing courses that are currently offered by the institution in addition to establishing new courses. President Brock has provided reverification that funding for the program is available at the institution.

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

9. Establishment of the Thomas W. Ventulett III Distinguished Chair in Architectural Design, 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 Thomas W. Ventulett III Distinguished Chair in Architectural Design, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: GIT proposed the establishment of the Thomas W. Ventulett III Distinguished Chair in Architectural Design, which will be housed in the College of Architecture. The position is funded from an endowment account in the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. made possible by the generous commitment of \$1.5 million by the friends and family of Mr. Ventulett. The chair is expected to significantly raise the national and international design reputation of the Architecture program, aid in recruiting faculty and graduate students, and advance design thought and research.

10. Revised Institutional Statutes, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University (“GSU”) be authorized to revise its institutional statutes, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: The revision of the statutes reflects a thorough review and brings the statutes into line with present Board of Regents policies and procedures. The statutes also clarify faculty involvement in governance, committee responsibilities, and committee membership. The amendments include organizational meetings of the senate, staff advisory council membership, and senate representation with regard to faculty members.

The general faculty of GSU approved these changes. The changes have also have been reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and were found to be consistent with the current organization and administrative processes at GSU. The revised statutes will be on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

11. Reorganization of Institutional Units, Columbus State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Frank D. Brown that Columbus State University (“CSU”) be authorized to reorganize institutional units, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: CSU proposed a reorganization of institutional units that serves to restructure vital functions on the campus while simultaneously streamlining the administrative organization. The reorganization will combine specific functions and services where appropriate in an effort to eliminate duplication and unnecessary cost.

CSU proposed specific changes with regard to the Office of Enrollment Marketing, the Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance, the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, the Office of the Vice President for Student and Community Affairs, and other offices.

Office of Enrollment Marketing

Under the revised structure, the Office of Enrollment Marketing will report to the vice president for academic affairs in order to tie student services more closely to the academic area. The goal of this change is better coordination with academic units and improved retention. The Office of the Vice President for Business and Finance will move the comptroller position as a direct reporting line under the vice president because of the position's financial responsibility. Other changes include Printing Services reporting to the Office of Public Relations and Central Receiving reporting to Business Services.

Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs

Under the Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs, two associate vice presidents will divide assigned duties presently contained in Institutional Research, Academic Policies, Graduate Studies, Faculty Issues, Academic Accreditations, and University Judicial Affairs. Other resultant changes include Institutional Grants and Sponsored Programs decentralized to academic units and the creation of a new Academic Outreach Center reporting to the vice president for academic affairs. The goal of such changes includes enhanced coordination and efficiency.

Office of the Vice President for Student and Community Affairs

The Office of the Vice President for Student and Community Affairs has responsibility for all student affairs and community programs as well as continuing education activities. Changes include a name change to the Office of the Vice President for Student Affairs and to include a direct reporting line for continuing education. The changes will enable the refocusing of the vice president's office on student welfare and service. Additionally, improved coordination of credit and noncredit outreach within a single division is a supplementary goal.

12. Reorganization of Institutional Units, Coastal Georgia Community College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Dorothy L. Lord that Coastal Georgia Community College ("CGCC") be authorized to reorganize institutional units, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: CGCC proposed the reorganization of its administrative structure. The specific change is to move the direct reporting line for the director of human resources from the Office of the Vice President for Business Affairs to the Office of the President. This change reflects the impact of the designation of the director of human resources as the ethics officer. The person holding this position also serves as the affirmative action officer. The revised structure will provide for the correct channel for ethics complaints and have a greater impact on the level of cultural diversity reflected in various

searches.

13. Nominees for Membership on the Peabody Board, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) name the following nominees to the membership of the Peabody Board for the term 2003 to 2006, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: The Peabody Board receives, screens, and selects individuals or entities deserving recognition for their radio and/or television programs. The Peabody Board is composed of the Chancellor of the University System and 12 other outstanding American citizens who have demonstrated in a notable degree their interest in public affairs and who also (by position and achievement) are prepared to evaluate, in an impartial and detached manner, the contributions of radio stations and chains in connection with the awards.

Ms. Yuen-ying Chan: Ms. Chan is Director and Professor of the Journalism and Media Studies Center, University of Hong Kong. An award-winning journalist and Hong Kong native, Ms. Chan established the University of Hong Kong’s Journalism and Media Studies Center in 1999. Ms. Chan serves as a media advisor at the East-West Center for Cultural Exchange in Hawaii. Ms. Chan’s honors include a Neiman Fellowship at Harvard University, a George Polk Award for journalistic excellence, and an International Press Freedom Award by the Committee to Protect Journalists.

Ms. Barbara Cochran: Ms. Cochran has been President of the Radio and Television News Directors Association since April 1997. She has previously served as Vice President of News and Washington Bureau Chief for CBS News, Executive Producer of NBC’s *Meet the Press*, Vice President of News for National Public Radio, and Managing Editor of *The Washington Star*. Ms. Cochran serves on the boards of the International Women’s Media Foundation and the National Press Foundation.

Ms. Rebecca K. Leet: Ms. Leet is President of Rebecca Leet Associates, which provides strategic counsel, executive-level facilitation, and communication direction to corporate and not-for-profit leaders. She is the author of *Marketing for Mission* and *From Fundraiser to Change Agent: The Story of Transforming the United Way of Metropolitan Atlanta*. Prior to starting her firm in 1985, she was a congressional reporter for *The Washington Star*, Director of News/Information for ABC News/Washington, Press Secretary to U.S. Senator Lowell Weiker, and Vice President for Communications for The Wilderness Society.

Mr. Ronald Simon: Mr. Simon has been Curator of Television at The Museum of Television since the early 1980s. Among the numerous exhibitions he has curated are *The Television of Dennis Potter*; *Witness to History*; *Jack Benny, The Television and Radio Work*; and *Worlds Without End: The Art and History of the Soap Opera*. Simon is an associate adjunct professor at Columbia University and Hunter College, where he teaches courses in the history of the media.

14. Termination of Specific Majors Under the Master of Education, North Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Nathaniel Hansford that North Georgia College & State University (“NGCSU”) be authorized to terminate specific majors offered under the Master of Education, effective November 19, 2003.

Abstract: NGCSU sought approval to terminate select majors under the Master of Education degree as a result of its comprehensive program review process. The institution reviewed the programs internally over two years ago to determine whether they should be revitalized. As a result of low enrollments, a review of institutional resources, and student selection of other majors, the programs are ready for termination. Termination of the following majors will not have an adverse impact on faculty or students: Teaching Field– Biology, Teaching Field– Chemistry, Teaching Field– Physics, Teaching Field– Behavioral Science, Teaching Field– History, and Teaching Field– Political Science. No students are currently in these programs, and none have been admitted to these majors since 2001.

15. 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 Obtain Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set outcome measures and survey policies and practices related to cardiovascular health for Georgia’s health plans	6/29/03 – 6/14/04	\$110,000
Georgia Department of Industry, Trade and Tourism Conduct economic impact study on Georgia’s film and video industry	6/23/03 – 8/24/04	\$4,500
Georgia Soil and Water Commission Explore rationale and designs for innovative water policies to enhance water management in the Flint River basin and Georgia	8/12/03 – 6/30/04	\$632,662
Georgia Department of Human Resources Recruit 16 senior companion volunteers to provide social and recreational activities for consumers at Georgia Regional Hospital in Atlanta volunteer station	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$45,036

Georgia Department of Education Provide vocational-related staff development activities to members of Georgia Vocational Staff Development Consortium and other organizations who satisfy participation requirements	6/1/03 – 5/31/04	\$70,000
Georgia Department of Education Conduct discussion groups with school administrators, teachers, and parents as an aspect of determining the effectiveness of the Learn and Serve schools in Georgia	5/30/03 – 6/30/04	\$30,000
Georgia Department of Education Recruit, train, and retain Department of Family and Child Services employees	8/16/03 – 8/15/04	\$317,796
Skidaway Institute of Oceanography Study temporal framework and sediment characterization of long cores from the New Jersey Shelf in support of the Geoclutter Initiative	3/1/03 – 12/31/03	\$5,000

University of Georgia

Atlanta Regional Commission Draft survey instruments and verify completed forms to measure extent to which local governments work with citizen groups; measure level of partnerships and cooperative arrangements of businesses with local schools; and prepare a general population telephone survey based on social capital index survey	9/3/03 – 1/30/04	\$30,056
Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Evaluate use of the plant growth regulator Mepiquat Chloride on various cotton varieties in skip-row production	1/1/03 – 12/31/03	\$7,000

Georgia Commodity Commission for Pecans Conduct an in-depth evaluation of water use on pecans to include economic aspects	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$7,000
Georgia Department of Community Health Provide research and data analysis to assist with addressing Georgia's critical healthcare workforce shortages	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$135,537
Georgia Department of Corrections Manage the Rogers State Prison Dairy Farm on a day-to-day basis to include all aspects of dairy production	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$314,304
Georgia Department of Corrections Manage the Rogers State Prison Dairy Farm on a day-to-day basis to include all aspects of swine maintenance	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$73,660

Georgia Department of Education Coordinate the 2003 School Nutrition Director's Conference and facilitate the design, printing, and mailing of conference brochures to school nutrition directors and superintendents	7/16/03 – 1/31/04	\$16,740
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide social work education and child welfare training for current department child welfare workers and students who are preparing for employment with the department to begin, continue, or complete their study for the Bachelor or Master of Social Work programs	8/16/03 – 8/15/04	\$211,955
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide training programs for Family Independence Case Managers and Medicaid Eligibility Specialists	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$1,580,261
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide 18 days of training for certain classifications of newly hired or recently promoted veteran employees, management training, and certification programs for Office of Child Support Enforcement	7/1/03 – 9/30/03	\$32,302
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide implementation of the Georgia Childhood Care and Education Professional Development system	10/1/03 – 9/30/04	\$219,306

Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Assist with supervision and programming for delinquent youth committed to the state who are participating in department-operated community programs, assist in providing prevention services to youth in the community determined to be at risk for delinquency, and assist in providing diversion programs to the juvenile court to prevent further penetration into the system	8/1/03 – 5/31/04	\$47,260
Georgia Department of Natural Resources Study effects of surface water withdrawals and water supply reservoirs on stream fish assemblages in the Georgia piedmont during nondrought	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$43,869
Georgia Childcare Council Expand the Teaching Basic Health and Safety in Early Childhood Curriculum and Training Initiative	10/1/03 – 9/30/04	\$93,183
Gwinnett/Rockdale/Newton Community Service Board Conduct Peach State Wrap Around Initiative, which services children and adolescents with serious emotional disturbances and their families	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$122,162

Office of School Readiness Coordinate and provide services for four-year-old children and their families service by Georgia's Pre-Kindergarten Program	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$64,952
Georgia Commodity Commission for Cotton Discover efficacious and economical weed management systems that can be implemented immediately by growers and to quantify the length of time various soil-applied herbicides with residual activity will suppress/eliminate spiderworm emergence	1/1/03 – 12/31/03	\$8,500
Georgia Commodity Commission for Corn Assess effectiveness of multiple fungicides on at least two different varieties of corn on the control of southern corn leaf blight and rust diseases of corn in Georgia	7/1/02 – 3/31/04	\$5,500
Georgia Department of Audits Conduct training for the Department of Audits and Accounts in workshops, courses, institutes, and conferences and perform other organizational development activities, as requested	8/1/00 – 6/30/04	\$100,000

Georgia Department of Education Produce projections for next five years of numbers of students that will make progress and become proficient in No Child Left Behind established requirements for achievement objectives for three levels of scores	8/1/03 – 9/30/03	\$18,000
Georgia Department of Human Resources Provide salary and benefits for an Education and Program Specialist responsible for coordinating DeKalb initiative for children and families	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$46,305
Georgia Department of Human Resources Develop partnership among Division of Family and Children Services, Family Connection, and communities	7/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$249,480
Georgia Department of Juvenile Justice Provide for a Gainesville regional youth detention center clinical supervisor	5/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$15,500
Georgia Forestry Commission Maintain the Bioenergy Marketing Directory as a viable source of information for Georgia and post it online at the Georgia Forestry Commission and the University of Georgia Engineering Outreach Web sites	11/1/02 – 10/31/03	\$13,500
Georgia Bureau of Investigation Provide Bureau with fiscal year 2004 promotional testing services for rank of Assistant Special Agent in Charge	7/1/03 – 11/1/03	\$21,450

Georgia Southern University

Southeast Health Unit of Ware County Provide services for HIV evaluation, such as meeting with partners, consulting, writing reports, and serving as project evaluator	1/1/03 – 6/30/04	\$2,500
Southeast Health Unit of Ware County Provide services for Perinatal Health partners by holding meetings to discuss impact and outcome evaluation design, consulting, and providing final written report	2/1/03 – 8/03/03	\$9,000
Professional Standards Commission Secure summer services of Georgia Southern University employee as program coordinator for the No Child Left Behind Program	7/1/03 – 8/31/03	\$5,332

Floyd College

Bartow County Government Provide computer classes in Microsoft Word Levels I and II in Continuing Education Office	9/17-24/03	\$2,000
---	------------	---------

TOTAL AMOUNT – NOVEMBER	\$ 4,711,608
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2004 TO DATE	\$ 121,897,558
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2003 TO NOVEMBER	\$ 12,137,958
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2003	\$ 25,349,678

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, November 18, 2003, at approximately 2:00 p.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor’s Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr., Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan, and Regents W. Mansfield Jennings, Jr., James R. Jolly, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, and Allan Vigil. Chair Wooten reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had seven applications for review; five were denied, one was continued, and one was granted. 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

- a. In the matter of file number 1640, at the University of Georgia, concerning the denial of waiver of the required GPA for graduation, the application for review was denied.

- b. In the matter of Sanford D. Morrison, Sr., at Floyd College, concerning removing suspension from file and resulting loss of pay, the application for review was continued.
- c. In the matter of Sharon N. Tucker, at Albany State University, concerning denial of promotion, the application for review was denied.
- d. In the matter of Keith D. Childers, at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning position elimination, the application for review was denied.
- e. In the matter of Jodi U. Chapman, at Georgia College & State University, concerning termination, the application for review was granted.
- f. In the matter file number 1645, at Gordon College, concerning denial of entry into the L.P.N. to R.N. Accelerated Program, the application for review was denied.
- g. In the matter of file number 1646, at the University of Georgia, concerning denial of readmission to the University of Georgia, the application for review was denied.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

After the Committee meeting reports, Chancellor Meredith gave his report to the Board, which was as follows:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Let me begin my remarks with one piece of great news that I felt should lead off my report today. That is the continuing rise in both the number and the quality of students coming into the University System. In terms of numbers, our fall 2003 enrollment is at a record high of 247,020 students. That's 14,000 above fall 2002. Since fall 2000, the System has grown by 42,000 students, which is the equivalent of about two and a half Georgia Institutes of Technology ("GIT"). And we continue to attract the "best and brightest" to our 34 campuses. The fall 2003 average SAT for first-time, full-time freshmen stands at 1036 – a record high and a record gain for one year: up six points over fall 2002. The college preparatory curriculum is paying off as more and more students are coming to us prepared. We are on our way to "creating a more educated Georgia" both in terms of access and quality.

This is our final Board meeting of this calendaryear. As we wrap this year up, it's important that we continue to look into the future to identify and prepare for the challenges ahead. We must simultaneously deal with the present and assume responsibility for the future. Let me just put this challenge into focus. Going back to our 1963 System enrollment of 38,584 students, it took 40 years to add 200,000 students to that base. In just the next 12 years, we

face the same challenge -- serving the needs of a projected 200,000 new students. This should give you some perspective as we hear momentarily about the System's need for more facilities.

As you are aware, we established a committee composed of University System Office officials who have spent the past 12 months reviewing our current landscape as well as what we may expect by 2015. As part of that process, the committee has looked at the impact of many internal and external factors on areas including, but not limited to, enrollment, business practices, System and institutional missions, and our service to the state. This committee's work is an integral part of our efforts to think strategically and to advance the System strategically. And this strategic approach has identified a number of very broad issues with which this Board will be dealing in the coming months. For example, it has been eight years since we undertook a look at institutional missions. In those eight years, we have grown and much has changed. This committee has looked at the big questions that we must tackle. For example, what are the future needs of the state in terms of the business community, economic growth, public health, the development of needed infrastructure, and a growing Hispanic population? These are critical strategic questions, and our conclusions will shape how active and effective the University System will be answering them.

As you can see, we have a great deal of critical work ahead. A tremendous amount has already been done or is underway. In just a few minutes, the Chair will convene the Strategic Planning Committee. I know you will be pleased with the reports from the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes; the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels; and the Director of Planning, Alan S. Travis. They represent the high-quality staff of the University System Office. They will be bringing for your consideration and action, reports and recommendations on two of these key strategic issues I've outlined. Specifically, Mr. Bowes will bring forward a report on our regionalization study and Ms. Daniels and Mr. Travis will bring to you a presentation on a study of the System's future capacity needs. Both reports contain a great deal of data and material. You are getting the highlights.

Last Thursday, the Improvement of the HOPE Scholarship Joint Study Commission wrapped up several months of work. As you know, President Michael F. Vollmer of Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College and I served on the commission. The Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, provided valuable support as a member of the commission's work group. Her assistance was singled out for praise by commission co-chairs Senator Bill Hamrick and Representative Louise McBee. Cathie, thank you for your good work. Stand and let us thank you. The Carl Vinson Institute of Government at the University of Georgia ("UGA") also made significant contributions to the commission's work. For our students, the Commission's recommendations mean no books, no fees, and a recalculation of the B average. This is simply a recommendation to the legislature.

Early this month, our Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP[®]”) office released the results of a new study that puts a dollar value on the education our students are receiving. It revealed that recent graduates of the University System of Georgia were earning an average of \$14,000 per year more than high school graduates. That’s just the average. For graduates of institutions such as the Medical College of Georgia, GIT, Georgia State University, and Southern Polytechnic State University, that figure jumps to \$17,000-\$19,000. So, tuition for four years totals \$12,800 at a research university, and you will make from \$14,000 to \$19,000 more per year for the rest of your working career. This sounds like a no-brainer. Our graduates can expect to earn nearly \$1 million more than high school graduates during their working lives. In contrast, the cost to the State of Georgia of high school dropouts is \$17.6 billion per year. This study is yet another indication of the University System’s tremendous value in generating economic growth. It should serve as a strong reminder to our funding partners that cuts to higher education can – and do – adversely impact the state’s economy. The University System of Georgia is the engine that powers Georgia’s economic growth. We need more fuel. Our growth will help all the citizens of Georgia.

A recent report on the nationwide nursing shortage compiled by the National Conference of State Legislators cited Georgia as one of several states with innovative programs aimed at growing the number of nurses. The report noted that ICAPP[®]’s Health Professionals Initiative is on track in its goal of 500 new healthcare workers by 2004.

In the field of technology, GIT recently has been at the center of several exciting announcements. As was noted yesterday, Governor Sonny Perdue announced the planned creation of one of the country’s most sophisticated facilities for advanced research in nanotechnology, the technology that allows scientists to manipulate individual atoms and molecules. The state-of-the-art clean room at GIT’s new Center for Nanoscience and Nanotechnology will allow it to compete with similar facilities planned or under construction at MIT, Cornell, Purdue, Stanford, and UC Berkeley. You approved this project a year and a half ago as an economic development project; a \$45 million private gift has made this possible. Action in this emerging area now will mean historic success in the future.

Also, earlier this month, GIT made national and statewide headlines. First, President Bush awarded the National Medal of Technology to a team of scientists that includes Dr. Russell Dupuis, a professor in GIT’s School of Electrical and Computer Engineering and a Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar.

Moving on, I have another national ranking to report: UGA and GIT ranked number four and seven, respectively, on Kiplinger’s list of the “100 Best Values in Public Colleges” this fall.

Here’s another piece of good news: University System employees contributed \$1.3 million

to the 2003 State Charitable Contributions Program. With the economy down, it is heartwarming to know that System employees still care enough about the welfare of others to make significant contributions to charity through this program. Thanks goes to the Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings, and all of the campus coordinators for their hard work in organizing each year's campaign.

The public relations office at Georgia Perimeter College ("GPC"), headed by Interim Director Jennifer Stephens, won a national award from the Printing Industries of America and six awards – more than any other college – from the southeastern district of the National Council on Marketing and Public Relations. GPC also just won a national award from the Printing Association of America. Let me ask the GPC public relations group to stand and receive our appreciation for their good work.

By now, I hope you've noticed the artwork that graces the Board Room and other areas of the University System Office. This artwork is part of an ongoing program by the Fine and Applied Arts Committee to share the talent of the System's art faculty and students. And a bit later today, this concept will be expanded from that of just sight to sound. This project serves to remind us of the high level of creativity within our System and the role we play in providing talented people with the resources to grow, to produce, and to shine. Let me ask the committee to stand as we express our appreciation.

In football, the University System is 50 and 36. Six of our eight teams have winning records. Valdosta State University will be hosting the first round of its playoffs this weekend, and we think Georgia Southern University will be in the playoffs again this year. UGA is on a path that could possibly lead to the Southeastern Conference championship game. GIT will either go to the Tangerine Bowl or the Humanitarian Bowl. In cross-country, Albany State University is doing well. Both men and women have placed second in their conference. Kennesaw State University's ("KSU") men placed first in their conference, and women placed second. State University of West Georgia's men placed second in their conference. Everyone has done extraordinarily well in volleyball, but GIT is 28 and 1. GIT is first place in the Atlantic Coast Conference and sixth in the nation. In soccer, KSU is first place in its conference and regional champions as well.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my report.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

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

Chair Leebern explained that at this meeting, the Regents would hear two presentations on subjects of great interest to them. The first would be on the statewide capacity study regarding space and facilities. The second would be about the consolidation and regionalization of administrative services in the University System of Georgia. The Regents had already received executive summaries of these two studies. Chair Leebern then called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, to begin these presentations.

Dr. Papp stated that the University System of Georgia is the best university system in the nation. To ensure that it becomes an even better university system in the future, it must continually review its present operations and assess its future needs. With these objectives of improvement and preparedness in mind, the University System Office during the past year commissioned two studies by external consultants, one to assess the System's overall facilities capacity and the other to explore the possibilities of consolidation or regionalization of administrative services. At this meeting, the Vice Chancellor for Facilities, Linda M. Daniels, and the Director of Planning, Alan S. Travis, would present the findings of the capacity study, which was undertaken by Sasaki Associates, Inc. ("Sasaki"). After this presentation, the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, would present the findings of the consolidation and regionalization study, which was undertaken by MGT of America, Inc. ("MGT"). Dr. Papp then turned the floor over to Ms. Daniels.

Ms. Daniels reported that the University System of Georgia is fast approaching its physical capacity to serve students. Thanks to the Principles for Capital Planning Allocation and their emphasis on academic space adopted by this Board in 1995, the System currently has the classrooms needed to accommodate its dramatic growth. But even with more and more rigorous scheduling and completion of construction projects currently underway, the System will soon exceed its classroom capacity. More importantly, crucial student support space is already at a deficit on many campuses. On the previous day, the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities heard from President Beheruz N. Sethna of the State University of West Georgia ("UWG") about that institution's needs in this area. At this meeting, Ms. Daniels would present to the full Board the statewide picture of the System's facilities needs. She noted that thanks to the Board's strategic commitment to analytically based, data-driven campus master plans, the staff and consultants had a solid structure and format for this analysis.

Ms. Daniels reiterated that the University System of Georgia is fast approaching its physical capacity to serve students, although physical capacity is not the only factor or even the most important factor in this System's capacity to serve students. Facilities comprise only one of many factors that impact capacity. If you were to put all those factors into a pie chart, what proportion would be facilities? You could look at the facilities share of the annual budget or any other number of ways to divide that pie, but if the pie is this System's capacity for creating a more educated Georgia, facilities are not so much a slice of the pie itself, but rather, facilities are rather the pie pan in which it sits.

Ms. Daniels noted that the last time she addressed the Board, it was to present a robust capital request budget. She explained that this report would shed some light on her passion in this regard. She then turned the program over to our Mr. Travis to provide an overview of the capacity study.

Mr. Travis greeted the Regents and thanked them for the opportunity to give this brief presentation on the System capacity study that was undertaken earlier this year by Sasaki Associates, Inc. in conjunction with the Board of Regents staff. Sasaki is a world-renowned higher education planning consultant that developed the System's original master planning template and has been a planning consultant to many of its institutions. The staff felt it important to combine their in-house knowledge with an expert's outside perspective to more fully understand the issues and implications of System capacity. The study had two points of orientation. The first was "top-down" – that is, to examine population growth and demographics in the State of Georgia out to 2020 and assess the impact of that population growth. The second was a "bottom-up" analysis to take the base facility data in the template master plans of the 34 System institutions, to project institutional space requirements out to 2020, and to assess the current and future capacity of the System and its institutions to absorb the expected enrollment growth.

Mr. Travis stated that this presentation would focus on the most critical findings and elements of the Systemwide capacity study. He said that the System is staring down the barrel of significant population growth, he reported. The U.S. Census estimates a growth of over 2 million people between 2000 and 2020, and many demographers feel that these estimates are overly conservative. Most of this growth will occur in Atlanta; the largest urban region will have a bigger share of Georgia's population in 2020 than it does today. In general terms, the vast majority of population growth will occur in the cities and along the coast. The University System of Georgia had a headcount enrollment of about 233,000 in fall of 2002, and the preliminary estimate for our fall 2003 enrollment total is about 247,000. The System has seen profound enrollment growth in the past three years, gaining about 40,000 students during that period, a sustained rate of increase of over 6%. In order to more fully understand the System's enrollment history, Sasaki identified a number of policy actions that affected enrollment in the last decade. Most significant among these were the creation of the HOPE Scholarship, the transition to the semester academic calendar, and the implementation of more stringent admissions requirements.

For this study, Sasaki defined an age 18 to 34 cohort of analysis, expanding its focus beyond the traditional student cohort from age 18 to 24. This was done in response to evidence showing that students in their late 20s and early 30s are taking an increasing number of classes at peak hours, which, in turn, affects the capacity of facilities. Well over half the state's 18 to 34 2020 population growth will come from the Atlanta region. The balance of the increase will be split evenly between the rural region and the sum of the other six urban regions. Both the rate and magnitude of growth in the other regions will be far less than in Atlanta. To get a handle on future growth, Sasaki compared nine headcount enrollment projections out to 2020. These ranged from a low of 288,000 to a high of 486,000. The mean of these projections is 345,000 students. This total, which is

considered relatively conservative, was used as the normative baseline for the capacity study. However, a number of factors led the staff and consultants to look toward the upper end of the forecast growth range for analysis and assessment. They defined the upper limit at 486,000 using the most aggressive Sasaki enrollment model.

The reported space inventory across the System in fall 2002 was roughly 65 million gross square feet, said Mr. Travis. When factoring in short-term enrollment growth and new facilities in the construction pipeline, the System is pushing the envelope of its physical capacity without further construction of new space. To accommodate the conservative enrollment projection of 345,000, the System would need to increase its total space inventory to roughly 84 million square feet by 2020. This is an increase of nearly 20 million square feet, one-third more than the current total. However, if growth were to occur as projected by the accelerated model, those 486,000 students would demand a total of 113 million square feet. This would represent an increase of nearly 50 million square feet, an increase of about 75% over today's inventory. The approximate cost of this new space in today's dollars would range from \$4 billion to \$10 billion.

Mr. Travis added that on top of the space needs he had just discussed, the System will also have to deal with the millions of existing square feet that will need to be replaced before 2020 due to obsolescence and deterioration. In addition, many campuses will have difficulty increasing their capacity due to a lack of available land. Also, the Regents and staff will need to evaluate and consider how distance learning via the Web and other technology-based service delivery will affect our future space needs. To sum up these findings, there is no doubt that the question of how and where to increase capacity for the state's growing population is one of the critical policy questions for the Board of Regents and the State of Georgia.

To review the top-down portion in a bit more detail, Mr. Travis discussed the population data and some spatial information relating to the System's institutions. To begin with, the consultants mapped the institutions by sector, creating a graphic image. The expected population growth of the state was an early point of consideration in the study. The U.S. Census Bureau projects nearly 9.6 million people in Georgia by 2010 and nearly 10.4 million by 2020. A major issue to consider in a higher education capacity analysis is the variable of participation rates. Georgia's participation rate among the 18- to 34-year-old cohort of analysis is an extremely low at 16.08%, a statistic that ranks us forty-ninth among all states and the District of Columbia. This is the lowest among states with a conventional diversified economic base. It is also nearly 4% below the national average. Sasaki also devised a set of regions to organize demographic trends for a different method of institutional analysis. There are seven urban regions organized around the state's metropolitan statistical areas that contain 28 institutions. The other six campuses are located in the rural areas that comprise the balance of the Georgia's landmass. The land areas encompassed by the rural region and the urban regions are roughly equivalent in size.

The overall population and 18- to 34-year-old cohort population were analyzed by region, explained

Mr. Travis. In 2000, there were 2.1 million Georgians in this group. About 1.75 million of them lived within the urban regions in 2000, while 330,000 lived in rural areas. The total 18- to 34-year-old population in the state in 2020 will be 2.7 million, an increase of about 600,000 persons. As with total population, the growth to 2020 was also projected by region. While there will be growth in all regions, the clear leader will be Atlanta with a projected 28.4% increase, representing nearly 400,000 persons. Elsewhere, the rural region posts the highest growth rate, as well as a 70,000-person increase that is roughly equivalent to the total contributed by the other six urban regions. Mr. Travis used bar graphs to illustrate that the comparative significance of Atlanta regional population growth is unmistakable. This growth will have tremendous future policy implications for the state and the University System of Georgia.

To examine future enrollment, Sasaki compared nine different models that project linear growth out to 2020 in a range from 298,000 to 486,000. The mean of the nine projections was a conservative total of 345,000 students. Although Sasaki chose the conservative model to base much of the capacity study upon, the consultants are also casting an eye toward the accelerated projection due to the continuing high enrollment growth rate experienced this fall and due to the tremendous opportunities that exist to increase student participation rates. The conservative and accelerated models establish a probable range of potential enrollment growth in the System to 2020. Mr. Travis showed the Regents a graph that displayed by institutional sector the growth in headcount enrollment projected by the conservative model. As the normative model used in the capacity study, it assumed that each institution would continue to capture a constant share of enrollment. The intent of this model was to focus on the growth of the System as a whole, by region and by sector, while avoiding the introduction of variables that significantly affect enrollment at individual institutions. Arraying the conservative growth model regionally – again assuming pro-rata institutional capture - about 60% of System enrollment in 2020 would be accommodated within the Atlanta region. This would be a subtotal of over 200,000 students.

Mr. Travis again stressed that these projections do not take into account active policy measures that might influence enrollment growth at individual institutions. Already, some institutions have created and expanded specialty missions such as military training, liberal arts, and others that have altered the demographics of their enrollments. The Board and staff must also be cognizant of the differences between traditional and nontraditional students and their different ability to travel and relocate for education. These issues and many others will be considered and debated as the Regents make active efforts to meet the mission of creating a more educated Georgia.

Next, Mr. Travis discussed the System's existing capacity and looked at projected space needs out to 2020. Sasaki compared the System's facilities by institution and space type against national normative guidelines that are the backbone of analysis in the System's campus master planning template. Sasaki found that the majority of the System's institutions have space totals that fall short of guideline recommendations in one or more critical core academic space types. Furthermore, many campuses have chronic shortages in student support spaces that have not been traditionally financed

directly by state funds. The bottom line is that System facilities are essentially reaching their current carrying capacity. Although the System can handle a small amount of incremental growth in the near term, it will not be able to adequately serve its future student enrollment without a significant expansion of its facilities inventory. For broad analytical purposes, it was necessary to determine the total gross square footage that would be needed in 2020 based on enrollment growth projections.

Building on the System's current inventory of about 65 million gross square feet and using space-planning guidelines provided by the Council of Educational Facilities Planners International, the total space need based on the conservative enrollment model is about 84 million square feet. Using the more aggressive enrollment model, the total space need rises to 113 million square feet. The estimated cost to construct these new facilities ranges between \$4 billion and \$10 billion. These estimates are only for new space, said Mr. Travis, and do not include other expenditures that will be needed for campus infrastructure and renovation of existing buildings. Also, the estimates are in 2003 dollars and are not adjusted for inflation.

Mr. Travis next discussed the current space inventory and 2020 needs by institutional sector, again based on the conservative enrollment model. Although enrollment growth rates are constant among sectors, their guideline need for new space is not – institutions have differing needs depending on the characteristics of existing space inventory as well as academic programs and missions. Research universities will need the most space in terms of area, but the other four sectors will need to achieve higher rates of space expansion to meet their guideline needs. When the same data are graphically arrayed by region, it is clear that the lion's share of additional space will need to be allocated to institutions in the Atlanta region, although there are profound space needs within nearly every region. With considerable population growth and sustainability issues in metropolitan Atlanta, what remains to be seen is how much of Atlanta's space need will actually be developed at institutions within the region and how much new space and capacity will be distributed to other campuses across the state.

At the very least, Georgia is likely to grow by 2.2 million residents to a total of 10.4 million by 2020, said Mr. Travis in summarizing the report. The Atlanta region will lead the state's growth. The System's current enrollment of 237,000 will grow to between 345,000 and 486,000 students by 2020, an increase of between 108,000 and 249,000 students. This range is broad because enrollment can be influenced by myriad variables and strategic issues. At present, the System is pushing the envelope of its existing physical capacity. Its current space inventory will need to grow to a total between 84 million and 113 million gross square feet by 2020, a range of roughly 20 million to 50 million square feet of new buildings. It will cost between \$4 billion and \$10 billion in today's dollars to develop this additional new space. From now on, decisions about how and where to accommodate enrollment growth in the University System of Georgia will be a critical policy issue for the Board of Regents.

Mr. Travis then turned his attention to next steps. In the University System Office, the staff will need to further develop and refine the study data and, most importantly, to integrate the information

with their other System resources. They are working toward the distribution of the study data out to campuses so it can be further refined and put to good use. The staff intend to use the capacity data and methodology for a more quantitative comparative evaluation of capital project requests. Finally, the senior administration and the Regents themselves are likely to examine policies on institutional and program growth as well as regional and sectoral allocation of enrollment and resources. The staff expect the institutions to begin using the capacity data as a structural element of ongoing strategic planning efforts. Also, the staff are strongly encouraging the institutions to evaluate the accuracy of their space inventories and make necessary corrections. Most importantly, the campuses will need to work toward a greater understanding of the role of capacity analysis in master planning and begin to use capacity analysis in the development of their annual capital project requests.

In conclusion, Mr. Travis reiterated that the University System of Georgia will need a \$4 billion to \$10 billion capital budget between now and 2020. The Board of Regents must decide whether Atlanta's large and growing student population will be served at home or whether it will be distributed around the state. Moreover, the System must begin right now, with a long stride, at a quick pace. Mr. Travis thanked the Regents for the opportunity to make this presentation and said that he and Ms. Daniels would be happy to answer any questions they might have.

Regent Coles stated that Georgia has experienced tremendous population growth over the past 20 years, but it has slowed down in the past few years. At the same time, because of the economic recession, increasing numbers of people have gone back to college in recent years to get retrained for better-paying jobs. There have also been students who stayed after their undergraduate years to pursue advanced degrees because of the poor job market. He asked whether these trends may be skewing some of the data in the Systemwide capacity study and whether the staff are comfortable with these projections in light of the enormous changes that have occurred in the State of Georgia in recent years.

Mr. Travis responded that this study certainly gives a nod to the population growth of the recent past. However, the primary focus of the study is projecting the future. The purpose was not to provide extremely quantitative or definitive enrollment projections. Rather, it considered a broad range of projections of potential growth. In essence, this study is aimed at trying to get a head start on accommodating future growth.

Ms. Daniels added that when she presented the capital budget request at the September 2003 meeting of the Board of Regents, she had used a 2% enrollment growth estimate, which is a very conservative baseline number.

Regent McMillan asked whether the enrollment growth projections take into account the private and technical colleges in the state.

Mr. Travis replied that for the purposes of this study, those considerations were taken but were not built into the methodology to any great degree. In particular, private institutions and out-of-state students were considered but not introduced because of the difficulty of quantifying such information.

Regent McMillan also asked whether there would be an appreciable increase in 18- to 24-year-olds entering postsecondary education. He noted that there are other variables that play into this over which the University System of Georgia has no control. For instance, there are projections that there will not be an appreciable number of that cohort unless K-12 education improves. So, he wondered whether and how this might play into these enrollment projections.

Mr. Travis responded that student participation rates are the variable that could blow all of these projections completely out of proportion. This is an extremely difficult variable to anticipate, but the study did try to take this into account.

Regent Carter noted the significant disparity between the study's projected facilities costs and the state's customary capital budget allocations. He asked whether the consultants or staff had given any thought to how to bridge this funding gap.

Ms. Daniels replied that the Regents on the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities are very interested in exploring private funding options, but the analysis shows that the System needs for the legislature to also increase state funding for core academic facilities. The System must leverage its private funding, but it may also need to reintroduce the old payback project concept for the myriad of projects that are not going to be able to be constructed completely from private or state funds.

Chancellor Meredith noted that the Board of Regents has requested \$337 million for its capital projects package in the fiscal year 2005 budget request, which was approved in September 2003. He also noted that there are no other university systems undertaking this kind of self-study. So, yet again, the University System of Georgia is blazing the trail for others.

Chair Leebern thanked Ms. Daniels and Mr. Travis for this presentation and then called upon the Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, to begin the second presentation to the Committee.

Mr. Bowes explained that the regionalization and consolidation study is part of the seventh goal of the strategic plan: "Seeking the most efficient, effective, and technologically sound business and service best practices and regularly comparing ourselves to national peers." In October 2003, Mr. Bowes had presented awards for the System's best practices and learned about a number of the best practices at System institutions. This study is about looking at the System and best practices that might be considered on a Systemwide basis. The purpose of the study is to enhance the performance level in the financial and administrative processes and reduce the overall cost of operations. One of

the other issues is the concern about having the personnel available on campuses with the expertise to perform a number of the administrative functions. The key issue is that the Board wants to be able to allow the institutions to redirect the funds they are spending in the administrative areas to instructional, core mission purposes. MGT of America was the consultant for this study, and they specifically examined back-office functions, such as payroll, financial, and student aid processes, rather than the student services functions. MGT was asked to identify a number of collaborative opportunities for the System. So, MGT performed a high-level review of University System of Georgia operations in which the consultants identified the strengths and weaknesses of various implantations of different options.

Mr. Bowes explained that the purposes of the study were fourfold: 1) to enhance System performance levels in financial and administrative processes, 2) to reduce the overall System cost of operations for administrative processes, 3) to address the lack of available personnel with expertise to perform administrative functions, and 4) to allow System institutions to redirect administrative savings to instruction. MGT gathered institutional and benchmark data, surveyed System institutions to gather additional information regarding administrative spending, performed on-site interviews on a number of campuses, and examined best practices in other state systems of higher education and public-sector agencies across the country.

Every institution in the University System of Georgia was part of this study, explained Mr. Bowes. However, in terms of the administrative and financial data, MGA focused on the four-year and two-year institutions because of the information already gathered from the fiscal year 2000 Systemwide benchmarking study. MGT found that within the System, institutional support expenditures per full-time equivalent (“FTE”) student vary considerably among institutions in the same sector. Additionally, institutional staff support per 100 FTE student enrollments vary considerably within the same sector. From fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 2001, institutional support as a proportion of total educational and general expenditures at System four-year and two-year institutions exceeds that of peer institutions. From fiscal year 1992 through fiscal year 2001, institutional support per FTE student enrollment at System four-year and two-year institutions exceeds that of peer institutions. Mr. Bowes asked why System institutions appear to have higher costs. He said that size is a major factor. System institutions are generally smaller as a group than comparable institutions in other states. Another explanation is organizational structure, which is also related to size. For example, smaller institutions may group more functional areas under administration (e.g., academic computing). The value of institutional cooperation is that it reduces administrative costs, promotes sharing of overhead expenses and leveraging combined purchases, enhances quality and breadth of services, and ensures sufficient level of expertise. It also ensures continuity during times of turnover, a sustained effort during peaks and valleys, and a more rapid diffusion of best practices across institutions.

MGT provided a number of examples of best practices across the nation, stated Mr. Bowes. MGT also made 12 site visits at a variety of types of institutions to talk with senior administrative staff

and staff who perform specific functions. A number of areas were identified in which regionalized or Systemwide coordination could be beneficial. After gathering information, MGT made a number of recommendations. First, MGT recommended consolidating “back-office” components of payroll processing and suggested looking at regionalization or consolidation of these processes, and this would affect the institutions that are part of the Systemwide implementation of PeopleSoft as part of the Georgia *FIRST* project. As part of this project, database management is centralized under the Office of Information and Instructional Technology. “Front-office” functions include hirings, terminations, promotions, benefit changes, record maintenance, timesheet preparation, and other functions that require interaction with the employees. “Back-office” payroll processes, on the other hand, include production of employee paychecks or direct deposits, transmitting cash to the payroll account, tax payments to the Internal Revenue Service, and so forth. MGT provided many options for payroll processing, including the current decentralized system, outsourcing, regionalization, and consolidation. The current system has separate payroll operations at each of the 32 sites participating in the Georgia *FIRST* project. However, the management of the 32 databases is centralized at Office of Information and Instructional Technology (“OIIT”) in Athens. The benefits of this system are that it provides a stable business process environment, stable software and database management, and a high degree of institutional flexibility. However, there are also some issues. The current system has a relatively high cost of operation because there are still 32 separate payroll operations while at the same time OIIT is providing helpdesk and production support. Mr. Bowes said that this seems to be a higher cost system, but the numbers are still being determined. Another concern is that there is a risk of losing experienced professionals. Even though the system requires redundancy of expertise, there are some institutions with only one person responsible for payroll. On one occasion, an institution called upon the University System Office to help with its payroll process because there was no one who could. There is not a cadre of payroll professionals to help run the payroll. Instead, staff have to be pulled off other projects to help out in this type of situation, and of course, there is a cost associated with this. There is also an extensive upgrade process for new versions of the PeopleSoft software, especially because there are 32 sites to do so. The problem is that the System is only able to roll out the new baseline product, which creates an inability to implement new functionality quickly.

Mr. Bowes next discussed the benefits of outsourcing payroll processes. This would involve contracting with a third party that has the expertise and would do the payroll for the System. One of the benefits is that a specialized company would have ready functionality and broad-based expertise. This is a particularly good option for small, fairly standardized businesses with limited funds to invest in software implementation and ongoing support. The problem is that for complex, large organizations, this can be expensive with both direct and indirect (overhead) costs. More importantly, the System would lose the investment it has already made in the implementation of PeopleSoft, including personnel, resources, expertise, and knowledge. Finally, outsourcing would require full implementation to a new system, including a review of business processes.

Mr. Bowes next discussed the benefits and drawbacks of regionalization. One benefit is that setting up a number of regional locations in the state would put the locations in close proximity to institutions. It would also aid in the rollout of new functionality by reducing the number of sites involved. Plus, it would help to aggregate staff expertise. Unfortunately, there would be limited or no cost savings because regionalization would not eliminate the helpdesk and production support. It could even result in much higher cost if the database management is regionalized. Moreover, the System would lose the benefit of having a single application model. With regionalization, there will be more business process issues among institutions in the region, such as the pay calendar, consolidation of payroll accounts, etc. There would also be less flexibility and security for institutions in the payroll process.

Then, Mr. Bowes discussed the possibility of consolidating payroll processes. Consolidation would provide the fastest rollout of new functionality. It would have a greatly simplified support structure. There would be a modest cost reduction at local institutions and a more significant cost reduction at central support level (e.g., hardware, training costs, etc.). Consolidation would also provide the aggregation of high-level expertise. There are some potential drawbacks, such as more significant business process issues (e.g., pay calendar, consolidation of payroll account, etc.) and less flexibility for institutions in the payroll process. However, the University of Georgia can serve as a consolidation model because it has approximately 17,000 employees and students on payroll located at more than 100 different sites across the State of Georgia and run by only 13 FTE employees.

Mr. Bowes said that the System must develop a purchasing collaboration strategy to identify opportunities to obtain better prices and terms through collaborative Systemwide purchasing contracts, to improve the purchasing processes on major contracts through standardization of procedures, and to promote use of outsourcing opportunities, where applicable, to reduce reliance on in-house staff to provide back-office services. The way to accomplish this is to form a committee of purchasing officers, including high-purchase volume institutions, hire a chief purchasing officer at the System level, work with the DOAS and other entities to clarify procurement relationships, and develop a standardized purchasing process for the System consistent with state requirements.

Mr. Bowes said that he envisions a purchasing council that would include all of the purchasing officers at the institutions. There would be an executive committee that would include the institutions with high purchase volumes as well as some of the smaller institutions, possibly involving DOAS or the Georgia Technology Authority. The executive committee would work directly with the System's chief purchasing director, who would liaison with the state purchasing entities as well as University System administrators on specific purchasing activities, including possibly outsourcing, collaborative contracts, and development of processes and procedures.

MGT also examined the System's utilities and suggested initially that the System may be able to purchase collaboratively, but because of state regulations, the System cannot. MGT also suggested establishing a revolving fund that would help institutions upgrade their facilities so they can qualify

for lower rates. Some institutions have already done this, and they have achieved significant cost savings. MGT also recommended creating a mentoring program for finance and business staff. Finally, MGT identified a number of areas of unmet need, such as facilities planning and management, environment safety, security, and internal audit. MGT recommended establishing regional centers or identifying host institutions in these areas. Mr. Bowes said that these are very good recommendations, but they have cost implications in their application.

In closing, Mr. Bowes presented to the Board a series of recommendations. The first recommendation was that the Board accept the MGT report. He noted that accepting the report is not the same as endorsing all of its recommendations. The second recommendation was that the Board direct the staff to evaluate the feasibility and benefits of all MGT study recommendations and bring forward findings as necessary for future Board of Regents action. The third recommendation was that the Board direct the staff to undertake a final analysis of different payroll processing options and present a recommendation for action within the next three months. The fourth recommendation was that the Board direct the staff to proceed with the purchasing strategy, including the hiring of a purchasing director for the University System of Georgia. The fifth and final recommendation was that the Board direct the staff to proceed with creating a mentoring program for finance and business staff. After presenting these recommendations to the Board, Mr. Bowes asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent McMillan urged the staff to consider a process where some institutions test MGT's recommendations before they are implemented at all institutions.

Mr. Bowes said that this is an excellent point, but the concern is that there are a lot of options in each functional area. The consolidation model is the only one that eliminates helpdesk and production support. In some respects, many institutions are already doing a sort of regionalization. For example, Georgia Perimeter College runs payroll for the Gwinnett University Center and the University System Office runs the payroll for the Georgia Public Library System. So, there are examples of how this works, but there is some doubt as to whether much cost savings can be achieved on a pilot basis.

Regent Jennings remarked that he was not convinced that any of these options would achieve a cost savings. He said that if there are no cost savings and no increased efficiencies, then the System is doing nothing but building a bigger bureaucracy.

Mr. Bowes replied that he was not proposing at this point any of these options. Rather, he was proposing that the staff be authorized to review them with the institutions.

Regent Jennings responded that reviewing the options with the institutions was one thing, but hiring people is something else.

Mr. Bowes responded that the only person he was suggesting hiring would be the System purchasing director and that person would be acting as an extension of the institutions to go after the kinds of contracts the System is already doing. This is the person who would pursue, for example, a contract with Microsoft on behalf of the System as a whole.

Regent Jennings noted that this was not one of the recommendations from the MGT study.

Mr. Bowes said that he was taking the recommendations further. There are a number of places where the System can do better and have collaborative contracts, and one way to implement that is to hire a Systemwide purchasing director to work on behalf of the institutions at the System level to leverage the System's purchasing power and effect cost savings. This recommendation is just to have someone on the staff of the University System Office who will look at Systemwide opportunities that will result in lower costs for each institution and the System as a whole. The payroll issue is separate from the purchasing issue. The study presents a number of different options, and the staff want to examine these options further to determine what is the most cost-effective approach to running payroll.

Regent Pittard stated that he agreed with Regent Jennings and would like to see some numbers. This is the classic problem of centralized versus decentralized management. He remarked that the idea of 32 different payroll systems for a payroll group of 35,000 boggled his mind and was unacceptable. Many of the Regents have run businesses bigger than that with just one payroll system. He asked that the staff come back with hard numbers and be bolder. He asked them to consider what alternatives the System is offering that it simply cannot afford any longer. The payroll is the rat's nest, and everyone knows it, he said. It is a huge opportunity for savings, but the staff must be bold in presenting the reasonable alternatives. He urged that the staff move forward on this and not dawdle.

Regent Leebern urged the staff to consider whether the centralization of purchasing would hurt local business and whether it would really add value or save money. He noted that it may be possible for institutions to benefit from coordinated purchasing without hiring a purchasing director. He expressed that he was reluctant to hire someone to review work that is already being done.

Mr. Bowes responded that the staff have discussed the option of having a particular institution take the lead on purchasing or have a person on the executive committee take the lead. This could be good if opportunities are identified and delegated. The problem is trying to sustain that effort over time because it does not fall back on an individual in the University System Office to coordinate the final purchases. The responsibility for this should fall on a person who is going to do the legwork for the executive committee. The job would be not as much about oversight as it would be about coordination and identification of opportunities.

Chair Leebern said that there were two motions to consider. The first motion was that the Board

accept the Systemwide facilities capacity study developed by Sasaki Associates, Inc. Motion made and seconded, the Board unanimously approved the acceptance of the study.

The second motion regarding the MGT of America report included the following: acceptance of the MGT report; that the Board direct the staff to evaluate the feasibility and benefits of all MGT study recommendations and bring forward findings as necessary for future Board of Regents action; that the Board direct the staff to undertake a final analysis of different payroll processing options and present a recommendation for action within the next three months; that the Board direct the staff to proceed with the purchasing strategy, including the hiring of a purchasing director for the University System of Georgia; and that the Board direct the staff to proceed with creating a mentoring program for finance and business staff. Regent White made the motion, which was variously seconded.

Regent Coles asked whether the Board could approve the creation of a purchasing director position without knowing how it would be budgeted.

Chair Leebern remarked that the Regents were expecting to achieve some cost savings as a result of this effort.

Chancellor Meredith noted that the institutions made this recommendation to the University System Office staff. He said that the position could be funded on an incentive basis such that the person would be paid out of the savings generated.

Seeing that there were no further questions or comments, Chair Leebern called for a vote on the second motion, which was unanimously approved. He then adjourned the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole.

PRESENTATION ON THE FINE AND APPLIED ARTS

Chair Harris said that this presentation would give the Regents a taste of the fine arts in the University System of Georgia. He introduced Dr. Lee G. Barrow, Professor of Music and Fine Arts Department Head at North Georgia College & State University (“NGCSU”). Dr. Barrow is also the current chair of the Academic Advisory Committee for the Fine and Applied Arts.

On behalf of the 10% of the faculty with the primary responsibility for educating and developing 50% of all of the students’ brains, Dr. Barrow thanked the Board and the Chancellor for the opportunity to share some of the exciting things the arts faculty do at all of the System institutions. For the past six months, the Academic and Advisory Committee for the Fine and Applied Arts had been working on a project to share the talent of some of the students and faculty across the state with the Board of Regents and the University System Office. The artwork that had been hanging in the University System Office hallways and the Board Room for the last four months represents 14 institutions across the System. This exhibit was coordinated by a subcommittee that was chaired by

Dr. Peggy Blood, Chair of the Department of Fine Arts at Savannah State University. Dr. Barrow introduced Dr. Blood to the Regents.

Dr. Blood greeted the Regents and thanked them for this opportunity to present the System's fine arts to them. She then introduced the subcommittee members: Dr. Carl M. Cates, Associate Professor and Department Head for Communication Arts at Valdosta State University ("VSU"); Scott Alboum, Assistant Professor of Communication Arts at VSU; Bobby Dickey Associate Professor of Art at Fort Valley State University; Anne F. Bessac, Associate Professor of Art at Gainesville College; Tayloe Harding, Professor of Music and Head of the Department of Music at VSU; and Dr. David Lee Johnson, Director of Choirs and Voice instructor at VSU. Dr. Blood also asked the faculty and student artists who participated in the art exhibit to stand and be recognized by the Board. She thanked the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Planning, Joseph J. Szutz, and the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, for supporting the work of the committee and helping to make this exhibit and performance possible. She then introduced a brief performance by the VSU Chamber Singers under the direction of Dr. Johnson. After this performance, she showed the Regents a video featuring President Ronald M. Zaccari of VSU, who is also an artist, sharing his thoughts on the importance of art in his life and in higher education. Then, the Chamber Singers performed another song. After this performance, Dr. Blood noted that the Chamber Singers have been invited to Italy for a concert tour in December. She said that the committee would like to present such performances to the Board on a more regular basis. She then thanked the Regents again and stepped down.

Dr. Barrow noted that there are approximately 50 fine arts functions per year at NGCSU and that similar artistic activities are going on at all 34 System institutions. He thanked the Board and stepped down.

Chair Harris thanked Drs. Barrow and Blood and President Zaccari on behalf of the Board for this entertaining presentation. He noted that there would be a reception following the Board meeting honoring the fine arts in the University System of Georgia.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Harris announced that there would be no December 2003 meeting of the Board of Regents. He then asked for a motion to authorize Chancellor Meredith to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Board between this meeting and the January 2004 Board meeting with such actions to be ratified by the Board at the January meeting. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved this authorization. He then called upon the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, to present an honorary degree recommendation.

Ms. Weber announced that President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) had nominated astronaut John Young for an honorary degree to be awarded at GIT’s December 2003 commencement. On behalf of President Clough, Ms. Weber submitted this nomination for the Board’s approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved both honorary degrees.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber reiterated that there would be no December 2003 meeting of the Board. The next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, January 13 and Wednesday, January 14, 2003, in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m. on November 19, 2003.

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

s/ _____
Joe Frank Harris
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia