

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
244 WASHINGTON STREET, S.W.
ATLANTA, GEORGIA
FEBRUARY 13-14, 1996**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, February 13, 1996, at 1:00 P.M., and again on Wednesday, February 14, 1996, at 9:00 A.M., in the Board Room at 244 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, Georgia. The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, Regent Juanita Powell Baranco. Present, in addition to Chairman Baranco, were Regents: Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. (Vice Chair), John H. Anderson, Jr., Kenneth W. Cannestra, S. William Clark, Jr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Suzanne G. Elson, Elsie P. Hand, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Edgar L. Rhodes, and William B. Turner. Absent on Tuesday, February 13, was Regent John H. Clark, and absent on Wednesday, February 14, were Regents Cannestra, John H. Clark, and McMillan.

The Attendance Report was read on both days by Secretary Gail S. Weber.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

Chairman Baranco announced that the Board had met in executive session at 12:45 P.M. to discuss various personnel issues and that no decisions were made.

ANNOUNCEMENTS:

Chairman Baranco extended, on behalf of the Board of Regents, sympathy to Senior Vice Chancellor Arthur Dunning and his family on the death of Dr. Dunning's mother, Mrs. Johnnie Dunning, of Mobile, Alabama.

Chairman Baranco announced that she had received a letter from Dr. Russell Edgerton, President of the American Association of Higher Education (AAHE), and she shared the letter's contents with the Board. Dr. Edgerton expressed his and the organization's appreciation for the magnificent support and contributions that the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia had made to the 1996 AAHE Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards. Dr. Edgerton thanked Chairman Baranco for leading a session on "Post-tenure Review and System Governing Boards" which, he said, "was the most highly attended session in its time band and very well received."

Dr. Edgerton also remarked that from Chancellor Portch's opening keynote to Mr. Walter Massey's closing plenary, the University System of Georgia had contributed time and again to the 1996 Forum.

Continuing his letter of gratitude, Dr. Edgerton mentioned the "absolutely lovely evening at the Georgia Freight Depot. I gather from (Chancellor Portch) that you were able to pull that

off in part because of the contribution that your colleague (Regent) Don Leebern made to the reception. I do hope you will pass on to him our thanks. That was the most gracious event we've ever had in the five years since we've been running the Forum."

The 1996 Forum on Faculty Roles and Rewards was held in Atlanta on January 18-21, 1996. The Chairman noted that the University System was well-represented at the Forum by faculty and staff from the various University System of Georgia institutions and from the Central Office.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Upon motion by Regent Leebern, seconded by Regent Dahlberg, the minutes of the meetings of the Board of Regents held on January 9-10, 1995, were unanimously approved as distributed on Tuesday, February 13, 1996.

PRESENTATION: THE ADVANCED ACADEMY OF GEORGIA, WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE

President Beheruz Sethna was introduced by Chairman Baranco to speak about The Advanced Academy of Georgia at West Georgia College. President Sethna introduced Dr. Diane Boothe, Director of the Academy, and three students of the Academy: Mr. Seth Raskind, Ms. Jena Gaskill and Mr. Stewart Jenkins. Using computer illustrations, President Sethna, explained that the Advanced Academy of Georgia was a program for superior high school students. Some of the state's brightest high school students come to the West Georgia College campus to participate in the Advanced Academy of Georgia. These students are in residence at the College for up to two years, and during their stay there they complete their high school requirements while taking college courses. The students remain high school students, and they get their high school diplomas from their own high schools. At graduation, however, they have completed one or two years of college work, and on the day of their high school graduations automatically become college sophomores or juniors.

President Sethna called it a "win-win-win-win" situation. It is a double win for the brightest students and their parents, for these students have the opportunity to excel, they have the opportunity to associate with their peers who are intelligent and dynamic, and they learn as much from their peers as from their professors. They also have a wonderful opportunity to accelerate their progress. It is a "win-win" situation both for West Georgia College and for other System institutions; therefore, it is a "win" for the University System of Georgia. The classes, the professors and the students all benefit at West Georgia College. Additionally, since these students are spending one or two years at West Georgia College, it is more likely that they can be retained within the state even if they transfer to other System institutions and the students will enhance and enrich these institutions as well. Finally, it really is a "win" situation for the high schools, because they sometimes have considerable problems in meeting the needs of such exceptional students. West Georgia College is able to meet their needs in an excellent manner. President Sethna pointed out that many sources quote Georgia Tech as being the number one university in terms of entering SAT scores at an average 1290. Comparisons show that the Advanced Academy of Georgia has an average SAT score of 1280 - ranked higher than Wake

Forest, the University of Richmond, the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, and all 15 of the south's best regional universities as rated by U. S. News and World Report. President Sethna also mentioned that the Academy students had taken SAT tests two years before other high school students.

Dr. Diane Boothe, the director of the Academy, addressed the meeting. She declared that the Advanced Academy of Georgia at West Georgia College would have a long-term impact. Dr. Boothe stated that challenging collegiate opportunities for academically-talented high school juniors and seniors had become a reality this past fall. The strong academic performance that was predicted was realized when, after the first quarter, Academy students earned an average GPA of 3.20. Four Academy students received straight A's, five received all A's with just one B, while one-half qualified for the Dean's List, and 70% earned a B average or better. The professors have welcomed these students with enthusiasm and have been pleased with their contributions. The students have served as guest speakers at weekly Thursday night leadership dinners. Dr. Boothe continued by stating that institutions of learning are known by the quality of their graduates; therefore, the Advanced Academy of Georgia will serve as a magnet for academically oriented students which will ultimately lead to high quality graduates. Academy students will be catalysts in reaching the academic experiences of other students. Dr. Boothe said she was confident that qualified students enrolled in the Advanced Academy of Georgia will continue to excel and bring credit to the University System of Georgia. She thanked the Board of Regents for their interest and positive support and announced that literature was available for those interested in learning more about the Academy.

Dr. Boothe then introduced a student of the Academy, Mr. Seth Raskind, and stated that Mr. Raskind was 16 years old. Dr. Boothe also mentioned that Mr. Raskind plays principal chair clarinet in the Atlanta Youth Symphony Orchestra and will be playing for the closing ceremony of the Olympics. Mr. Raskind, a business major, thanked the Board for inviting him to speak. He spoke about the academics at the Advanced Academy of Georgia. Mr. Raskind noted that most of the Academy students had outgrown the academic courses at their high school for a variety of reasons. Examples given by Mr. Raskind were: (a) one student had taken every computer science course available and needed more; and, (b) other students were interested in psychology, philosophy or law, but those courses were not available at their high schools. Mr. Raskind stated that the situation is analogous to saplings planted at a nursery. At first, the trees are inside of the greenhouse with plenty of room to grow in their individual pots. The faster-growing varieties run out of room when their branches hit the ceiling and walls of the greenhouse; then the trees are moved outside where they have unlimited room to grow. This represents what the Advanced Academy offers to its students - room to grow. All of the students in the Academy take regular courses at West Georgia College - these courses are not taught separately by the Academy. Most students are finishing their high school requirements by taking college courses. As an illustration, Mr. Raskind noted that Mr. Stewart Jenkins had just finished his third year of high school math: this is usually Algebra II or Trigonometry, but Stewart had taken Calculus IV instead. Sometimes, stated Mr. Raskind, there are several Academy students in a class, but frequently there will only be one. They do, however, have a daily opportunity to meet with advisors in case an academic problem comes up. Professors are aware of these students' presence in their classes and have been very positive about it. So far, the academics of the Academy have been challenging for these teenaged students, but most feel it is well worth the effort. The majority of the students are glad to have the opportunity to attend the Academy so that they no longer have to contend with the greenhouse effect they experienced at high school.

This charter class of the Advanced Academy of Georgia, remarked Mr. Raskind, hopes to be the first of a long series of Academy classes.

Next, Dr. Boothe introduced Ms. Jena Gaskill, a psychology major, who is an 18-year-old student and was runner-up for Junior Miss. Ms. Gaskill said she was proud to be a student in the Advanced Academy of Georgia. She noted that she would have been a senior at Pebblebrook High School in Cobb County, but that she had chosen instead to pursue a more challenging path. As a high school student, Ms. Gaskill was a cheerleader and she participated in the performing arts program and various clubs. Ms. Gaskill, however, considered the opportunities available in the Academy and felt she would gain more there than if she stayed in her high school. All of the students, she noted, had profited by experiencing a whole new lifestyle. They had moved out of their familiar homes, and they had learned to depend on each other. These exceptional teenagers live with people who have the same goals and the same purposes, declared Ms. Gaskill, that is to gain quality education. Ms. Gaskill continued by stating that the college courses are so different from high school and they are much more stimulating. Most high schools, she noted, do not have the capabilities to challenge accelerated students. Ms. Gaskill remarked that, along with changes in lifestyles and academic standards, came major social opportunities to her and her cohorts. Ms. Gaskill also remarked that many of the students work at on-campus jobs: James works in the computer center, Seth works with Dr. Boothe, and she works in the office of the Vice President of Academic Affairs. Several other students have off-campus jobs. All the young students have opportunities to meet and converse with people they otherwise would not have, stated Ms. Gaskill. On the other hand, remarked Ms. Gaskill, even though she and the other teenaged students had entered into a college lifestyle, they were not entirely like mainstream college students. She noted, however, that the Academy students were gaining leadership skills and engaging in extra-curricular activities; one planned activity is a trip to Alabama to see a production of "To Kill a Mockingbird" in April. Additionally, several students who are taking honors political science will be going to Washington, DC at the end of March. Overall, declared Ms. Gaskill, the Advanced Academy has been a wonderful experience for all of its students.

Lastly, Dr. Boothe introduced Mr. Stewart Jenkins. Dr. Boothe commented that she was very proud that Mr. Jenkins exempted the first five levels of college math, that he had begun with Calculus IV and received the highest grade in the class. Mr. Jenkins noted that the Academy had allowed him to broaden his horizons significantly. He noted, however, that without several key factors, as he is visually-impaired, he may not have been able to achieve what he had. Among these factors, Mr. Jenkins listed the support and encouragement of his family, friends, Dr. Boothe and other administrators of the Academy. He also stated that another factor which was most interesting, but not necessarily the most important, is the technology that provides marvelous visual aids so that he can see better. He demonstrated the low vision enhancement system (LVES). Explaining how LVES works, Mr. Jenkins stated that an image is taken in by three small cameras which is sent down to a computer in which he can control the contrast and magnification, it is then displayed on two screens in front of his eyes - which helps significantly to improve his sight. In Physics lab, for instance, Mr. Jenkins can observe an experiment more closely; in other classes he can read what is written on the chalkboard from a reasonable distance. In conclusion, Mr. Jenkins stated that his peers and the administrators of the Academy have been just as helpful as the technology of LVES - that, although science has contributed to society in the form of advanced technology, it is still necessary to maintain a personal flavor.

President Sethna stated that the students in the first class of the Advanced Academy of

Georgia have plans for the future: one student plans to go on for a Ph.D. and the others intend to pursue advanced degrees either at West Georgia or at other institutions in Georgia. President Sethna declared that he was delighted to present these exceptional students to the Board of Regents.

Comments

Regent S. William Clark, Jr. asked whether these students would receive their diplomas from the high school they had attended before they were part of the Academy. President Sethna answered that that was the case.

Regent McMillan queried whether there was a waiting list; he wanted to know how many such students could be accommodated. President Sethna answered that, since this was the first year of the Academy, there was a small entering class and that he expected the number to remain small for a few years. There is no waiting list, and West Georgia College is able to accommodate more students. President Sethna stated, however, that there is an on-going marketing campaign, and the College would welcome more students of this calibre. He invited the Regents to take brochures and distribute them to any interested parties.

Regent Hand applauded this effort with a "Hurray" to the Advanced Academy of Georgia. She added that she hoped many more students would take advantage of this opportunity. Regent Dahlberg said that he was likewise impressed with the Academy.

Regent Clark noted that there were such students everywhere. He stated that he would like to see the Board promote this program to, perhaps, include some two-year institutions of the University System of Georgia.

President Sethna noted that only a handful of states had such programs. He said that the way to make the Advanced Academy of Georgia a success and a nationally-known phenomenon was to put increasingly more resources into it. The President proposed that the University System of Georgia should make the Academy a flagship program. That would demand more resources; therefore, he hoped that the Academy will be nurtured for a while and then eventually other alternatives would be considered. President Sethna suggested that such programs should correspond to the policy that the Board had used to build excellence for selected programs in select places.

Regent McMillan commented that, because the state supplies each high school with appropriations, that some of those monies might be transferable to the Academy to, at least in part, support the instructional area. President Sethna noted that West Georgia gets the benefit of the post-secondary option; however, some high schools exert modest resistance because they are losing their best students. Some of that resistance has been reduced because the teenagers actually remain as students on the rolls of these particular high schools and the schools get credit for their SAT scores. President Sethna continued by saying that there are about 600 high schools in the state, and the Academy has an enrollment of 20

students; therefore, no one high school can claim that they are experiencing a big drain on their resources. He also noted that the high schools in Carrollton and in Carroll County had been most supportive of the program.

Regent Turner asked whether the students would continue at West Georgia College. President Sethna answered that he has asked the question of the students, and six of them do plan to continue there while one student plans to continue at Georgia Institute of Technology.

Chairman Baranco noted that this program was consistent with the System's Vision Statement. President Sethna added that Chancellor Portch had been most supportive of the program, as well. Chairman Baranco then invited all the presenters to stay on so that Board members would have the opportunity to meet and talk with President Sethna, Dr. Boothe, and the students.

PRESENTATION: UPDATE ON AUDITS AND REORGANIZATION AT GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

Chairman Baranco called upon President Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology to present an update on audits and the reorganization at the institution. President Clough introduced the Senior Vice President of Administration & Finance, Mr. Robert Thompson, who helped in the presentation.

President Clough stated that this was an important issue. Audit issues at Georgia Institute of Technology came to the attention of the President when he was interviewing for the job at the Institute. Audits were done, starting in 1992 and leading up to 1995, when there was an electronic data processing audit. These audits dealt with a series of issues - financial control, financial aid, information systems, indirect costs on the federal side, personnel documentation and personnel procedures, along with other issues.

After spending some time on campus after assuming the presidency, President Clough realized that there were two levels of issues. The first level deals with global issues: the organization of Georgia Tech and the culture that has been established there in operating the way it has for about 20 years. The second level deals with the more operational issues which Mr. Thompson would address. President Clough said that he wanted to give credit to those who were on campus before his arrival: he named Mr. Bill Ray and others who had worked hard to address the audit issues. The Board of Regents had an audit in 1995 which brought up 62 issues. Most of the issues had been addressed by the time he became President, remarked President Clough, and all had now been addressed and continue to be assessed to see if the measures taken are working.

In 1993, in order to address some of the electronic data processing issues at Georgia Tech, a project called AIMS (Administrations Information Management Systems) was undertaken. It was a very ambitious project; it was supposed to address all aspects of information systems at the College. President Clough decided to terminate that effort, however, because the AIMS project seemed unable to achieve the goals for which it was set up. President Clough noted that the AIMS project did result in the Institute undertaking the effort to implement the SCT Banner System for student information and, particularly, for student accounts. This

system, declared President Clough, is successful and working very well for the students. In terms of financial aid problems, a number of people were terminated and new people were brought in who had worked very hard and had done fine work in cleaning up that area. As an example, President Clough mentioned that the Department of Education was recently on campus and conducted an audit. The Department auditors looked at thirty-one randomly- selected student records as well as all the processes and gave Georgia Tech a completely clean bill of health, with the exception of one small area that held a student to a slightly higher standard than they should have been. Additionally, the Institute had also reached a settlement with the federal government about some indirect cost issues that derived from many institutions. These difficult issues involve reorganization and replacement of personnel, and they involve renovation dollars in some cases.

President Clough then spoke about broader issues. He mentioned the need to install a better computer system at the Georgia Institute of Technology in order to manage information flow. The President quoted Mr. Bill Gates (from Microsoft) as saying, "The second law of information automation is that automating an inefficient organization will make it worse; automating an efficient organization will make it better." Georgia Tech, remarked President Clough, has grown very rapidly; it went from an institution with a volume of \$8 million in 1972 to a \$200 million volume today. The Institute has doubled its size, but the management systems did not grow to accommodate this rapid growth. There are organizational issues such as: (1) lack of communications between financial bases, (2) lack of high level administrative oversight, (3) duplication of operations, (4) lack of information at the working level to the faculty, and (5) lack of process (this was recognized in one of the Board of Regents' audits). These difficulties led to cultural problems whereby faculty and students spend a great deal of time in figuring ways to get around an inefficient system.

Beyond internal organization issues, Dr. Clough noted that it is believed that there are issues existing at the System level. The President explained that the Institute does business in accordance with System rules, and sometimes there are issues there that cause concern. The Sixth Street project, for example, fell behind in schedule. Finally, when the President decided something had to be done, to complain to the contractor, he was told to follow a certain process which he described as: (1) write a letter to Chancellor Portch; (2) the Chancellor will give the letter to someone on his staff; (3) that person will write to GSFIC; (4) GSFIC will then write to the Contractor and notify him that the President at Georgia Tech is complaining that he is behind schedule; (5) then the Contractor sits on that request for some time and writes back to GSFIC to say that things are O.K. and will probably finish in late March; (6) the letter will come back to Chancellor's office; (7) then the letter will then be forwarded to President Clough: all of this process will take about two months time. President Clough did note that the Board was making a considerable effort to simplify this process.

President Clough continued by stating that the upper levels of Georgia Tech had been reorganized, and that this had been completed in the first year of his presidency. The Board, he mentioned, had approved that reorganization. The President stated that he had established a position of Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, a high-level oversight position represented by Mr. Bob Thompson. President Clough announced that he had created other positions as well, but at the same time he had eliminated three Vice Presidencies. The President remarked that all this, he felt, had made the organization more efficient. He had also developed an institute-wide strategic plan. A summary of the strategic plan is available on the Internet and can be accessed on the Georgia Tech Home Page. President Clough said that it was hoped that

all students, alumni and friends would comment on this strategic plan. President Clough said he felt that the plan is very important to Georgia Tech and its surrounding community. At a meeting of Deans and all Vice Presidents, in which 48 action items were ranked in the strategic plan, this was one of the highest priority items. This was clearly a high-priority item with the external community, as well. A team of outside consultants estimated that it will take 5 years to complete all the action items. President Clough said that he was pleased to share the plan with the Board and that it represented a major overhaul of a complex institution.

President Clough introduced Mr. Bob Thompson who spoke about his part in the improvement of the administration of Georgia Institute of Technology. Sometime after joining the staff at Georgia Tech, Mr. Thompson noted that he had put together five goals and asked the administrative staff to embrace them. These five goals included: (1) outstanding customer service where many problems needed to be solved; (2) the improvement of systems, particularly the business systems which needed to be user-friendly to all parties and not just to administrative personnel; (3) the updating of business processes which were outdated and certainly not in line with today's technology (there needed to be a lot of time spent on these processes integrating them with business and systems planning); (4) ensuring fiscal integrity and accountability -- key things which were needed to create a culture on campus where these two things would be given attention throughout the organization at all levels; and, (5) moving to performance-based planning in budgeting, in an environment of scarce resources, that will encompass all of the resources - human, fiscal and capital.

Mr. Thompson stated that an important factor in attaining the five goals was engaging the firm of KPMG Peat Marwick and employment of Mr. Fred Turk, who is very knowledgeable in the area of higher education. Mr. Turk and his colleagues spent last summer on the Campus talking with faculty, staff, students, administrators and focus groups of various kinds; then they did a study to recommend an effective organizational structure for administration and finance functions at Georgia Tech. There were also some subsidiary objectives to assess the strengths and weaknesses of the organization, to recommend structures and alternatives to those structures, to identify functions and linkages with other organizations within Georgia Tech and affiliated organizations such as the Georgia Tech Research Corporation and Athletic Association, and, also, to look for opportunities to redesign and use technology to reduce costs and improve service. Mr. Thompson stated that the administration of Georgia Tech respected the organizational findings of KPMG Peat Marwick and that they grouped their findings in three areas. First, some missing and misplaced activities were found when they looked at administrative structure (for example, outside of a place where indirect cost studies are done for the federal government, Georgia Tech did not have an office that was continually doing costing analysis for various purposes in administration). Second, they found a lot of unsound functions in grouping of activities - things were grouped together that would not be expected to be together, while other things that should have been together were apart. Third, there were very unclear definitions of roles and responsibilities - it was not always clear who was responsible for certain functions and whether these functions were being carried out.

The KPMG group did find that a major effort would be needed to address all these problems and that it might take three to five years to complete. It was also felt that there needed to be a means of ensuring that strong and decisive leaders were developed in the organization of administration and finance. There should also be: (1) a careful delineation of control responsibilities from support services to address the customer service kinds of issues, (2) the diversity should be increased on the campus, (3) a culture should be established for performance

and accountability in the organization, and (4) credibility should be built on and off the campus.

Since last fall, there has been a team on the campus of Georgia Institute of Technology doing a facility assessment in order to look at space conditions and space requirements, including comparisons with peer institutions. Also, a study of maintenance is underway to better understand what kind of maintenance level is needed to prevent more deferred maintenance. Once the assessment is finished, probably at the end of April, the information will be used to develop a long-range capital plan and set priorities. At the same time, an effort will be started to revisit the campus master plan. This master plan was put together in 1990 as part of the Olympic planning process; therefore, this six-year-old plan may need to be updated. Within a year's time, the goal is to have a full long-range capital and financial plan along with a way to help sell it to all the various constituents who are interested in the future of the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Comments:

Regent Leebern asked if, from KPMG's assessment for re-engineering in the investment management area, what other groups would interact and exchange data for overall investment and management of ancillary support groups. Mr. Thompson answered that he had spent some time with the Georgia Tech Foundation, the Georgia Tech Research Corporation, the Georgia Tech Athletic Association, and those at Georgia Tech proper who invest money; he had found the Foundation has been doing a good job of investing their money wisely and getting a good return for the Institute. In looking at the other entities, it was not clear that there was a focused, integrated effort to make sound investments and to contribute to the cash flow. Mr. Thompson remarked that the hope was to get someone on board who can look at the big picture for the Institute and who can help all these entities do a better job with investment return in a more consistent, integrated way.

Regent Jones commented that he was most impressed with the presentation and wanted to compliment President Clough and Vice President Thompson for their part in it. He noted that he very much appreciated the hard work that had gone into this presentation and its most revealing nature. Regent Jones recommended to the Chancellor and the Board that all the other institutions in the University System take a hard look at the Georgia Tech study and consider a similar exercise for their particular institution. Chairman Baranco agreed that the other institutions could learn a great deal from this study. Regent Rhodes also commented that this exercise would be beneficial to many of the other institutions.

On Tuesday, February 13, 1996, there being no objection, the meeting was recessed at 2:15 P.M. by Chairman Baranco in order for the Committees to meet.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Upon motion by Regent Leebern, with no objection, the Board unanimously approved and authorized the following Committee reports:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION

The **Committee on Education** met on February 13, with the following members present: Regents S. William Clark, Jr. (Chairman), Elson (Vice Chair), Dahlberg, Hand, McMillan and Rhodes. Regent John H. Clark was absent. Regent S. William Clark, Jr. presented the Committee's report with the request that the following items be adopted. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the Presidents of the institutions of the University System submitted various items, listed below, for approval or discussion by the Board. After discussion of these and other items and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Education, by motion of Regent S. William Clark, Jr., seconded by Regent Rhodes, and unanimously adopted (except where otherwise noted), the Board approved and authorized the following items.

The first agenda item was introduced by Regent S. William Clark, Jr., Chairman of the Committee on Education. Regent Clark stated that this item which deals with the Core Curriculum has far-reaching consequences for the education of all undergraduate students. The Core Curriculum proposal is part of the massive effort already underway, continued Regent Clark, to revamp the curriculum from top to bottom. The proposal includes 10 guidelines for redesigning the curriculum to meet the needs of students who will live and work in the next century. Regent Clark remarked that this proposal requires that all students gain mastery of the writing and mathematical skills essential for college level work. It also requires that all students take courses in the Humanities, Fine Arts, the Social Sciences, the Natural Sciences, Mathematics, and Technology. One of the most important features of the Core Curriculum proposal, declared Regent Clark, is that it strengthens transferability from any system institution to any other. Concluding his introduction of the proposed new Core Curriculum, Regent Clark mentioned that it is a major improvement over the current core curriculum, it was illustrated in the three-page document comparing the two that could be found in each Regent's notebook, and that the Education Committee endorses the proposal.

1. Core Curriculum

The Board approved the proposed principles and framework for the core curriculum for implementation with semester conversion.

To allow institutions sufficient time for planning, the semester conversion guidelines indicated that changes in the core curriculum were to be submitted for Board approval this month. Additional recommendations related to the definition and goals of general education are being developed and will be presented at a future meeting.

The proposed principles and curricular framework were developed by the Administrative Committee on Undergraduate Education (Undergraduate Council), the Executive Committee of the Administrative Committee on Academic Affairs, and Academic Affairs

staff and revised based upon suggestions from the institutions. The principles and framework were developed with the goal of allowing institutions some flexibility in defining learning outcomes while ensuring that the core curriculum completed at one System institution is fully transferrable to another System institution.

Principles Across the Core That Are Common to All Institutions

Each institution's core curriculum shall

1. Encourage the development of written and oral communication skills and critical thinking within the broader academic context,
2. Permit opportunities for interdisciplinary learning,
3. Include offerings that reflect the special characteristics of the institution,
4. Feature international components that increase global awareness and introduce the student to different cultural perspectives,
5. Include an informed use of information technology,
6. Employ pedagogy designed to increase intellectual curiosity and to initiate a continuing interest in the subject matter,
7. Feature courses that are challenging and rigorous and provide learning experiences that distinguish a field,
8. Introduce the methods used by technical and scientific professionals such as the evaluation of empirical data, problem recognition, problem definition, the application of scientific principles, and logical problem solving,
9. Be cohesive and provide entry to both specialized studies in the student's chosen field and remaining courses (whether upper or lower division) in the institution's general education curriculum, and
10. Be designed with the assumption that students have met all admissions standards to the institution (with appropriate academic support provided for those who have not).

Curricular Framework for the Common Core **60 Semester Hours**

A. Essential Skills 9 semester hours

The following courses shall have common course numbers throughout the University System. Each course in this section (A) shall be three semester hours:

English Composition I

English Composition II

College Algebra (or) Mathematical Modeling (or other course approved by the Undergraduate Council)

More advanced mathematical courses may be required for certain majors and/or institutions with the approval of the Undergraduate Council.

Transfer: Course-by-course. Any higher-level course or more advanced requirements must apply equally to native and transfer students.

B. Institutional Options 4-5 semester hours

Courses approved by the Undergraduate Council which address institution-wide general education outcomes of the institution's choosing. Examples include, but are not limited to, global issues, oral communication, information technology, critical thinking, wellness, geography, and foreign languages.

Transfer: If B is completed, the receiving institution must accept this area in its entirety. If it has not been completed, the receiving institution must require the student to take additional course work to complete the necessary hours. However, this area is not to exceed a total of seven semester hours at all institutions. Receiving institutions must accept any approved course in this area whether or not the course exists at the receiving institution.

C. Humanities/Fine Arts 6 semester hours

Courses which address humanities/fine arts learning outcomes and which have been approved by the Undergraduate Council. Interdisciplinary courses are acceptable.

Transfer: If C is completed, the receiving institution must accept this area in its entirety. If it has not been completed, the receiving institution must require the student to take additional course work to complete at least six semester hours. However, this area is not to exceed a total of eight semester hours at all institutions. Receiving institutions must accept any approved course in this area whether or not the course exists at the receiving institution.

D. Science, Mathematics, and Technology 10-11 semester hours

Courses approved by the Undergraduate Council which address learning outcomes in the sciences, mathematics, and technology. These need not be sequential courses. Interdisciplinary courses are acceptable.

Students complete one of two options:

Option I -- Non-Science Majors

1. A four-hour laboratory or a three or four-hour non-laboratory course, and
2. A four-hour laboratory course.
3. Three additional credit hours in mathematics, science, or technology.

Option II -- Science Majors

1. Two four-hour laboratory courses.
2. Same as number 3 in Option I above.

Transfer: Course-by-course. Receiving institutions must accept any approved course in this area. If D is complete, the receiving institution must accept this area in its entirety.

E. Social Sciences 12 semester hours

Courses approved by the Undergraduate Council which address learning outcomes in the social sciences including, but not limited to, history and American government. Interdisciplinary courses are acceptable. If credit course work is used to satisfy the U.S./ Georgia history and constitutions requirement, course(s) shall be part of this area.

Transfer: If E is complete, the receiving institution must accept this area in its entirety. If it has not been completed, the receiving institution must require the student to take additional course work to complete at least twelve hours. However, this area is not to exceed a total of fourteen semester hours at all institutions. Receiving institutions must accept any approved course in this area whether or not the course exists at the receiving institution.

F. Courses Related to the Program of Study 18 semester hours

Lower-division courses related to the discipline(s) of the program of study and courses which are prerequisite to major courses at higher levels. The Undergraduate Council will develop guidelines for acceptable courses in this area after appropriate consultation with faculty in the relevant disciplines.

Transfer: Course by course. If F is complete, the receiving institution must accept this area in its entirety.

Additional Transfer Guidelines

Provided that native and transfer students are treated equally, institutions may impose additional reasonable expectations such as a grade of "C" in English Composition.

For students who transfer after completing the core curriculum at a System institution, receiving institutions may require that these students complete the requirements as specified for native students; however, the total number of hours required of the transfer student for the baccalaureate degree shall not exceed the number of hours required of native students for the same major field.

Comments:

Regent Anderson asked how this core curriculum program will actually strengthen the program. Regent Clark answered that this would strengthen the transferability of course credits but not grades. He also noted that there will be an undergraduate council that will survey all of the courses in all units to be certain that all course curriculum throughout the University System of Georgia will result in uniform courses that will automatically transfer to any unit in the System. All institutions will be required to accept these credits. Regent Anderson mentioned that some institutions have had a history of not accepting certain course credits from others

in the University System. Regent Clark stated that with this new core curriculum implementation, it would no longer be possible for one unit of the System to reject course credits from another unit of the System.

Senior Vice Chancellor James Muyskens remarked that Regent Anderson had asked a very important question. He stated that the transferability, at least in principle, is one of the strengths of the System. Dr. Muyskens stated that the System wants to make certain that it is a strength in practice, as well. There have been a number of cases whereby some institutions have been violators of the current rules. For every category in the Policy, there are specific transfer rules and policies. He noted that he had met with all the Chief Academic officers of all the institutions, and that there had been firm agreement that transferability will be the basis for the new core. A few problems may come up now and then, but this phase should address them.

Chairman Baranco added that she had sat in on some of the discussion on this subject and she had heard a number of questions expressed on this issue. The position was made very clear that all concerned definitely want transferability. She expressed her concern about uniformity in nomenclature, and had been assured that that would take place as well.

Regent Anderson remarked that, because he was not on the Education Committee, he felt as though he was less-informed in this area. Regent Clark stated that as Chair of the Education Committee, it was his job to inform all the Regents of what had taken place in the Committee meeting. He offered to spend all the time needed in order to answer any questions.

Chairman Baranco noted that this was a significant piece in the history of the Board of Regents. She asked Senior Vice Chancellor Muyskens to acknowledge the people who had worked so very hard on the document. Dr. Muyskens remarked that it had been a major effort and that many people had contributed to it. He stated that Dr. Joan Elifson, presently Acting President of Georgia Southwestern College, had been a key player from early on in the study. Another major player and one who was present at the meeting was Dr. Frank A. Butler, Vice President and Dean of Faculty at Armstrong State College; Dr. Muyskens also noted that Dr. Butler would be the Chair of the Undergraduate Council, and that his work there was just beginning. Two people on Dr. Muyskens' staff whom he acknowledged for their work on the Core Curriculum Study were Dr. Jan Kettlewell, Assistant Vice Chancellor - Academic Affairs, and Dr. Kathleen Burk, Director of the Regents' Testing Program. Dr. Burk will continue to work on many details that are still being polished using the study as a template.

Regent Jenkins asked whether some required courses could still be exempted. Dr. Muyskens said that this was the case. Regent Jenkins queried whether, in a transfer situation from a two-year college to a university, when the two-year

college has exempted a course or courses, would the university be required to also exempt them for a student. Dr. Muyskens answered that it would.

Regent Hand requested that Dr. Muyskens elaborate on the vocational and technical schools which presently have an Associate degree and the transferability of credit there. Dr. Muyskens noted that this had been discussed in the Education Committee. There were many on-going efforts to devise proposals of cooperative degree programs during the next several months. These core courses will be the ones that the students who are in technical schools take, and they will be in sync with those in the academic programs. Regent Clark reiterated that a student in technical school can take a core course, and this will automatically transfer to a university if the student enrolls there.

Regent Dahlberg commended the group who had researched and devised the Core Curriculum plan. He stated that he felt it important that the Board periodically review (perhaps once a year) the issues that arise having to do with this subject -- that this was important to assure a seamless System. The Chancellor and Chairman Baranco agreed with Regent Dahlberg's suggestion. Chairman Baranco thanked Dr. Muyskens and his group for the extensive work they had done and were continuing to do in this area.

2. Discussion Item: New Accreditation and Re-achievement of Accreditation, Georgia State University

Georgia State University has received notification that two of its programs were awarded full accreditation.

The doctoral program in school psychology was awarded full accreditation by the American Psychological Association, with the next site visit to be held in 2000.

The baccalaureate degree program in social work was reaccredited to October 2003, for the full eight year cycle by the Council on Social Work Education.

3. Discussion Item: Reaffirmation of Accreditation, Macon College

A copy of President S. Aaron Hyatt's summary highlighting Macon College's recent accreditation self-study and site visit was distributed to the Board members. This summary is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

The Southern Association of Colleges and Schools re-affirmed Macon College's accreditation at its December 1995 meeting.

4. Information Item: Re-designation of Stegeman Hall, The University of Georgia

Stegeman Hall is in the process of being demolished as a part of the preparations for hosting the 1996 Olympic Games. This facility, which has been in use since 1943, was named for Herman J. Stegeman, who coached football, baseball, basketball, and track as well as served as Athletic Director and Dean of Men during the 1920's and 1930's.

Coach Stegeman was one of the most popular and successful coaches in the history of the University. He was widely admired as a mentor, counselor, and role model for all male students, both athletes and non-athletes. A respected leader in collegiate athletics, he was instrumental in elevating the University of Georgia's athletic program into national prominence.

Coach Stegeman's devoted service and important contributions to the University merit permanent recognition. The Coliseum represents the most appropriate manner to ensure this recognition.

Thus, President Charles B. Knapp has redesignated the Coliseum in honor of Herman J. Stegeman. President Knapp has also reserved the option of designating a second name for the Coliseum in the future.

5. Approval of Associate of Applied Science degree programs, Darton College in Cooperation with Albany Technical Institute

The Board approved the request of President Peter J. Sireno that Darton College be authorized to offer Associate of Applied Science degrees in Business, Health, Services, and Technology in cooperation with Albany Technical Institute, effective immediately.

In November 1995, both the Board of Regents and the State Board of Technical and Adult Education approved the Student-Centered Collaboration for Public Postsecondary Education in Georgia with Annotation. In fulfillment of the requirements of this agreement, the two state agencies have developed and forwarded to their respective institutions procedures for implementing cooperative associate of applied science degrees. This item represents the first such agreement to be brought for approval to the Board. Staff members in the two central offices have jointly reviewed the proposal and have determined that it meets the criteria approved by the two entities in November. It is anticipated there will be a large number of cooperative agreements ready for Board review in March.

Specifically, Darton College and Albany Technical Institute have developed and are seeking approval of the following four associate of applied science degrees which will build on specific technical programs:

Associate of Applied Science in Business

- Accounting
- Information and Office Technology
- Microcomputer Specialist

Associate of Applied Science in Health

- Dental Assisting
- Medical Assisting
- Radiologic Technology
- Surgical Technology

Associate of Applied Science in Services

- Child Development and Related Care
- Culinary Art
- Environmental Horticulture

Associate of Applied Science in Technology

- Advanced Drafting
- Advanced Drafting and Design
- Advanced Machine Tool Technology
- Automotive Technology
- Electronic Technology
- Industrial Electrical Technology
- Printing/Graphics Technology
- Applied Manufacturing Technology

6. Establishment of One-time Cycle of an External M.Ed. Degree Program On-site in the Liberty County School District, Armstrong State College

The Board approved the request of President Robert A. Burnett that Armstrong State College be authorized to offer a one-time cycle of the existing M.Ed. Degree program on-site in the Liberty County School District, effective immediately.

The Liberty County School District is part of the local P-16 community council that is based at Armstrong State College. Within this local P-16 council, Liberty County School and Armstrong State College are working collaboratively to increase the influence of master teachers on teacher education students, while increasing the professional development opportunities that are available for the teachers. This request to offer the M.Ed. Program on-site in the Liberty County School District, on a one-time only basis, is intended to meet the teachers' needs for graduate education as they prepare for increased responsibility in working with student teachers from Armstrong State College.

7. Discontinuation of Degree Programs From the College of Education, Georgia State University

The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University be authorized to discontinue the following degree programs, effective Fall 1996:

- B.S.Ed. Education on Students with Mental Retardation
- M.Ed. Prevocational Education of Students with Mild Handicaps
- Ed.S. Foreign Language
- Ed.S. Special Education Administration
- Ph.D. Communicative Arts Education
- Ph.D. Reading Instruction

The above-listed programs were deactivated in the Fall of 1994. The students in the programs at that time either have completed their degrees or have transferred to other programs. Thus, no students are currently enrolled in the programs.

8. Discontinuation of Degree Programs from the College of Public and Urban Affairs, Georgia State University

The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University be authorized to terminate the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degree programs, effective the end of summer quarter, 1996.

Georgia State University is seeking to terminate the Associate of Arts and the Associate of Science degree programs within the College of Public and Urban Affairs. These two programs were deactivated in December 1994. Impact on the students will be minimal, as students can access the courses offered within these majors at any of the System's institutions. Students have been adequately informed about the plans to terminate these programs and will be accommodated through the core curriculum and general education courses at the institution.

9. Elimination of Department of Community Dentistry, Medical College of Georgia

The Board approved the request of President Francis J. Tedesco to eliminate the Department of Community Dentistry in the School of Dentistry, effective immediately.

Departments of Community Dentistry have helped to focus pre-doctoral dental education on the conceptual and programmatic aspects of behavioral sciences and public health. Community Dentistry, however, has had limited success in applying these principles to clinical situations. This philosophical impasse has led to a gradual phasing out of Community Dentistry across the country and to an integration of the dental behavior sciences with other appropriate basic sciences and clinical disciplines. The Medical College of Georgia wishes to follow this national pattern. Additionally, since the retirement of the chairperson of Community Dentistry in 1993, it became clear that the primary responsibilities of that department should be redistributed. No students are presently enrolled in the Community Dentistry program. Also, the two faculty who were a part of the department have been assigned to the Pediatric Dental Department and the Oral Rehabilitation Department respectively. The Medical College of Georgia has concluded that there is not a need for a separate administrative unit in the School of Dentistry for Community Dentistry. These practices and functions have been integrated into other departments in an appropriate manner. Therefore, it is being recommended that the Community Dentistry Department be eliminated immediately.

10. Conferring of Emeritus Titles. 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 data indicated:

(a) **GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dr. John C. Athanassiades, Professor Emeritus of Management, Department of Management, College of Business Administration, effective March 1, 1996.

Dr. John D. Blakeman, Professor Emeritus of Counseling and Psychological Services, Department of Counseling and Psychological Services, College of Education, effective March 1, 1996.

Dr. Alfred Robert Roberts, Professor Emeritus of Accountancy, School of Accountancy, College of Business Administration, effective March 1, 1996.

Dr. James P. Rozelle, Posthumous Associate Professor Emeritus of Computer Information System, Department of Computer Information System, College of Business Administration, effective March 1, 1996.

(b) **THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Mr. Charles E. Aguar, Professor Emeritus, School of Environmental Design, effective February 14, 1996.

(c) **WAYCROSS COLLEGE**

Dr. James M. Dye, Founding President of Waycross College Emeritus, effective February 14, 1996.

11. Change of Faculty Tenure Status

(a) **MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA**

Dr. James W. Curtis, Jr., Associate Professor, Department of Oral Rehabilitation, School of Dentistry, from *tenure* track to *non-tenure* track, effective February 15, 1996.

Dr. Geoffrey R. Tompkins, Assistant Professor, Department of Oral Biology, School of Dentistry, from *tenure* track to *non-tenure* track, effective February 15, 1996.

(b) **WEST GEORGIA COLLEGE**

Dr. James N. Mathis, Assistant Professor, Department of Biology, School of Arts and Sciences, *three years probationary credit towards tenure*, effective January 3, 1996.

12. Appointment of Faculty and Leaves of Absence. The Board approved the appointment of faculty members at the salaries and for the period recommended at the following institutions: Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College, Armstrong State College, Augusta College, Clayton College, Columbus College, Dalton College, DeKalb College, Floyd College, Ford Valley College, Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, Kennesaw State College, Medical College of Georgia, Middle Georgia College, North Georgia, Savannah State College, University of Georgia, Valdosta State University and West Georgia College. These appointments and leaves of absence were recommended by the presidents of the institutions subsequent to the last regular meeting of the Board on January 9 and 10, 1995. The recommendations were found by the Chancellor and his staff to be in order. A list of these appointments and leaves of absence is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

13. Appointment of Faculty Members Previously Retired from the University System. The Board approved the part-time appointments of faculty members previously retired from the University System. The appointments were recommended by Chancellor Portch and Presidents Prater, Clough, Patton, Knapp, Allen and Bailey, as follows:

(a) **FORT VALLEY STATE COLLEGE**

Dr. George Canty, Jr., Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of Chemistry, School of Arts and Sciences, for period September 1, 1995-June 13, 1996.

Mr. J. C. Hill, Jr., Assistant Professor, Department of English, School of Arts and Sciences, for period December 8, 1995-June 12, 1996.

(a.) **GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Dr. Harold R. Hunt, Jr., Part-time Associate Professor, School of Chemistry and Biochemistry, College of Sciences, for period January 3, 1996-June 7, 1996.

Mr. Alfred Ledon (*over seventy years of age*), Accountant III, for period February 15, 1996-June 30, 1996.

(b.) **GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dr. Jerry H. Etheridge, Part-time Instructor, Department of Music, College of Arts and Sciences, for period January 2, 1996-June 7, 1996.

Dr. Charles C. Knox, Professor Emeritus, Department of Music, College of Arts and Sciences, for period January 1, 1996-February 29, 1996.

Mr. Charlie F. Prince, Director Administrative, (NTT) for period February 14, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Dr. Eckhart H. Richter, Associate Professor Emeritus, Department of Music, College of Arts and Sciences, for period January 2, 1996-June 7, 1996.

(c.) **NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE**

Dr. Bob W. Jerrolds, Professor Emeritus, Department of Education, for period January 1, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Dr. Paul E. McClure, Part-time Instructor, Department of English, for period September 1, 1995-June 30, 1996.

Dr. Judith N. True, Professor, Department of Education, for period January 1, 1996-June 30, 1996.

(d.) **THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Dr. Robert Elliott Carver, Professor Emeritus, School of Forest Resources, for period August 14, 1995-September 16, 1995.

Ms. Frances T. Denman, Educational Program Specialist, Department of Poultry Science, College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, for period January 1, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Mr. Ernst C. Von Glasersfeld, (*over seventy years of age*), Professor Emeritus, College of Education, for period December 6, 1995-December 11, 1995.

Dr. William Harvey Hale, Jr., Part-time Associate Professor, Vice President for Service, for period February 18, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Mr. Thomas Melvin Parham, Jr., Professor Emeritus, School of Social Work, for period January 1, 1996-June 30, 1996.

Mr. Robert G. Perkins, Program Specialist, Vice President for Service, for period March 1, 1996-February 28, 1997.

Mr. Von Glasersfeld, Ernst C., (*over seventy years of age*), Professor Emeritus, College of Education, for period December 6, 1995-December 11, 1995.

(e.) **VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Dr. Hansel W. Allen, Program Coordinator, Department of Early Childhood and Reading Education, College of Education, for period September 1, 1995-June 30, 1996.

16. Administrative Appointments. The Board approved the appointment of the following individuals to the administrative positions as indicated, effective on the dates indicated.

(a) **THE UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Dr. Michael Hannafin, Professor Wheatley Chair/Eminent Scholar, School of Professional Studies - Department of Instructional Technology, College of Education, *with three years of probationary credit*, effective January 1, 1996.

(b) **KENNESAW STATE COLLEGE**

Dr. Nancy S. King, Vice President Student Success/Enrollment and Prof., effective February 15, 1996.

15. The **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION** reported through its Chairman that the individuals listed below had filed applications for review of decisions made by the presidents of their respective institutions, as authorized by Article IX of the Bylaws of the Board. After careful consideration, discussion, and upon the recommendation of the Committee on Education and the Associate Vice Chancellor for Legal Affairs, with motion properly made, variously seconded and unanimously adopted, the Board made the following decisions:

1. The University of Georgia: Mr. Clifton Wayne Jones, concerning his application for review of in-state tuition status. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board remanded this application to the University of Georgia for review and decision.

2. Albany State College: Mr. James L. Sackor, concerning his application for review of the termination of his position. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

3. West Georgia College: Ms. Beth Carter, concerning her application for review of her in-state tuition status. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

4. The University of Georgia: Mr. Roger M. Wittman, concerning his application for review of his residency for tuition purposes. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

5. Georgia Southern University: Mr. James T. Reese, concerning his application for review of his in-state tuition status. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

6. Fort Valley State College: Mr. David Williams, concerning his application for review of his expulsion from a college dormitory. After investigation, review and careful consideration, the Board denied this application for review.

Report on Committee on Finance and Business Operations

The **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS** met on February 13, 1996, with the following members present: Regents Cannestra (Chair), Coleman (Vice Chair), Allgood, Anderson, Jones, Leebern and Turner. After discussion and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and Committee on Finance and Business Operations, by motion of Regent Coleman, variously seconded and unanimously adopted, the Board approved

and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Amendments to Fiscal Year 1996 Budget

The Board of Regents approved the consolidated amendments to the Fiscal Year 1996 Budget of the University System of Georgia as displayed in Appendix I, which is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources/Treasurer.

2. Policy Regarding the Service of Campus Executive Officers on Bank/Financial Institution Boards

The Board of Regents adopted a formal policy which restricts the President and Chief Business Officer of each unit of the University System of Georgia and any other officer or employee who participates in the selection of the College's or University's depository (bank) from serving on the governing boards of banks or other financial institutions.

In December 1995, the Committee directed the staff to review any policy which governs the relationships between executive officers of universities and colleges and banks or other financial institutions with which institutions do business and to propose any revisions which seem appropriate. The following two items address this directive.

Background

In 1984, Chancellor Crawford issued a letter to campus presidents advising them not to serve on the governing boards of banking institutions and to monitor closely the service of staff on such boards. This action was taken in response to concerns raised by the Finance and Business Operations Committee regarding the appearance of such activity as well as its legality. The Committee believed that presidents should maintain close relations with the entire business community served by the campus. To serve on the board of one business enterprise would give the appearance of favoring that enterprise, even though no direct business relationship existed. In his letter, Chancellor Crawford also noted that questions could be raised about the legality of a public official depositing funds in a bank on whose governing board s/he serves.

In 1993, Chancellor Propst requested the Board's advice on the continuation of this "unofficial" administrative policy. This was prompted by the request of a president to serve on the board of directors of an institution where there was to be a mutual understanding that the financial institution would neither solicit nor receive the institution's business. The Board at that time directed that the "unofficial" policy be continued.

There currently is no policy which restricts other members of college or university management, who may have a role in the selection of a bank or other financial institution, from serving on the governing boards of banks or financial institutions.

The State Code of Ethics prohibits state employees from receiving compensation from vendors doing business with their agencies or institutions. The Ethics Code applies to executive officers of the University System of Georgia colleges and universities who may

desire to work as paid consultants for banks or other financial institutions doing business with their campus.

3. Banking and Financial Services/Cash Management Policy

In order to bring Board policy into conformance with other policies governing the acquisition of goods and services by units of the University System of Georgia, the Board approved revising the current policy to require a best value competitive bid process for the selection of banking and financial services that would be undertaken every three years.

The Board further approved a plan whereby the cash management practices of each institution (e.g., the daily movement of operating funds between different interest bearing accounts) be considered by the newly established Audit Committee as a possible area for review in the annual audit plan of the University System of Georgia.

Background

Current Board Policy gives substantial discretion to college and university presidents in selecting banks for the deposit of operating and payroll clearing account funds. Section 704.01 authorizes presidents to determine the bank, or banks, where funds are deposited and requires the presidents to inform the Treasurer of the Board (Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources) as to the bank, or banks, chosen. The Business Procedures Manual (Directive 20) states the following:

“Regents’ policy assigns to the President the privilege of selecting the bank or banks in which the General Operating Account and Payroll Clearing Account of each unit of the University System is to be located.”

Directive 20 further states that, in most instances, these accounts are rotated every three or four years, although that is not required. The purpose for this, according to the Manual, is to allow “patronage from time to time with the various banks in the community.” Directive 21 restricts placement of deposits to banks or savings and loans associations within the State of Georgia and limits the placement period of time deposits to twenty-four months. The treasurer of the Board of Regents is responsible for providing corporate approval for new accounts and advising banks as to the approved signatories. Directive 23 establishes procedures for investing in the Local Government Investment Pool. There is no University System policy which requires competitive bidding as such for banking or other financial services.

4. Assessment of the Pattern of Use of Lapsed Funds

It was requested that the staff assess the pattern of use of lapsed funds into and out of contingency funds, and report back to the Committee at an appropriate time.

Comments:

Regent Allgood questioned the wording of the agenda concerning serving on

boards. Regent Coleman remarked that the System attorneys had approved the wording of the above policies.

Regent Dahlberg asked whether it was known if any Presidents or Chief Financial Officers did serve on the boards of banks or other financial institutions. Chancellor Portch answered that there were no presidents serving on such boards, but that it was not known whether other administrative officers at any institution in the System were presently serving on such boards.

Regent Turner asked whether Item #2 had been broadened to include businesses other than banks. Regent Coleman said that the term, "other financial institutions," should cover the spectrum. Chairman Baranco interjected that the Board should ask the Organization and Law Committee to consider the wording of this item, because it could entail a conflict of interest. Regent Jenkins, Chair of the Organization and Law Committee, said that the Committee would discuss the item.

Regent Jones requested information about how the interest earned on money deposited by the University System or any of its institutions is used. Does the utilization of this interest income come to the Board for approval? Senior Vice Chancellor Desrochers answered that the interest income would be budgeted and would come through the budget amendments that are presented to the Board. Regent Jones wanted further clarification about whether the interest income expenditure was budgeted ahead of time or after it was known how much it would be. Dr. Desrochers responded that this income was budgeted when a good estimate was known.

Although Chairman Baranco remarked that a state law requires any interest income to revert back to the state treasury; Regent Jones noted that the institutions of the University System, however, could use such income and were not required to return it to the state treasury. Chancellor Portch stated that the institutions do submit budget amendments on which interest income is identified to the Board's Finance and Business Committee. Regent Anderson pointed out that some expenditures shown on the "University System of Georgia Fiscal Year 1996 Report Unexpended Plant Fund Narrative for the Month of February 1996," which was included in the agenda, identified interest income as providing the funds to pay for such expenditures.

Report on Committee on Buildings and Grounds

The **COMMITTEE ON BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS** met on February 13, 1996, with the following members present: Regents Jones (Chairman), Anderson (Vice Chairman), Allgood, Cannestra, Coleman, Leebern and Turner. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the presidents of the several institutions of the University System listed below submitted eleven items for approval by the Board.

After discussion of these items, and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Buildings and Grounds, with motion by Regent Jones, variously seconded, and

unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Authorization of Project "ADA Improvements," Georgia Institute of Technology

The Board authorized project "ADA Improvements," Georgia Institute of Technology, with a total project budget of \$2,250,000.

Further: The Board approved the selection of McDevitt Street Bovis as the Program Manager for this project.

Further: The Board authorized the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources to award a contract for a Construction Manager for this project to be ratified by the Board at its next meeting.

- As part of its Olympics and Paralympics requirements, Georgia Institute of Technology has requested authorization to perform ADA modifications to 16 facilities. These will be used heavily during the Olympics and Paralympics.

- The facilities have been identified in a Phase I ADA Transition Plan for Olympic and Paralympic use which reviewed 52 campus buildings. This plan is a key element of the Village Supplemental Agreement between ACOG and the Board of Regents.

- The modifications need to be completed prior to the Olympics. Therefore, an accelerated delivery mechanism is necessary.

- Funding for this project is from a FY '96 \$8 million appropriation to the Georgia Building Authority for Statewide ADA Improvements.

2. Appointment of Construction Manager, University System of Georgia

The Board approved the appointment of Turner Construction as the construction manager for the Addition to Food Science, The University of Georgia.

- The Addition to Food Science, The University of Georgia, was authorized by the Board with a construction cost of \$4,775,000.

- Construction managers for five of the nine projects were approved at the December, 1995 and January, 1996 meetings. The above construction manager selection has been completed since the January, 1996 meeting, leaving the remainder for approval at the March, 1996 meeting.

- The construction manager selection process is a qualifications and fee based approach that takes into consideration the firm's experience and qualifications and fee.

3. Information Item: Albany Flood Recovery

Regent Jones acknowledged the difficulties being experienced by the students, faculty and administrative personnel at Albany State College while they await the completion of

the renovation of their institution which was damaged by a flood in the summer of 1994. Regent Jones asked Ms. Linda Daniels, Director of Facilities Planning, to expound on the present state of the renovation of Albany State College.

Ms. Daniels stated that all of the new facilities that had been presented on the master plan are well into design. Full advantage was being taken of the program management team approach to make sure that the central energy plant (with long-lead equipment items) is designed and ready for bidding, and that she hopes this will make up some of the time that had been lost. The demolition of buildings is ongoing and scheduled for completion in May 1996. Forty-three of the seventy-five acres of land needed have been acquired. An important milestone, noted Ms. Daniels, was the final signing by the federal government of the environmental assessment which was required for the overall success of the project.

Regent Jones remarked that it had taken months to get all the signatures on the environmental assessment mentioned by Ms. Daniels. He also noted that there had been some delay in receiving funds from FEMA, but Ms. Daniels stated that signing of the environmental assessment should free up access to funds.

Chairman Baranco stated that Vice Chancellor Rewerts and Director Daniels had done outstanding jobs in coordinating this renovation work. The Chairman mentioned that she had visited the site and had sat in on a number of meetings concerned with this project and that she was very impressed with the Facilities staff being on top of the work.

4. Information Item: Report on Roswell Center Report

Regent Jones stated that some time ago the Board had approved the leasing of an empty school building located in the city of Roswell, Georgia, to be renovated to the specifications of Georgia State University for occupation in July 1996. This space was needed in order for the University to conduct registration for their fall quarter during the 1996 Olympic games. Regent Jones noted that this item was brought to the Board and the Chancellor to apprise them of the status of this item.

Georgia State University has vigorously pursued the lease agreement approved by the Board at its April 1995 meeting. Negotiations have been ongoing for several months through John D. Marshall and Stephen L. Langston of Georgia State University working with Mr. Vincent Lu, the developer, his architectural advisors, and Mr. Kevin Johns of the City of Roswell. The expectation of the University, based on original statements made by the developer and his representatives to Georgia State officials and Vice Chancellor Rewerts, was that most of the existing structure would be demolished and rebuilt to University requirements. Georgia State has worked with the developer's architects (first the Satula Group and then ROSSER) to arrive at a plan that meets Georgia State's requirements and the developer's requirements. Until September 7, it appeared this would be achievable. On September 7, the developer indicated he could not afford any of the schemes developed by the architect and could not afford to demolish and rebuilt to Georgia State standards. Georgia State offered to continue working with the developer to reach an acceptable solution.

After two months with no word from the developer, he finally provided Georgia State University with a very rough, not drawn-to-scale layout of the proposed facility in November 1995. The layout appears to be the existing layout. Analysis of the proposed plan shows that many of the classrooms do not meet either the Regents or Georgia State design criteria regarding length to width ratio, and this is especially critical in classrooms using video instructional techniques as is planned. Required spaces -- a library and a large classroom -- are not included. Further, the total square footage in the plan is nearly 20% less than promised by the developer and approved by the Board.

Unless the developer quickly provides a scheme that reasonably meets the needs of Georgia State and the terms of the original agreement, it appears that Georgia State will have no other option than to pursue another location. The campus is extending their current lease to assure they have a continued location, and they are proceeding to explore other alternatives for the future in that direction.

5. Report on Lease of Space by Institutions

POLICY FOR LEASED SPACE

It is the intention of the Board of Regents to insure that currently owned space within the University System is utilized with the greatest efficiency. The Board of Regents wants to assure that campuses lease space only when it is appropriate to do so given the nature of the space needed, location of programs and the space demands on campus. When leasing is required, the Board of Regents also wants to assure the rental rates are cost/beneficial.

As campuses have primary responsibility for space management, it is incumbent on campuses to assure adequate review of each leasing decision. Campuses are to establish review procedures which assure that all available space on campus is utilized to maximum benefit and that leased space is sought only when there is no appropriate space available on campus; when the program requires an off-campus site; when it is more economical to lease than to build additional space; no other campus has appropriate space which may be used; or when there are other extraordinary circumstances which require leasing. Campuses are charged with assuring they obtain the best rental rates in the area where leasing is to occur and to negotiate multiple year renewal options when possible. Campuses are to report annually on all leased space to the Office of Facilities of the Board of Regents which will exercise oversight on leasing activity. The report should be submitted in conjunction with the submittal of capital budget request.

Comments:

Regent Rhodes questioned whether the matter was brought to the Board only for their attention or brought to them for approval. Regent Jones answered that it was brought for approval of the lease policy.

Vice Chancellor Rewerts explained that the annual report would give a snapshot in order to evaluate capital projects and that existing policy already requires that the Board approve each lease over \$50,000.

Chancellor Portch further explained that the Board had been approving such leases but there had been no accumulated reporting of them. This will allow the Board to see the totality of such leases. Regent Jones then asked whether this compilation would be done by the Office of the Facilities or by the auditors. He received the answer that the Office of Facilities would be receiving and compiling these records.

6. Resolution Authorizing Sale of Bonds for University System Projects included in the 1996A and B Bond Sales

The Board approved the adoption of resolutions, Exhibit "A" and "B", prepared by the Business and Finance Section of Division 2 of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 1996A and 1996B G. O. Bonds by the State of Georgia through the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission for use in funding projects for the University System of Georgia. Copies of Exhibit "A" and "B" are on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources.

The Business and Finance Section of Division 2 of the Department of Law prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents resolutions to cover the sale of 1996A and 1996B G. O. Bond Issue for the following projects:

H-44	Humanities Building \$ 6,360,000 Dalton College	
H-45	Academic Building 13,435,000 Southern College of Technology	
H-46	Renovation of Price Memorial Hall 3,045,000 North Georgia College	
H-47	Athletic, Recreations & P.E. Complex 11,800,000 Savannah State College	
	Improvements to Campus Drainage System 1,725,000 South Georgia College	
H-68	Classroom/Student Center Facility 4,855,000 Floyd College	
H-66	Renovation of Academic Building 2,210,000 Brunswick College	
H-69	Biology & Chemistry Building 22,885,000 Valdosta State University	
	Health, Physical Education and Recreation Building 7,650,000 Albany State College	

	Renovation of Brooks Hall	2,500,000	
	The University of Georgia		
H-28	Completion of Animal Science Complex	2,590,000	
	The University of Georgia		
	Georgia Public Telecommunications Commission	12,315,000	
	Equipment and Furnishings		
	Herty Foundation	1,910,000	
	Governors Traditional Industries	1,430,000	
	Competitiveness Initiatives		
	Veterinary Diagnostic Laboratory Design	\$ 300,000	
			\$ 95,010,000

Report on Committee on Research and Extension

The **COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH AND EXTENSION** met on February 13, 1996, with the following members present: Regents Hand (Chair), Dahlberg, Elson, S. William Clark, Jr., McMillan and Rhodes. Regent John H. Clark (Vice Chair) was absent. The Chair, Regent Hand, reported that Item No. 1 involved 164 agreements for clinical research and that Item No. 2 involved 17 contracts with state agencies, for a total of \$671,460 in awards. The Committee, through its Chair, reported that in separate letters to Chancellor Portch, the presidents of the several institutions of the University System listed below submitted items for approval by the Board. After discussion of these items, and upon the recommendations of the Chancellor and the Committee on Research and Extension, by motion of Regent Hand, seconded by Regent Cannestra, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Information Item: Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7-8, 1984, the presidents of Armstrong State College, Brunswick College, Columbus College, Darton College, Georgia College, Georgia Southern University, Georgia State University, Medical College of Georgia, and University of Georgia executed 164 memoranda of understanding respecting affiliation of students for clinical training in the programs indicated.
2. Information Item: Pursuant to authority granted by the Board at its meeting on February 7-8, 1984, the presidents of Georgia College, Georgia State University, and University of Georgia executed 17 service agreements with the indicated agencies for the purposes and periods designated, with the institutions to receive payment as indicated.
3. Appointment of Research and Extension Staff: The Board approved five full-time research/scientists or engineers at the Georgia Institute of Technology and one part-time faculty, retired and over seventy years of age, at The University of Georgia. The appointments were recommended by President Clough and President Knapp subsequent to the last meeting of the Board on January 9 and 10, 1996. The recommendations were found to be in order and are on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

(a.) **GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY**

Dr. James Edward Dupree, Principle Research Engineer, Signatures Technology Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective February 1, 1996.

Dr. Melinda K. Higgins, Research Scientist II, Electro-Optics Environment and Materials Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective February 1, 1996.

Mr. William H. Stark, Jr., Research Engineer I, Information Technology and Communications Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective February 1, 1996.

Ms. Michelle A. Starmack, Research Associate I, Office of Contract administration, effective January 29, 1996.

Dr. Gisele (NMI) Welch, Research Engineer II, Electro-Optics Environment and Materials Laboratory, Georgia Tech Research Institute, effective January 11, 1996.

(b.) **UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA**

Dr. Ernest Edmund Provost, (*over seventy years of age and retired*), Professor Emeritus, Georgia Center for Continuing Education, Vice President for Service, for period March 25, 1996-March 29, 1996.

AUDIT COMMITTEE REPORT

Regent Coleman, Chairman of the Audit Committee, reported that the Committee had had its very first meeting on Tuesday, February 13, 1996. Regent Coleman reminded the Board that they had been given, at the last Board meeting, a draft charter and that there had been lengthy discussion and comments that had been recorded and given a great deal of consideration. Two meetings had been held to discuss the Charter in an effort to put into it revisions as suggested; thereby producing the revised Charter that the Board members had before them. Regent Coleman noted that at the meeting staffing considerations had been discussed for the audit department, and that it was felt that some outsourcing might be the wisest way to meet some audit needs. An audit plan was discussed which would be based on risk assessment; progress on such is to be reported back to the Committee in April 1996. The Committee recommended the adoption of the revised charter and sought the Board's advice on the question of immediate action or waiting a month for the Board to review the Charter.

By motion of Regent Coleman, seconded by Regent Leebern, and unanimous approval of the Board, the Charter was approved. The Charter is on file in the office of the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources.

Regent Coleman noted the concern that some things have not been currently and directly reported to the Board of Regents. As Chairman of this Committee, Regent Coleman announced the Committee's desire to have a more direct line with the units of the University System. The Board, stated Regent Coleman, wants prompt reporting of problems. Regent Coleman remarked that the Board is not on a witch hunt - but the Board needs to know about efficiency, inefficiency, and personnel problems so that the Regents can be sure that the System is running as it should. Board members do not want to learn about problems when they read the newspaper. Regent

Coleman noted that he had recommended at the Committee meeting that the Chancellor call a meeting of the System presidents: Regent Coleman took this action because, even though past policy already dictates or allows in-house auditors to have a direct line to the Central Office, it was felt that that policy has not been followed and not been exercised. The Board does not want the institution presidents to feel as though someone is being put in their "house" to report on them; that can best be done by a meeting to reassure the presidents that the Board does not deem them to be ineffective or that there is suspicious activity in their institutions - that the Board just wants to revamp the old audit policy. Chancellor Portch stated that this would be incorporated into the next University System Presidents' meeting.

Chairman Baranco congratulated Regent Coleman on the work of the Audit Committee and expressed the gratitude of all the members of the Board.

Comments

Regent Dahlberg asked whether System presidents and other System employees fill out forms concerned with conflict of interest. Chairman Baranco said that they did. Regent Dahlberg then asked, in the case of such conflict of interest being reported, who evaluates these forms. Chairman Baranco answered that the forms go to the Secretary of State's office. Regent Dahlberg said that he felt it would be good for the Board to review such forms periodically. Chairman Baranco noted that the Law and Organization Committee would take this issue under consideration.

Regent Dahlberg asked for clarification of the approval process of the Board. Chairman Baranco responded by outlining the procedure: (1) when the Board meets on Tuesdays, each Board member has an agenda of assigned committee items. It is assumed that every Board member reads their report in advance of the Board meetings. It was decided that the recommendations of the various committees would be adopted by unanimous consent without having lengthy discussions but with the very clear understanding that any Regent can extract any particular item for further discussion. Chairman Baranco added that one reason that the Board has a Planning and Oversight Committee is to bring to the whole Board such items that call for discussion of the full Board; these items, it is felt, should not be relegated to a particular committee.

Regent Dahlberg said that he still felt it confusing that the Board approves the committee reports at the beginning of the reporting process, while, at the same time, some items are brought up separately and voted upon. Chairman Baranco then explained that the committee reports are approved after the committees have thoroughly discussed and voted on each item, with the option to draw out any item for further discussion and/or approval or rejection. The Chancellor noted that this process had not yet been recorded in the Bylaws.

Regent Leebern also remarked that, in order to expedite the approval of the committee reports, the Board had agreed to approve these reports in such a manner. Before that decision was made, it had taken a great deal of time to approve each and every agenda item.

Regent Jones then noted that measures had been taken to require that Buildings and Grounds agenda items be submitted by the first of each month preceding the month in which a Board meeting is held. This was done in an effort to make sure that both the Committee and the Facilities staff have enough time to familiarize themselves with these items and thoroughly research them before the Board meetings take place. Regent Jones also noted that he sometimes did not receive materials early enough in order to be completely informed before each Board meeting. After hearing from the Secretary about the procedure for sending such materials, Regent Jones agreed that it would be quite helpful if such materials were sent out a day or two earlier by an expedited delivery method.

VISITATION COMMITTEE REPORT:

In the absence of Regent John H. Clark, Chair, Chairman Baranco reported that a Visitation Report had been received from Regent S. William Clark, Jr.

THE CHANCELLOR'S REPORT

Chancellor Stephen R. Portch addressed the meeting and reminded the Regents that it was the Georgia legislative season. He stated that a major presentation had been made to the Appropriations Committee, and that he wanted to publicly thank Chairman Baranco for her participation in that. The Chancellor also thanked Regent Leebern for his attendance at the session. Chancellor Portch remarked that many of the Regents had been keeping up with highlights of the legislative workings on "Lawmakers 96" on GPTV which does a very good job of keeping everyone up to date. The Chancellor also mentioned that the staff had kept its promise to provide an accountability report for last year's investments and that copies had been distributed to the Regents.

Chancellor Portch announced that the first round of the supplemental budget was complete, and with only 18 days left, several rounds remained. In the supplemental budget, the House brought forward the University System's capital projects into this year - that was what the Board had just acted upon. This was good news. The legislature, however, did propose reducing these capital projects by \$7.6 million. The House also proposed reducing the University System's resident construction budget by \$6 million because of a technicality on receiving certain retirement benefits beyond what had been allocated. The Senate responded by proposing to restore both the capital projects and the \$2 million - in the final analysis, the Senate position prevailed on the capital budget and what the Board had voted upon was kept intact. The Chancellor mentioned that a couple of Regents had particular interest in animal science projects which were brought forward with the support of the Governor and the Legislature. He lamented, however, that the staff had not been successful in regaining the \$2 million item. The Chancellor announced that he and Vice Chancellor Tom Daniel would be keeping the Board informed in the days to come as the pace accelerates.

Keeping life in some sort of perspective during this period, Chancellor Portch noted that the Runnin' Regents have stepped up their schedule. The team had been on a "tear" -- defeating Kennesaw State College and Clayton State College. On Friday, the Runnin' Regents were to face their toughest competition of all. Chancellor Portch noted that the Student Advisory Committee (SAC) was having their winter conference and, as a part of that, the Regents' team

would be playing the SAC team in the newly-renovated Alexander Memorial Coliseum. Chancellor Portch emphasized that the game would be played from 10:00 p.m. to midnight, which would probably be past the bedtimes of many on his team.

The Chancellor reported that the P-16 effort was going extremely well. He noted, also, that it is being copied. Maryland is the latest state to announce that they would have a K-16 initiative which is parallel to Georgia's P-16. The Central Office has, in addition, been providing Maryland's system with information.

Chancellor Portch noted that he was particularly pleased that Department of Technical and Adult Education Commissioner Ken Breeden and Department of Education Superintendent Linda Schrenko have been very active participants in the P-16 effort. He stated that the three of them had met twice just the past week to explore the linkages in all three systems on behalf of all the students of these systems. As an example, the Legislature has provided the post-secondary enrollment program for high achieving high school students. Some innovative things are being tried to encourage interest in the P-16 program; Valdosta, for instance, is using distance education. Nevertheless, the program is nowhere near what it should be given the number of high-achieving students there are in the state. A very good example of this were the three students who attend the Advanced Academy of Georgia at West Georgia College and who addressed the meeting yesterday. Discussions are ongoing to find ways to speed up that program, and in the next few weeks some new proposals will be brought to the Board to accelerate the linkages between the three sectors of education in this state. The Chancellor noted that he was delighted with the progress so far.

The Chancellor mentioned that, as a follow-up to the Georgia business leaders' meeting that was held at the Governor's Mansion, a survey had been sent on February 10 with replies requested by February 26 to Georgia community bankers, Georgia industry associations, select economic developers, and the Georgia Chamber of Commerce's existing industry committee. He noted that there was a copy of the survey in each Regents' folder. The Chancellor also stated that Kennesaw's School of Business is helping on that project. The next scheduled meeting would be on April 18 in Statesboro to focus on that region of the state. There are plans for Regent Allgood and the Chancellor to conduct some additional meetings around the state. Attempts would be made to ask the business community how the System can serve them better and how they use the services currently provided: this information will be very valuable for the System.

Good News Items:

Each month good news is shared with the Board, the Chancellor announced, but this month had been quite extraordinary.

1. USA Today had a big article about the top 20 college students in nation. Two of those students were from Georgia: Ms. Ayodele Embry, a Georgia Tech senior majoring in electrical engineering, and Mr. Robert Sutherland, a UGA senior majoring in biology. These students will each receive \$2,500 scholarships - not just for academic achievement, but for additional things they did as individuals. Each Regent received a copy of the newspaper.

2. The University of Georgia was listed among the top 50 colleges and universities enrolling the largest numbers of freshmen merit scholars in 1995 with 38 students. Merit scholarships are the most prestigious national scholarships, and the University of Georgia was among the leaders in that.

3. Georgia Institute of Technology's Engineering Professor, Dr. Oliver McGee, was

named the 1996 Black Engineer of the Year. Dr. McGee's award was for education at the college level.

4. Brunswick College was selected by the National Academic Advising Association for a National Certificate of Merit Award for its academic advising and orientation program. This is another area upon which the University System has been focusing.

5. The strategic planning brochure for the Board of Regents' Vision Statement was a Special Merit Awards winner by the National Case Advancement Awards Competition. This award was received just this past month.

6. A very interesting technological event recently took place in the Board room. Because the Legislative members find it somewhat difficult to get feedback from their constituents while the Legislature is in session, Representative Larry J. "Butch" Parrish, from Swainsboro, decided to hold a Town Meeting using the GSAMS technology. Representative Parrish then arranged to use the Board room for the Town Meeting and conversed with people who came to East Georgia College to participate in the meeting. Representative Parrish very much appreciated being able to use the GSAMS technology to make contact with his constituents. The University System is grateful to Ms. Kim Iddins for her help in ensuring that the technology was working properly. The Chancellor also expressed his gratitude for Ms. Iddins' help during Board meetings.

7. GALILEO continues to command attention. The National Chronicle of Higher Education had a major story citing five states leading in the use of technology and its libraries. GALILEO was a very prominent part of that story.

8. The Chancellor introduced the 1996 National Research Librarian of the Year, Dr. Ralph E. Russell of Georgia State University. Chancellor Portch noted that Dr. Russell was a major player in the GALILEO project. Dr. Russell received a round of applause as the Chancellor asked him to address the meeting.

Dr. Russell stated that, in the 35 years in which he had worked in libraries in higher education, the most exciting thing he had seen was the GALILEO project. He commended and thanked the Board of Regents for what they had done for the users of libraries; he also thanked the Chancellor for his insightful and informed leadership. Dr. Russell remarked that the institution where he works, Georgia State University, is the single largest consumer of information from GALILEO's electronic files. There are 15,000 prints a day from the on-line system in the Georgia State University's library terminal - this is in addition to whatever is printed on the rest of the campus and throughout the state. Dr. Russell thanked the Board on behalf of over 200,000 users of GALILEO at the present time and, eventually, all the people of Georgia.

Chancellor Portch remarked that Dr. Russell's award came with a check for \$3,000 which he would use to take his family to New York to receive his award.

Comments:

Regent Hand asked the Chancellor whether drastic cuts in the area of extension had been restored to the "B" Budget. Regent Hand expressed her concern about drastic reduction to that very vital program. The Chancellor stated that that had not come up because the "B" Budget was just being discussed during the week of the Board meeting. Regent Hand questioned whether the Chancellor and Mr. Daniel had been making contacts concerning these cuts, and the Chancellor answered that they had been talking with legislators and with the University of Georgia (UGA) on this subject. The Chancellor stated that there had been a two-pronged approach in working with UGA to establish priorities and also in communicating with the Legislature. Chancellor Portch said that there were on-going conversations concerning the subject.

Chairman Baranco thanked Chancellor Portch for his report and remarked that it was good for the Regents to hear the good things that are happening in the University System of Georgia. She noted that these good things are the result of good leadership.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Chairman Baranco asked Assistant Vice Chancellor Elaine Newell to further expound upon Regent Dahlberg's question concerning conflict of interest forms. Ms. Newell stated that because the members of the Board of Regents sit on a state board, they are covered by the Ethics in Government Act. This Act was the reason for the Regents having been asked to fill out financial disclosure forms. These forms go to the State Ethics Commission. She noted it was her understanding that, unless the Commission sees a problem on these forms, the forms would simply be filed and no further action would be taken. Ms. Newell stated that the Regents were required to fill out a separate document, the State Business Transaction Disclosure Report - this is in a portion of the code that covers all state employees and covers conflict of interest matters. The two reports are very similar, but they probably came from bills passed at different times when there were different focuses put on the Legislature. Regent Dahlberg asked whether, when a key employee in the University System fills out a form and some conflict is found, what happens to that employee. Ms. Newell responded that the only persons required to fill out the financial disclosure report are the Chancellor and members of the Board of Regents.

Regent Anderson asked for an update on the Project No. G-88, "University Apartments." Chancellor Portch responded to this request by stating that there had been ongoing conversations between the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission (GSFIC) and the other parties involved. The preceding week there had been a proposal which was being assessed by GSFIC who would probably have a counter-proposal - it is very clearly the goal of the University System of Georgia that all related procedures be completed before the Olympics. The Chancellor said that he expected to be able to report in March on the final outcome. Regent Rhodes wondered whether GSFIC had the final decision or would that be up to the University System. Vice Chancellor Rewerts answered that it was understood, from working with John Butler, that Mr. Butler would not be satisfied unless the Board is satisfied. The Chancellor noted that an encouraging aspect was that on the engineer's report there were updates on very finite examinations on the settling and in August a predicted range was declared; the engineers have found the settlement is on the low end of the predicted range. Vice Chancellor Rewerts added that, most likely, no remedial structural repairs would be needed, although there might be a few

cosmetic problems to deal with in the future.

NEW BUSINESS

Chairman Baranco referred to the most recent committee list and noted that some of the temporary committees needed to be updated. The Chairman then asked Regent Jenkins, the Chair of the Organization and Law Committee, to review the committee structure to decide which committees should be kept and which could be disbanded. Chairman Baranco also appointed Regent Dahlberg to the Organization and Law Committee, effective immediately.

The Chairman called for the report of the Committee on Planning and Oversight. By motion of Regent Anderson, seconded by Regent Jones, and there being no objection, the regular meeting of the Board of Regents was recessed and the meeting of the Committee on Planning and Oversight, meeting as Committee of the Whole, convened.

MEETING OF THE COMMITTEE ON PLANNING AND OVERSIGHT, MEETING AS COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Regent Leebern, Chair of the Committee on Planning and Oversight, announced that the Tuition Policy Direction Recommendations would be presented to the Board of Regents. Regent Leebern reminded the assemblage that, in April 1995, the Board had approved the Policy Direction on Tuition. At that time, the Board requested that Chancellor Portch appoint a committee to study and address a number of issues surrounding this policy on tuition. Regent Leebern noted that the report would focus on those issues and that it would be the first reading of the report. The report would be voted on at the March meeting of the Board. Chancellor Portch, announced Regent Leebern, would introduce the report and then there would be a presentation by the Committee whose Chairman is East Georgia College's President Jerry Ashcroft. Joining President Ashcroft in making the presentation was Mr. Thomas Kemp, a graduate student at the Georgia Institute of Technology.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Board of two actions concerning tuition that had been taken last year and which are already in place. One was the reduction of tuition by 5% at the two-year colleges and, in addition, there was no increase: thus, those students actually realized about a 10% reduction (no further changes are planned for this until comparisons can be made with other institutions nationwide). In studying tuition as a System, it was found that Georgia is a low-tuition state -- which is appropriate given the economic condition of many of the state's citizens. The Chancellor remarked that it was also found there were a number of areas where the System was hurting itself and was seriously out of line on tuition. One area is that all sectors are of below-average tuition, both regionally and nationally, with the exception of the two-year colleges which (when compared with their counterparts nationally) were on the high side. The national data will not be available until later this year to see where the System stands. Further analysis will be done, and the results will be brought to the Board. The second item concerned out-of-state tuition where it was found that out-of-state students were only paying 75% of their instructional costs. That was not consistent with national patterns which were typically 100% or, sometimes, more than that. The Board took the action of bringing out-of-state tuition to 100% over a four-year period, phased in with a lower phase in the beginning. That policy went into effect this fall, and the System is on target to bring that about. There was some discussion about whether this would impact the number of out-of-state enrollees; there was no significant change in the out-of-state enrollees this fall. The enrollment was down by 62 students, which does not register even a percentage point; therefore, a drastic drop in enrollment of out-of-state students is not likely to happen.

In addition to the aforementioned two issues, there were ten more issues identified which the Board's policy direction on tuition. The Board members asked that a systemwide group be appointed to make recommendations on these issues. The report to be presented would detail those issues. The Chancellor remarked that the Committee was right on schedule with their report. President Jerry Ashcroft, Chair of the Committee, was then introduced, and the Chancellor also announced that President Ashcroft would be joined by Mr. Thomas Kemp, a graduate student who was a member of the Committee.

President Ashcroft addressed the meeting by stating that he was especially pleased that the Board of Regents had scheduled their October 1996 Board meeting at East Georgia College. He remarked that the faculty, staff and students were excited about the Board coming to their college and that he had spoken with Senator Gillis, Representative Parish and Mayor Buckley, all

of whom are also delighted about the meeting.

President Ashcroft expressed his gratitude to the Chancellor for giving him the opportunity to Chair the Tuition Study Committee. The President noted that, in addition to the Committee, there was a Sub-committee on In-State Alternatives to 12-Month Requirement which had been appointed earlier. President Ashcroft remarked that the Tuition Study committee and the sub-committee had combined their efforts. President Ashcroft stated that present at the meeting were the people who had worked on the study: Mr. Bob Thompson, Vice President for Administration and Finance at Georgia Institute of Technology, Mr. Bob Bugbee, Associate Vice President of Finance at the University of Georgia, Dr. Tom Jones, Vice President for Academic Affairs at Columbus College, Dr. Barry Fullerton, Vice Chancellor for Student Affairs at the University System of Georgia and also Chair of the Sub-committee for In-State Alternatives to 12-Month Requirement. President Ashcroft stated that he had asked Mr. Thomas Kemp, a Georgia Tech graduate student and member of the Tuition Study Committee, to join him and share in the presentation. He noted that Mr. Kemp had ably kept the Committee's focus on the student as they went about their work. The President also stated that Mr. Kemp is a Public Policy major and that working with him had given him great optimism for the future of the nation.

Chancellor Portch met with the Committee to give them their charge on the 15th of August 1995. President Ashcroft noted that the Committee carefully reviewed the Board's tuition policy adopted on April 12, 1995. The Board had given the Committee 10 important tuition issues to study, and they kept their focus on those 10 issues. The Committee's report responds to those 10 issues along with one more that the Chancellor brought to the Committee - one concerning corporations based in Georgia who had employees who are residents of other states. Those corporations wanted their employees to take specific courses from the University System, so the Committee developed a recommendation on that subject. The Committee listened to the Chancellor as he pointed out key items from the Board's policy direction and asked the Committee to: (1) take off their institutional hats and take a System perspective when looking at tuition; (2) draft recommendations in keeping with good public policy; and, (3) keep in mind that a strong revenue base is necessary to move the academic programs in the University System to national pre-eminence. The overlying charge that the Chancellor gave to the Committee was to be sure that the recommendations made were in the best interest of the students. The Committee also heard from the Sub-committee on In-State Alternatives to the 12-Month Requirement. President Ashcroft then asked Mr. Tom Kemp to take a few minutes to share with the Board his understanding of how the Committee's recommendations will affect Georgia students in the future.

Mr. Kemp said that he was grateful for the opportunity to work on the Tuition Study Committee. He noted that he was very pleased with the work done by the Committee during the past 10 months. Mr. Kemp mentioned that about 2 years ago there was a proposal in the University System to increase graduate tuition; graduate students were vehemently opposed to this proposal for the reason that the money would be returned to the University System and be distributed throughout the different units. The current proposal is much more student-focused, and most graduate students support an increase in their tuition because they understand that the additional tuition will come back to the collecting units. Mr. Kemp said that the 5% increase in graduate tuition, when paid, would go directly to benefit graduate education. Mr. Kemp noted that the Committee had included him in all their discussions and they had welcomed his input. Mr. Kemp also mentioned that he had conferred with many other graduate students throughout the University System at both smaller colleges and universities, as well as a few graduate student members of the Student Advisory Council. In summary, Mr. Kemp reported that he was very pleased with the increase in graduate tuition because of the direct benefit to graduate education.

President Ashcroft continued by listing the key findings:

(1) The Board should increase graduate tuition and that increase would be 20% above the base undergraduate tuition. It appeared to the Committee from their data that undergraduate tuition is subsidizing graduate tuition and that the Board's tuition policy was to make undergraduate tuition as accessible to Georgia citizens as possible. The Committee, therefore, recommended that the increase in graduate tuition be phased in at 5% per year over a 4-year period. The Committee also recommended that a 3-year plan for the use of that revenue at each institution be submitted to the Chancellor and the Board of Regents: the plan must show how the institution would use the money to enhance the quality of the academic programs. Finally, there should be annual accountability to graduate students and to the Board of Regents, as well as to the public with regard to the use of that revenue.

(2) The Committee recommended that institutions have the ability to request from the Board of Regents permission to charge a differential tuition for professional programs. The Committee is aware that, currently, the professional programs are very inexpensive as compared to others in the nation and recognize the fact that many of the citizens in the state's professional programs are able to benefit from those professional programs in that they earn high incomes. Again, to keep the University System competitive, the Committee recommended that institutions, when making their requests to the Board of Regents and the Chancellor, (a) provide justification and show the impact of the increase, (b) indicate where the tuition increase would place them in relation to the SREB and to like institutions nationally, and (c) report how that revenue would be used to enhance the quality of that professional program.

(3) The issue of student fees was discussed and the Committee arrived at a number of points to be used as guidelines. Central to this is that the guidelines for student fees would be based on service to the student. If a fee cannot meet the test that the fee is appropriate to the service being rendered, the fee would be deemed inappropriate and not allowable.

(4) With regard to the basis for setting tuition, the Committee looked at whether the University System of Georgia should use a plateau or a per-credit approach. The report outlines the advantages and disadvantages to both approaches. From an equitable standpoint, the per-credit tuition seems very fair, i.e., you pay for what you get. The Committee, however, was interested in the Board's concern about having students move through their programs and graduate as promptly as possible in order to open the doors of the institutions for other Georgia citizens. The plateau method encourages more rapid movement through the programs of study. The plateau method is also the method currently being used and would be the easiest to deal with while many other changes are occurring at the institutions. The Committee also recommended that Georgia State University and DeKalb College implement the same twelve credit plateau system that the rest of the University System institutions are using. From the Committee's standpoint, that involves an issue of fairness for the citizens of Georgia.

(5) President Ashcroft stated that he believed it is critical and imperative that the increases in revenue are not offset by a reduction in state appropriations. To make it possible for graduate tuition to increase by 20% and for professional school tuition to be increased, and then to have those increases offset by the Legislature, would be equal to no progress toward the goal of national pre-eminence. The Chancellor told President Ashcroft that he had talked with the Governor and members of the Budget Committee and Office of Planning and Budget, and they understand this issue. The Committee feels it is critical for the Board to be very vigilant with regard to this particular point.

Comments:

Regent Turner asked whether President Ashcroft's fifth key point was doable under the current formula. Chancellor Portch answered that it was doable according to conversations that he had had with the Office of Planning and Budget (OPB), the legislative budget office and the Governor. He noted that, nevertheless, there would be some accounting procedures involved which would be necessary in order to show students how the money is being spent.

Regent Clark stated that the Medical College of Georgia and the Dental School were required by the Board of Regents to take almost exclusively Georgia students, but he wondered if any of the other graduate professional programs are restricted to mostly students from this state. He noted that the System was educating Georgia citizens as inexpensively as possible to be doctors and other professionals, but he did not want to see institutions who cannot recruit students from out of state raise their tuition to match some of the private institutions. President Ashcroft acknowledged that this subject had been discussed by the Committee. When an institution puts together a justification, the institution must indicate how a tuition increase places them in relationship to the Southern

Regional Education Board (SREB) states, as well as with other similar institutions nationwide. This justification must be approved by the Board which will give it careful scrutiny. With regard to graduate tuition, an increase of about 20% would bring the System institutions' tuition to the mid-level of other institutions in the country - it would put the University System of Georgia in the upper quartile of the SREB for graduate tuition. The average tuition of SREB institutions, however, is very low with regard to the rest of the nation. Regent Clark emphasized that these justifications would receive severe scrutiny from the Board and the Education Committee to ensure that the students are actually benefitting from this increase in tuition.

Chairman Baranco asked for clarification of the history of the differentiation of tuition of Georgia State University and DeKalb College. President Ashcroft answered that, in the case of DeKalb College, their tuition procedures began under the public school board of DeKalb County. When they were brought into the University System, they were allowed to maintain the same tuition procedure that they had been using. The Committee feels it would be appropriate for them now to conform their tuition policies to the rest of the two-year colleges in the University System. During its history, Georgia State University has had a unique clientele with a part-time enrollment - their tuition goes back to their early beginning when they had primarily night-school and part-time students. At this point, when they bring their tuition in line with other University System institutions, there will be a significant increase in revenue on their campus. It will also be helpful in terms of fairness for the rest of the System.

Chairman Baranco also wanted to know the implications of this tuition study, if any, for the two-year schools as a whole. President Ashcroft responded by saying that there should no effect on the two-year schools as the issues that the Committee had been requested to study had to do with graduate and professional study and the plateau system. The issues with the two-year colleges had been addressed in the April 12, 1995, policy direction statement which indicated two things: (1) the reduction by 5% of the tuition for two-year colleges, and (2) the increase for the senior institutions. The Chairman noted that there had to be some consistency across the board and that that was her concern. The Chancellor remarked that this was a good reason for bringing the tuition of DeKalb College and Georgia State University in line with the rest of the institutions in the University System.

Regent Hand commented that the guidelines will answer a great many questions that some Regents had with regard to off-campus students, athletic fees, and things of that nature. She noted that

there had been a lot of criticism about the charging of certain fees for off-campus students, etc.

Regent Jones wanted further clarification about medical students. Regent Clark mentioned that there were only 2% out-of-state students in System medical programs. The Chancellor also acknowledged that there was close to 100% enrollment of Georgia citizens in the medical school and dental school.

Regent Leebern asked about retention of funds at the graduate school level. Mr. Tom Kemp answered that the intention of the proposal is that any additional revenues collected from graduate students will be returned to graduate study programs. An accountability report will be given so that the Regents can see how that money has been spent. President Ashcroft agreed, and noted that because this tuition increase is being phased in over a 4-year period, the Board would have an opportunity to see during that time if the plan was working. Mr. Thompson suggested it would be helpful to review such reports as early as February rather than in April so that adjustments could be made early.

Regent Leebern announced that the above-described proposal would lay on the table until the March meeting, and that further comments and suggestions would be welcomed.

By motion of Regent Coleman, seconded by Regent Jones, and there being no objection, the Board voted unanimously to close the Meeting of the Committee of the Whole and reconvene the regular session of the meeting.

Chairman Baranco announced that there was a letter from Mr. Jimmie McEver in the Regents' packets. She then recognized Mr. McEver who invited everyone to visit the Student Advisory Council's Winter Conference being held in Atlanta from Friday, February 16, to Monday, February 19. Mr. McEver issued a special invitation for all to attend the basketball game on Friday night and the legislative breakfast on Monday morning. He expressed his gratitude to Representative Calvin Smyre, Senator Jack Hill and Vice Chancellor Tom Daniel for helping to set up the breakfast.

The Chairman announced that Assistant Vice Chancellor Annie Hunt Burriss had arranged for the Board of Regents to have an active role in the Georgia Chamber of Commerce's Red Carpet tour. Ms. Burriss stated that this was a first-rate tour, an annual event in conjunction with the Masters Golf Tournament, where the Georgia Chamber of Commerce and all the various economic development stakeholders in Georgia get together. Top CEO's are brought in from around the world to recruit in Georgia. For the very first time the University System of Georgia is going to be featured - on April 10, 1996, an event will be held in Athens at the University of Georgia and that night another will take place in Atlanta at the Georgia Institute of Technology. All members of the Board of Regents will be invited. Chancellor Portch will speak about the University System of Georgia's role in developing intellectual capital in Georgia. Ms. Burriss mentioned that April 10 would also be the evening of the Wednesday Board meeting. She also noted that Regent Dahlberg, as Chair of the event, would be sending a letter to each Regent.

There being no further business to come before the Board, by motion of Regent Leebern, seconded by Regent Bill Clark, and without objection, the meeting was adjourned at 11:15 A.M. on February 14, 1996.

s/GAIL S. WEBER
Gail S. Weber
Secretary
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia

s/JUANITA POWELL BARANCO
Juanita Powell Baranco
Chairman
Board of Regents
University System of Georgia