

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
Savannah State University
in Savannah, Georgia
April 20 and 21, 1999**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, April 20 and Wednesday, April 21, 1999 in the Student Center Ballroom on the campus of Savannah State University. The Chair of the Board, Regent Edgar L. Jenkins, called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 20. Present on Tuesday, in addition to Chair Jenkins, were Vice Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, S. William Clark, Jr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent George M. D. (John) Hunt III 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 March 9 and 10, 1999 were unanimously approved as distributed.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Next, Chair Jenkins called on President Carlton E. Brown of Savannah State University (“SSU”) to make a presentation to the Board, which was as follows:

Chairman Jenkins, members of the Board of Regents, Chancellor Portch, Board of Regents staff: the faculty, staff, students, alumni of Savannah State University, and I are deeply honored by your presence on our campus. And, on behalf of the campus community, I am very pleased to have this opportunity to address you and to share with you some of our recent events and accomplishments. We have planned for you what we hope will be a very enjoyable stay. If there is anything that we can do to make your visit more enjoyable or efficient, you have only to ask.

Let me begin with reference to the charge that you and the Chancellor provided to me as I assumed the presidency of this historic institution. In 1997, you asked me to come to Savannah to stabilize this institution’s leadership, to improve its outcomes, repair its reputation, create greater efficiencies, and to bring it in line with University System of Georgia (“USG”) policies and priorities. You also asked that I seek to restore internal and external confidence in the institution and seek to resolve the internecine conflicts that appeared perpetually to plague Savannah State.

When my partner, Dr. Joseph Silver, and I arrived at Savannah State University on July 1, 1997, we found an institution that had experienced four years of enrollment decline, an institution not on track with the implementation of several System priorities and initiatives. We also found students longing for leadership and eager to cover new ground and be challenged. We found many very strong and dedicated members of the faculty who sought support for effective teaching and quality service and scholarship and staff members with good skills prepared to work above and beyond the call of duty to improve the institution. We also found a very strong and dedicated corps of alumni prepared to be of assistance and a city waiting to support good efforts.

We planned change around a set of themes to integrate our actions and develop a unified address to change. One theme was that of an open, caring, and involving administration that addressed the needs of the institution and its students through focused, open communication and honest dialogue and responsiveness. A second theme was to connect wherever possible the growth and development of the institution to the economic and social development of Savannah, Chatham County, and all of Southeast Georgia. The final, and really overarching theme, was one of rapid, systematic change in a spirit of rebirth. The time had long passed for Savannah State to experience a renaissance.

It is our belief that we have accomplished much of what we set out to do. However, the inspiration that we have received from this institution, its alumni, its students, and the spirit of its history has caused us to set our sights much further than even the very ambitious goals we set prior to our beginning. So, while we have accomplished much, the greater distance is yet before us.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

We have brought the institution up to date on several USG initiatives. With the support and hard work of many members of our staff and with very strong support from several key operations of the USG, we are pleased to announce that as of a few weeks ago, we had not only completed the work that had not been done but are on par with the rest of the University System at BANNER 3.1. In January of this year, I proudly proclaimed the completion of the best registration cycle ever at Savannah State University. While many were involved in this accomplishment and we established a team approach to our work, one person who was already heavily tasked in their regular work invested even more deeply to achieve this task. This person is our very hard working Director of Financial Services, Mrs. Janice Allen, who served as our BANNER Team Leader. To complete our movement to improved more efficient services, we created the position of Dean of Enrollment Management to provide oversight for much of this work.

We have advanced our interests and System initiatives in international education. Several critical contacts with African governments and institutions of higher education have yielded study abroad opportunities for faculty. An additional study tour, led by the Vice President for Academic Affairs, will take place this summer in Ghana. This opportunity also includes student participants. We have also established new initiatives in China and other parts of the Pacific Rim and have formed new student recruitment relationships in the Caribbean.

Technology at Savannah State University has been greatly enhanced through System special initiatives. Two new servers have been brought to campus to serve administrative and academic computing. Through careful planning, up-to-date equipment has been placed on each faculty member's desk along with networking capacity. Several new student access laboratories have also been established with specialized and general functions. Key laboratories have also been made accessible to students during evening and other nontraditional hours. In fact, with some creative reorganization and the willing involvement of staff, we have extended the available hours of all services for students at no increase in costs.

The Savannah State University community is deeply appreciative of the emergency allocations made in 1996 for residence hall renovations. The effective use of those funds has enabled us to survive while we prepared for long-term solutions to our student housing needs. Your further response to act outside of the box and place a residence hall payback project on the capital projects list served as a significant ray of hope for this community. On behalf of our students, I want to thank you for this beginning. The planning and design funds appropriated by the legislature this year to begin the development of the payback project for the construction of residence halls are a critical element in

our long-range address to this issue. It is our intention to plan and design this facility very rapidly, and we hope to complete this process and begin construction on that project in the year 2000. Your strong support has also been invaluable in our pursuit of additional housing solutions. Your permission to pursue the development of a facility through a public-private partnership will enable us to build our first new residence hall over the next year. These efforts are a boon to the growth potential of Savannah State University. Housing has become the only major concern that parents of prospective students have about enrollment here. They are highly

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

complimentary of our academic programs, the quality and concern of the faculty, the caring spirit of staff, and the exceptional character of our students.

Last fall, we achieved a substantive change in our accreditation with the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools for approval to continue to offer advanced degrees. We received approval without recommendations, which is a substantial accomplishment. We are now moving at all due speed in pursuit of professional accreditations for our graduate programs in public administration and in social work. Both programs are very much in line for the achievement of a speedy review and approval. The faculty and leadership of those programs have been critical to our progress thus far. We have reinvented a graduate program infrastructure through the establishment of the Office of Graduate Programs and Research headed by Dr. George Williams. We are also in hot pursuit of professional accreditation for our College of Business with the hiring and efforts of a new dean.

The campus community is grateful for your approval last year of the first bachelor's degree program in African and African-American studies. Implementing this program has greatly strengthened our capacity to become a major force in the preservation, interpretation, and furtherance of culture here in the rich historical and cultural milieu of Southeast Georgia. Of course, you know we have a new graduate degree program awaiting your review and approval during this meeting. This program is a key aspect of our constellation of graduate programs and even aids to strengthen both the M.P.A. and the M.S.W.

Let me share with you now a short videotape that gives you my picture of Savannah State University. (Videotape was shown.)

When we arrived, we discovered that the institution did not have adequate promotional or recruitment materials. We changed the position of public relations to communications and community relations. We hired the best candidate for this position we could find, who happened to be an alumna of the program in mass communications. I asked her to develop an institutional video over the next

two years and to seek to find new ways to tell the Savannah State story. Within months, the video was produced. You have all seen the first ever issue of the Savannah State University Magazine and you are all aware of the enormous amount of very strong positive press that we have received. In all cases the person responsible is Ms. Loretta Heyward.

It has always been my view that high-quality academic programs, particularly professionally oriented programs, must not only place intense intellectual and knowledge development demands on students. They must also provide curriculum connected learning experiences in realistic practical settings in which students learn to apply knowledge and skill. Additionally, and in consort with Board of Regents' initiatives to be of service to the economic and social development of the community, the institution ought to seek to make a measurable difference to the community in its development and use of practical settings. I shared these ideas with faculty and staff from the start, and the first fruits of this approach came in what has come to be known as the Midtown Center Project. You saw some short excerpts in the tape from the early days of that effort.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

The young professor who engaged with his students and the midtown community to make this project possible is Dr. Scott Sells. With him are Ms. Keisha Carter, a former Midtown resident and project director, and one of the wonderful social work students with whom the project was initiated, Ms. Brenda Spencer.

We intend to play a larger and more comprehensive role in social and economic development in our region. We soon expect to help create new small minority businesses through a business development center and small business incubator. Stay tuned for future announcements. We have spent a good deal of our time over the past one and a half years positioning the institution to better impact economic development in Savannah, Chatham County, and Southeast Georgia. We have partnered with several of the larger local businesses on mutually beneficial ventures. The most recent of these is our partnership with St. Joseph Chandler's Hospital on a workshop on the Y2K problem as a small business management issue. We have systematically developed relationships between the new dean of the College of Business and key figures in the local business community. I have been elected to the board of directors of the Chamber of Commerce and to the board of directors of the Savannah Economic Development Authority. Members of these boards will be with us this evening.

The future of Savannah State University and much of the future of Georgia depends on the effectiveness of our educational institutions. Thus, we are not only now more aggressive participants in the regional P-16 Council but have established our own sub-council for focusing our efforts directly on our own

agendas. We continue to be a major and active supporter for PREP (Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program), while we continue to strengthen our several programs for preparing young people for college: Talent Search, Upward Bound, National Youth Sports Program, and others. The outcomes from these programs are second to none. I have met many of the graduates of years past. They are prime-time news anchors on major networks, physicians, chiropractors, teachers, and business people.

Additionally, each college has begun the development of specific curricular and programmatic relationships with schools. The most recent of these is our partnership with Savannah High School in a Business Development Academy.

With the exception of Fort Valley as a land grant institution, Savannah State University has annually secured a larger share of federal and private research dollars than any other institution of its approximate size and classification. With the establishment of greater support strength for grantsmanship, we expect these trends to strengthen.

Under the very able leadership of Dr. Silver, Vice President of Academic Affairs, Savannah State University reinstated the Regents' Distinguished Professor position in the 1997-1998 academic year. The faculty member chosen brought great benefit to faculty and students through their provision of lectures, seminars, and a real focus on the teaching learning process. We also sought to gain approval for the appointment of a Calloway Professorship. Again, Dr. Silver's dogged leadership won the day. You have already met our 1997-1998

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

Regents' Distinguished Professor, Dr. Charles Elmore. This year's Regents' Distinguished Professor is Dr. Sajwan who continues to impact faculty and students through his learning leadership. We recently received approval for the appointment of our Calloway Professor, Dr. Jerome Wright. Both individuals are noted for the very high quality of their teaching at all levels, as attested by peers and students. They also are among our very best and most productive scholars, researchers, and grantsmen. They are present and supportive of students in many endeavors. In short, they exemplify the entire faculty role at its finest. Dr. Silver likes to refer to them as our "faculty bookends."

Students have been the greatest joy of my two years here. Savannah State University is blessed with very serious, dedicated students of unusually strong character. While a number of our students must work and attend school full-time, they continue to be deeply interested in service to the community. Without making it a requirement, nearly all groups, clubs, organizations, and teams maintain some variety of service commitments. In fact, last year, we formed the Student Athletic Advisory Committee to address issues of the welfare of student

athletes. The very first item on their agenda was the need for athletes to engage in community service. We have students of very high character and social consciousness.

It has always been my view that external support for college and university needs is stronger when it follows strong internal support. Under Dr. Brock's leadership, we began the Tiger Program, a program of faculty and staff scholarship support for our students. This was a first ever program which raised over \$45,000 in its first year and currently supports 14 high-achieving students. We hold an annual on-campus parade to celebrate the prior year's accomplishment and to launch the next year of the program. This year, one of our strongest and most positive students was inspired enough by faculty and staff giving to this fund that she immediately caucused with her sorority members and returned to announce their contribution to the Tiger Program. In fact, this young lady has very boldly been a voice of positive support and urging strong involvement of students in the uplift of the university. She is a senior this year, holds office in several curricular and co-curricular organizations, serves as a peer counselor, and is a mass communications major with expectations of completing a Ph.D. in psychology. She writes poetry, organizes poetry reading cabarets, and so much more, and I want you to meet her — Ms. Melissa Teemer.

Eric Hanor is another senior of note. He has pursued a major in engineering technology and holds currently a 3.59 GPA. He is also a strong athlete, playing as a member of our basketball team for four years. Upon graduation, Mr. Hanor will be employed by Lockheed Martin as a software engineer.

Ms. Lynette Goodman is a junior Naval ROTC student. This year, she is the NROTC Commander. She carries a GPA of 3.04 and this year alone received a number of awards, including the Gold Medal of the Military Order of World Wars, the National Sojourners Award for Americanism, the National Naval Officers Association Award, the Captain Donnie Cochran Leadership Excellence Award, and in her required summer cruise was ranked number one among midshipmen on the U.S.S. Tarawa and the United States Naval Institute Award. As if these awards are not enough, she is also a member of the Savannah

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

State University Track Team, holds the university record in the triple jump, and is a two-year qualifier and attendee at the NCAA Division II National Meet. Our historic strength in sciences and in naval leadership as delineated in the videotape continues unabated.

And finally, our top scholar. This young lady is scheduled to graduate this spring and will pursue graduate school and a medical degree. Ms. Crystal Bright will

graduate with a 3.998 GPA and is our House of Representatives Scholar. I have been asking her all year who gave her the B. She finally told me and described what to her was the most important course experience in her development. This professor challenged her, pushed her beyond her own expectation, worked with her, and supported her. That professor was last year's Regents' Distinguished Professor, Dr. Charles Elmore.

The alumni have not sat idly by while these efforts were underway. Regular contributions from the alumni increased fivefold during our first year. We also received during that first year the single largest gift ever from an alumnus, \$100,000 in General Electric stock from Mr. Henry Nash. The alumni also completed a fund drive that purchased new uniforms for the SSU Marching Tiger Band. They have launched the Committee of 1000 for the millennium. This is an attempt to solicit \$1000 from 1000 alumni for the first million dollar endowed scholarship fund for Savannah State University students.

Ladies and Gentlemen, Savannah State University is a great community with wonderful students. They have supported, advised, and been involved in our work since we arrived. Together, we have engineered the first enrollment upturn since 1994. And, if recruitment activity is any predictor, a recent recruitment event on campus, which normally draws 250 to 300 students, attracted a much larger attendance. We stopped counting after 800.

By 2005, SSU will only operate academic programs classifiable as very good or excellent by national standards and measures. We intend to reach and exceed all enrollment targets by 2001. By 2005, SSU will triple the number of graduates pursuing advanced graduate and professional degrees. By 2005, SSU will have fully professionally accredited programs in business, public administration, and social work. By 2005, SSU will boast a graduate student enrollment of over 500. By 2005, SSU will increase its endowed funds sixfold. By 2005, SSU will offer degree programs off-site in at least three locations alone or in collaboration with other institutions. By 2005, SSU will be recognized for its measurable impact on economic and community development interests in all segments of the local economy.

We are very pleased that you chose to meet on our campus in this last year of the century. For us, this event represents a symbolic turning point for our institution. We hope that you can see that we are in the early stages of a very significant renaissance. This renaissance will finally move us past the issues of the past several decades and enable us to find our niche among the great institutions of this System.

We are confident in asserting that Savannah State University has had a long and

glorious past. We are equally confident in asserting that her very best years lie ahead.

SPECIAL PRESENTATION

After President Brown's presentation to the Board, Regent Baranco acknowledged the improvements on the campus of SSU in a relatively short period of time. She noted that when President Brown was being installed as the president, the campus was in a serious and vulnerable situation. She commended President Brown for his leadership in the "magnificent" improvements to the physical plant as well as the faculty and staff. She thanked President Brown and Vice President Silver as well as the faculty, staff, and students for the remarkable change at SSU.

Chair Jenkins added that on behalf of the Board, he wanted to express his appreciation to President Brown for his fine work at SSU and pledge the Board's cooperation and assistance in the future.

Regent Coleman echoed Regent Baranco's commendations. He said that it was nice to be a local resident and to have people compliment him on the selection of President Brown and the progress at SSU. He added that SSU had recently won its fifth baseball championship.

President Brown added that the basketball team had to come back from behind to win the tournament. He also added that the tennis and track teams were excelling in their sports.

Chair Jenkins again thanked President Brown.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chair Jenkins next convened the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent White.

Chair White thanked Chair Jenkins and noted that this was the first meeting of the Board of Regents since the legislature ended its session. He remarked that the System had an outstanding outcome from the legislators. For example, the general fund for fiscal year 2000 is \$1.63 million, an increase of 5% over the fiscal year 1999 budget. Chair White thanked the Regents and the Central Office budget staff for their hard work during the legislative session. He explained that the Board was at the point where it would determine how to distribute the budget across the System. There were four action items that the Board would address as a Committee of the Whole: fiscal year 2000 budget allocations (Item 1, p. 23), fiscal year 2000 tuition and non-resident fees (Item 2, p. 23), fiscal year 2000 mandatory student fees (Item 3, p. 24), and the fiscal year 2000 salary administration policy (Item 4, p. 25). He noted that the budget presentation would begin with a general discussion of the budget by Chancellor Portch. Then, Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers, Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs James L. Muyskens, and Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes would speak to the Board. Chair White then turned the floor over to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair White and Chair Jenkins for their availability as the staff created the budget allocations. He noted that the budget process is a continual process which would begin anew immediately following the Board meeting at the presidents' meeting on April 22, 1999, when the presidents would begin designing their strategy for the next fiscal year's budget. However, the budget process accelerates mightily in the last few days, he said. Eleven working days after the legislative session concluded, the Central Office staff had to have the budget materials and allocations to the printer to have them mailed to the Regents. The Chancellor thanked the staff for working overtime to get this done. At this meeting, the Chancellor would give the Regents an overview of what happened in the legislative session. Dr. Desrochers would discuss the budget allocation process and the salary administration policy. Dr. Muyskens would discuss a few of the special funding initiatives to illustrate how they evolve from Board ideas to funding at the campuses. Mr. Bowes would discuss tuition and fees. Finally, the Chancellor would come back and summarize the four action items.

The fiscal year 2000 University System budget results from many partnerships, stated Chancellor Portch. He expressed that the staff felt very good about their working relationship with the new Governor and the legislature. The Chancellor remarked that it was a good session both in outcome and in spirit. While the System will never get everything it wants and its operating funds remain particularly tight, this Governor and legislature have continued the momentum that the System had, which was the goal that the Board set out to accomplish this session. The overall budget increase is 5%, an increase of over \$83 million. Chancellor Portch noted that \$39 million of this increase is attributed to the 4% merit-based salary increases, which is 1% over other State employees, recognizing the System's competition in the national marketplace. In addition, the formula funding, about \$28 million, is essentially fully funded. So, the salary and the formula budgets comprise a great deal of the increase, and they were both fully funded, recognition of the Board's comprehensive enrollment plan. Included as part of the formula funding is the continuing increase in major renovation and rehabilitation ("MRR") funding. The System is now at 1% of building replacement value. Five years ago, when the Board made this a high priority, the System was at .75%. He stressed that while the System cannot stop at 1%, it has come a long way in five years because the Board made MRR a high priority. In addition to doing well in its major areas, the budget continued to be successful in its special COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

funding initiatives. The System now has over \$46 million in the special funding initiatives, such as electronic registration and the job bank, the Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program (“PREP”), the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program (“ICAPP”), and the P-16 initiative. The Chancellor was very pleased with this continued success. He reminded the Board of its new special funding initiatives, teacher preparation and the regional engineering program. He noted at the March 1999 meeting that the teacher preparation initiative budget was in jeopardy, and he thanked the Board for its help in securing that funding (\$3 million). The \$2 million for the regional engineering program, which will initially benefit the Southeast region in particular, was fully funded, and an additional \$1.5 million was added in the amended budget. He remarked that this is on track to be launched this fall and will have an enormous impact throughout the State. The statewide desktop learning initiative was allotted \$1.5 million in the budget, as was the \$2.5 million matching funds for the eminent scholars program. The Chancellor remarked that the System has gained tremendous momentum with many institutions now leveraging private match dollars for the State resources and that he was very pleased with the expansion of this program beyond the research universities. The Yamacraw Mission was allotted approximately \$9 million in the budget, and it will increase the production of high-tech graduates in the State. These were the highlights of the legislative session, and the Chancellor noted that while the Board did not get everything at the level it had requested, overall there was great support for the University System. He remarked that the legislators were impressed by the depth of the Regents’ knowledge about the special initiatives, particularly teacher preparation.

The Chancellor next addressed the fiscal year 1999 amended budget. The total amended capital budget for fiscal year 1999 was \$166 million. This budget was the vehicle for the Governor’s capital outlay agenda this year, and the System had a very good year in this most important area of growth and renewal. Chancellor Portch reminded the Board that in June, it goes back to the capital projects process. There were a number of items in the amended budget. The nuclear reactor decommissioning at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) was fully funded at \$7 million. The start-up funds for the regional engineering program and Yamacraw Mission were provided (\$1.5 million and \$3.9 million, respectively). A request for \$500,000 for hazardous waste remediation at the University of Georgia (“UGA”) was approved, as was the funding to finish the master planning process of all institutions (\$450,000). Finally, although it is not in the University System’s budget, the research institutions will benefit from the highest funding ever awarded to the Georgia Research Alliance for targeted research opportunities (\$32.1 million). The Chancellor reminded the Board that the capital outlay award of \$166 million was one of the highest this decade. Six of the major capital outlay projects were funded for construction, totaling \$133.5 million. The projects funded were the architecture building at Southern Polytechnic State University, the instructional complex at Gordon College (“Gordon”), the environmental sciences and technology facility at GIT, the health and natural sciences facility at North Georgia College & State University, the student learning center at UGA, and the Gwinnett Center (Georgia Perimeter College [“GPC”] and UGA). In addition, planning and design are already well underway for the university learning center at Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”) and the technology and commerce center at Columbus State University. The Chancellor noted that every indication in the session was that these projects will be first up for funding next year. There was also additional funding for planning and design of the sciences and nursing facility at Georgia Southern University (“GSOU”), the Camden Center (Coastal Georgia Community College), and the Russell Library and Information Technology Center at Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”). So, essentially, the System is down 11 items on its major capital outlay projects list.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

On the payback projects list, planning and design funds were provided for the SSU housing residence hall and a parking deck at Kennesaw State University (“KSU”). Chancellor Portch remarked that he was particularly pleased about the SSU housing project, which is the second housing project in planning at SSU. He also asserted that at the next legislative session, the Board needs to have another conversation about having its own bonding authority for revenue and payback projects. He felt that long-term this would be good for the State and the System. In the minors projects area, the System was awarded planning and design funds in the amount of \$979,000 for eight projects at the following institutions: GCSU, GPC, GSOU, KSU, UGA, Darton College, Floyd College (“Floyd”), and Gainesville College. Five other projects were awarded planning, design, and construction funds totaling \$18.3 million, as follows: Valdosta State University’s university center renovation, East Georgia College’s classroom addition and activity center, GSOU’s Coastal Georgia Center expansion, State University of West Georgia’s Adamson Hall renovation, and UGA’s Fanning Center. The Chancellor stated that overall, the amended budget combined with the fiscal year 2000 budget puts the System in really good shape. A total of 33 projects was approved, and an additional \$21 million was approved for the year 2000 computer problem remediation. Chancellor Portch recognized that the Board’s personal interest in this issue was helpful in gaining this funding, and he also recognized the hard work of Dr. Desrochers and Associate Vice Chancellor for Information Technology Randall A. Thursby on this issue. He asserted that \$21 million will have many long-term benefits on the System’s technology capability.

In concluding his presentation, the Chancellor stated that he was pleased with the direction and the momentum of the budget resources provided by the legislature this year. He noted that the staff will do its best to spend these resources well and be accountable for them. Before he turned the floor over, however, he wanted to say a word on tuition and fees, which Mr. Bowes would discuss in greater detail. He explained that tuition essentially is a 75%-25% split between the State allocation and student tuition. He remarked that this is a good continuing commitment by the State to its students, since many states now have moved toward a 60%-40% split, putting more cost on the students. However, Chancellor Portch was particularly concerned with mandatory fees. The last two years, the Board has indicated that it wants to keep mandatory fees very low and it wants to demand good business plans before even contemplating increasing fees. So, the staff and institutions have taken this into consideration. In addition, the staff have been in conversation with the Office of Planning and Budget and the Governor’s Office about the long-term future of mandatory fees in terms of their relationship to the HOPE Scholarship Program (“HOPE”), because mandatory fees are covered by HOPE. So, the staff wants to develop over the next year a long-term solution to the challenge of ensuring that mandatory fees never endanger HOPE. It is particularly important, for this reason, to keep the fees very low this year. The Chancellor remarked that no one will be entirely happy with either their allocations or their mandatory fees; however, it is best to keep things manageable as the staff develop their long-term strategy on mandatory fees.

Regent McMillan noted that the Regents’ Scholarships were not in the budget, and he inquired about this.

The Chancellor responded that this was a redirection that the System lost in the legislative budget process. It followed an audit that questioned all scholarship programs in the State given HOPE. There was some question whether the State needed to support other scholarship programs. The staff made the case that it wanted to keep the Regents’ Scholarships with redirections and enhancements, but in the final analysis, the program was lost.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Regent McMillan urged that the Board continue to support this program, because the Regents' Scholarships are need-based scholarships and the System is very low on this type of student financial aid.

Chancellor Portch agreed about the need-based nature of this program and said that the Governor has some ideas about the need-based side of student financial aid. If the Governor is able to bring his ideas to fruition, the Regents' Scholarship will not be the most significant way to provide this type of aid. The Chancellor projected that within a year, the Board will see something more significant replacing this on the needs-based level.

Dr. Desrochers next addressed the Board. She reminded the Regents that the Governor's budget for fiscal year 2000 was not yet signed, so the actions the Board would take at this meeting would be contingent on the Governor's signing the final budget. She then thanked Chair White and the Central Office budget staff, Mr. Bowes, Budget Director Shelley Nickel, and Assistant Budget Director Robert L. Whitaker. She remarked that they all worked very hard to develop the budget and the allocations. Dr. Desrochers stressed that the University System has limited resources and it is not possible to meet all the hopes and needs of the institutions. After the Governor and the General Assembly made their decisions, the staff had to make their own tough decisions in order to make recommendations to the Board. When the System starts the process each year, the presidents of the System institutions have had a full year to think about what they want and need on their campuses and they advocate their cases very effectively. Some institutions have stories of rapid enrollment growth, others of declining enrollment, many of space problems, and most of technological infrastructure issues. In order to make this a fair process, each year the Chancellor appoints a different group of presidents to be on the presidential budget advisory committee. They begin their work in the summer to review the budget agenda and what the Regents' strategic initiatives have been and to make recommendations to the Chancellor about what the staff should bring to the Board in the budget proposal in the fall. This year, the presidential budget advisory committee also considered what the allocation principles should be. After the University System's budget has been presented to the Governor and the legislature, during that period of January and February of each year, Dr. Desrochers, Dr. Muyskens, and the staff meet with the individual presidents and their respective executive teams. This year, they went to the presidents in each of the five regions of the State, instead of having the presidents come to them. In Savannah, for example, they met at Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") with five or six different institutions. The requests that the institutions develop during the budget process are always way beyond the funds that will be available, regardless of what the Governor and legislature do. After the legislature takes its actions, the staff have to develop the recommended allocations. This year, there were 11 days for the staff to do this.

Dr. Desrochers stressed that the staff always keep in mind what the strategic initiatives of the Board have been in the past several years and where they appear to be going. Also, the Governor instructs the staff how it can construct a budget. This year, the Governor said to look at 5% redirection with a very strong message that an actual 1% to 2% reduction was likely. The Governor also instructed that a 4% enhancement was possible. This year, the presidents advisory committee looked closely at both the redirection strategy and the allocation principles. She stressed that the allocation principles were very important in putting together the budget that was now before the Board. The staff did not just look at what the formula funding generates in terms of dollars for each institution, because the State bases its funding on the enrollment credit hours. Additionally, the staff examined the reasonable range of expenditures per student by sector at the two- and four-year sectors. There are some very high and low institutions, but there has been progress in bringing the

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

institutions within the same range. The strategic initiatives of the Board of Regents and the missions of the institutions also affect the staff’s determination of how to allocate the resources, and the enhancement of programs’ quality is also an allocation principle. These principles were agreed to by the presidents in the summer session as reasonable parameters to take into consideration in making the budget allocations.

Next, Dr. Desrochers discussed the allocations themselves. She said that Chancellor Portch had already covered most of this, so she would be brief. The adjusted budget base was approximately \$1.3 billion. There is the salary increase, which is approximately \$35.5 million, the additional square footage of \$5.9 million, and \$3.8 million in MRR funding. Dr. Desrochers focused on enrollment and strategic program enhancements (\$21.8 million). She noted that this was the basic growth money coming through the funding formula to the University System and this was the money to which the staff applied the allocation principles. Approximately \$17 million out of the \$21.8 million is distributed to most institutions for enrollment needs. The remaining amount was focused on specific strategic initiative needs that the staff felt were individual needs at institutions or System needs overall. Some of the money will be used in the area of information technology to support important initiatives such as PeopleSoft and BANNER. Another piece of that money is for specific faculty needs at a few of the institutions. The Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”), for example, will need additional faculty positions, as was determined by the Blue Ribbon Commission’s recommendations and agreed to by the Regents. Additionally, Gordon, which is experiencing a very rapidly growing student body, has a great need for faculty to reduce class sizes. Also, there are several new programs that the Board approved for Dalton State College and Macon State College (“MSC”), and there are specific funds allocated in support of those programs. There is also a small amount of money dedicated to the start-up of the Gwinnett Center. She asked if any of the Regents had any questions about these funds.

Regent Jenkins asked whether there is a time frame for institutions to come within the specified ranges for expenditures per student that Dr. Desrochers had discussed.

Dr. Desrochers responded that while there is no time frame, the desired ranges have been determined and the staff would like to have all two- and four-year institutions within their appropriate ranges. At this time, there are only a few that are above or below the ranges. So, she felt that at this time, the System is in pretty good shape.

The Chancellor added that there is concern when there is a continuous pattern, but in most instances, there is not a pattern. He noted that even a slight change in enrollment in an institution with a small base budget could throw it out of range. However, if an institution over a five-year period was consistently over its range, then that would create concern. Sometimes, it can take a five-year period to implement enough reductions without hurting enrollment. The institutions who are above the range have a responsibility to bring their expenditures per student down. The Chancellor noted that KSU had very explosive growth and it took an approximate two-year period to bring the expenditures back into the appropriate range.

Regent Jenkins asked whether institutions are given a time frame and whether they are responding.

Chancellor Portch explained that institutions are responding and there is a phase-in over several years to bring them into range. The danger of doing it all at once is that they may cut the very source of their ability to increase enrollment and get themselves back in good shape.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

WHOLE”

Dr. Desrochers added that this is an issue that the staff bring to the attention of presidents during their budget discussions.

Regent Averitt said he would like to see the ranges.

Dr. Desrochers responded that she could provide those figures to him. Then, she introduced Dr. Muyskens to discuss certain special funding initiatives.

The Chancellor interjected that this is a very complex business with a lot of anomalies. He noted that the eminent scholar program at MSC had \$1 million last year. That was in MSC’s original base budget last year. The State allows MSC to direct State funds to the endowment. So, that comes out of this year’s State money. Any institution that had an endowed chair last year will see an artificial change in the budget as a result, because this is not easy to reflect on a balance sheet.

Dr. Muyskens explained that he would be talking about two special funding initiatives in particular, teacher preparation and regional engineering, to demonstrate how the Board’s work gets translated into allocations for institutions. He reminded the Regents that the teacher preparations principles it adopted last year stated that early childhood teachers must know how to teach reading and mathematics. After the principles were adopted and action items were developed, in anticipation of the funding that the System is now receiving, the staff presented the principles and action items to the System institutions that have teacher education programs. The institutions were then given the opportunity to request funding against the allocation they hoped to get for these purposes. In the case of teacher preparation, it meant adding faculty in conjunction with curricular innovations that would be required in order to meet the new demand the Board was putting on teacher education programs. When the staff went around the State to meet with the presidents about the budget, part of the presidents’ presentations was to talk about how they would like to help to meet this new requirement. In addition to the budget hearings, the staff had additional opportunities to review these proposals in light of the implementation plan and the action items the Board adopted last year. Out of that, the staff assigned the funding for the special funding initiatives as follows: teacher preparation (\$3 million), regional engineering (\$2 million), statewide desktop learning initiative (\$1.5 million), eminent scholars (\$2.5 million), Yamacraw Mission (\$9.1 million), and ICAPP (\$4.1 million).

As an example of how the staff did this, Dr. Muyskens demonstrated how a piece of the Georgia State University (“GSU”) budget allocation (\$378,000) had to do with the teaching of mathematics. At GSU, the math faculty got together with the faculty in the College of Education to see how they could meet the challenge the Board put before them to ensure that early childhood teachers are well prepared to teach math. They started by examining what the students in schools are expected to know and be able to do. Then they looked at college courses and examined how they matched up. The answer was, of course, that there was not a very good match. While the standard college courses give future teachers mathematics skills, they do not necessarily give them what they need to understand math in a way that they can teach it effectively to those who know nothing yet about it. Then, the work began to develop a program and hire faculty to teach math in that new way. So, part of the process was for them to reengineer their college-level math course to meet the Board’s teacher preparation objectives. Dr. Muyskens stated that he has been very excited about this because not only is this making it possible for institutions to prepare teachers to teach young children math and therefore meet the Board’s teacher preparation guarantee, but this will give the System improved math instruction in general.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Another element of last year's teacher preparation initiative was creating partner schools to link schools and colleges in teacher preparation to ensure that the System is working more closely with the K-12 schools and to ensure that teacher candidates have hands-on classroom experience. Dr. Muyskens reminded the Board that many presenters to the Strategic Planning Committee last year stressed the importance of such partnering. The resulting teacher preparation principles stressed the need for these kinds of cooperative efforts. The budget reflects the effort to do just that. It requires having more master teachers at the schools and having partner school coordinators. In this initiative, the staff are trying to develop the link so there is a better experiential component in teacher education courses. For example, at AASU, the faculty decided to start the beginning teachers with hands-on teaching experience. Using distance education, the students at AASU can observe teachers in classrooms and start early to discuss in-class teaching methodology with faculty.

Dr. Muyskens reminded the Regents that the preparation of school leaders was also an element of the teacher preparation initiative. As a result of the Board's concern that principals know how to enable teachers to do their job, a network of innovative doctor of education ("Ed.D.") programs is being developed across the State using distance education. Dr. Muyskens will discuss this further in June. Next, Dr. Muyskens addressed the concern of the Regents' about bringing an end to out-of-field teaching, which he would also discuss in more detail in June. The Business-to-Teaching Program, modeled on the Troops-to-Teaching Program, will encourage mid-career adults to switch to teaching. Dr. Muyskens stated that there would soon be a request for proposals to address this issue. This was another example of translating the Board's teacher preparation principles into specifics on how institutions are changing their teacher education programs. Dr. Muyskens stressed that this does not mean just adding funds to add a professor; rather, this funding will start up the innovative curricular change the Regents urged the System to do in its initiative.

The second special initiative Dr. Muyskens discussed was regional engineering. He reminded the Board that the staff have been monitoring the need for engineering education for many years, and it is important also to increase the numbers of people in information technology. This initiative addresses these issues. In this initiative, there are two undergraduate programs, the bachelor of science in computer and software engineering and the bachelor of science in civil engineering programs. In addition, there are existing master's degree programs in electrical and environmental engineering at GIT that can be accessed through distance education. The funds allotted for this special initiative are for faculty, laboratory equipment, and renovation to start this project. In addition, there is also some funding for this initiative in the 1999 supplemental budget. GIT is well into the recruitment process for faculty. At this point, the System is well underway in this initiative. Dr. Muyskens then turned the floor back to Dr. Desrochers.

Dr. Desrochers stated that the bottom line is that there is \$83.3 million in new funding, for a budget total of \$1.4 billion. She stressed that this includes a 1% redirection reduction (\$13 million), which is prorated by the size of the budget to the institutions to be taken in administrative and support services, not instruction. There are also additional funds that the System receives from the lottery in the amount of \$25.9 million for the Equipment, Technology, and Construction Trust ("EACT"), Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO"), the Connecting Teachers & Technology initiative, etc. Finally, Dr. Desrochers reminded the Regents that the B-units provide essential services to the State in cooperative extension, MCG's hospital and clinics, and a variety of other line items in the State budget. The total State "B" budget amounts to \$200 million now, and the "B" units also saw a 1% reduction and a 4% salary increase.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

The final item that Dr. Desrochers discussed was the salary increases, and she stated that the staff were very pleased and grateful for the 4% salary increase. She showed the Regents a bar chart depicting the distribution of salary increases in fiscal year 1999. She explained that the chart demonstrates that decisions are being made on an individual basis according to the merit of the individuals involved. She stressed that this is the continuing policy. Item 4 on the Committee's agenda is the same policy as last year except that it is at a 4% level rather than 6% level, effective July 1. Dr. Desrochers then turned the floor over to Mr. Bowes, who would discuss tuition and fees.

Mr. Bowes turned the Regents attention to Appendices II and III of their agenda materials. (These items are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.) The theme this year, he said, was to keep tuition and fees low. In terms of developing tuition recommendations, that is a relatively simple task. Under an agreement with the Governor and legislature, the University System is required to raise 25% of the total amount approved under the formula budget from tuition revenues. The other 75% represents State appropriations. Based on the formula amount that was approved for fiscal year 2000, the System will be required to raise a minimum of \$497 million from tuition revenues to support institutional costs. Taking that number, the staff performed an analysis examining institutional projected enrollments and revenues. The analysis indicated that the System needs to raise tuition rates for undergraduate resident students an overall 4.5% so that, together with increases at the graduate, nonresident, and professional program levels, the System can meet the \$497 million target. The resulting dollar increases per semester per student would be \$27 at the two-year college level, \$39 at the state universities, and \$52 at the research universities. Mr. Bowes remarked that the impact on the student is very small. He then turned attention to other policy directives as they affect development of the tuition recommendations. The first of these was graduate tuition rates. For the last four years, the staff have been adjusting these rates by approximately 5% per year in addition to the base-level increases to achieve a point at which the graduate rates would be at a level 20% higher than the undergraduate rates. This year, the graduate rates will increase at approximately 3% to 4% above the overall 4.5% to achieve that objective. So, in fiscal year 2000, the System will have reached the policy objective that it started four years ago. Nonresident fees are set at three times the rate of in-state tuition. The phase-in for this policy objective, which was started a number of years ago, was completed last year. It means that non-Georgia students will pay four times the amount that Georgia students pay for their educational costs. It is known as the "full-cost policy." Finally, there are professional program differentials. Board policy allows institutions to seek approval from the Board of Regents to charge differential tuition for professional programs based on the academic marketplace and the tuitions charged by peer institutions with similar missions. The staff have recommended a number of such tuition increases from those institutions that requested adjustments this year.

Mr. Bowes next discussed mandatory fees. He explained that mandatory fees are fees paid by all students for services that are primarily self-supporting and funded through the auxiliary enterprise or student activity funds. They include fees for health services, athletic, student activities, transportation and parking, and technology. Following the Board's and the Chancellor's directives as well as the recommendations of the recent Coopers & Lybrand study, the staff instituted a new process that requires institutions to submit business plans to them with financial statements that fully support and justify any suggested fee increases. The process began last year, and the staff were very rigorous on the institutions. The increases last year were far lower than in prior years. This year, the staff followed an even more rigorous approach. The staff informed the institutions that they would keep the fee increases as low as possible while still properly funding programs. They also said that the institutions would have to justify those increases using very clear cost assumptions and enrollment projections. Finally, in a very few cases where it was warranted, the staff

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

was recommending some fee increases to the Board. Mr. Bowes noted that while their were 68 fee

proposals submitted, only 16 were being recommended for approval as requested, 8 were being recommended for approval at a reduced level, and 44 were not being recommended this year. Only one new fee was being recommended for approval. This fee is to support the KSU parking deck payback project that was identified earlier in the budget presentation. With these recommendations, the overall average increase in fees is very small, only about 2% across the System. By sector, it breaks down to 1.2% for research universities, 2.8% for four-year colleges and state universities, and less than 1% for the two-year colleges. While the staff was much tougher this year, Mr. Bowes said that many of the requests were not without merit, though the staff did not think this was the year to go forward with them. Institutions tended to be conservative and to follow the staff's advice. Every year, the staff examines data from the Washington Coordinating Board Survey of tuition and fees to see how the System compares with the rest of the nation. From this information, it was concluded that Georgia remains lower than the national average with respect to tuition and mandatory fees. The comparisons rank Georgia in the middle to the lower half of the scale across the country. In closing, Mr. Bowes stated that the information technology program fee at CCSU is recommended for continuation. The external review report, which the staff would be sending to the Regents shortly, gives the staff a level of comfort with the program, both academically and financially, to support continuation of the fee at this time. However, there are issues regarding the Floyd information technology program that the staff will share with the Committee on Finance and Business Operations in May, and the staff were recommending that approval for continuation of the technology fee at Floyd be withheld until then. Mr. Bowes then stepped down.

Chair White asked whether the Regents had any questions.

Regent Allgood asked how the establishment of the Wellness Center will impact the mandatory fees at MCG.

Dr. Desrochers explained that the Wellness Center is being built by interest income, and there will be user fees, but those fees will not be part of the mandatory fees program.

Chancellor Portch responded that the fees discussed in this presentation were fees required of every student.

Regent Allgood requested more detailed information about the fees for the Wellness Center.

Regent Jones asked for clarification about the 75%-25% tuition split.

Chancellor Portch explained that tuition makes up the 25% of the overall budget that the State does not give the System.

Regent Jones asked for further clarification about out-of-state tuition.

Mr. Bowes explained that an out-of-state student pays the tuition that an in-state student pays, plus the nonresident fee, which is three times the amount of tuition. So, the out-of-state student is essentially paying four times the tuition of an in-state student.

Regent Jones asked whether any analysis had been done to determine whether this was still a "good deal" for out-of-state students.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

The Chancellor pointed to the national comparisons by the Washington Coordinating Board Survey and

noted that most states have a similar policy. Wisconsin, for example, charges out-of-state students 125%, whereas the University System of Georgia only charges 100%.

Mr. Bowes said that an out-of-state student at a research university will be paying approximately \$4,800 a semester, or \$9,600 a year, for tuition.

Chancellor Portch estimated that the national average would likely be closer to \$12,000 and stated that this is still a good value for out-of-state students.

Regent Jones noted that private colleges and universities are more expensive. He stated that in Alabama several years ago, the legislature had to take a stand because too many students were coming into the state because tuition was so cheap.

The Chancellor said that in Georgia, the cost was only 75% to out-of-state students when he arrived here, and now it is 100%. He added that GIT in particular is a value compared to its peer institutions, Massachusetts Institute of Technology ("MIT") and Stanford University.

Regent Clark asked why out-of-state students were listed at MCG when there is a Board policy that the Medical School can only admit in-state students.

Mr. Bowes explained that there are undergraduate and graduate programs at MCG other than medical and dental programs.

Regent Clark remarked that the materials distributed indicated that the medical and dental programs cost \$8,000 to out-of-state students, while Emory University costs approximately \$20,000.

Regent Cannestra stated that it looked like the program costs were just multiplied by three.

Chancellor Portch reiterated that the nonresident fee is three times the tuition rate, and the fee is added to the tuition rate, resulting in a cost to out-of-state students of four times the tuition rate.

Regent Cannestra noted that different programs also have differing tuition rates.

There was some confusion about the structure of the nonresident tuition rates, so Mr. Bowes gave an example. He explained that the undergraduate nonresident full-time student would pay a \$3,621 nonresident fee, plus \$1,207 in tuition. (A resident student would pay only the \$1,207 in tuition.)

Regent Cannestra asked why the tuition is listed that way.

Mr. Bowes explained all tuition policies currently are structured along these lines, such that the nonresident fee is set up separately from tuition. Part of that is because of the waiver policies the Board has in certain instances.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Regent Howell asked what the actual final cost of tuition to an in-state student at a research university would be. He asked whether the \$1,207 in the budget materials was for 12 semester hours.

The Chancellor replied that it was.

Regent Howell asked how many hours were in a four-year degree and how much it would end up costing a student.

Mr. Bowes explained that a plateau is set at the rate for 12 credit hours per semester, but a student can take more credit hours without additional tuition costs.

Regent Howell estimated that, for an in-state student, tuition for a four-year degree at a University System research institution would be approximately \$9,656.

Mr. Bowes concurred.

Regent Howell commented that this was “a remarkable bargain.”

Chancellor Portch said the tuition plateau is standard in higher education. He reminded the Board that during the process of semester conversion, the System took the opportunity to limit the number of credit hours in programs to 120, making it possible again for students to complete their degrees in four years.

Regent Jobe stated that he would like to see a comparison of out-of-state tuition at System research universities compared to similar tuitions in neighboring systems. He then asked what accounted for the large differences in mandatory fees across the System at various institutions.

Mr. Bowes referred back to the Coopers & Lybrand study, which responded to this very issue. He stated that the fees are cost-based, and there are many factors that play into the differences among institutions, such as the nature of the program itself, whether there is a football program, the number of students paying the fee, etc.

Chancellor Portch noted that SSU has a football team, while AASU does not. This would have an impact on athletic fees, for instance.

Regent McMillan asked if having a foundation made a difference, and Mr. Bowes conceded that private fund raising can make a difference.

Regent McMillan asked how to discern in the “B” budget what funds go to Fort Valley State University (“FVSU”) for its 1890 function (mandated by the federal government).

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Dr. Desrochers explained that FVSU is operating under new federal rules for the "1890 institutions" (land-grant institutions and historically black institutions) that require certain State-matched funds. Some funds have already been allocated to the institution that would qualify as matched funds, including some special initiative funding.

The Chancellor added that this will probably be broken into a separate line item next year because of the federal requirement.

Regent Jones asked whether that was required because FVSU is a land-grant college.

Chancellor Portch responded that it was, and Regent Jones said that this was good.

Regent Baranco commented that she had heard that Mississippi is raising instructor salaries by 8%. She felt this was something the System should watch, particularly since it is a Southern state.

Chancellor Portch stated that Louisiana has been raising salaries considerably as well. The base salaries in these states have been so low, however, that they will need to do this a number of years to catch up with the national average. The national average salary increase is just above 3%, so the System's increase of 4% continues the momentum the Board wanted. The high-increase states tend to be those that are way below the national average.

In closing, the Chancellor explained again that the four actions up for approval at this time were the budget allocations, tuition and nonresident fees, mandatory student fees, and the salary and wage administration policy. He reiterated that any actions the Board would take would be contingent on the Governor's signing the final budget bill, which he would do shortly. Should there be any changes as a result of the Governor's final budget action, he requested the Board's authority in consultation with Chair Jenkins and Chair White to make any necessary adjustments. He anticipated that if there were any, they would be minor, but he did not want to be preemptive of the Governor, since he had not yet signed the budget. Chancellor Portch said that the staff would be happy to answer any further questions.

Regent Coleman made a motion to approve all of the items.

Regent Leebern seconded the motion.

Chair White called for a vote, and all of the Regents voted to approve the four items. In closing, he again thanked Dr. Desrochers and her staff for working hard on the allocation process in such a short period of time. He then asked for a motion to adjourn the meeting into its regular session. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chair Jenkins adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings at approximately 2:55 p.m.

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met again on Wednesday, April 21, 1999 in the Student Center Ballroom on the campus of Savannah State University. The Chair of the Board, Regent Edgar L. Jenkins, called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Jenkins, were Vice Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, S. William Clark, Jr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, April 21, 1999 by Ms. Valorie Williams, Chaplain of the Wesleyan Gospel Choir of Savannah State University.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, April 21, 1999 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent George M. D. (John) Hunt III had asked for and been given permission to be absent on that day.

OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE

The Oversight Committee met on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 at 10:30 a.m. in room 125, the Quiet Lounge, of the Student Center on the campus of Savannah State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Charles H. Jones, Vice Chair Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Kenneth W. Cannestra, and Edgar L. Rhodes. Chair Jones reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, neither of which required action. Those items were as follows:

1. Information Item: Southern Regional Education Board (“SREB”) Contract

Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs James L. Muyskens provided to the Committee follow-up information on the overall SREB contract between Georgia and other states as well as private institutions, as was requested at the March 1999 Committee meeting.

2. Information Item: Master’s of Business Administration Programs at the University of Georgia

President Michael F. Adams, Dean of the Terry College of Business P. George Benson, Director of Graduate Programs Kay L. Keck, and Associate Dean of Academic Programs Robert D. Gatewood attended the Committee meeting and presented information to the Committee on the master’s of business administration programs at the University of Georgia, particularly with regard to in-state and out-of-state student enrollment in these programs. Also joining the discussion via teleconference was Associate Dean for Faculty and Research James S. Trieschmann.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 at approximately 3:00 p.m. in the Student Center Ballroom on the campus of Savannah State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Glenn S. White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents David H. (Hal) Averitt, Kenneth W. Cannestra, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chair White reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed five items, four of which were considered by the Committee of the Whole and all of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Fiscal Year 2000 Budget Allocations

Approved: The Board approved the allocation of State appropriations for fiscal year 2000 among the various institutions and operating units of the University System of Georgia.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 9 to 20.)

2. Approval of Fiscal Year 2000 Tuition and Non-Resident Fees

Approved: The Board approved the tuition rates for fiscal year 2000 as described in Appendix II to become effective in the fall semester 1999. The tuition rates for fiscal year 2000 are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 9 to 20.)

Background:

Undergraduate Resident Tuition: 4.5% Increase

Proposed undergraduate resident tuition rates are set at a rate 4.5% above current tuition rates. This is the minimum amount required to ensure that tuition revenues for the system as a whole comprise 25% of formula-generated funding based on institutional enrollment and tuition revenue projections. The 25% amount is the State requirement for State/student cost sharing. A portion of that increase (.6%) is directly related to the legislative action to split the Board's recommended \$10 million for health reserves into the 75% State, 25% tuition model (i.e., \$7.5 million state allocation, \$2.5 million tuition).

Graduate Program Policy: Graduate Rates Increase at 5% Per Year

Proposed graduate tuition rates for fiscal year 2000 are set at a 20% base rate above undergraduate rates, as required by Board policy adopted February 1996. The policy requires that increases be phased in over four years at approximately 5% per year (in

addition to rate increases at the undergraduate level) until the 20% level is achieved. This is the final year of implementation.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

2. Approval of Fiscal Year 2000 Tuition and Non-Resident Fees

(Continued)

Non-Resident Full Cost Policy

Proposed non-resident tuition fees are set at three times the proposed resident tuition rates, as mandated by Board policy adopted April 1995.

Professional Program Policy

In accordance with Board policy, institutions are authorized to request separate tuition rate adjustments for select professional programs. The purpose is to provide additional funds for program improvement and to allow programs to remain competitive with peer programs in public colleges and universities in other states. Programs included in this category are the University of Georgia law, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine programs; master's of business administration and nursing programs at Georgia State University; and the master's in management program at the Georgia Institute for Technology. Recommendations for tuition rate changes in these and other programs appear in Appendix II.

3. Approval of Fiscal Year 2000 Mandatory Student Fees

Approved: The Board approved increases and/or adjustments in mandatory student fees for various institutions of the University System of Georgia. The recommendation is based on justified program increases including salary and operating expenses. Fiscal year 2000 mandatory student fees are on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 9 to 20.)

Background: Last year, the Board of Regents' staff introduced a comprehensive review of fee requests, which requires institutions to establish business plans for their major auxiliary enterprises and to submit financial statements which fully support and defend any adjustment in fee rates. The fee review carefully considers only those requests that meet the minimum submission criteria, document fully all costs and revenues, and are consistent with business plan objectives. As a result, the mandatory fee recommendations presented in Appendix III reflect an overall average increase in fees across the University System of less than 2%. Of the 68 mandatory fee requests submitted for approval, only 24 were recommended for approval in whole or in part.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

4. Approval of Fiscal Year 2000 Salary Administration Policy

Approved: The Board approved the statement of Salary and Wage Administration, which is as follows:

SALARY AND WAGE ADMINISTRATION POLICY FISCAL YEAR 2000

The Board of Regents allocated to each institution funds equivalent to a four percent (4%) salary increase for all employees. These increases must be provided on the basis of merit. With these funds, the institutions may grant salary increases to individual employees. It is expected that individual merit salary increases will be reasonably distributed among employees in amounts ranging from zero (0%) to ten (10%) percent. Salary increases may exceed ten percent (10%) for employees exhibiting exceptionally meritorious performance. Salary increases that exceed ten percent must be justified individually in writing when the budget is submitted. (This requirement shall be waived for information technology employees covered by the policy approved by the Board in November 1998.) Salary increases for non-faculty employees and staff shall become effective July 1, 1999 and salary increases for faculty shall become effective on the contract start date, as required by action of the General Assembly.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 9 to 20.)

5. Acceptance of Gifts to the Georgia Institute of Technology

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

<u>Company</u>	<u>Value</u>	<u>Item</u>	<u>Department</u>
Altera Corporation	\$1,783,249	Computer equipment and maintenance	Electrical/Computer Engineering
AutoSimulations, Inc.	\$1,320,000	100 Auto Mod/Auto Sched and support services	Industrial/Systems Engineering
Cabletron Systems	\$ 103,935	Materials for the Sustainable Education Building	Civil & Environmental Engineering
Cadence Design	\$4,581,930	Software license for a	Electrical and

Computer		Complete set of Cadence Software products	Engineering
Hewlett-Packard Co.	\$ 235,930	Devices and Connections to enable dial-up capabilities	Electrical and Computer Engineering

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

5. Acceptance of Gifts to the Georgia Institute of Technology

(Continued)

SCM Group	\$1,136,517	Installation and maintenance related to equipment loan	Architecture Advanced Wood Products Lab
Microsoft Corp. Computing	\$ 491,939	Copies of Windows NT Workstation, Office, Visual Studio Enterprise, Text and documentation	College of

Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be approved by the Board of Regents. GIT has advised that there are no obligatory costs to be incurred by the acceptance of these gifts. The only known costs associated with this action will be future maintenance and repair as required to properly maintain the items.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 at approximately 3:10 p.m. in the Student Center Ballroom on the campus of Savannah State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Vice Chair David H. (Hal) Averitt, and Regents Kenneth W. Cannestra, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Glenn S. White. Chair Coleman reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed seven items, six of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Demolition of Building 711, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board declared Building 711 at the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) to be no longer advantageously useful to GIT or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of this building.

The Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the disposal of this building from the campus of GIT.

Background: Building 711 located at 176 Fifth Street, Atlanta, Georgia, is a 2500-square-foot wood-frame residential structure built in 1925 and acquired in 1981. The house is not currently occupied because of its condition and would require \$90,000 of repairs to render it habitable. The structure has no historical significance. There is no opposition to the demolition.

After demolition, a request to lease the land to a fraternity/sorority for construction of a house will be presented.

The cost of the demolition, including environmental remediation of lead paint and asbestos, is estimated at \$13,000 and will be funded by general operating funds.

2. Demolition of Building 031A, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College

Approved: The Board declared Building 031A at Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (“ABAC”) to be no longer advantageously useful to ABAC or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of this building.

The Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the disposal of this building from the campus of ABAC.

Background: Building 031A, also known as the Old Ag Engineering Technology (AET) Building, is a 13,589-gross-square-foot masonry structure built in 1954.

The cost of the demolition, including environmental remediation of lead paint and asbestos, is estimated at \$100,000 and will be funded from the capital project budget.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

2. Demolition of Building 031A, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (Continued)

Project No. I-24, "Renovation and Addition to Old AET Building," was authorized by the Board in September 1997. The legislature funded the project in the fiscal year 1999 budget. In the course of design, the Office of Facilities requested that the architect compare the costs of the renovation/addition project as originally conceived against the cost of total demolition and new construction. This comparison demonstrated that the two scenarios have an initial cost of approximately the same; however, the long-term operating costs for renovation are more expensive than for new construction, and the configuration of the existing building constrained the program requirements.

3. Rental Agreement, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of an addendum to the rental agreement between Atlantic Investors, Ltd. - Series V, Landlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Tenant, covering 48 apartment-type residential units for the period from July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000 at a monthly rental of \$22,335.81 (\$268,029.72 per year/\$5,583.95 per unit per year) for the use of Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU").

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

Background: In March 1998, the Board approved the investigation and development of a concept to construct a student housing complex at AASU. AASU forwarded a draft proposal for a privately funded constructed and operated facility on campus to house targeted groups of students who comprise under 5% of its students; this draft proposal has been reviewed by the Office of the Attorney General and will be ready to send to developers in early May 1999. The earliest potential construction completion date would be August 2000. AASU therefore requested Board approval on the continued rental of 48-apartment type residential units for its use. The rental rate for the renewal period is a 5% increase over the current monthly rental.

The facilities house approximately 175 students (fall occupancy). These students are primarily intercollegiate athletic students, health science students, international students, and students in the 13-county service area who are not within commuting distance.

4. Rental Agreement, Office of Information and Instructional Technology Athens Space

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Ivey Realty Associates, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 18,600 square feet of office space located at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street, Athens, Georgia for the period beginning July 1, 1999 and ending June 30, 2000 at a monthly rental of \$22,475 (\$269,700 per year/\$14.50 per square foot per year) with option to renew for four consecutive one-year periods commencing July 1, 2000 at the same rental rate for the use of the Board of Regents' Office of Information and Instructional Technology ("OIIT").

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

4. Rental Agreement, Office of Information and Instructional Technology Athens Space (Continued)_____

The Board also authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Ivey Realty Associates, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 11,520 square feet of office space located at 1150 Dearing Extension, Athens, Georgia for the period beginning September 1, 1999 and ending June 30, 2000 at a monthly rental of \$13,920 (\$167,040 per year/\$14.50 per square foot per year) with option to renew for four consecutive one-year periods commencing July 1, 2000 at the same rental rate for the use of OIIT.

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

The Board approved this rental agreement with the understanding that any future renewals would come back to the Board for approval and that the staff would develop an appropriate long-range plan for housing OIIT staff within the year.

Background: A part of OIIT has occupied this space at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street since July 1, 1994. The last option period under the rental agreement has been exercised and a renewal of the agreement was necessary. The current rent is \$20,150 per month.

The facility at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street is used for office and classroom space for OIIT staff which support help desk, instructional technology endeavors, student information system, PeopleSoft project support, standard operating system, and local area network support ("LAN") for the non-research universities, and Regents Central Office Consolidated Reporting Systems. There is also an instructional classroom, which is used for faculty development and staff development activities.

The space at 1150 Dearing Extension is immediately adjacent to the space at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street. Current space is not sufficient for the current staff and function of the office. Since moving into the current space, the technology initiatives (Connecting Teachers & Technology, Connecting Students & Services, statewide desktop learning initiative, Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO") and GALILEO interconnected libraries) have been added, PeachNet has been extended and with it the need to expand the help desk services, and GALILEO now serves all segments of education in the State of Georgia. Areas currently expanding are: the customer service area, distance education and academic innovation division as a result of the Desktop Initiative, PeopleSoft project support personnel, support for the BANNER Student Information System and Regents' Consolidated Reporting Systems, the ongoing institutional operating system, and LAN support personnel. A facility that was acquired to accommodate 63 people maximum now accommodates over 90 with an anticipated increase of 10 to 15 people in the coming fiscal year. The cost of relocating to another facility would be high due to the necessary infrastructure requirements to support various technical equipment. OIIT has an opportunity to relieve the overcrowding by expanding into the adjacent building without having to divide location of staff and costs associated with putting high-speed communications in a building at another location.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

4. Rental Agreement, Office of Information and Instructional Technology Athens Space (Continued)

Discussions about a long-range plan for housing the above functions are now underway. Impacting these discussions will be the technology initiative principles to be adopted by the Board as a result of its current strategic planning initiative; technology trends which now permit organizations to consider distributed geographic models as part of the solution for locating high-technology staff; the need to recognize environmental and quality of life issues inherent in locating staff centrally, especially within the Atlanta metropolitan area; and advantages inherent in creating space, staffing, and technology partnerships with one or more institutions within the University System. The long-term solution will be ready for initial presentation to the Board within six to nine months following adoption of the technology initiative principles.

5. Authorization of Project "Food Science Addition," University of Georgia

Approved: That the Board authorize Project "Food Science Addition," University of Georgia, with a total project budget of \$4,387,000, using amended fiscal year 1999 appropriations designated for the traditional industries program.

The project, which is Phase II of III, will add approximately 18,285 gross square feet to the Food Science and Technology Building to provide space for outreach facilities and targeted research initiatives.

Background: This building houses the Food Science and Technology Department of the College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences. The goal of the three phases of planned renovation and addition is to provide modern facilities both new and renovated for teaching, research, development of new food processing methods, and outreach to consumers and businesses.

Phase I, authorized by the Board at its meeting held December 9 and 10, 1997, focused on a major renovation of the existing pilot plant and associated research laboratories on the first floor. Renovation of 17,241 gross square feet is currently under construction at a cost of \$1,713,035 and is scheduled for completion in June 1999.

Phase III is projected to renovate approximately 28,700 gross square feet of existing teaching, research, and office areas into state-of-the-art facilities. The estimated construction cost is \$4 million.

The construction cost of the addition is \$3,375,000 (\$184.57 per square foot). Funding for this project is \$187,000 in planning funds appropriated by the legislature in the fiscal year 1999 budget and \$4,200,000 appropriated in the fiscal year 1999 supplemental budget.

Since this project was approved, the staff in conjunction with the University of Georgia will proceed with the selection of an architectural firm.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

6. Authorization of Project “Transgenic Poultry Facility,” University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized Project “Transgenic Poultry Facility,” University of Georgia, with a total project budget of \$1,432,198, using \$1,200,000 in fiscal year 1997 Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) funds and \$232,198 in amended fiscal year 1999 appropriations designated for GRA funds.

Background: The mission of the Transgenic Poultry Facility at the University of Georgia is to provide facilities for genetic research and the development of products derived from that research for the benefit and expansion of the Georgia economy.

The facility will be approximately 24,300 gross square feet, comprised of housing for roosters and hens, a brooder space, a battery room for newborn chicks, a hatchery, and staff personnel support spaces.

The construction cost of the facility is \$1,182,198 (\$48.65 per square foot), as bid on February 15, 1999. Funding for the project is \$1,200,000 in fiscal year 1997 GRA funds and \$232,198 in amended fiscal year 1999 appropriations designated for GRA funds.

The design of the project is complete. Since the project was approved, the staff in conjunction with the University of Georgia will proceed with the award of a construction contract.

7. Information Item: Housing Concept Proposal, North Georgia College & State University

In October 1997, the Board passed a new student housing policy that requires the preparation of a comprehensive plan for student housing together with a financial plan to support the housing program objectives. North Georgia College & State University (“NGCSU”) has developed a comprehensive student housing plan that is consistent with the policy.

The NGCSU plan consists of constructing new on-campus privatized housing facilities, demolishing of one of the oldest existing housing facilities, and renovating the remaining four buildings. According to the plan, the net result will be 1370-bed capacity, which will be an increase of approximately 170 beds, or 14% over current capacity. Currently, the campus operates 1200 student housing beds with a 95% occupancy rate. Approximately 36% of the students are housed on campus. With the proposed housing plan, this percentage should not change significantly, as the campus is experiencing enrollment growth. It should also be noted that the enrollment assumptions in the housing plan are consistent with the Board-approved enrollment target of 20% growth by 2002.

Staff will work with the Office of the Attorney General to prepare a Request For Proposals (“RFP”) for public/private housing at NGCSU modeled after Southern Polytechnic State University but modified to respond to specific campus needs. A summary of the RFP will be presented to Chair of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities prior to advertisement based on the Board’s support for this concept.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 at approximately 3:10 p.m. in room 125, the Quiet Lounge, of the Student Center on the campus of Savannah State University. Committee members in attendance were Chair Edgar L. Rhodes and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., S. William Clark, Jr., and Elridge W. McMillan. Chair Rhodes reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 12 items, 10 of which required action. Additionally, 124 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval as well as 350 faculty members recommended for tenure and 585 recommended for promotion. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. University System of Georgia Reading Consortium

UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA READING CONSORTIUM

**Center for the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium
housed at
Georgia State University**

Background: In spring 1998, with the concurrence of the education deans from the University System, Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs, brought together faculty who were nominated by the institutions, classroom teachers, and representatives from the Department of Education (“DOE”), the Georgia Professional Standards Commission, and the Central Office to discuss ways to improve teachers' success in teaching children to read. The participants formed the University System of Georgia Reading Consortium (the “Consortium”).

Ten University System institutions are members of the Consortium: Georgia State University (“GSU”), University of Georgia, Valdosta State University, Augusta State University, Armstrong Atlantic State University, Columbus State University, Georgia College & State University, Fort Valley State University, North Georgia College & State University, and the State University of West Georgia.

The goal of the Consortium is to better prepare teachers at all grade levels to effectively assess and instruct students to become competent and critical readers. The Consortium is an active response to the Board of Regents’ “Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.”

The Consortium created a proposal to the Georgia Professional Standards Commission for a “reading endorsement” for K-12 classroom teachers. The reading endorsement was officially adopted by the Georgia Professional Standards Commission in fall 1998. The endorsement consists of a three-course sequence for current classroom teachers in all subject fields and grade levels. The endorsement will be delivered by the participating institutions beginning summer 1999. Some institutions will offer the endorsement through a summer institute model. Others will offer it through distance technology for teachers who are not close to a university.

The participating universities wish to form a center, initially to be based at GSU, so they can continue to help one another with teacher development strategies for improving reading in Georgia's schools.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

1. University System of Georgia Reading Consortium (Continued)

Goals and Objectives of Proposed Center: The goals and objectives of the center are as follows:

- Support member institutions' efforts to guarantee that teachers who receive this reading endorsement have demonstrated competency at assessing students' literacy needs and planning appropriate instruction
- Facilitate ongoing evaluation and improvement of the reading endorsement
- Monitor the effectiveness of the Consortium's efforts to improve literacy in the State of Georgia
- Provide a yearly forum to bring together Statewide participants in endorsement programs
- Increase public awareness and understanding of effective approaches that can improve the reading abilities of P-12 students of Georgia
- Conduct and disseminate research on the effective teaching of reading
- Promote dialogue and collaboration on the effective teaching of reading across Consortium members from the institutions, the Board of Regents, the Professional Standards Commission, and the DOE

2. Establishment of the Master of Science in Urban Studies, Savannah State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carlton E. Brown of Savannah State University ("SSU") to establish the master of science in urban studies, effective April 21, 1999.

Abstract: The master of science in urban studies is one of three programs for which SSU was given planning authority by the Board of Regents as part of the Savannah Compact. Further, the proposed program is congruent with the mission of SSU and is part of the Savannah State University Strategic Plan.

The proposed collaborative graduate program is designed to prepare students for managerial and other professional positions in a variety of work settings in the public, nonprofit, and private sectors. Students must complete a set of core courses devoted to understanding and analyzing urban issues as well as ways of generating new knowledge about urban areas. In addition to the core and thesis, each student selects courses from one of the following concentrations: urban politics, urban and regional economic development, public management, or administration of justice.

Many career opportunities are available to graduates of the master of science program in urban studies. Graduates may work in such areas as urban planning, human resources management, transportation system management, nonprofit management, aviation, and many other areas. Positions currently held by program graduates from other institutions include: county zoning administrator, policy analyst, code enforcement officer, public relations specialist, court administration officer, federal assistance specialist, planners (law enforcement and environmental), and city manager.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Establishment of the Master of Science in Urban Studies, Savannah State University (Continued)

Need: The discipline of urban studies is a broad, interdisciplinary field that encompasses many academic fields. Students trained in urban studies may find employment in many fields within the public and private sector. *Georgia's 1998 Career Planner* reports that between 1992 and 2005, general employment

in three fields typically considered to be areas of employment for graduates with degrees in urban studies (e.g., community service, protective service, and transportation) will average between 3% and 5% of new job openings. Currently, only one State-supported institution in Georgia, Georgia State University, offers a masters degree in urban studies. The creation of the proposed degree program will provide an opportunity for residents of South and Coastal Georgia to obtain an advanced degree in urban studies without leaving South Georgia.

The master of science in urban studies proposal committee developed and administered a paper-based survey among 50 public and nonprofit sector agencies within the Savannah-Chatham area in 1995, 1997, and 1998. Some of the interviewees were also contacted by telephone. Thirty-three agencies (a response rate of 66%), representing 7,942 employees, returned the survey. Sixty-four agency directors were contacted in 1998. Thirty-eight of the respondents replied to the survey. In brief, almost two-thirds (63%) of the respondents from the 1995 survey agreed that prospective employees with a master of science in urban studies would be attractive candidates for employment. The agencies also reported that a total of 193 employees would be interested in pursuing this degree if approved. Twenty-five agencies, approximately three-fourths of the respondents, agreed to make internship placement available.

Through telephone interviews and written letters, support for the program was provided by the United Way of Coastal Empire, the Savannah-Chatham Public Schools, the Savannah Police Department, the Office of the District Attorney for Eastern Judicial Circuit, the Savannah City Manager's Office, the Sea Coast Workforce Development Board, the Girl Scout Council, the West Broad YMCA, the Georgia Department of Corrections, and Senior Citizens Savannah-Chatham County, Inc.

Delivery: SSU is the lead institution, and Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") is the assisting institution in the delivery of the proposed master of science in urban studies program in accordance with *Institutional Relationships, Mission and Academic Programming: Armstrong State College, Savannah State College, and Georgia Southern University* (December 7, 1994). The degree, master of science in urban studies, will be conferred by SSU. The two institutions share in program resource acquisition and development, including faculty. Drawing upon current resources and faculty expertise in the College of Liberal Arts and Social Sciences, the College of Business Administration, and the College of Science and Technology, SSU's program responsibilities lie with its College of Liberal Arts and Social Science, coordinating with the other divisions within the institution. SSU retains responsibility for the public management concentration and for the development of a new concentration in urban regional economic development. AASU will provide instruction in the administration of justice concentration. Both institutions will share responsibility for the development of the urban politics concentration. The distance learning facilities at SSU and AASU permit access to remote educational resources. The proximity of the Coastal Georgia Center for Continuing Education to local, State, and national government offices will facilitate the delivery of urban courses to government employees.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Establishment of the Master of Science in Urban Studies, Savannah State University (Continued)

Objectives: The principal objectives of the program include the development of analytical and research skills and the utilization of the intellectual resources necessary for the generation of new knowledge of urban areas in Georgia and worldwide. A second objective is to train students to apply analytical skills developed in urban studies to both the public and private sectors. An additional objective of the proposed degree program is to add to the general public's awareness of the problems and strengths of Georgia's urban areas through community activity.

Curriculum: The 36-semester-hour curriculum consists of an interdisciplinary core curriculum of 21 semester hours, 6 semester hours of internship or thesis, and 3 or 4 courses from a specialty concentration (i.e., a minimum of 9 hours) in a specialty concentration in one of the following areas: urban politics, urban and regional economic development, public management, or administration of justice.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will be 10, 15 and 25.

Funding: In addition to the redirected faculty resources from both campuses, four faculty members, an assistant director, and a director will be hired to form the corps instruction and administration of the proposed master of science in urban studies program.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Establishment of the Master of Science in Sports Medicine, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Robert A. Burnett of Armstrong Atlantic State University ("AASU") to establish the master of science in sports medicine, effective April 21, 1999.

Abstract: The master of science in sports medicine will prepare students for career opportunities in sports medicine through the sports health track and athletic training track. The tracks will focus upon the prevention, management, evaluation, and rehabilitation of athletic injuries. It is anticipated that the master of science in sports medicine will attract professionals such as physical therapists, physician assistants, cardiac rehabilitation specialists, and students from undergraduate athletic training programs and physical education who desire professional training in the field of sports medicine. Students enrolled in the sports health track are not seeking athletic training ("AT") certification. Students enrolled in the athletic training track are seeking AT certification.

The master of science in sports medicine degree program is clearly central to the mission of AASU with the College of Health Professions serving as a designated Regional Health Professions Education Center. The master of science in sports medicine degree program has been included as part of the planning priorities for new programs at AASU. A memorandum of understanding will be developed with Georgia Southern University to collaborate on the delivery of the sports health and athletic training tracks.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Establishment of the Master of Science in Sports Medicine, Armstrong Atlantic State University (Continued)

Need: The institution surveyed three groups of sports medicine specialists: physical therapists with certification in sports physical therapy, fellows of the American College of Sports Medicine, and certified athletic trainers in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina. A total of 2,420 were surveyed, and 577 responses were received. Of the surveys received, 75% of the respondents agreed there is a need for graduate-level sports medicine education. Nearly 50% of the respondents agreed that graduates from the program would have enhanced job opportunities.

The F. H. Mills study, entitled “Current Status of Athletic Health Services in Georgia High Schools,” observed the services rendered for athletic related injuries. It was noted that coaches were often responsible for the prevention, care, and rehabilitation of athletic related injuries. It was also observed that the training of coaches to deal with these injuries consisted of first aid and CPR. Therefore, it was inferred that a need exists in Georgia’s high schools for qualified professionals to deliver sports medicine services to approximately 12,000 athletes. For the master of science in sports medicine program, the projected market will be employers in the following areas: secondary schools, colleges and universities, professional sports organizations, hospitals/health systems, private practice clinics, corporate/industrial centers, and self-employed practitioners.

Objectives: The objectives of the master of science in sports medicine are to prepare students to serve as leaders in the multidimensional, professional field of sports medicine; to prepare students to enter professional practice as a certified athletic trainer by providing comprehensive post-baccalaureate entry-level athletic training academic preparation; and to provide supervised clinical education experiences for students enrolled in the program.

Curriculum: The master of science in sports medicine will be housed in the Department of Health Science in the College of Health Professions. The master of science in sports medicine (MSSM) degree will have two tracks: sports health (36 semester credits) and athletic training (80 semester credits).

The sports health track will target the professional who already has certification and/or licensure in a health-related area and is seeking graduate credentials to enhance his/her employment marketability. Accreditation is not available for the sports health track. For example, a licensed physical therapist may complete the sports health track to meet the requirements for specialty certification in sports physical therapy. These students are not seeking AT certification.

The athletic training track will produce graduates to enter the field of sports medicine with academic preparation to complete athletic training certification. The track is proposed for the individual who seeks athletic training certification credentials. The program of study is designed to meet the accreditation standards and guidelines of Commission on Accreditation of Allied Health Education Programs (“CAAHEP”) and the Joint Review Commission-Athletic Training (“JRC-AT”) and to prepare students for the National Athletic Trainers Association (“NATA”) AT certification.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Establishment of the Master of Science in Sports Medicine, Armstrong Atlantic State University (Continued)

Rationale for the 80-Semester-Hour Degree Waiver: The request for the waiver is for the athletic training track only. This request is based on the *Essentials and Guidelines for an Accredited Educational Program* for the athletic trainer and curriculum content to prepare students for the national certification examination. Accreditation requirements for JRC-AT and CAAHEP were used in designing the athletic training track for the master of science in sports medicine program. NATA requires a minimum of 1500 internship hours for certification. The athletic training track would prepare applicants for AT certification.

AASU's proposed program of 80 semester hours will include course work addressing the CAAHEP/JRC-AT required subject matter as well as a significant number of credit hours designed for supervised clinical education. At present, the number of clinical education credit hours are expected to be equal to or greater than 20 to 24 semester hours. This component of the program coupled with the required thesis or professional project supports the 80-semester-hour requirement.

Furthermore, the physical therapy graduate students, some of whom are admitted in their senior year, currently complete 107 semester hours in 7 semesters for an average load of 15 hours per semester. Applying this load to a 5-semester graduate entry-level program results in a 75-semester-hour program. Students would carry an average of 16 hours, which would result in an 80-semester-hour program.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will range from 22 to 24 students for the sports health and athletic training tracks.

Funding: The institution will redirect monies from other areas to initiate and maintain the program. Faculty members currently providing instruction in the AT internship program will be reassigned to the master of science in sports medicine program. Additionally, two faculty positions were requested in the fiscal year 2000 budget to support this proposal.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

4. Establishment of the Bachelor of Fine Arts With a Major in Interior Design, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Hugh C. Bailey of Valdosta State University ("VSU") to establish the bachelor of fine arts with a major in interior design, effective April 21, 1999.

Abstract: The bachelor of fine arts with a major in interior design is designed to provide students with opportunities to master the creative and technical skills needed for the successful application of design processes. The 120-semester-hour curriculum in interior design is formulated to produce students who are adept at using technology for communications, design, and research. The program stresses the ecological impacts of design decisions such as licensing, codes and regulations; design and spatial form; space utilization planning and energy conservation; and interiors, furniture, and textiles.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

4. Establishment of the Bachelor of Fine Arts With a Major in Interior Design, Valdosta State University (Continued)

Need: The bachelor of fine arts with a major in interior design has been structured to address an identified need that exists in the South Georgia region and in the State of Georgia. Data gathered from the Georgia Department of Labor's *OES Industry Occupation Matrix, Report B*, indicated that there should be a greater than 26% increase in employment opportunities in the field of interior design between 1994 and 2005 within the State. The proposed program is unique to the 41-county region served by VSU. The VSU Office of Institutional Research and Planning cited data from the Statewide and Regional Supply-Demand Analysis conducted by the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP"), which projected an annual unmet need of more than ten employees in employment categories related to interior design and the shortfall expected each year. For example, the study focusing on districts in Athens, Atlanta, Augusta, Columbus, Macon, and Rome projected a total unmet need of 340 positions. These positions were categorized under designer, merchandise displayer, and interior designer.

Objectives: The bachelor of fine arts with a major in interior design degree will be a professional degree program with emphasis on (a) historic preservation, conservation, and rehabilitation of historic interiors, (b) residential, and (c) commercial and related design fields. The purpose of the proposed degree program will be to prepare students for professional careers in the fields of interior design and related design disciplines which currently exist in the region and in visual arts and design and the disciplines related to interior design history and practice. The major program goals are to provide a comprehensive theoretical and practical professional preparation for graduates entering interior design and related design fields, a professional academic program that meets a demonstrated need in the region and the State of Georgia, and new career opportunities for a culturally diverse South Georgia student population. These fall within and are guided by the university, college, and departmental mission statements.

Curriculum: The interior design program will be housed within the College of the Arts, Department of Art. The 120-semester-hour curriculum requires 60 semester hours of core course work, with 42 hours devoted to general education courses and 18 hours of foundation courses in Area F specific to the major. The foundation courses for all bachelor of fine arts students are drawing, design, computing, and an introduction to visual arts and design concepts. The proposed 60-semester-hour upper-division curriculum includes courses related to interior design theory and practice with 12 hours required in art and interior design history. The program will be subject to the accreditation standards of the National Association of Schools of Art and Design (NASAD). The institution will also seek a more specialized accreditation from the Foundation for Interior Design Education Research (FIDER).

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will be 15, 20, and 20.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2002, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

5. Establishment of the Pilot Collaborative Doctor of Education Degree With a Major in Curriculum and Instruction With Albany State University, Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the requests of Presidents Hugh C. Bailey and Portia H. Shields of Valdosta State University (“VSU”) and Albany State University (“ASU”), respectively, that VSU be authorized to offer its doctor of education degree (“Ed.D.”) with a major in curriculum and instruction in a pilot collaborative with ASU, effective April 21, 1999.

Abstract: VSU will offer on a pilot basis its Ed.D. program in curriculum and instruction on the campus of ASU. This pilot is a first step toward a longer-term goal of the two institutions establishing a collaborative doctoral program. A full proposal for the collaborative doctoral program will be presented to the Board following revisions in VSU’s Ed.D. program to meet the Regents’ “Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools.” A memorandum of agreement has been signed between the two institutions.

6. Reorganization of the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science Into Two Distinct Departments: the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and the Department of Computer Science, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University (“GSU”) to reorganize the Department of Mathematics and Computer Science into two distinct departments: the Department of Mathematics and Statistics and the Department of Computer Science, effective July 1, 1999.

A separate Department of Computer Science will advance the goals set forth in the institutional strategic plan. Identifying the discipline of computer science with its own department will create a recognized community of scholars who are experts in computer science and who are concerned with excellence in teaching and research in that discipline. Given the role of mathematics in the core curriculum and the need to add computer science faculty in response to the increasing numbers of majors, the number of faculty in mathematics and computer science is projected to increase over the next ten years. Housing such a large faculty from two distinct disciplines in a single department does not seem reasonable. Separate departments of 22 mathematics faculty and 11 computer science faculty would better serve GSU’s instructional and research objectives.

The operating budget for the two departments will be drawn from the budget of the current Department of Mathematics and Computer Science. Initially, the two departments will share facilities, administrative staff, and systems staff until new space is identified in accordance with the university master plan. On the basis of the Computer Science Accreditation Board criteria for faculty, teaching loads, class sizes, curriculum and resources, GSU is ready to have a separate Department of Computer Science.

7. Establishment of the Dan Sweat Distinguished Scholar Chair in Educational Policy, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that the Dan Sweat Distinguished Scholar Chair in Educational Policy be established at Georgia State University (“GSU”), effective April 21, 1999.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

7. Establishment of the Dan Sweat Distinguished Scholar Chair in Educational Policy, Georgia State University (Continued)

The Georgia State University Foundation (the “Foundation”) has received gifts in excess of \$500,000 to create and help endow the Dan Sweat Distinguished Scholar Chair in Educational Policy. The chair would be shared jointly between the College of Education and the School of Policy Studies. The university will identify a scholar of national repute who will lead an effort in the development and implementation of educational policy. This chair will engage an individual with interest and expertise in policy issues related to education. These interests include issues such as the funding of education (state allocations, formulas, and vouchers), budgeting issues (incentives for teachers and schools), educational reform (charter schools, site-based management, school choice), and educational production.

Dan E. Sweat, an active and committed alumnus, became involved with GSU while leading Central Atlanta Progress and The Atlanta Project. Mr. Sweat served as chair of the Foundation, where he worked to implement changes in educational priorities and policies that would improve access to and delivery of education. Once heralded as Atlanta’s “premier civic administrator” by the *New York Times*, Mr. Sweat was one of Atlanta’s most respected public administrators. During his career, he was tapped by mayors, governors, and former President Jimmy Carter to spearhead various projects and initiatives.

Because of the dedication and distinguished friends of the university, GSU requested that the Board of Regents seek matching funds from the Georgia Eminent Scholars Endowment Trust to establish the eminent, distinguished scholar chair in the College of Education and the School of Policy Studies in honor of Dan Sweat.

8. Revised Statutes, Waycross College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Barbara P. Losty that Waycross College (“WC”) be authorized to revise its institutional statutes, effective April 21, 1999.

The faculty senate at WC approved the revised statutes at the December 2, 1998, faculty meeting. Compared to the previous statutes, the revised document incorporates changes in the academic administrative structure, changes in committees, and updates references to the Board of Regents’ policies.

The revisions have been carefully reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and the Office of Academic Affairs and were found consistent with the current organization and administrative structure at WC. A copy of the revised statutes is on file in the Office of Academic Affairs at the Board of Regents.

9. Termination of the Certificate Program in Flow Cytometry, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board of Regents approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco of the Medical College of Georgia to terminate the certificate in flow cytometry, effective April 21, 1999.

The Department of Medical Technology deems it appropriate to not have flow cytometry in its program array. Termination is being requested because there are no students in the program, and no faculty will be affected by this action. The program has not had more than one or two inquiries, and there is no faculty expertise available to administer the program.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

10. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System

Institutions

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Edgar L. Rhodes and were approved by the Board. All regular appointments, promotions, and grants of tenure are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS: AT THE REQUEST OF THE PRESIDENTS OF VARIOUS INSTITUTIONS IN THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM, THE BOARD CONFERRED THE TITLE OF EMERITUS UPON THE FOLLOWING FACULTY MEMBERS, EFFECTIVE ON THE DATES INDICATED:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

STALLYBRASS, MICHAEL PETER: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF MATHEMATICS, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE APR 11, 1999.

(B) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

JOHNSON, EVERETT A.: DIRECTOR AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF INSTITUTE OF HEALTH ADMINISTRATION, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE MAR 1, 1999.

MCDAVID, JOHN W.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF COUN. & PSYCH. SRVS., COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1999.

PILCHER, LORENE C.: RESEARCH PROFESSOR EMERITA, DEPARTMENT OF EARLY CHILDHOOD EDU., COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1999.

STALLINGS, WILLIAM M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE MAY 3, 1999.

(C) MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

LILLIS, PATRICIA P.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ADULT NURSING, DEPARTMENT OF ADULT NURSING, SCHOOL OF NURSING, EFFECTIVE MAY 8, 1999.

(D) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

DAUENHAUER, BERNARD PETER: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1999.

MCMAHAN, ROSEMARY: EMERITUS ASSISTANT PROFESSOR OF PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND SPORT STUDIES, SCHOOL OF HEALTH & HUMAN PERFORMANCE - DEPT OF PHY EDUC & SPORTS STUD, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1999.

(E) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

PRESLEY, DELMA E.: DIRECTOR EMERITUS OF THE GSU MUSEUM AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, DEPARTMENT OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE MAY 1, 1999.

(F) KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

GOLDEN, BEN R.: PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL & PHYSICAL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1999.

ZOGHBY, MARY: PROFESSOR OF ENGLISH EMERITA, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, COLLEGE HUMANITIES & SOCIAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1999.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS (CONTINUED):

(G) NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

DAY, SHERMAN R.: PRESIDENT EMERITUS OF N. GEORGIA. COLLEGE & STATE U., PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF EDUC. & CRIMINAL JUSTICE, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1999.

(H) ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE

HILL, LAWRENCE NORMAN: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HEALTH & PHYSICAL EDUCATION AND RECREATION, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, PHYSICAL EDUCATION & RECREATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 2, 1999.

SUMNER, JOANN T.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF NURSING, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, EFFECTIVE SEP 2, 1999.

(I) GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

THOMAS, SUSAN M.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH (CLARKSTON), DIVISION OF HUMANITIES (CLARKSTON), EFFECTIVE MAY 7, 1999.

APPROVAL OF LEAVES OF ABSENCE: THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING LEAVES OF ABSENCE AND THE SALARIES FOR THE PERIODS RECOMMENDED AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MITRA, SABYASACHI: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DUPREE COLLEGE OF MANAGEMENT, LEAVE FROM AUG 23, 1999 TO AUG 7, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

CHESSEY, RONALD KEITH: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF GENETICS, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 1, 1999 TO JAN 31, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

JERZAK, KATARZYNA: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMPARATIVE LITERATURE, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 19, 1999 TO MAY 9, 2000, WITH PAY.

THOMAS, EMORY MORTON: RESEARCH PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM JAN 1, 2000 TO MAY 31, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

(C) VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

EDWARDS, FAYE S.: INSTRUCTOR, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 1, 1999 TO MAY 31, 2000, WITH PAY.

HARRELL, GREGORY KENT: INSTRUCTOR, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 1, 1999 TO MAY 31, 2000, WITH PAY.

(D) KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY

ROBINSON, KENNETH C.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT AND ENTREPRENEURSHIP, MICHAEL J. COLES COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, LEAVE FROM AUG 16, 1999 TO MAY 13, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

APPROVAL OF LEAVES OF ABSENCE (CONTINUED):

(E) STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA

BIANCHELLI, ELENA: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES AND LITERATURE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 16, 1999 TO MAY 10, 2000, WITHOUT PAY.

(F) GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

STERN, TINA: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY (DUNWOODY), DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE (DUNWOODY), LEAVE FROM AUG 16, 1999 TO MAY 12, 2000, WITH PAY.

APPROVAL OF FACULTY FOR TENURE STATUS CHANGE: THE BOARD APPROVED TENURE STATUS CHANGE FOR THE FOLLOWING FACULTY MEMBERS, EFFECTIVE ON THE DATES INDICATED:

(A) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

WELCH-ROSS, MELISSA: ASST. RESEARCH PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NONTENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUG 16, 1999.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

HARDING, ROBERTA M.: TEMP ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF LAW, FROM NONTENURE TRACK TO TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE JAN 6, 1999.

(C) NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

HANCOCK, CHARLENE: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NONTENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUG 1, 1999.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM: THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

COX, JAMES M., JR.: SR RES TECH, SYSTEMS DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY, GEORGIA TECH RESEARCH INSTITUTE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 3, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

O'NEIL, DAVID R.: PROGRAM SPECIALIST, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAR 25, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

FOWLKES, DIANE L.: PROFESSOR EMERITA, WOMEN'S STUDIES INSTITUTE, COLLEGE OF ARTS & SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING APR 23, 1999 AND ENDING APR 24, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HARRIS, JOE FRANK: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION & URBAN STUDIES, SCHOOL OF POLICY STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 10, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

LONG, CHARLES R.: ASSOC PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, SCHOOL OF POLICY STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 17, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 10, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM (CONTINUED):

(B) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CONTINUED)

MCCULLOUGH, MARGARET J.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NUTRITION & LABORATORY TECHNOLOGIES, COLLEGE OF HEALTH SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING AUG 15, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(C) MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

CRUMRINE, ROBERT S.: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ANESTHESIOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 1, 1999 AND ENDING APR 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(D) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

BRADHAM, LEONA B.: SCIENT. ADMIN. SPECIALIST, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING APR 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

FERRE, FREDERICK: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SR VP FOR ACAD AFFAIRS & PROVOST, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEB 15, 1999 AND ENDING FEB 19, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HACKNEY, PATRICIA D.: PUBLIC SERVICE ASSOCIATE, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

HARRINGTON, DAVID L.: MARINE FISHERIES SPEC, MARINE RESOURCES EXTENSION, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

PIPPIN, JAMES ARTHUR: ASSOC PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF SOCIAL WORK, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING APR 1, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 31, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(E) ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY

WILSON, JOHN: HOUSING COORDINATOR, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAY 3, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 9, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(F) FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

MCCORMICK, PAULETTE: INSTRUCTOR, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 6, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 6, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(G) SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE

LOTT, WILMA R.: ADMIN COORD, PROF MATH, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUN 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:
THE BOARD APPROVED THE FOLLOWING PART-TIME APPOINTMENTS OF FACULTY MEMBERS OVER THE
AGE OF 70 PREVIOUSLY RETIRED FROM THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM:

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

BLICKSILVER, EDITH H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, (NTT) DEPARTMENT OF LITERATURE,
COMMUNICATION & CULTURE, IVAN ALLEN COLLEGE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAR 29,
1999 AND ENDING JUN 11, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

CRADDICK, RAY A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, COLLEGE OF ARTS &
SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING DEC 1, 1998 AND ENDING DEC 30, 1998,
AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(C) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

DENMAN, FRANCES T.: RESEARCH TECHNICIAN III, DEPARTMENT OF POULTRY SCIENCE,
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD
BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

EDWARDS, JAMES DON: J. M. TULL PROF EMERITUS, J. M. TULL SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTING,
COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999
AND ENDING JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

RIVERS, JOHN B.: MARINE FISHERIES SPEC, MARINE RESOURCES EXTENSION, VICE
PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1999 AND ENDING
JUN 30, 2000, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(D) FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

SIMMONS, JULIUS C.: COUNSELOR, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR
PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 6, 1999 AND ENDING MAY 7, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY: THE BOARD APPROVED THE APPOINTMENT OF FACULTY MEMBERS
AT THE SALARIES AND FOR THE PERIODS RECOMMENDED AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	20
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	17
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA	11
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	12
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	6
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	2
ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	3
ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY	2
AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	4
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	2
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY	1
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	10
NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	7
SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY	1
STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	3
ATLANTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE	1
COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	1
GAINESVILLE COLLEGE	1
GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE	1
GORDON COLLEGE	2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

PROMOTION OF FACULTY: THE BOARD APPROVED THE PROMOTION OF FACULTY MEMBERS
AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	82
---------------------------------	----

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	31
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA	36
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	134
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	27
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	33
ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	11
ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY	18
AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	11
CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	10
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	17
FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	5
GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	10
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY	7
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	27
NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	6
SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY	4
SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY	5
STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	12
DALTON STATE COLLEGE	5
MACON STATE COLLEGE	7
ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	5
ATLANTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE	1
BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE	3
COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	5
DARTON COLLEGE	2
EAST GEORGIA COLLEGE	6
FLOYD COLLEGE	9
GAINESVILLE COLLEGE	7
GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE	34
GORDON COLLEGE	2
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	10
SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	2
WAYCROSS COLLEGE	1

GRANTING OF TENURE: THE BOARD APPROVED THE GRANTING OF TENURE TO FACULTY MEMBERS AT THE FOLLOWING INSTITUTIONS:

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	35
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	20
MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA	6
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	48
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	30
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	31
ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	8
ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY	14
AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	7
CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	6
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	7
FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	3
GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	18
GEORGIA SOUTHWESTERN STATE UNIVERSITY	8
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	20
NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	4

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

GRANTING OF TENURE (CONTINUED):

SAVANNAH STATE UNIVERSITY	9
SOUTHERN POLYTECHNIC STATE UNIVERSITY	4
STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	11
DALTON STATE COLLEGE	3
MACON STATE COLLEGE	2
ABRAHAM BALDWIN AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE	3
BAINBRIDGE COLLEGE	2
COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE	3
DARTON COLLEGE	2
FLOYD COLLEGE	4
GAINESVILLE COLLEGE	6
GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE	22
GORDON COLLEGE	4
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	6
SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE	1
WAYCROSS COLLEGE	2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

11. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7 and 8, 1984, the presidents of the listed institutions have executed the indicated number of memoranda of understanding respecting affiliation of students for applied learning experiences/clinical training in the programs indicated:

University of Georgia		Georgia Southwestern State University	
Communication Sciences	4R	Nursing	4, 4R
Foods and Nutrition	1		
Recreation and Leisure	4	Kennesaw State University	
		Nursing	4
Georgia Southern University		North Georgia College & State University	
Family & Consumer Sci.	1	Physical Education	4
Leadership (Counselor Educ.)	2	Physical Therapy	3R
Nursing	3		
Social Work	1	State University of West Georgia	
		Health Sciences	1R
Valdosta State University		Nursing	3, 5R
Nursing	8, 69R	Physical Education/Recreation	1
Armstrong Atlantic State University		Darton College	
Physical Therapy	3	Health Information Technology	1
Augusta State University		Medical Laboratory Technology	6R
Psychology	1	Occupational Therapy Assistant	1
Georgia College & State University		Total	136
Health Sciences	2		

R = Renewal

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

12. 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:

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
University of Georgia			
Evaluate potential of corn as rotation crop to control nematodes	Georgia Commodity Comm. for Corn	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$9,500
Study control of insects in field corn	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$9,000
Study post-harvest storage grain fumigation training for Georgia farmers	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$6,080
Study effects of planting date and corn hybrids on yield on maize weevil infestation	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$2,250
Conduct county education programs for corn production	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$5,000
Study high residue conservation tillage system for corn	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$7,700
Study corn yield as it relates to row widths	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$3,100
Provide technical support for extension corn improvement	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$33,300
Provide practical market risk management for corn growers	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$4,000
Study maize weevil infestations in corn	“ ” “	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$3,080
Provide support for agricultural research assistant III	Georgia Commodity Comm. for Peanuts	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$5,343
Observe remedial education programs in Georgia public schools	Georgia Dept. of Education	2/1/99 - 6/30/99	\$130,600
Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
University of Georgia			
Conduct nutrition conferences and workshops	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	12/31/98 - 9/30/99	\$121,290
Conduct fire safety educational project	“ ” “	1/1/99 - 9/30/99	\$6,988

Assist with annual board educational retreats	“ ” “	12/1/97 - 1/31/00	\$150,000
Assist Need Families Leadership Development Institute	“ ” “	3/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$248,410
Conduct historic preservation division workshops	Georgia Dept. of Natural Resources	7/1/98 - 6/30/99	\$42,000
Provide coastal incentive grant	“ ” “	4/1/98 - 9/30/99	\$10,000
Conduct Lunch ‘N Learn roundtable workshop	Governor’s Council on Developmental Disabilities	9/30/98 - 8/31/99	\$4,700
Floyd College			
Provide computer training	Georgia Dept. of Revenue	1/12/99 - 1/14/96	\$4,400
Provide keyboard training	City of Rome, Georgia	1/25/99 - 1/28/99	\$1,040

TOTAL AMOUNT THIS MONTH \$ 807,781
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99 To DATE \$29,974,424
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 98 (TO APRIL) \$84,578,648
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 98 \$86,491,530

AUDIT COMMITTEE

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, April 20, 1999 at approximately 3:45 p.m. in room 125, the Quiet Lounge, of the Student Center on the campus of Savannah State University. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Regents J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, and Glenn S. White. Vice Chair Howell reported to the full Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed four items, none of which required action. He noted that Mr. Stark will be mailing to the Regents a risk analysis for them to identify any institution or department where they feel there may be a need for added audit attention. He encouraged the Regents to complete and return these to Mr. Stark. The items the Committee reviewed at this meeting were as follows:

1. Information Item: Status of Fiscal Year 1999 Audit Plan

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark reported to the Committee on the status of the fiscal year 1999 audit plan through April 15, 1999.

2. Information Item: Summary of Year-to-Date State Department of Audits Findings

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark reported to the Committee on the State Department of Audits findings in its most recently released reports of System institutions. Seven reports were reviewed with one ranked Code 1, three ranked Code 2, two ranked Code 3, and one ranked Code 4. There was some discussion about Southern Polytechnic University, which was ranked Code 4. Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers reported on the corrective action taken by the President Lisa A. Rossbacher to address concerns identified in the audit.

3. Information Item: Georgia Institute of Technology Department of Mathematics Audit

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark reported to the Committee that travel policies were not being complied with by certain faculty members of the Georgia Institute of Technology Department of Mathematics and those policies should be enhanced. Procedures to ensure the proper disposition of funds obtained by GIT or its foundation should also be enhanced. Additionally, policies to administer "off-campus duties" should be enhanced to ensure compliance with Board policy. President G. Wayne Clough made comments on the audit review and the business processes and presented to the Committee his plans for corrective action on this audit.

4. Information Item: Budget Review and Oversight Committee ("BROC") Follow-up of Auxiliary Enterprise Programs

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Internal Audit Ron Stark reported to the Committee on the recommendations by the BROC on the auxiliary enterprise programs budget oversight and the Central Office's response to this report.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

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

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Since we last met, we have concluded a successful legislative session. I want to thank the Board for its support and personal involvement, the presidents for their fine efforts before and during the session, and the usual exemplary work by Tom Daniel (Vice Chancellor for External Affairs), aided ably by a number of people from the campuses.

In many ways, the success of the session depends quite a bit on pre- and post-season. In pre-season this year, we had what became known as "Priority #1." I visited all 34 campuses, including meeting with community leaders. You, too, engaged in many public activities, as did the presidents. Once again, we spoke with one voice and one message: "The State's economic future required that the University System maintain its momentum." The message was heard and widely and accurately reported on by the media.

In the post-season, it's vital we do two things: 1) Thank those who've supported maintaining our momentum. 2) Make sure we deliver and are accountable for delivering.

I am asking our presidents to ensure their local legislators are appropriately thanked. I would ask that each of you do likewise and that all of us thank the leadership for their support. The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the Speaker; the Appropriations Committee chairs Terry Coleman and George Hooks, plus other members of the Budget Conference Committee, Terrell Starr, Charles Walker, Tom Buck, and Larry Walker; the chairs of our respective committees, Jack Hill and DuBose Porter; and the important role played by the directors of the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget ("OPB"), Tim Burgess, and of the Legislative Budget Office, Robert Hobbs.

Incidentally, as many of you have heard, Tim Burgess is joining the University of Georgia's Budget Office. Governor Barnes has appointed Bill Tomlinson as the new OPB Director. I'm delighted with that appointment, because not only is Bill good to work with, but also knows and cares deeply about education.

An additional word or two about Governor Barnes. Many, including me, wondered about whether he would continue the momentum for the University System and education. Clearly, he has. He had a remarkably successful session on a host of issues, yet was still very focused on the budget--and particularly helpful on several key issues, including teacher preparation. Plus he put his stamp early on Georgia's high-end economic future through his Yamacraw initiative.

On a personal note, I think it's very important for Georgia that our Governor is an intellectual — proving that a folksy intellectual is not an oxymoron! I've learned from our budget hearing and this session that he has a very sharp mind and a very quick wit. Plus he's the State's first E-mail Governor, which has a number of agency heads scrambling to improve their typing skills! In the upcoming months and during next session, he will focus on education. We must be ready to inform and to assist him in those efforts.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

Before it appears that I'm already deifying the Governor of Georgia, I do need to point out that he has yet to compete — so to speak — with Minnesota's new governor, who already has earned his own bumper sticker. I saw a car with Minnesota plates last week with this bumper sticker: "My governor can beat up your governor!"

At any rate, I am personally grateful to the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Speaker, other leaders, and every member of the General Assembly for their accessibility and for their support for a more educated Georgia.

Since we're in Savannah today, I thought there would be no better way to make real the legislative session and budget than to localize them with just a few examples:

- On the economic development front, this region will benefit mightily from the support received in both the supplemental and fiscal year 2000 budget for regional engineering. The proposal was well received and well funded.
- Instructional equipment is already being purchased at Savannah State, Armstrong, and Georgia Southern; faculty are already being recruited by Georgia Tech. Also, thanks to a capital minors project, the Coastal Georgia Center in downtown Savannah will be expanded — in large part to help the engineering program.
- A good director has been hired by Georgia Tech and has been hard at work for months in this region. A new curriculum is in design, and distance education courses are being developed, in part using the desktop learning initiative. The local business community, through the BETA Group, is raising scholarship funding! And the three local campuses are recruiting students to enter the program. Much has happened since your approval last September, and we're on target to begin the program in September of 1999.

When you couple that with the likely impact of Governor Barnes' Yamacraw Initiative, there's no doubt that this region has added considerably to its educational and, therefore, economic future.

And when you link that to another of the Board's initiatives--the Research Island on Skidaway (which, incidentally, got design money through GRA (Georgia Research Alliance) for a new research facility in this budget)--you can see the reality of our Priority #1 message.

To be fully successful, however, we know only too well that any community needs strong K-12 schools with talented teachers well connected to our colleges and universities. This past week, I gave yet another presentation on P-16 and PREP (Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program) to a national group of governors, legislators, and education leaders. Governor Barnes and Secretary Riley also spoke to the group. Two national publications have recently focused on these programs--*Crosstalk* and *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. Interestingly, they both used as their examples this region of the State.

CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD

And once we have these beneficial relationships with the local schools, it's crucial that we have welcoming campuses. In that regard, I'm particularly pleased that we have a major movement underway on student housing here at Savannah State University, with now the possibility of both a privately funded facility and a State project (both on a general fund and payback basis). This has been a priority of President Brown's and mine for some time now, and we're delighted to see this movement forward. It will make recruiting students to this campus all the easier, especially with a strengthened academic program — including the new master's program you approved today — being developed as well.

Talking about presidents, I'm sure many of you remember the day two years ago that we came here to introduce Carlton and Pete Silver. We asked them to build trust on campus and in the community; we asked them to work on academic quality and student-centeredness; we asked them to rebuild the foundations. We didn't expect overnight miracles, hence our five-year appointment. They have worked tirelessly; the campus has made significant progress. Much remains to be done, but we're well on course, and I thank them and the entire campus community for responding so positively to our challenge.

Meanwhile, across town, Bob Burnett has announced his retirement, with so much to be proud of at Armstrong Atlantic. He retires, as we all should, excited, energized, and fulfilled — and especially pleased with his final five years at the helm. The very able Frank Butler will be Interim President next academic year, while we conduct the search. In this continuing cycle, we will later today make our appointment of President for North Georgia College & State University, concluding our four searches this year, all filled for the fifth year in a row with our top choice candidates.

While we've been busy, so have our campus folks bringing distinction to the system:

- President Nesbitt has been elected president of the American Association of Women in Community Colleges.
- President Shields has been elected to the board of directors of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.
- ABAC (Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College) received their first Fulbright Grant this year (their first year to apply!). Their division of humanities under the leadership of Dr. Charlotte Pfeiffer was approved by the U.S. Department of Education for a four-week study project to Japan this summer. In addition to Dr. Pfeiffer, four others from ABAC, four from public schools, and six from other colleges in Georgia will make the trip.
- West Georgia Advanced Academy student Jason Hay was recently awarded West Georgia's first Goldwater Scholarship. Approximately 300 Goldwater Scholarships are awarded annually to sophomore and junior students in the U.S. on the basis of academic merit. The scholarship is designed to foster and encourage outstanding students to pursue careers in the fields of mathematics, the natural sciences, and

engineering. Jason is currently a high school senior and a sophomore physics major. The University of Georgia also had two recipients of the Goldwater Scholarship.

- Georgia State will appear in an upcoming issue of the national *Facilities Manager* magazine as recipients of the Award for Excellence in Facilities Management (Association of Physical Plant Administrators' highest institutional honor). Kudos go to Doug Ault, Physical Plant Director, and Mr. James Sears, Assistant Director of Building Services, and the team in the Building Services Unit of the Physical Plant Department.

- Coastal Georgia's literary magazine *Seaswells 1998* was awarded first place with special merit by the American Scholastic Press Association.

- UGA researchers have been in the spotlight. Research microbiologist David Lewis who is joint-staffed with UGA and the EPA received national coverage, including a feature in *Newsweek* regarding his research into the prevention of the spread of AIDS and other illnesses through dental implements. Research by soil scientist Daniel Markewitz which shows that acid rain dissolves forest nutrients quicker than once believed was featured by CNN and its interactive Web site.

- Valdosta State University won CASE District III's Award of Excellence in the Educational Fundraising Project category for their Faculty/Staff Participation entry. Faculty and staff contributed over \$100,000 this year.

- Valdosta State continues to prepare excellent teachers. During Honors Day, the most prestigious award, the Annie Powe Hopper Award, went to early childhood education major Patricia Crockett. Her university supervisor praised her accomplishments, stating that in 25 years, she had never had as exceptional a student teacher as Ms. Crockett. Word of her fantastic teaching spread, and Ms. Crockett had several offers for positions available midway through the school year. Southern Christian Academy in Lakeland held a position open just for her. Ms. Crockett is currently teaching 3- to 5-year-olds there. The most compelling part of the story is Ms. Crockett has persevered over two decades to complete her bachelor's degree. Now it's her husband's turn. She is reciprocating support as he furthers his education. Regent Cannestra was the Honors Day speaker. Congratulations to all those who bring honor to the system.

As we meet at Savannah State University today, we are reminded about the progress of our State and nation in providing greater equity of opportunity for tomorrow's leaders for tomorrow's economy. While it is true that our agenda is as yet unfinished, it is also true that our direction is clear and our commitment is deep.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

After the Chancellor's report to the Board, Chair Jenkins recognized Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development & Economic Services Annie Hunt Burriss and her mother, Mrs. Mary Jenkins Hunt, from Elberton, Georgia.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chair Jenkins next convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole and turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern stated that at the March 1999 Board meeting, the Strategic Planning Committee held a discussion on the draft principles on instructional technology and distance learning, which have been developed from the Board’s year-long technology initiative. Those principles would be up for adoption by the Board at this meeting. However, before the Board would vote on the principles, it would be hearing from a special guest from the United Kingdom. Chair Leebern remarked that it would be most fitting to have the System’s British Chancellor introduce this guest.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair Leebern and said that he wanted to give the Regents a little cultural history lesson. He stated that he has experienced difficulty explaining to other British people what he does for a living, because in the Oxford English Dictionary, the first use of the word chancellor in the year 1066 was “a petty official in charge of children, idiots, and lunatics.” Further confusion occurs because in England, a chancellor does no work. Rather, this is an honorary position held often by a very distinguished person who does none of the work. The chief executive officer (“CEO”) of a university in England is actually the vice chancellor. So, when Chancellor Portch would introduce Sir John Daniel as a vice chancellor, it would mean that Sir John is in fact a CEO. The Chancellor noted that after World War II, the United States made a profound decision that has had a very far-reaching impact, the decision to implement the GI Bill. The GI Bill made higher education accessible to returning veterans, which resulted in its being widely available to Americans today. The same thing did not happen in Europe. With many other struggles after the war, there was no equivalent to the GI Bill. Higher education was never openly available to significant numbers of the British. In fact, when the Chancellor went to his undergraduate institution in the late 1960s in England, only about 4% of the population had access to higher education. There were probably fewer students in all of England than are currently in the University System. It was a very elitist system. That changed in the late 1960s on the dream of Prime Minister Harold Wilson (Labour Party). He wanted to make higher education available to nontraditional students and others. So, he created the concept of what later became known as The Open University (the “OU”). It began as the University of the Air, because it used television and a superb system of individual tutors around the country. Since its inception, this institution has grown to be the most significant university of its type in the world, heralded most of all for its quality. It has fundamentally led the change of higher education in Great Britain. Today, there are many more universities and a much higher proportion of citizens now have the opportunity to go to college. Chancellor Portch noted that while the Board is now discussing virtual universities and distance education, this has already been done by the OU for 30 years. He stated that after Prime Minister Wilson departed from office, a minister of education by the name of Margaret Thatcher became Prime Minister. The Chancellor was a student leader at the time, and it gave him some pleasure to see her in Atlanta recently. He noted that although she was a superb minister of education, the students did not believe so at the time. Her first act was to ban the free school milk that the schools had for nutrition purposes. That gave the students a great chant for reciting outside her office: “Margaret Thatcher, the milk snatcher.” Nonetheless, she made her reputation as minister of education, and one of the important things she did was sustain the Labour Party’s dream of the OU, and she made it possible for the institution to build and grow. Sir John is the vice chancellor of the OU. He has a very distinguished academic career. He was president of Laurentian University, Ontario before he moved to this position at OU in 1990. In 1998, he added the duties of being president of the United States Open University (the “USOU”). He may be the first person ever to head

universities in all three countries. Now, he is heading the OU in both the United Kingdom and the United States at once. He would be giving 10 **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

speeches in 11 days in his current visit to the United States. Chancellor Portch said that the Board was honored to have him at this meeting. The OU is now responsible for over 200,000 students, 25,000 of whom live outside Great Britain. Sir John is a citizen of both Canada and the United Kingdom, and he holds honorary degrees from universities in eight countries. He was recognized by Queen Elizabeth in 1994, when he was knighted for his services to education. Sir John is a person who believes that technology can do a lot for education. He is a Reader in the Anglican Church and was the first person to preach in Westminster Abbey from a laptop computer. At this meeting, he would be telling the Board about the relationship between distance learning and what the University System can do and whether there are potential strategic partnerships as the Board goes forward with this initiative. The Chancellor then welcomed Sir John Daniel, whose speech to the Board was as follows:

“Distance Learning and Clear Thinking”

Thank you for inviting me to Savannah. It is a privilege to address this meeting of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia in a year when you have chosen distance learning and technology as your theme topic. May I begin by congratulating you on the dynamism of the University System in Georgia? We hear in Europe about the importance that Governors Miller and Barnes and their colleagues in the legislature have given to education in this State. Your Chancellor has an international reputation for which we in the United Kingdom feel a little reflected glory. Very importantly, you have taken initiatives in the vital area of financial support to students which have generated a vigorous debate. Promoting debate is a cardinal virtue at the Open University, so it is a pleasure to be with you and to contribute to your debate on the topical issue of distance learning and technology.

I bring you greetings from the chancellor of the Open University. The titular head of our university is Betty Boothroyd, Speaker of the House of Commons. Although her role within the Open University is largely ceremonial, as is traditional for U.K. university chancellors, she takes a keen interest in the university and particularly in our activities in the United States. She began her career as a political assistant in Washington in the Kennedy administration and has great affection for this country. For my remarks to you this morning, I have chosen the title “Distance Learning and Clear Thinking.” Right now, distance learning is very fashionable. If, as I did, you began working in this field long ago when it was not fashionable, that is good news. The bad news is that when something becomes fashionable, everyone tends to pile in and try to redefine it to fit their own hobbyhorses. Inevitably, the concept becomes fuzzy, which usually contributes to its decline as a fashionable item. My aim is to try and make distance learning less fuzzy for you. It is in fact a very simple phenomenon both in concept and practice. I want to strip away some of the obfuscation that surrounds it and show you what a powerful tool it is. To do this, I've divided my remarks into three parts.

First, why are we interested in distance learning at all? What do you, as a group of distinguished citizens charged with guiding a large and mature public higher

education system, have to gain from it? What problems can it solve? What challenges can it help you to meet?

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Second, I shall bring this down to earth by showing that distance learning can deliver benefits. Too often, when we hear enthusiasts talk about the promise of a new educational technology, we are right to fear their nostrum is the triumph of hope over experience. I shall report on the signal success of the world's large distance teaching universities, which I call the mega-universities, and of the Open University in particular.

Third, and finally, I shall describe briefly the developing activities of the Open University in the U.S.A. and the creation of its sister university, the United States Open University. There may be things that the USOU and that University System of Georgia can do together for the benefit of the people of this State and for the greater impact of your work around this nation.

First then, what can distance learning do for you? In answering this question you must first disentangle distance learning and technology. They have become hopelessly intertwined, especially in this country. I might have entitled this talk "Technology Is the Answer. What Was the Question?" because that phrase sums up the problem. Mountaineers say that they climb mountains "because they are there." That's fine for mountaineers, but it's not good enough as a reason for investing public money. Before we deploy distance learning in general, or a specific technology in particular, we must have some goal in mind. What are we trying to achieve?

As Regents, you have your own goals for the University System of Georgia. They mesh with the issues that preoccupy public bodies concerned with higher education all over the world. It is the eternal triangle of access, quality, and cost. Some might add flexibility and make it an eternal quadrilateral, but since the geometry of triangles is simpler, I prefer to see flexibility as part of the access challenge and stick with the triangle.

The tensions within this triangle manifest themselves the world over. In the developing countries, there is a crisis of access. Half the world's population is aged less than 20, and universities are about to be hit by a tidal wave of young people. The developing countries cannot solve this problem using traditional methods, because campus education is too costly on the scale they need it. The social fallout from insufficient access to universities is not just a problem for those developing countries. We live in a global village, and if tens of millions of youngsters grow up uneducated, unemployed, unconnected, and unstable, that will be our problem too. Cost is not only an issue in the emerging markets. As Regents, you must worry about the costs of higher education in Georgia. For an American family, the cost of sending a child to college, adding up tuition, room, and board, is approaching 15% of the median family income. That's up from 9% of median family income 15 years ago. Moreover, 15% of income is the cost for a public university. For private universities the figure is nearly 40% of median family income, up from just over 20% in the same 15-year period. People are asking whether this considerable and escalating personal investment in university education is value for money. You, as Regents, have to try and square the circle.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Then there is the challenge of quality. In the U.S.A., you still take a fairly relaxed approach to this, accepting that variable quality is inevitable and policing things with a light touch through your regional accrediting bodies. Other jurisdictions have become much less relaxed about quality. The United Kingdom now has a ferocious state-run quality assurance system for higher education. It has a three-pronged approach to institutions. First, it assesses the adequacy of the quality assurance arrangements in each university and publishes its findings. Second, it assesses the quality of teaching by discipline and by institution and publishes those results. Third, it assesses the quality of research by subject and by institution. Those results are not only published, but also serve as drivers for the flow of public funds to research in each university.

Academics visiting the U.K. from overseas find this all a bit nightmarish and hope this system doesn't start playing at a theatre near them. I have to confess that I myself rather like the system. That's partly because it provides public accolades for the quality of what we do at the Open University but more generally because it has sparked a more sophisticated discourse about quality in our land. There was a time when the reputation of a university was simply a function of its age, its wealth, and the exclusivity of its intake. Those times are ending as people see the folly of measuring inputs instead of judging outputs.

Finally, there is the challenge of flexibility. As student profiles change, flexibility of learning opportunities becomes essential. The paradox is that while flexibility enhances access, it tends to increase costs and lower quality. It increases costs because the campus infrastructure designed for less flexible learning methods still has to be paid for. It threatens quality simply because very flexible structures collapse unless they are well designed. The eternal triangle is distorted in unhelpful ways.

You have only to express the challenge facing higher education as a complex balancing of access, cost, quality, and flexibility to appreciate that responses based on a single technology are implausible. The notions that “the Web will solve that” or “video-conferencing is the answer” simply don't stand up.

That doesn't imply we should forget technology; it means instead that we should start with a broad concept of technology. What is technology? Here's how we define it for our first-year technology students at the Open University: “Technology is the application of scientific and other organized knowledge to practical tasks by organizations consisting of people and machines.”

There are two key points in that definition. First, technology is more than applied science. Non-scientific knowledge, such as crafts, design, tacit knowledge, and managerial skills, is involved too. Second — and very important — technology always involves people and their social systems. When we use technology in education, processes, approaches, rules, and ways of organizing things are just as important as hardware and software. Start from this definition of technology, and you can point to the success of technology in responding to the challenges facing higher education. You find, however, that the effective responses are new applications of technology rather than applications of new technology. What do I mean?

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

The new application of technology is the increasingly organized body of knowledge about distance learning. Distance learning uses a combination of hard and soft technologies. Hard technologies are bits and bytes, electrons and E-mail, satellites and search engines. Soft technologies are processes, approaches, sets of rules, and models of organization. The most

important key to using distance learning in a way that is both intellectually powerful and competitively cost-effective is to get the soft technologies right. The hard technologies change. Indeed, they change quite rapidly. Only three years ago, video-conferencing was all the rage. Now, to hear some people talk, you would think that the Web is the only learning medium. But in a few years, the pattern of available technologies and the fashions in media use will have changed again. To handle these changes, you need a sound framework of soft technologies to ensure you employ the hard technologies effectively.

In fact, these soft technologies are the working practices that underpin the rest of today's modern industrial and service economy division of labor, specialization, teamwork, and project management. But these are not the traditional working practices of college teaching.

On campus, the habit is for the same individual to do everything: develop the curriculum, organize the learning resources, teach the class, provide academic support, and assess student learning. This makes for a robust, cottage-industry model that does not require much organization. However, it also does not allow us to reconfigure the eternally challenging triangle of cost-access-quality in the directions of lower costs, greater access and higher quality.

With the right blend of soft and hard technologies, that triangle can be reconfigured. The mega-universities are the best example of such success. A mega-university is a university that teaches at a distance and has at least 100,000 students. There are now 12 of them, but since none of them is in the United States, you may not know much about them. The U.S. does have huge universities like California State University ("CSU"), with several hundred thousand students, but they are federated universities with many campuses and thousands of faculty. The mega-universities are unitary institutions with one campus and only hundreds of faculty.

The numbers alone, over 3 million students in just 12 universities, suggest that these mega-universities are resolving the crisis of access. This is partly because the mega-universities have also addressed the crisis of flexibility. They allow lifelong learners to study whenever they choose and wherever they are.

They are also a dramatic response to the crisis of cost. In this country, there are 3,500 colleges and universities with an enrollment of 14 million students and an annual spend on higher education of around \$175 billion. That's an average cost of \$12,500 per student. The comparative figure for the mega-universities is less than \$350 per student, which is more than an order of magnitude smaller. But the real comparison is within each country. In each case, the per capita student cost at the mega-university is well below the average cost at the other universities in the same country. In two cases, it's only 10% of that average. The cost revolution is real.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

So far, so good on access, cost, and flexibility. But, you are muttering, what about quality? Here I move from the general to the particular and cite the Open University, which is the mega-university that I know best.

The United Kingdom now has robust quality assessment processes backed by statutory authority. They allow us to judge the quality of the Open University. Sparing you the detail, of which there is plenty, the most telling indicator of the quality of a British university is the proportion of its teaching programs that are rated as excellent. On this measure, the Open University ranks eleventh out of 98 U.K. universities. Results were announced recently for the teaching of general engineering. The Open University was the only university to gain the maximum score of 24/24. Cambridge University, which all agree has an excellent school of engineering, had to be content

with 23/24.

When you combine the Open University's quality scores with the scale of its operation, you get a remarkable result. In disciplines that include chemistry, earth sciences, music and social policy, as well as general engineering, a majority of all English students enrolled in excellent-rated degree programs are studying with the Open University. That tells you two things. First, distance learning can be successful for practically any subject. Second, the link between quality and exclusivity that has tarnished university education for a thousand years has been finally broken.

But I get ahead of myself. I must give you a thumbnail sketch of the Open University to put all this in context. The simplest approach is to ask the obvious questions: why, what, who, when, where, and how?

Why? First then, why the Open University? It was set up in 1969 with very strong political support, which is usually essential for successful innovation in higher education. Three politicians had four aims. Harold Wilson, then Prime Minister, wanted to increase access to universities, especially for working adults. He also thought that the new technology of television was far too important to be confined to entertainment and wanted it applied to education. Jennie Lee, the minister whom Wilson charged with creating the Open University, was determined this new university be as good as the best and therefore gave it independent status. Margaret Thatcher, who became Prime Minister during the start-up of the university, saw it as a way of reducing the costs of higher education. These goals were summed up in the inaugural speech by Lord Crowther, the first Chancellor, who said that the mission of the Open University was to be open as to people, open as to places, open as to methods, and open as to ideas. Ever since its foundation, the Open University has carried a heavy charge of idealism on the basis of that noble mission.

What? What then, is the Open University today? It is the largest university in the U.K., with 160,000 students in degree credit courses, including a graduate school of 30,000 and about 1,500 research degree students. In the jargon of the trade, it is a multiple-media distance learning system. Its teaching spans a wide range of subjects that may soon include medicine, and its faculty engage in research.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Who? Who is involved in the Open University? The largest group of students is aged between 25 and 45, but there are 800 students over 80 and the number of students under 24 is rising fast. Full-time staff number 3,600, and there are 7,000 associate faculty, located all over the world, who provide academic support and mentoring to each student. The profile of the Open University student body is more like that of the population at large than you find in other universities.

When? When does the Open University operate? It observes a conventional timetable — except that the academic year begins in February — and has start and finish dates for each course. This allows students to be part of a local cohort and also provides the incentive of some pacing of their study.

Where? Where is the Open University? The headquarters are in Milton Keynes, England, but its reach is international. Thirty thousand people are taking OU courses outside the U.K., and they wrote their examinations in 111 countries last year. Nearly all the overseas students are in partnership arrangements. There are, for example, over 10,000 OU students in the countries of the former Soviet bloc taking business courses in their own languages — all the way from Prague

to Vladivostok.

How? Finally in this series of questions, how successful is the Open University and why is it successful? I've given you the quality assessment data. Completion rates, another measure of success, are high. Academics here tell me they find that OU course materials are of top quality and often define the state of the art on the topics they address.

Why has the OU been successful? Its founders built a learning system whose key elements have stood the test of time and have shown themselves capable of evolution as times have changed. Those key elements are four:

1) Well-designed multiple-media teaching materials

The key innovation here was the course team. Putting together substantial interdisciplinary teams of faculty and professional staff costs money. However, by working together in a collaborative but critical style, the team ensures that the material of the course is both academically up to the minute and that it is lively and efficient to learn from.

2) Personal academic support to each student

The key innovation here was the notion of tutor — what we now call associate lecturers. The OU spends around \$3 million each year training these 7,000 key people. They are devoted, dedicated, and effective, and many students eulogize about their role. Their role is evolving and the challenge at the moment is to develop protocols so that on-line tutoring is maximally effective and efficient.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

3) Efficient logistics

Administration and logistics are vital. The Open University operates at scale and relies on its logistic and administrative systems. Last year, during the October exam session, students wrote 120,000 examination scripts at sites in 111 countries. That's just one example of the challenges of scale. The number of scripts that went astray was in single figures.

4) Faculty who conduct research

I've mentioned the OU's general commitment to research across all its disciplines. One particularly important area of investigation is technology in education, where I suspect we must have the world's largest research group. They work in two related units. The Institute for Educational Technology advises on the design of courses and conducts intensive research on the nature of OU students and the effectiveness of our courses. The Knowledge Media Institute ("KMI") was set up in 1995 with a mandate to combine leading-edge development of the Web, the Internet, and on-line communication generally with the scaling up of the resultant technologies to reach large numbers of students.

I said that I would conclude with an update on the Open University's activities in the U.S.A. as background for discussion of possible partnerships with the Georgia System. In recent years, these activities have developed in two stages. First, we have developed partnerships with two major state universities. Florida State University ("FSU") is working with us in offering a master's in open and distance learning and on developing a series of upper division programs. A partnership with the California State University system has resulted in a new teacher training program called CalStateTeach that will take its first 1,000 students this summer. There are 30,000 unqualified teachers in the elementary schools of California, and that state will need nearly 200,000 more teachers in the next decade. With our help, CSU has developed a California version of the Open University's successful post-baccalaureate teacher training program. Its key features are three: it is scalable, it is quality, and it takes the training right into the schools.

As these partnerships developed, we realized that something more was needed. We felt that the Open University could best enhance its contribution to the sophisticated U.S. higher education system by establishing an independent American university sharing the values of the U.K. Open University.

The Council of the U.K. Open University has set up the United States Open University as a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation registered in Delaware and licensed as an institution of higher education in that state. It has a board of governance largely made up of distinguished Americans from various walks of life. In February, USOU achieved candidacy for accreditation status with the Middle States Association of Schools and Colleges. It will seek licenses to operate in other states as the need arises.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

USOU will operate in two related ways, and discussions like those we are having today will determine the balance between them. First, USOU will have the capacity to teach its own courses and programs. We start this year with master's and upper division courses in business, computing, software engineering, European studies and international studies, and we shall develop the program further in 2000 taking advantage of the U.K. Open University's huge bank of

quality courseware.

Second, and very importantly, USOU seeks partnerships with American universities and community colleges in order to help them increase their reach and impact through Open University methods. With universities, the interest is primarily in the joint development of distance learning programs that reach beyond individual states. We are working with Florida State University, for example, to develop an upper-division program in information studies to which both FSU and the Open University will contribute courses. FSU has involved Florida's community colleges as key players in the distance delivery system for this and other programs in their state, and USOU intends to extend that idea further.

Personal support and mentoring to students is a vital element of Open University Supported Open Learning. Although USOU will, of course, make appropriate use of on-line technologies, the USOU board has made it clear that it sees optional group meetings and opportunities for face-to-face contact with associate faculty as a very attractive feature of the system. They want to see it reproduced here. The community colleges, through both their faculty and their facilities, could provide a superb intellectual and physical network for this purpose.

I note that we are also working with the Western Governors University ("WGU") to link USOU credit-based awards and WGU's competency-based awards. That's an important new area, not least because the corporate sector is convinced that competency-based education is the way of the future.

That is a very brief account of what some consider the most successful innovation in higher education of the last half of this century. Thank you for inviting me to tell you about it. I look forward to exploring whether the creation of the United States Open University could help Georgia's University System to engage more deeply in distance learning and thus address the tensions of the eternally challenging triangle of access, cost, and quality.

After Sir John spoke to the Board, Chair Leebern thanked him for his presentation and asked whether the Regents had any questions.

Regent Baranco said that she had three practical questions: 1) How are students tested for examination purposes?, 2) What are the physical facilities the OU utilizes?, and 3) Is the cost of \$400 to students inclusive of everything, including infrastructure?

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Sir John responded that the OU's testing is rather conventional. Students are scored based on a combination of continuous assessments and examinations. The continuous assessments consist of tutor-marked assignments, of which the students do between five and seven during the course of a 36-week course. These assignments are marked by the associate faculty. He noted that one of the most important teaching activities is to comment extensively on these assignments. Once those assignments have been corrected and commented on, they are sent to the main campus, where the full-time faculty sample and monitor them to see that the associate faculty are commenting effectively and marking consistently. The faculty handle over a million assignments a year, and this is a basic element of the OU's quality assurance. Additionally, there is a three-hour proctored examination at the end of each course. Sir John remarked that the OU probably over-examines, at least by modern British standards, but it was felt that in a distance learning system, it is important that there be no doubt that it was the actual student who tested. So, the examination process is rather conventional, but the OU is moving toward electronic means, particularly for the assignments. However, with over a million assignments, if only 1% went astray, it would be devastating. The OU must therefore be certain that whatever replaces paper is highly dependable.

Regarding Regent Baranco's second question about facilities, Sir John replied that the OU has a 70-acre main campus in the city of Milton Keynes, which is 50 miles north of London, where most of the full-time staff work. There are also 13 regional offices around the United Kingdom, each with a small staff of between 50 and 100, which are the front-line student services facilities. So, a student in Aberdeen, Scotland would go to the Scottish office of the OU in Edinburgh, which would arrange for his tutor for the course he is taking. When those tutors hold group meetings, as they are encouraged to do, they take place locally, and the OU simply rents facilities in community colleges, schools, or whatever suits the purpose. Where the OU works in partnerships, the partner institution reproduces that organization, although the academic supervision is still with the OU. In those cases, such as Russia, Bulgaria, and Singapore, the examinations come back to the U.K. to be centrally marked to ensure that there is a common standard throughout the system.

In terms of cost, Sir John reiterated that the budget of the OU is about \$400 million. About 55% of that comes in a direct state appropriation, which is worked out on a formula basis giving so much per student with variations for what they are studying. He noted that this is a fairly conventional kind of system, exactly the same system that operates for the other British universities. All of the universities' part-time students will be getting relatively the same per capital grant. There has never been any introduction of a different mode of funding for distance learning, nor did Sir John assert there ever should be. Nearly all the rest of the funds come from student fees, which vary a bit by program. In round figures, it will take between six and ten years for a student to complete a bachelor's degree at the OU, because the institution encourages students not to do more than an equivalent half-time study because they almost all have full-time jobs. The total cost of the degree, including all fees and miscellany, will be about \$6,000. A master of business administration degree will cost double or triple that amount. The OU has a considerable process of helping disadvantaged students, because it takes its mandate of openness extremely seriously, so \$4 million to \$5 million is waived each year for certain categories of students. One of the new initiatives of the present British government is to come in much more strongly with fee support. Only with this present government, finally part-time students have access to student loans and other forms of support, which is a major breakthrough.

Regent White asked Sir John about the associate faculty and their qualifications. He also asked whether there is any resistance by the faculty about learning to teach via distance learning.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Sir John responded that there are about 800 full-time faculty who are very much like faculty in other universities, only they develop courses rather than teach in classrooms. The primary task of about 150 to 200 of the full-time faculty, who are based in the regional centers, is to hire, train, and supervise the associate faculty, of which there are 7,500. The associate faculty are not like adjunct faculty in the United States. Most of them have tenured positions in other universities or are practicing professionals in law and business. The OU celebrated its twenty-fifth anniversary four years ago, and in those four years, Sir John has signed hundreds of 25-year certificates for associate faculty who have been working with the OU part-time all that time. "Why do they do it?," he asked. He replied that the OU pays them honestly and most of them enjoy teaching students online more than they enjoy teaching on campus. They also do it because they feel part of a great world-wide academic network. So, the OU could be described as an expression of the whole U.K. academic collective who are coming together for this particular operation even though they have interests elsewhere. Sir John said that there has not been resistance by faculty; indeed, many other university presidents who are appointed in Great Britain go through a phase of wondering why some of their staff are moonlighting for the OU and wondering if they should prohibit it. However, when they pause and examine what is going on, they discover that their faculty are getting far more training from the OU than they are getting from their own institutions. Now that most British universities want to get into distance education, the first thing presidents do is corral all the faculty who have been teaching for the OU and ask them how to do that. So, the OU has been part of a massive technology transfer operation in that respect.

Regent Jones asked who owns the British OU and the USOU.

Sir John responded that the USOU is a membership corporation registered in Delaware with two members in the U.S. He is one ex-officio member, and the other member is the vice chair of the OU's board of trustees. It is technically a not-for-profit body in support of an overseas charity. It is the institution's intention to develop USOU as an American university and to reinvest surpluses to allow it to develop, and the British OU has made the USOU a loan to help with its start-up. The real advantage is that it can tap into a considerable body of existing curricular material, which will have to be adapted in some cases to U.S. standards of higher education.

Regent Jones asked whether the British government contributes to the OU in England.

Sir John reiterated that 55% of the OU's budget comes from state appropriations.

Regent Jones asked how the enrollment in public colleges in England and the public funding for those colleges has changed over the history of the OU.

Sir John replied that enrollment in the British university system has increased 50% in the last six or seven years and the funding has not increased as much. In fact, the per capita funding for students has fallen by approximately 25% this decade. In order to do that, the funding bodies created a ferociously competitive system where they gave all the money for growth to those institutions operating with quality at least cost. He remarked that if the Board wanted to study different methods for funding universities, England is a great way to do that, because the country has tried everything.

Regent Cannestra asked whether all the students enrolled are in degree programs and also how the OU handles laboratory-based courses, like chemistry.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Sir John explained that students register per course, but the OU encourages students to plan for where they are going. They do not have to commit that they will do a particular degree. As for the second

question, Sir John explained that the laboratory issue has been addressed in two ways. First of all, in many of the science and technology courses, a student receives a substantial home experiment kit, which he keeps for the year. Sir John said that this was not a child's chemistry kit, but rather sophisticated equipment. For instance, for a third-level physics course, a student will receive a laser and an optical bench to set up in her home. The student will likely do more experiments at home than she would if she had to go to a lab for a week during the year, he asserted. However, students obviously cannot do all kinds of experiments at home, so there is a system called "residential schools." This is also why the OU's academic year is backwards. It starts in February and finishes in October so that during the summer, the OU can borrow other facilities of other institutions for this purpose. From the beginning of July until the end of August, OU takes over the campuses of 15 British, 1 French, and 1 German universities. So the student doing a science class will go to the campus for a week to one of those institutions, which is set up expressly with a full-day program of labs, seminars, field trips, and whatever else must be done face to face. That is not just for science courses, but also for other courses where the faculty feel personal interaction is necessary, like fine art students who visit galleries. This program is popular with the institutions whose facilities the OU uses, because it is an attractive proposition even though the OU negotiates a very good price.

Regent Clark asked whether the OU offers a degree in medicine. He did not understand how a person could learn to be a doctor without seeing patients.

Sir John responded that any teaching or training program can be done in part by distance education and in part by other means. The British government wants to increase the output of doctors by 1,000 each year and, the role of the OU will be to do a foundation course and perhaps be involved in some of the network assessment as the students spend less of their time doing practice in hospitals and more of it in community medical centers and doctors' offices.

Regent Jenkins thanked Sir John for his presentation and asked if the OU were starting over, what he would do differently in terms of policy and implementation.

Sir John replied that many of the decisions made "on the fly" in the early days were nonetheless very robust, such as the materials and the associate faculty. However, when the OU was created, it was assumed that the full-time staff would always be a very small staff who would be commissioning the courses from other faculty and other institutions around the country and, for that reason, the founders wrote into the charter that all members of the faculty would be members of the senate, assuming that there would be no more than approximately 60 members. Now, there is an academic senate of over 1,000 members, but Sir John still felt it was a very effective body. Either because they could not make the commissioning work or because there was too much money around in the 1970s, it became easier to hire a full-time staff as necessary to develop programs. Nowadays, as the OU expands into other programs, this is not an option Sir John wants to pursue. For instance, when the OU added a law degree two years ago, it did not hire law faculty. Rather, it made an arrangement with the College of Law, a very old established college in England, and they developed the academic curriculum that the OU delivers throughout its system. Instantly, this program became the largest law program in the U.K., with over 1,000 students. Sir John stated that the OU would likely use this approach more as it adds new programs and develops existing programs. One of the hopes for the USOU courses is also to bring courses from the United States into Europe, because the expense of the operation is the development of the courses, so the more it can tap into good quality courseware, the better the program. **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Regent Coleman noted that Sir John had mentioned a quality assurance agency and asked for whom this agency works.

Sir John explained that the agency works for the state. It is a statutory body whose governing board has representatives appointed by the secretary of state as well as representatives of the higher education sector and businesses. The idea was to have a body that assures the government that its money is being spent properly and assures the institutions that it operates in a way that is intellectually credible. The agency is beginning to stabilize, but it is a rather intrusive system and intimidates faculty from other countries.

Regent Coleman asked whether this agency also inspects conventional universities.

Sir John responded that it does. While there is an office, it draws heavily on faculty across the country to be visiting teams of assessors at institutions. For example, when they assessed the general engineering program at the OU, there was a team of about five people who came and spent about five months examining materials, visiting the summer residential schools, going to tutorials, examining what the associate faculty were doing, etc. It is a very thorough process of assessment and relatively output-oriented.

Regent Coleman asked how often the OU is inspected.

Sir John replied that each discipline is assessed about every five years, but there were three in process at the moment. The assessment of the entire institution is also performed once every five years, and the state funding is directly related to the performance on the assessment.

Chancellor Portch added that this is a substantial political and cultural difference. The percentage of all education funded by the British federal government is very high. In contrast, the federal budget for higher education in the State of Georgia is very low and it goes to student aid. When there are efforts to have national funding, they fall on the basis of the State's rights versus the federal government's rights. That is not much of a debate in the U.K.

Sir John said that it was interesting that England is going federal without thinking it through at the moment. So, the OU has historically been funded for the entire country by the Higher Education Funding Council for England, but with the creation next month of a Scottish parliament, the OU will be moving to the Scottish Higher Education Funding Council for the funding of students from Scotland. That has the civil servants seriously worried because they think the OU will have its hands in everyone's pockets. This is a result of the fact that they did not think the federal funding system through before putting it in place.

Seeing that there were no further questions, Chair Leebern again thanked Sir John for his presentation. He then turned the Regents' attention to the second part of the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee. He noted that the technology principles document, titled "Educational Technology and the Age of Learning: Transforming the Enterprise," had been on the table for 30 days and was now up for approval. The two minor changes suggested by Regents at the March 1999 Board meeting had been incorporated. Chair Leebern stated that Dr. Muyskens was available to answer any questions, but the Regents had no questions or comments.

Regent Coleman moved to adopt the principles, and the motion was variously seconded.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chair Leebern called for a vote. Motion made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the principles of "Educational Technology and the Age of Learning: Transforming the Enterprise." (This document is on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.)

With motion properly made by Regent White, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board was reconvened in its regular session.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Jenkins called upon Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning to present to the Board two honorary degree nominations.

Dr. Dunning thanked Chair Jenkins and explained that the first nomination was for Mr. J. Mack Robinson by Georgia State University ("GSU"). Mr. Robinson is a recognized state, national, and international leader in the fields of business, banking, insurance, media, fashion, sports, and philanthropy. As a versatile entrepreneur, he has used his keen insights and business acumen to mastermind the acquisition of more than 40 businesses over the past 30 years, explained Dr. Dunning. Mr. Robinson helped establish GSU's insurance program. It is now one of the finest in the nation. Mr. Robinson and his wife, Nita, were named Philanthropists of the Year in 1994 by the Georgia Chapter of the National Society of Fund Raising Executives. Dr. Dunning noted that Mr. Robinson recently honored GSU by pledging \$10 million to fund enhancements to the College of Business Administration, which was subsequently named the J. Mack Robinson College of Business Administration. Now, he said, it was time for GSU and the University System to honor Mr. Robinson by way of this honorary degree.

The second nomination was for Mr. Marvin Schuster by Columbus State University ("CSU"). Mr. Schuster and his wife, Ruth, have lived in Columbus for 32 years. His record of support for and interest in CSU is outstanding, remarked Dr. Dunning. Mr. Schuster's level of financial support is remarkable, his leadership significant and broad-based, and his dedication complete. He has served as a member, secretary, treasurer, vice chair, and chair of the Columbus State University Foundation Board of Trustees. He has supported CSU's programs in athletics, music, business, and others. Schuster Enterprises owns and operates 55 Burger King franchises. Mr. Schuster is active in the community. The United Way, Boy Scouts, and recreation activities benefit from his leadership and support. Dr. Dunning stated that he is a true and complete supporter of CSU and the University System.

On behalf of Presidents Carl V. Patton and Frank D. Brown, Dr. Dunning submitted these nominations for the Board's approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the honorary degrees.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, May 11 and Wednesday, May 12, 1999 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

Vice Chair Cannestra toured the campus of North Georgia College & State University and had discussions with Acting President Sherman R. Day on March 5, 1999. He also toured the State University of West Georgia and visited with President Beheruz N. Sethna on March 8. On April 7, Vice Chair Cannestra toured the campus of Valdosta State University, visited with President Hugh C. Bailey, and spoke at the Honors Day service.

At approximately 10:50 a.m., the Board took a brief recess.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:00 a.m., the Board was reconvened in its regular session, and Chair Jenkins called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing a possible presidential appointment and personnel matters. With motion made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who voted to go into Executive Session were as follows: Chair Jenkins, Vice Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, S. William Clark, Jr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Warren Y. Jobe, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

At approximately 11:10 a.m., Chair Jenkins reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. The Board had discussed in Executive Session the reappointment of University System presidents, as listed below, and the reappointments of Gail S. Weber as Secretary to the Board and Dr. Lindsay Desrochers as Treasurer of the Board.

Chair Jenkins called for a motion to approve in open session all of these actions. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the above-referenced actions.

The approved presidential reappointments were as follows: President Michael F. Adams, University of Georgia; Jeremiah J. Ashcroft, East Georgia College; Hugh C. Bailey, Valdosta State University; Jacquelyn M. Belcher, Georgia Perimeter College; David A. Bell, Macon State College; William A. Bloodworth, Jr., Augusta State University; Carlton E. Brown, Savannah State University; Frank D. Brown, Columbus State University; James A. Burran, Dalton State College; G. Wayne Clough, Georgia Institute of Technology; H. Lynn Cundiff, Floyd College; Rosemary DePaolo, Georgia College & State University; Michael L. Hanes, Georgia Southwestern State University; Edward D. Jackson, Jr., South Georgia College; Dorothy L. Lord, Coastal Georgia Community College; Barbara P. Losty, Waycross College; Harold J. Loyd, Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College; Martha T. Nesbitt, Gainesville College; Carl V. Patton, Georgia State University; Oscar L. Prater, Fort Valley State University; Lisa A. Roszbacher, Southern Polytechnic State University; Beheruz N. Sethna, State University of West Georgia; Portia H. Shields, Albany State University; Betty L. Siegel, Kennesaw State University; Peter J. Sireno, Darton College; Richard A. Skinner, Clayton College & State University; Francis J. Tedesco, Medical College of Georgia; Harold E. Wade, Atlanta Metropolitan College; and Jerry M. Williamson, Gordon College.

In Executive Session, the Board had also discussed the appointment of a new president at North Georgia College & State University. Chair Rhodes made a motion to appoint Mr. Nathaniel Hansford for this post, and the appointment was variously seconded. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved this presidential appointment, effective July 1, 1999.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:15 a.m on April 21, 1999.

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

s/
Edgar L. Jenkins
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia