

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA
HELD AT
270 Washington St., S.W.
Atlanta, Georgia
June 13 and 14, 2000**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, June 13 and Wednesday, June 14, 2000 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met as a Committee of the Whole on Tuesday, June 13. On Wednesday, June 14, the following Committees met: the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole; the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities; the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension; and the Committee on Organization and Law. After the Committee meetings on Wednesday, the Chair of the Board, Regent Kenneth W. Cannestra, called the meeting of the full Board to order at 9:00 a.m. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Cannestra, were Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL TENNIS CHAMPIONS

Chair Cannestra called upon the Chancellor to make a special presentation.

Chancellor Portch explained that the University System was privileged to have three national championship tennis teams this year. The University of Georgia ("UGA") Lady Bulldogs shocked the number one Stanford University Cardinals in a five to four win, the Lady Bulldog's second National College Athletic Association ("NCAA") Division I title. The last time the team reached the finals in 1994, they also beat the Cardinals five to four. Additionally, the All-American duo of Marissa Catlin and Lori Grey ranked number one in the doubles championship. Moreover, Coach Jeff Wallace was named the Intercollegiate Tennis Association's Coach of the Year. The team was not able to be present at this meeting.

Two other national championship teams were able to attend this meeting of the Board of Regents. Chancellor Portch stated that the Georgia Perimeter College ("GPC") women's tennis team beat Central Florida Community College 43 to 37 to win their first ever national championship at the National Junior College Athletic Association's ("NJCAA") Division II Championship in Tucson, Arizona. Then, the GPC men's team won its third consecutive NJCAA Division II Championship in Tyler, Texas. These championships bring great honor to the University System, said the Chancellor, and he called upon President Jacquelyn M. Belcher to introduce the teams.

President Belcher greeted the Board. She remarked that there are many champions at GPC, but at this meeting, the tennis champions and their coaches were represented at the Board meeting. She introduced Head Coach Joyce Garrett, the women's team coach.

RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL TENNIS CHAMPIONS (Continued)

Coach Garrett greeted the Board. She introduced the following members of the women's team: Ms. Mayumi McDowell, Ms. Mary Brooke Spearman, and Ms. Cindy Delgado. Ms. McDowell was the number one doubles champion along with Joy Mitchell. Ms. Spearman was a semifinalist in number two singles and doubles. Ms. Delgado was the national champion in number four singles. Coach Garrett stated that she was very proud of the team and that she appreciated the support of the Board and GPC.

Next, President Belcher called upon Assistant Coach Chris Becker for the men's team.

Assistant Coach Becker greeted the Board and stated that Head Coach Billy Pate sent his regards. He then introduced the following members of the men's team: Mr. Mario Toledo, Mr. Bartosz Koldej, Mr. Brendan Zackey, Mr. Marco Grangeiro, and Mr. Gilberto Alvarez. He remarked that the championship game against the Tyler, Texas team was challenging to the end, but the team did a great job.

President Belcher noted that the Regents had been given brochures about each of the teams, and she thanked the Chancellor and the Board for this recognition.

Chancellor Portch congratulated President Belcher and the tennis teams.

After this presentation, the Board adjourned for Committee meetings, beginning with the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. At approximately 10:00 a.m., the full Board reconvened for its regular session.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, June 14 by Regent Donald M. Leebern, Jr.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, June 14 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regent Edgar L. Jenkins had asked for and been given permission to be excused both Tuesday, June 13 and Wednesday, June 14. Additionally, Regent White had asked for and been given permission to be excused Tuesday, June 13, and Regents Allgood and Baranco had asked for and been given permission to be excused Wednesday, June 14.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on May 9 and 10, 2000 were unanimously approved as distributed.

RECOGNITION OF DR. DAVID H. BOTTOMS AS GEORGIA'S POET LAUREATE

Chair Cannestra called upon Chancellor Portch to make a special presentation.

Chancellor Portch remarked that he was pleased to announce that Governor Barnes had recently appointed Dr. David H. Bottoms Georgia Poet Laureate. Dr. Bottoms is a Professor of English and Creative Writing at Georgia State University ("GSU"). The Chancellor noted that each of the Regents had been given a copy of Dr. Bottoms' poem, "The Boy Shepherds' Simile," which was designed, set, and printed on the occasion of his inauguration. The Chancellor stated that being Poet Laureate is an onerous position, because a person can be called upon to write a poem specifically for a particular occasion. Dr. Bottoms was born in Canton, Georgia. He earned his bachelor's degree from Mercer University, his master's degree from State University of West Georgia (formerly West Georgia College), and his doctorate from Florida State University. He is a prolific writer of poetry books and novels. His work has appeared in numerous magazines and anthologies, and he has held over 150 readings and writing workshops at colleges and universities across the nation. His first book, *Shooting Rats at the Bibb County Dump*, was chosen by Robert Penn Warren as winner of the 1979 Walt Whitman Award of the Academy of American Poets. Chancellor Portch then introduced Dr. Bottoms.

Dr. Bottoms thanked the Chancellor. He thanked each of the Regents for this honor and for their appreciation of the importance of literature and the arts to the University System and to the State at large. He also thanked President Carl V. Patton for his support of the creative writing faculty at GSU. He remarked that he is very proud of what GSU is doing in the State, in the nation, and internationally. Too often in our culture, literature and the arts are thought to be impractical, frivolous, and unimportant, but this is true foolishness, remarked Dr. Bottoms. Indeed, just the opposite is true, he contended. The arts are among the greatest of human endeavors, he said. We know of past cultures from the artistic endeavors of those cultures. We define ourselves spiritually and culturally through the arts. Robert Penn Warren was fond of saying that the world is always trying to tell the poet something. Dr. Bottoms found it intriguing that the poet does not tell the world something, but vice versa. We all have that element of the poet in us, he said, if we just listen to the way the world speaks to us. He explained that to him, a poem is an act of interpretation, being humble enough to listen to the signals the world sends and trying to put those signals into words to make some sense out of things. Poetry has a sense of revelation, he said. He then explained that "The Shepherd Boy's Simile" is a poem about his childhood in Canton, Georgia. One of his major distinctions growing up in Canton was that his mother was the superintendent of the Sunday School of the Canton First Baptist Church. This meant that when Christmas came around, he was always drafted into the Christmas program as one of the characters at the manger, having to stand out on the cold front lawn of the church dressed in a sheet. Dr. Bottoms then read the poem, which was about that experience. He then thanked the Board again and stepped down.

Chair Cannestra thanked Dr. Bottoms and proceeded to the Committee reports.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

The Executive Committee met on Tuesday, June 13, 2000 at 10:15 a.m. in the Chancellor's Conference Room, room 7019, for the purpose of discussing fiscal year 2001 compensation for the Chancellor. Committee members in attendance were Chair Kenneth W. Canestra and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Edgar L. Jenkins, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. No actions were taken at this meeting, and the full Board further discussed the compensation issue during Executive Session on Wednesday, June 14. (See page 68.)

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met as a Committee of the Whole on Wednesday, June 14, 2000 at 9:00 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Glenn S. White, Vice Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and James D. Yancey. Chair White reported during the full Board meeting on Wednesday that the Committee as a Whole had reviewed one item, which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Approval of Institutional Operating and Capital Budgets for Fiscal Year 2001

Approved: The Board approved the institutional operating and capital budgets for University System of Georgia institutions and agencies. The list of those institutions as well as tables providing a comprehensive picture of their recommended budgets from several perspectives and breakdowns of the budgets by functional category are on file with the Office of Capital Resources. These budgets have been reviewed by Capital Resources staff for compliance with Board of Regents' policies and directives.

This item was discussed in full by the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. (See pages 7 to 9.)

Background: The fiscal year 2001 educational and general operating budget for the University System of Georgia is \$3.79 billion. This represents an increase of \$119 million, or 3 % over fiscal year 2000. The Systemwide auxiliary enterprise budget, which includes housing, food services, intercollegiate athletics, bookstores, and shops, is \$306.9 million for fiscal year 2001, an increase of \$13.6 million over last year. The student activity budget, which supports educational, recreational, cultural and social activities for students, is \$60 million, an increase of \$4.5 million. Finally, the recommended fiscal year 2001 capital budget, including all sources of funds (auxiliary enterprise funds, interest income, and institutional and other funds) is \$169.9 million. This is an increase of \$3.3 million above last year's approved amount, exclusive of general obligation ("G.O.") bond-funded projects. Like last year, G.O. bond-funded projects were approved in the fiscal year 2000 supplemental budget.

The fiscal year 2001 operating and capital budget recommendations were the culmination of the process begun in late January 2000. The senior leadership group in the Central Office held campus budget conferences via the Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System ("GSAMS") with each institutional president and senior staff. From these meetings, which centered on key institutional budget priorities and enrollment trends, allocation recommendations for State appropriations were developed. These were approved by the Board of Regents in April 2000. Also at the April meeting, the Board approved recommendations on tuition and mandatory student fees, including technology fees. These actions by the Board formed the basis for the institutional budgets presented at this meeting. In addition to budget requests reflecting State appropriations and tuition revenues, each institutional budget includes auxiliary enterprise funds, student activity funds, capital funds, and all other sources of revenue.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

1. Approval of Institutional Operating and Capital Budgets for Fiscal Year 2001 (Continued)

The tables presented to the Board provided a comprehensive picture of recommended institutional budgets. The recommendations include a breakdown of budgets by fund source (i.e., educational and general, capital, auxiliary enterprises, and student activity) and a detailed description of educational and general budgets by revenue source and expenditure category (personal services, operating expenses, and equipment). The capital budget recommendation indicated sources of funds and types of projects. Capital projects that are to be supported by institutional funds will be subject to appropriate review, as required by policy. The staff also provided a table that depicted the breakdown of the budget by functional category: instruction, research, public services, and academic, student, and institutional support.

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

At approximately 9:05 a.m. on Wednesday, June 14, Chair Cannestra convened the meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole. He then turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent White. Board members in attendance at this meeting in addition to Regents Cannestra and White were Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

Chair White thanked Regent Cannestra and explained that this presentation would be the final phase of the budget process. He noted that each of the Regents had been sent a copy of the proposed fiscal year 2001 institutional operating and capital budget prior to this meeting. This budget is the culmination of a tedious year-long process that the staff takes on with each of the institutions in the University System. At this meeting, the staff was presenting the budget for Board approval. Chair White called upon Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers to begin the presentation.

Dr. Desrochers reiterated that this is the culmination of the year-long budget process. All revenue sources and expenditures are represented within the budget. She noted that the budget is created by Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes and Budget Director Shelley Nickel, and she asked them to present it to the Board.

Mr. Bowes greeted the Board and said that, for the benefit of the newer Regents, he would review the budget process. In September 1999, the Board approved the fiscal year 2001 budget request, and at this meeting, the Board would consider the annual fiscal year 2001 budget, which is based on the actions taken by the Board in April 2000 to allocate the State appropriations and to implement some of the tuition and fee recommendations. For the last month or so, the institutions had been developing their annual budgets based on those actions, and the staff were submitting the final recommendations for the Board's approval. The total budget is \$4.33 billion, all funds included. There are four major categories of funds. The education and general fund is used to support the central mission of the institutions: instruction, research, and public services. The fund's revenue comes from State appropriations, tuition, and other sources, such as continuing education revenues, which are included as part of departmental sales and services. The fund comprises approximately 87.6% of the total budget. The auxiliary enterprise fund supports those activities that are ancillary to the central mission, such as intercollegiate athletics, student health, housing, food services, and the like. These activities are considered to be self-supporting, meaning that the amount of revenue raised must be sufficient to cover total costs, and are supported by elective fees. The auxiliary enterprise fund comprises about 7.1% of the total budget. The student activity fund supports the cultural, social, and recreational activities provided for the benefit of students. These are supported by mandatory fees, which are now subject to review by campus committees that have a minimum of 50% student membership. This fund comprises about 1.4% of the budget. Finally, the capital outlay fund reflects funds that are used for construction, renovation, and ongoing repair of facilities. The fund sources include major repairs and rehabilitation ("MRR") funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, interest income, and general operating funds. This comprises about 3.9% of the total budget. Mr. Bowes noted that the capital outlay presented as part of the budget did not include funding for major construction projects, which are funded separately by general obligation ("G.O.") bond funds that were approved in the fiscal year 2000 amended budget.

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

Next, Mr. Bowes discussed some of the recent budgetary trends. The educational and general fund is \$3.791 billion, an increase of approximately 3.2% over last year. Increases in this fund in recent years have been in the range of 6% to 8%. This year, the appropriation was relatively flat except for the additional funds received for salary increases. Mr. Bowes noted that this fund also includes funds received for the transfer of the public library system to the University System and the creation of the State Data and Research Center (the “Data Center”) at the Georgia Institute of Technology. The State appropriation of \$1.574 billion represents a 4.2% increase over last year. This matches last year’s budget increase, but the bulk of the new funds are for the public library system and the Data Center, which totals about \$55 million, not including lottery funds. The average increase in State appropriations over recent years has been about 4.5%. Finally, tuition and other revenue comprise \$854 million of the budget this year, an increase of about 2.8% over last year. Tuition represents about half of this figure. The balance includes funds for indirect cost recoveries, gifts and grants, endowment income, departmental sales and services, and new funds for the recently approved technology fees.

Mr. Bowes stressed that the University System budget functions in a very dynamic environment, in which some of the revenue and expenditure assumptions can be affected by changing enrollment, economic conditions, and other factors that are unforeseeable at the beginning of the fiscal year. The institutions are therefore encouraged to continually reevaluate their budgets and the underlying assumptions and to make adjustments as needed. Mr. Bowes reported that this year, the Central Office budget staff have been working closely with the Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. on the issue of the budget process to find ways to make improvements in the process for the benefit of the institutions and the Central Office. He then turned the floor over to Ms. Nickel.

Ms. Nickel thanked Mr. Bowes and stated that she would be focusing on the fiscal year 2001 education and general budget broken into categories by function and by source of revenue. Then, she would review the capital budget. She showed the Regents a PowerPoint slide of the education and general budget broken into functions and explained that the functions describe how the funds are intended to be spent. The functions are used in higher education nationwide, which allows for comparisons between systems and institutions. The percentages for functions are consistent with last year’s budget, with about 50% of the funds being spent in instruction, research, and public service. Ms. Nickel noted that the Medical College of Georgia’s hospital and clinic function represents about \$312 million this year. That will be diminished in the future as the MCG Health, Inc. contract goes into effect. The sponsored funds and patient fees will no longer be part of the University System budget, which will only reflect the State appropriation supporting that function. Turning to the sources of revenue, Ms. Nickel reported that the State appropriations continue to be the largest source of revenue at approximately \$1.7 billion this year, including about \$32 million in lottery funds and \$67 million in special funding initiatives. She stressed that these are funds that the University System requests on an annual basis and are appropriated on an annual basis. In other words, they are not considered part of the University System’s ongoing base budget. Within those funds is about \$26 million that supports the technology infrastructure, which the staff are in discussion with the Office of Planning and Budget and the Legislative Budget Office in trying to make them part of the base budget in the future, since those expenditures will not go away. Sponsored funds account for about \$1.1 billion, or 30%. Tuition and other revenue account for approximately \$850 million, or 23%. These percentages are both very similar to those of last year’s budget. The last and smallest source of funds is sales and services, which is where continuing education fees are budgeted.

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

The capital budget is supported with MRR funds, investment income, lottery funds, and auxiliary funds, explained Ms. Nickel. This year, the MRR fund is about \$52 million, which is \$22 million more than it was five years ago. Some examples of the projects that will be begun or completed this year are the housing renovations at the University of Georgia, a book store expansion at Georgia Southern University, and some classroom renovations at the Georgia Perimeter College Decatur campus. In closing, Ms. Nickel noted that all in all, this was a healthy capital budget. She then stepped down.

Chair White asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments about the institutional operating and capital budget. Seeing that there were no questions or comments, he asked whether Dr. Desrochers had any final remarks.

Dr. Desrochers invited the Regents to call her if they had any questions. She recognized that this is a different kind of budgeting than that to which many people are accustomed.

Chair White asked for a motion to approve the budget.

Regent Leebern made the motion, which was variously seconded. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the operating and capital budget.

In closing, Chair White thanked Dr. Desrochers, Mr. Bowes, and Ms. Nickel for their work. He then adjourned the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole and turned the floor back to Chair Cannestra.

There being no further business to come before the Board, Chair Cannestra adjourned the Board into its regular Committee meetings.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Wednesday, June 14, 2000 at approximately 9:20 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Charles H. Jones, Vice Chair Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Regents Connie Cater, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Chair Jones reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed six items, all of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Resolution, 2000B and 2000C G.O. Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia

Approved: The Board adopted a resolution prepared by the Revenue Division of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 2000B and 2000C general obligation (“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.

Background: The Revenue Division of the Attorney General’s Office prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a resolution to cover the sale of 2000B G. O. bonds for the following projects:

I-41	Nursing, Health Science & Outreach Macon State College (Design)	\$650,000
I-42	Agricultural Sciences Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College (Design)	\$285,000
I-54	Renovation Classroom E Georgia Perimeter College	\$2,900,000
	Governor’s Traditional Industries Program	\$1,500,000
		<hr/>
		TOTAL \$5,335,000

Additionally, the Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a resolution to cover the sale of 2000C G. O. bonds for the following projects:

I-14	University Learning Center Clayton College & State University	\$22,300,000
I-31	Technology & Commerce Center Columbus State University	\$14,930,000

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

1. Resolution, 2000B and 2000C G.O. Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia (Continued)

I-43	Physical Education Building Darton College (Design)	\$729,000
I-44	Recreation /Athletic/Student Center Georgia Southwestern State University (Design)	\$1,144,000
I-45	Classroom & Convocation Center Kennesaw State University (Design)	\$1,425,000
I-81	Classroom Replacement, Phase II Augusta State University (Design)	\$1,202,000
I-82	10 th Street Chiller Plant Phase I Expansion Georgia Institute of Technology	\$4,800,000
I-65	Planning & Design of Wellness/Dorms/Classroom Middle Georgia College	\$310,000
I-90	Renovation of Dormitories Middle Georgia College	\$280,000
I-58	Underground Electrical Distribution Gainesville College	\$1,300,000
I-89	Plan/Design Renovation of Classroom/Gym South Georgia College	\$250,000
	Herty Foundation	\$620,000
		<hr/> TOTAL \$49,290,000

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

Approved: The Board authorized the continuation of a rental agreement between Ivey Realty Associates, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 18,600 square feet of office space located at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street, Athens, Georgia for the period beginning July 1, 2000 and ending June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of \$22,475 (\$269,700 per year/\$14.50 per sq. ft. per year) at the same rental rate for the use of the Board of Regents' Office of Information and Instructional Technology ("OIIT").

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

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

The Board also authorized the continuation of a rental agreement between Ivey Realty Associates, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 11,520 square feet of office space located at 1150 Dearing Extension, Athens, Georgia for the period beginning July 1, 2000 and ending June 30, 2001 at a monthly rental of \$13,920 (\$167,040 per year/\$14.50 per sq. ft. per year) for the use of OIIT.

At its April 1999 meeting, the Board approved this rental agreement with each of the four annual extensions of the agreement to be presented to the Board for approval. This was the approval of the first annual extension of the agreement.

As part of the technology master planning initiative, the Arthur Andersen LLP consultants were asked to consider the location of the Athens-based staff as part of their review. Since this report is being made to the Board at the June 2000 meeting and the lease expires June 30, 2000, permission is being requested to renew the lease with the understanding that the recommendations contained in the consultant's report will be assessed and action will be taken to develop a long-range plan based on the findings.

Background: The facility at 1865-1867 W. Broad Street is used for office space for OIIT staff who provide help desk, instructional technology, Student Information System, PeopleSoft project, standard operating system, and local area network ("LAN") support for the non-research universities, as well as support for the Regents' Central Office consolidated reporting systems. There is also an instructional classroom, which is used for faculty and staff development activities.

The space at 1150 Dearing Extension is immediately adjacent to the space at 1865-1867 Broad Street and offers space for the technology initiatives, such as Teachers & Technology, Connecting Students & Services, desktop distance learning initiative, Georgia Library Learning Online ("GALILEO"), and GALILEO Interconnected Libraries. This space also provides expanded help desk services for PeachNet and support for GALILEO. Additionally, this space provides offices for the customer service area, the distance education and academic innovation division as a result of the desktop distance learning initiative, PeopleSoft project support personnel, support for the BANNER Student Information System and Regents' consolidated reporting systems, the ongoing institutional operating system, and LAN support personnel.

3. Amendment to Lease, Georgia Perimeter College, Lawrenceville

Approved: The Board authorized an amendment to the lease agreement between Gwinnett Industries, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, covering approximately 81,725 square feet of space at 5155 Sugarloaf Parkway and 1800 MacLeod Drive at a monthly rental rate of \$107,449.86 (\$1,289,398.32 per year/\$15.78 per square foot per year) through June, 2001 with option to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods beginning July 1, 2001 with rent increasing 2.5% per year for the use of Georgia Perimeter College("GPC"), Georgia State University, and the University of Georgia.

That the terms of this amendment are subject to the review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

3. Amendment to Lease, Georgia Perimeter College, Lawrenceville (Continued)

Background: GPC has been leasing space at this location since July 1989 for classrooms, computer labs, faculty offices, and other functions related to providing instruction. The previous monthly rental rate is \$104,829.13 (\$15.39 per square foot per year). The new rental rate is a 2.5% increase from the previous rent amount. The rent includes all operating expenses.

In December 1998, the Board approved the Gwinnett Center to be established on Collins Hill Road. This new facility, which is projected for occupancy in fall 2002, will house the library, an interactive learning commons, 14 high technology classrooms, and computer/technical support spaces.

Bids were received for the site work package on June 6. Site work should begin in late June and will be completed in September 2000. Building construction will begin in October 2000 and should be completed in March 2002. Move-in will occur during the spring and summer of 2002 with classes to begin in August 2002 for the fall semester.

In March 2000, the Board received an information item concerning the need to pursue a privatized development for 120,000 square feet to replace the existing leased space and provide immediate expansion space for upper-division programs. This space would be located on or adjacent to the Collins Hill Road property. Occupancy is projected for August 2001.

4. Acquisition of 1724 Metropolitan Parkway, Atlanta, Atlanta Metropolitan College

Approved: The Board authorized the purchase of property at 1724 Metropolitan Parkway, Atlanta, Georgia from Republic Bank, St. Petersburg, Florida at a purchase price of \$370,000 for the use of Atlanta Metropolitan College ("AMC"), using a fiscal year 2001 legislative appropriation for this purchase.

The legal details involved with this acquisition are subject to the review and legal approval of the Office of the Attorney General.

The Board also declared the building on the property to be not advantageously useful to AMC or other units of the University System of Georgia and authorized the demolition and removal of the building.

The Board requested that the Governor issue an Executive Order authorizing the demolition and removal of this building.

Background: This property is contiguous to the southern boundary of the AMC campus. Master planning for the campus includes acquisition of this parcel to permit a new, identifiable main entrance to the campus.

Funds for the acquisition have been provided by a legislative appropriation (fiscal year 2001) for this purpose for the price set by Republic Bank based on an appraisal by Ronald W. Curry, MAI, Atlanta, Georgia.

A phase I environmental assessment has been completed, indicating no significant problems.

The building on the property is a 62,000-square-foot former bowling alley, which is in poor condition.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

5. Major Repairs and Rehabilitation Funds

Approved: The Board authorized distribution of major repairs and rehabilitation (“MRR”) funds in accordance with staff recommendations.

In May 2000, the staff reviewed for the Committee the target allocation methodology used for MRR funds. At this meeting, staff recommended MRR projects to the Board which will be funded according to the campus funding targets. Proposed projects from each institution have been reviewed by the Board of Regents’ Office of Facilities staff for priority, quality, and cost. Recommendations generally follow campus priorities, although all must meet the test of quality and cost.

Guidelines are used to screen campus requested projects for MRR funding. MRR funds are not used for new construction, land acquisition, or auxiliaries. Funds are devoted exclusively to maintenance of current facilities. Institutions are expected to perform adequate annual maintenance and operation; MRR is intended to cover non-routine larger expenditure items. MRR is intended to be used for building system and building integrity purposes before other uses; for example, roofs and HVAC systems take priority over sidewalks and driveways. MRR should be focused on critical building systems and utility infrastructure to reduce building outages due to failed central systems.

6. Major Capital Projects

Each year, the Board of Regents staff review the priority list of major capital projects and evaluate any additional projects submitted by the institutions for consideration. In previous years, the Board has added to the list in roughly the dollar volume of projects that were funded for construction in the prior budget cycle. The objective was to hold the overall priority list of major capital projects to a total cost of approximately \$500 million. This process also includes consideration of inflation and other related matters. While these matters were discussed as a Committee of the Whole (pages 16 to 28), the Board actions are as follows:

- A. Approved: The Board approved a 3.75% increase in project funding for projects currently on the capital projects list.

Background: Last year, based on a study conducted by an independent construction cost estimating firm, project costs were increased by 5% to reflect the construction inflation being realized in Georgia. For consistency, the staff asked the same firm to compute an appropriate inflation factor for this year. The recommendation was that projects currently on the major capital outlay projects priority list be increased by a 3.75% inflation factor.

- B. Approved: The Board adopted the rank order of projects 21-26 for a cumulative cost of \$514,668,000 and added these projects to the fiscal year 2001-2005 five-year capital outlay rolling plan, as presented below:

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

6. Major Capital Projects (Continued)

	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Requested State Funds</u>	<u>Cumulative Costs</u>
21.	Georgia State University	Teaching Laboratory Building	\$45 million	\$445,668,000
22.	University of Georgia	College of Pharmacy	\$35 million	\$480,668,000
23.	Georgia Southwestern State University	Health and Human Sciences Building	\$12.5 million	\$493,168,000
24.	Albany State University	Liberal Arts Building	\$21.5 million	\$514,668,000

Altogether, nine major capital outlay projects were presented for consideration and placement on the major capital outlay projects priority list. For further information on these items, see pages 16 to 28, “Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, ‘Committee of the Whole.’”

C. Approved: The Board also approved the following payback projects:

	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Requested Payback Funds</u>	<u>Cumulative Costs</u>
	University of Georgia	Parking Deck	\$12,800,000	\$12,800,000
	Augusta State University	New University Center	\$5,200,000	\$18,000,000
	Georgia State University	Parking Deck Acquisition	\$2,100,000	\$20,100,000
	Kennesaw State University	Parking Decks	\$15,000,000	\$35,100,000

For further information on these items, see pages 16 to 28, “Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, ‘Committee of the Whole.’”

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

On Tuesday, June 13, 2000 at 11:00 a.m., Chair Cannestra convened the meeting of the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities as a Committee of the Whole. He then turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Jones. Board members in attendance at this meeting in addition to Regents Cannestra and Jones were Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Juanita P. Baranco, Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, and James D. Yancey.

Chair Jones explained that the rolling five-year capital projects program is four years old. He noted that this system, which was devised by Senior Vice Chancellor Lindsay Desrochers, works very well for the System. He then introduced the Chancellor.

Chancellor Portch thanked Chair Jones and recognized former First Lady Rosalynn Carter, who would be contributing to Georgia Southwestern State University’s presentation. He reiterated that this was the fourth year of the capital outlay planning process that was introduced in 1997 in support of the System’s comprehensive plan. It is a method which has gained considerable support both within the System and with the Governor and legislature. The proof is in the results., said the Chancellor. In that four-year period, 20 new projects have been funded by the legislature for over \$400 million. At this meeting, the Regents would be replacing the projects that were funded in the last legislative session with new projects. The Board would again use the established principles because they continue to be valid and relevant today. This process is part of the strategic plan, which looks at academic programming, enrollment planning, workforce planning, and then capital priorities. Presidents present their institutions’ proposed projects, and this personal interaction between the presidents and the Board is one of the great strengths of the process. The Chancellor reminded the Board that the staff reexamine the list every year. There were no changes in enrollments or circumstances that would warrant changing the existing list, so at this meeting, the Board would add additional projects totaling approximately \$100 million to \$120 million, which would continue the five-year rolling plan. In closing, Chancellor Portch thanked the Board for the work that is involved in this process. He then asked Dr. Desrochers to approach the Board.

Dr. Desrochers greeted the Board. She thanked Chair Jones for his compliments and invited the Regents to suggest any improvements to the process. She explained that the funding sources for capital outlay projects include general obligation (“G.O.”) bonds from the State. The projects selected at this meeting would be recommended to the State for G.O. bond funding. Some of the projects also are payback projects. While the Board asks the State to provide the funding for these projects up front, the institutions pay back on those projects based on the fees that are collected from housing, parking, etc. General operating funds are also used for capital construction in the University System. During Wednesday’s meeting of the Committee on Finance and Business Operations as a Committee of the Whole, the staff would explain the plans for capital construction by campus based on the general operating funds available to the institutions. There are also major repairs and rehabilitation (“MRR”) funds and lottery funds that are specifically identified for capital projects. Finally, institutions have interest income that they have been committed to earn over the years to use for capital construction in appropriate areas of the campuses. Dr. Desrochers noted that it had been four years since the staff and the Board developed the principles for how to evaluate majors and minors projects. The principles were listed under Section I of the Regents’ capital projects notebooks, and Dr. Desrochers reviewed them with the Regents. These principles are on file with the Office of Facilities in the Central Office. In closing, Dr. Desrochers complimented Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham and his staff for their continuing efforts to work with the institutions on this process. There would be nine presentations at this meeting, she said, and they all have merit. Dr. Desrochers then called upon Mr. Chatham to tell the Regents more about the process.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Mr. Chatham greeted the Board and reiterated that this is a rolling plan concept. It allows institutions to present to the Regents concepts of projects with estimates of cost without expending a large amount of money to develop a full project that may or may not be accepted. So, the presentations at this meeting are simply concepts of projects. Those that are selected to go on the five-year rolling capital projects list will then be developed over the next several years to become a full project. Next year, the projects that are placed on the list this year will be developed with regard to their physical characteristics and a report will be submitted to the Office of Facilities. The following year, a report will be submitted concerning the academic characteristics of the facility. The third year, all of these issues will be integrated by a professional consulting firm and a cost validation will be performed. The project will then be funded. This process allows the best chance for the most worthy projects to be developed and fine-tuned using a standardized process. Six of the projects on the top of last year's list have been funded by the legislature and have rolled off the list. The next eight projects are currently in design using revolving funds or funds provided by the legislature for design purposes. The rest of the projects on the list (approximately \$236 million) remain unfunded. Mr. Chatham showed the Regents the 20 projects left on the list, eight of which are in design. At this meeting, the Board would fill in the spaces at the bottom of the list, and their target total for the final list would be \$500 million. He stressed that this is only a target; it is not a finite number.

To improve the five-year rolling capital projects process, the Board recognized that a plan with projects going through a five-year cycle needs to have an annual cost escalation due to inflation, explained Mr. Chatham. A project goes on the list at the bottom, and it matures over a number of years. The cost for the same project when it reaches the top of the list is going to be affected either positively or negatively by factors of cost escalation. Over the last few years, an independent cost-estimating firm has given the Board an estimate of cost inflation. This year, the staff asked the same firm to make a recommendation on escalation this year, and using that information, the staff were recommending a 3.75% inflation escalation this year. Mr. Chatham asked for a motion to approve this cost escalation.

Regent Leebern moved to approve this recommendation, and the motion was variously seconded.

Chair Jones asked whether there was any further discussion.

Regent Baranco asked how the staff determined that figure.

Mr. Chatham explained that the staff asked an independent cost-estimating firm to take a survey of Georgia-based construction for the last year and estimate in the aggregate the estimate for cost escalation for all types of projects.

Regent Baranco remarked that some building costs are beginning to go down because the market is going in other directions.

Mr. Chatham responded that the staff are regularly asked to defend this figure in various committees and have done so.

Regent Leebern asked whether the consultants break down the individual escalations of the different types of projects.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Mr. Chatham replied that they do not. Basic construction projects are at a lower percentage of increase this year, while more technical projects, such as laboratories, are at higher percentages. Overall, the consultants were recommending an escalation of 3.75%.

Regent Leebern asked whether the consultants had broken down the escalation figures between renovations of old buildings and building new projects.

Mr. Chatham responded that they had not been asked to do that, but the general consensus is that if there is a 5% to 10% contingency factor for new construction, it should be at least double that amount for renovation. So, the escalation factor in this case would likely be about 7.5% or more. However, Mr. Chatham was only estimating.

Regent Hunt remarked that if interest rates go up, construction costs will come down and projects will be cheaper in general as a result of supply and demand.

Chair Jones stated that he had never seen construction costs come down.

Mr. Chatham responded to Regent Hunt that the staff had expected that type of phenomenon after the Olympic period boom, but there was not a decrease in cost after that period.

Chair Jones then called for a vote. Motion properly made and seconded, the Board voted by a majority to approve the 3.75% escalation.

Regent Baranco voted against the motion and explained that she wanted to encourage the staff to monitor the escalation of capital outlay costs.

With that, Chair Jones called upon the first presenter.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

The following presidents, representing their respective institutions, presented their proposed capital projects to the Board:

President

G. Wayne Clough

Institution

Harold Loyd

Georgia Institute of Technology
 (“GIT”)

Michael Hanes

Project (Cost)

Portia Holmes Shields

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural
College (“ABAC”)

Undergraduate Learning Center
(\$46 million; \$33 million State,
\$13 million institution)

Frank Butler

Georgia Southwestern State
University (“GSSU”)

Renovate Three Historic
Buildings (\$9 million)

Frank Brown

Albany State University
 (“ALSU”)

Health and Human Sciences
Building (\$12.5 million)

Jacquelyn M. Belcher

Armstrong Atlantic State
University (“AASU”)

Liberal Arts Building (\$21.5
million)

Carl V. Patton

Columbus State University
 (“CSU”)

Technology Resource Center &
Infrastructure (\$19 million)

Michael F. Adams

Georgia Perimeter College
 (“GPC”)

Center for Information
Resources (Library) (\$26.5
million)

Georgia State University
 (“GSU”)

Fine Arts & Humanities
Buildings (\$12 million)

University of Georgia (“UGA”)

Teaching Laboratory Building
(\$68 million; \$45 million State,
\$23 million institution)

College of Pharmacy Facility
(\$35 million)

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

After each presentation, the Regents had the opportunity to ask questions of the respective president or make comments regarding the project. Those questions and comments were as follows:

Georgia Institute of Technology

Regent Cannestra noted that the original documentation said that there would be 20 classrooms, 20

administrative offices, and 20 technology support offices. Another document says there will be 30 administrative offices and 30 support offices. He was concerned that the undergraduate learning center was shifting from the undergraduates to the administrators and technology support staff.

President Clough responded that the administrative offices are not necessarily for administrators. Rather, they are for the people who run the co-op program, the study abroad programs, and other student-focused programs.

Regent Cannestra stated again that it seemed the proportion was moving in the wrong direction.

President Clough concurred that the emphasis should be on undergraduates and stressed that the number of classrooms was not reduced. He called upon Mr. Robert K. Thompson, Senior Vice President for Administration and Finance, to elaborate on this.

Mr. Thompson stated that the facility would be a “one-stop shop” for students to attend class and obtain technical support as well.

Regent Cannestra restated his position.

President Clough remarked that his comment was well taken.

Chair Jones asked whether the \$149 per square foot cost excluded private contributions.

President Clough replied that this was the amount the State would be funding relative to the size of the building.

Chair Jones asked whether the map of the campus presented was a current map or the master plan.

President Clough replied that it was the master plan.

Chair Jones then asked Dr. Desrochers whether all of the presentations at the meeting would be incorporating their respective master plans.

Dr. Desrochers responded that each project had been reviewed in accordance with the respective campus master plan.

Mr. Chatham added that all of the projects to be considered at this meeting were consistent with the campus master plans.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Abraham Baldwin Agricultural College

Regent Baranco asked why it is more cost-effective to renovate the buildings than to demolish them and start over, particularly with Tift Hall.

President Loyd responded that it probably is not more cost-effective, but they are historical buildings and to demolish them would change the entire look of the campus. He asserted that this project somewhat compensates for the cost by doing all three at once. To renovate the buildings one by one would likely cost much more than doing them together.

Regent Leebern remarked that it did not seem the college had been a very good steward of those facilities. It seemed to him the student facilities had been neglected, while the administrative offices were preserved.

President Loyd responded that the college had maintained the exteriors of the buildings.

Regent Leebern reiterated his remark.

President Loyd replied that the buildings were ex-residence halls.

Chancellor Portch noted that President Loyd had written him, saying that he did not want the dormitories to fall into disrepair.

Regent Hunt asked whether the interiors of the buildings would have to be completely excavated, leaving only the structures of the buildings.

President Loyd responded that this was correct. Everything inside the buildings will change, while everything outside will remain relatively the same.

Regent Hunt noted that the girls' dormitories have been abandoned for approximately 40 years.

President Loyd replied that the buildings were abandoned before he came to the college in 1971. Because they were classified as residence halls, the college could not request State funds, but had to use auxiliary funds instead. That likely played a role in the fact that they were never renovated.

Georgia Southwestern State University

After his presentation, President Hanes called upon former First Lady Rosalynn Carter to make a few comments about the Rosalynn Carter Institute (the "Institute").

Mrs. Carter greeted the Board and remarked that she is excited about the proposed project at GSSU. She explained that when she and former President Carter returned to Georgia after his presidency, the then president of GSSU and a delegation from the community came to see her and asked her to help the university work on the issue of mental health. However, she had already established a very good mental health program at the Carter Center. So, they decided to work with those people caring for people with mental illnesses,

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Georgia Southwestern State University (Continued)

which grew to include all caregivers. At the time, they did not realize the significance of that decision. In 1998, when the Institute was established, nobody was working on the issue, but everyone agreed that it was much needed. So, the Institute found itself on the cutting edge of this issue, which is a major issue today and will become more important as the population ages. Because of its importance, the Institute has become known nationally and internationally. GSSU has helped to put caregiving on the map. The Institute has received major research and technical assistance grants from the Pew Charitable Trusts and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Core operations funding comes from the Charles L. Mix Fund, and major individual contributions have been made to the Institute. The Institute has a relatively small staff, including an eminent scholar. The Institute has been very good for the community and many people come to GSSU to visit the institute. It has established partnerships across the country, and it has become a real resource and research facility for them. The Institute’s current location was formerly a residence, and it does not have enough meeting space nor access for those with disabilities. The long-range goal of the Institute is to integrate its programs with the range of disciplines at GSSU. This building will give the Institute much-needed space so that it can grow and support the related research. In closing, she thanked the Regents for their consideration of this project.

Regent Hunt remarked that bringing mental health and nursing under the same umbrella was impressive.

Mrs. Carter stated that it was wonderful to have use of the facilities of the university.

Regent Howell asked whether the four buildings referenced in the proposal would be demolished.

President Hanes replied that two of the buildings would be demolished. The President’s house will remain, and the student health center will become the campus police station. The School of Nursing (old library) will be held because there are many renovations planned over the next five to six years with nowhere else to move faculty and staff during that time. So, the old library will serve as swing space while other buildings are being renovated. President Hanes noted that 9 out of 34 buildings on campus are in poor or unusable condition. In fact, there was a MRR project needed in every building on campus. All of the MRR projects in academic buildings have been completed, but there are still a number of renovations planned over the next five to six years.

Regent Howell asked whether the funds for this project will do anything with the existing facility used by the Institute.

President Hanes replied that it would not, but \$1 million will be put into the old library for removal of hazardous materials and some major systems updates.

Chair Jones noted that the cost per square foot is considerably less than other projects. He also commended the work of Mrs. Carter.

President Hanes stated that he was also very proud of Mrs. Carter. She has not only given to GSSU, but has also provided leadership throughout the State of Georgia and the world.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Georgia Southwestern State University (Continued)

Mrs. Carter remarked that she is very proud of GSSU and its activities.

Chair Jones stated that the Board was very pleased to have Mrs. Carter at this meeting and to know that she is part of the GSSU community.

After this discussion, at approximately 12:30 p.m., Chair Jones adjourned the meeting for lunch. The Committee meeting reconvened at approximately 1:20 p.m.

Albany State University

Regent Hunt asked whether this project was outside of the flood zone on the east side of the highway.

President Shields replied that it was. The existing building is in the flood plain.

Regent Allgood asked whether the building was damaged in the flood.

President Shields responded that it was, but it was repaired and brought up to code.

Regent Howell asked where Holley Hall is located.

President Shields responded that it is near the river, but it will be demolished.

Assistant Vice Chancellor for Design & Construction Linda M. Daniels showed the Regents where the building is currently located on a map.

Regent Howell asked how much of the campus master plan is already constructed, and Ms. Daniels showed him.

Chair Jones asked whether there is a bridge across the river.

President Shields responded that Albany Tomorrow is planning to build a bridge as well as buildings and hotels.

Chancellor Portch noted that ALSU's master plan was the inspiration for the master planning process Systemwide.

Regent Allgood asked whether the master plan was developed after the flood, and the Chancellor responded that it was. Regent Allgood recalled the original presentation of the master plan and remarked that he had never seen a campus master plan before. The Board recognized that the concept would be useful for every institution.

Regent Baranco stated that after the flood, there was some discussion of whether buildings would be renovated or demolished. She asked whether Holley Hall was supposed to be renovated or demolished.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Albany State University (Continued)

Vice President for Fiscal Affairs Kenneth Dyer responded that Holley Hall was originally slated for renovation, because the Federal Emergency Management Association's flood management program mandates that if a building is more than 50% damaged, it will be demolished and replaced outside of the

flood plain. Holley Hall was determined to be less than 50% damaged. So, minimal renovations were done in order to bring the building back up to code in order to get another five years' life out of it.

Regent Wooten asked how large the existing building is.

Mr. Dyer replied that Holley Hall is less than 60,000 square feet.

Regent Wooten remarked that the proposed project will nearly double the existing square footage.

Armstrong Atlantic State University

Chair Jones asked about Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education ("Georgia GLOBE").

President Butler explained that this initiative will put the core curriculum on the Internet to create an e-Core.

It was noted that this project had been presented for consideration on the rolling capital projects list before.

President Butler responded that this was the third time it had been presented.

Columbus State University

Regent Baranco remarked that it seemed to be a trend in the capital projects proposals to incorporate a classroom setting in the library. She asked whether this is a trend around the nation.

President Brown replied that it is a trend in terms of the university's need. The master plan identified an inadequate number of classrooms, library spaces, and audio-visual spaces on the campus. So, this project includes classroom space to satisfy that need as well as to provide the technology access that students so badly need. He did not know whether this was a national trend.

Georgia Perimeter College

Chair Jones asked President Belcher on which campus her office is located.

President Belcher replied that her office is located on the Decatur campus.

Chair Jones asked how many campuses Georgia Perimeter College has.

President Belcher responded that it has three large campuses and two other locations. Additionally, the college has recently entered into another relationship with Georgia State University in Alpharetta.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Georgia Perimeter College (Continued)

Chair Jones asked how many students the college serves.

President Belcher replied that the college has over 14,000 students.

Chair Jones asked how many languages the students speak.

President Belcher estimated that they speak approximately 90 languages and represent over 100 countries.

Chair Jones remarked that this was interesting. He asked to which campus this project related.

President Belcher responded that it was the Clarkston campus.

Georgia State University

Regent McMillan asked whether there was the possibility that Kell Hall would be condemned.

President Patton replied that there are a number of code issues in the building, but there is a program in place to address the most difficult ones. He agreed that the building is not up to the Americans with Disabilities Act standards. While it seems that all of the ramps would make the building handicap-accessible, the ramps are too steep.

Regent Hunt asked whether Kell Hall will be demolished.

President Patton responded that the plan is to demolish it, but first it will be used as swing space while a few other projects are constructed. Nothing will be moved into the building permanently.

Regent Hunt asked how long it will be before the building is demolished.

President Patton replied that it depends on when this building is funded, but approximately three to four years thereafter.

Regent Howell asked where the new facility would be located.

President Patton responded that it would be at the corner of Decatur Street and Central Avenue where a small walk-up McDonald’s currently stands. The location is directly across the street from the natural science laboratory and diagonally across from the General Classroom Building.

It was asked whether the private funding was primarily from one major donor or whether there were many different sources.

President Patton responded that there are many different contributors, including some local foundations, but he expects to be able to name this building after a major contributor. There will also be a broad campaign among the alumni and friends of the university as well.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Georgia State University (Continued)

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that with the classroom building project, there were some significant land acquisition issues. He asked about the acquisition of this property.

President Patton replied that this property has only one owner and that this will likely be a much simpler transaction. He added that the issue with regard to the classroom building project was simply price, and once the individual was paid his price, the Board never heard from him again.

University of Georgia

Chair Jones remarked that the Board should do what it can to produce more pharmacists in this State. He asked which universities produce pharmacists other than the UGA and Mercer University.

President Adams responded that there are no other universities in Georgia that produce pharmacists. He noted that the shortage numbers that he had reported during his presentation take into account these two universities' projected productivity. So, this is a very critical State need.

Chair Jones commented that Georgia must be importing some pharmacists from other states.

President Adams replied that not only is Georgia importing significant numbers of pharmacists, but also there is still a strong demand for more pharmacists. In fact, the industry often contacts the university looking to meet that need.

Regent Hunt asked whether biotechnology will be included in this facility.

President Adams responded that there will be additional biotechnology research and coordination with the Medical College of Georgia and the School of Veterinary Medicine.

Regent Leebern asked whether President Adams had a vision to retrofit the existing facility.

President Adams replied that the buildings will be connected. He did not include the dollar figures for that in this proposal because he did not know them at this time. However, the retrofit of the existing building will be funded by monies the university raises on its own. Some estimates for the retrofit are between \$6 million and \$10 million.

Regent Leebern asked how much this facility will alleviate the demand for pharmacists.

President Adams responded that it is very hard to project far in advance, because so much is based upon the migratory patterns in the State. If Georgia continues to have the immigration that it has had for the last ten years, then this issue may need to be revisited in another ten years. Realistically, this project is the facility that the current site will bear. It will meet the needs for this decade and probably two or three decades beyond, based on the best projections available. The site is such that if this project is pushed back beyond a foreseeable time frame, it would probably have to be developed on another site and include a major pharmacy building costing approximately \$100 million. He asserted that this is the most cost-effective way of addressing the problem at the present time.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

University of Georgia (Continued)

Regent Cannestra asked whether using the Internet and telephone to obtain prescriptions was taken into account in President Adams' projections.

President Adams replied that they were taken into account. However, it is very early to project how the Internet will affect the field. It is one of the reasons that the university is training pharmacists on the doctor of pharmacy professional degree level rather than on the bachelor's degree level. In the future, pharmacists may be the center hub directing others in the actual filling of prescriptions. Even taking that into account, President Adams did not think this project would create an oversupply of pharmacists.

Regent Leebern noted that pharmacies now only fill prescriptions at certain hours of the day because of the pharmacist shortage.

President Adams added that another problem is quality control. Georgia is importing some pharmacists who are not trained at the levels that historically Americans have expected, and there are major issues of licensing that exist because of the shortage.

Regent Baranco asked President Adams about the federal grant and what it would add to this project.

President Adams responded that he and the dean of the college are confident that the project can receive grant money. There are two things that are required to increase the number of pharmacists. One is space, and the other is people. The university has already created three endowed positions in the last year, and there are two more in the strategic plan. The university could do much more research in many fields if it had the

space. President Adams is working with the university's foundation to come up with an approximately \$30 million building for the area of biomedicine to enhance the research being done in that field. So, this facility will not address the overarching need for additional research productivity, but it will dramatically enhance the research productivity in the field of pharmacy.

Chair Jones asked President Adams how many students are in the School of Pharmacy.

President Adams replied that the program accepts approximately 100 applicants per year and there is very little attrition. This project will allow the program to grow to approximately 150 accepted applicants per year, an approximate 50% increase in class size.

Regent Wooten noted that there will be 57 research labs in the new facility, which will significantly increase the graduate program as well as the collaborations with biomedicine.

President Adams said that this will allow more joint participation between the college and the industry than there has been historically.

Regent Hunt commented that it is even more difficult to attract pharmacists to South Georgia.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

After the presentations, Mr. Chatham stated that each Regent had been given a green ballot sheet, and he explained how to mark the ballots. He suggested that the Regents take a short break to consider the projects.

Regent Baranco asked how much all of the proposed projects would cost together.

Mr. Chatham replied that they totaled approximately \$235 million, but it would only take about \$114 million to bring the rolling list up to its approximate goal of \$500 million.

The Chancellor stated that after a short break, the staff would collect the ballots. They would then tally the scores and prepare a report to be presented to the Board when it reconvened on Wednesday, June 14.

At approximately 3:00 p.m., the Committee of the Whole took a short break.

Chair Jones reconvened the meeting at 3:10 p.m., after the staff had collected all of the ballots. He then called upon Mr. Chatham to present the payback projects.

Mr. Chatham reiterated that the staff would tally the scores on the ballots, adding the new projects to the bottom of the revolving list for the review and approval at the full Board meeting on Wednesday, June 14. He explained that the last agenda item of this meeting was to consider the payback projects. There were four projects for the Board's consideration. The first was a parking deck at Kennesaw State University ("KSU") (\$15 million). It is the only one of the four that has previously received State funding. During the last session of the legislature, the budget provided \$600,000 for the planning and design of that project. The second project was also a parking deck (\$12.8 million) for UGA. Mr. Chatham reminded the Regents that UGA's master plan calls for a series of parking decks to be created to move automobiles off the campus and onto the perimeter so that roads and asphalt can be replaced with green spaces. The third project was a new university center (\$5.2 million) at Augusta State University. This project will go a long way toward completing the master plan of that campus. All of the first three projects were considered last year and recommended as part of the budget, but the KSU project was the only one that received any State funding. Finally, the fourth project was another parking deck (\$2.1 million) at Georgia State University. Mr. Chatham stressed that these are payback projects, which means that the funds are made available to the University System via bonds and then paid back from student fees or other forms of revenue. He asked the Regents to vote on the order in which these projects would be ranked and presented to the legislature for consideration. After the Regents voted, Ms. Daniels collected their ballots. Mr. Chatham reported that this concluded the day's business.

Chair Jones adjourned the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities as a Committee of the Whole at approximately 3:20 p.m. and turned the floor back to Chair Cannestra.

Chair Cannestra adjourned the meeting. In closing, he reminded the Regents that the Committees would meet at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 14, followed by the meeting of the full Board.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Wednesday, June 14, 2000 at approximately 9:20 a.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Vice Chair McMillan reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 11 items, 9 of which required action. Additionally, 446 regular faculty appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Establishment of the Master of Science in Bioinformatics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia

Institute of Technology ("GIT") to establish the master of science in bioinformatics, effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: GIT has developed the master of science in bioinformatics to satisfy the demand of industry and academy professionals for qualified graduates in this field. Bioinformatics is the interdisciplinary combination of information technologies and applied mathematics with molecular biology and genetics. The interdisciplinary program integrates mathematical, statistical, and computer methods to analyze biological, biochemical, and biophysical data. Demand for the program is found in the pharmaceutical and biotechnological industries. Emory University and GIT have jointly established a biotechnology incubator for small companies in this emerging field. A master's degree is preferred for many entry-level positions in the field; and, a doctoral degree in this discipline is primarily focused upon research. The master of science in bioinformatics degree was developed with support from the Alfred Sloan Foundation. The foundation established a grant program to fund several new programs in the country. Because bioinformatics is an emerging field, GIT will be one of the few institutions in the country with a master's degree in this area, rivaling programs offered at such institutions as Boston and Stanford Universities.

Need: The proposed master of science in bioinformatics is designed to fulfill specific needs for focused scientific knowledge and skill in the marketplace. Because of the genes and proteins identified and sequenced each year, there is a need for professionals with expertise in both biological and computational science to manage and interpret the biological information. According to SmithKline Beecham's senior computational scientist, Mr. James Fickett, "The need for high[ly] qualified workers in this field is currently so strong, that in many groups, new hires are often people from related fields who need several months of on-the-job training before they are ready to work in bioinformatics." Dr. Wendy Bailey of Merck Research Laboratories indicated, "The proposed program will produce graduates with the necessary cross-disciplinary education required to fulfill the needs of a growing bioinformatics field within the pharmaceutical industry." The human genome project lies at the center of the new drug-discovery paradigm that relies on bioinformatics to generate analysis and research data in pharmaceutical development. Other companies that have pledged to support the program include Microcide Pharmaceuticals, Inc. (Mountain View, CA), Incyte Pharmaceuticals (Palo Alto, CA), Human Genome Sciences, Inc. (Rockville, MD), and Genome Therapeutics Corporation (Waltham, MA). Dr. Yury Khudyakov, Chief of the Diagnostic Development Unit at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention ("CDC"), stated, "The establishment of a new graduate program in bioinformatics will be of significant interest at CDC as the need for qualified professionals increases in this discipline." In recruiting life science companies to Georgia, a strong presence in bioinformatics has already proven to be a significant advantage. This is perhaps best illustrated by the fact that EmTech Bio, a multi-million dollar informatics company and commercial joint venture of GIT, Emory University, and the Georgia Research Alliance, is in the process of finalizing plans to relocate an operational facility to the region.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

1. Establishment of the Master of Science in Bioinformatics, Georgia Institute of Technology

(Continued)

Objectives: The curriculum is geared toward training professionals for industrial jobs. The goal of the program is to provide graduates with advanced skills in mathematics and computer science and a broader, intensive knowledge of biology and biochemistry. It is expected that students will enter private-sector employment after completing the program.

Curriculum: The program will be administered collaboratively among the Schools of Biology, Mathematics, Chemistry & Biochemistry, Physics, and Biomedical Engineering, as well as the College of Computing. The 37-semester-hour program requires three semesters of coursework and does not require a thesis. The stand-alone degree requires the following: 1) the first two semesters cover foundation courses in biology and biochemistry, computational courses in computer science and mathematics, and advanced courses in molecular genetics; and 2) the third semester is devoted to specialized courses in bioinformatics and provides some flexibility in other courses (i.e., mathematics, computer science, etc.) to meet the diverse needs of the students in the program. With the exception of a course in biology, mathematics, and computer science, most of the courses were already offered through other graduate programs. Undergraduate prerequisites in the program are the following: introductory course in biology, one semester of computer programming, introductory course in organic chemistry, one year of calculus, and one year of physics. Faculty members interface with industry on many projects, all of which provide experience in establishing close industrial relations that contribute to graduate training experiences. Student fellowships will be obtained through an "industrial affiliates' program." Corporate gifts to the Georgia Tech Foundation will also be used for student fellowships. For example, students enrolled in the program may be asked to serve on a team that manages databases of biological data, including nucleic acid, protein sequences, and macromolecular structures. Another student experience may involve the use of graphics-oriented tools for molecular sequence analysis or the use of a phylogenetic profile to detect genetic recombination and align nucleotides with encoded amino acids.

Projected Enrollment: The program is projected to attract traditional and non-traditional students. It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 14, 16, and 18.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources and internal redirection.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the Central Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal. In addition, an industrial advisory board has been established to ensure that the program is meeting the needs of the targeted applied area.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Establishment of the Major in Applied Computer Science Under the Existing Master of Science Degree, State University of West Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of Acting President Thomas J. Hynes to establish the major in applied computer science under the existing master of science degree, effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: The program will produce highly skilled information technology professionals ready to join the workforce and contribute to the progress of the State. The graduate program has been designed to provide a balance among theoretical concepts, effective training in current technologies, and practical applications leading to certification and licensure.

Need: The State's need for information technology and computer science professionals mirrors the shortages experienced by the nation. The September 1999 *Atlanta Journal Constitution* reported that Georgia has one of the fastest-growing workforce populations of information technology professionals in the country. The number of such workers will double by the year 2006. The proposed program will assist in alleviating the shortage of information technology and computer science professionals documented by the U.S. Department of Commerce. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics, the projected increase in information technology occupations is much higher than any other type of occupation. The projected growth in all occupations by year 2006 is 14%; however, the projected growth in information technology occupations is approximately 100%. According to a 1997 study conducted by the Department of Labor, "America's New Deficit: The Shortage of Information Technology Workers," the anticipated demands for information technology professionals will reach 1.6 million by the year 2005. In an article published by the American Association of Computing Machinery, at least 190,000 information technology jobs went unfilled in 1997. The same year, the production of information technology students nationally was about 35,000 students. The following is a brief list of companies with multiple job openings requiring graduates of this degree: MCI Worldcom, IBM Corp., SCI of Atlanta, Inc., Management Decisions Inc. (MDI), CDI Corporation, Remington International, Interactive Business System, People Network Inc., Maxim Group Opportunities, Metro Information Services, Ablest Staffing Services, Metamor Industry Solutions, Surfair, Inc., Management Recruiters International, and Superior Technical Resources. Documented reports in the State have also supported the development of the program. According to the April 2000 Carroll Tomorrow: Economic Development Strategy Report, the West Georgia region is a vital part of the strategy to educate and retrain information technology professionals. In addition, the need for more information technology graduates was supported in the report, Occupational Employment, Demand for College Graduates, and Migration: A Statewide View, which was prepared for the Intellectual Capital Partnership Program ("ICAPP").

Objectives: The master of science with a major in applied computer science will prepare students for further academic pursuits leading to advanced managerial and technical skills in information technology. The degree will prepare students for advanced roles in such areas as

network programming and support, database programming and administration, software development, Internet/Intranet development and support, multi-media systems, and software engineering. The program will admit students holding undergraduate degrees in fields other than computer science to accommodate career changes and the retooling/retraining required for information technology professionals. Students admitted to the program who do not have an undergraduate background in computer science will be required to take specific prerequisite courses before being admitted to candidacy for the degree. The program has been developed to retrain students in the field, further the educational attainment of those just entering the field, provide opportunities for advanced COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Establishment of the Major in Applied Computer Science Under the Existing Master of Science Degree, State University of West Georgia (Continued)

professional certification, and increase access through flexible program delivery. State University of West Georgia plans to offer select courses at satellite campuses located in Newnan and Douglasville. In addition, some courses will be offered online, but not 50% of the program. When State University of West Georgia decides to offer 50% or more of the curriculum via a distance technology medium, the institution will submit an external degree request to the Central Office for recommendation to the Board.

Curriculum: The 36-semester-hour program will consist of seven required core courses that cover the main subject areas of computer science. Students admitted to the program without an undergraduate degree or major in computer science will be required to complete specific prerequisite courses. The core courses lead to specialization in different areas. The core courses have a theoretical and quantitative emphasis, and the depth courses have an applied emphasis. The core courses cover the following subject areas: telecommunication networks, database systems, software engineering, operating systems, computer architecture, artificial intelligence, and autonomous agents. Students must complete two depth courses. These courses prepare students to obtain appropriate professional technical certification. The technical certification would include, but not be limited to, Microsoft, Novell, Oracle, Cisco, and Linux certification. Technical certification extends beyond the PC platform and Microsoft-based certifications to specialized enterprise and infrastructure technologies. The program was developed based on the Computer Science Accreditation Commission's draft report on the Computing Curriculum 2001.

Projected Enrollment: The program is projected to attract traditional and non-traditional students. It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program student enrollment will be 15, 30, and 45.

Funding: The institution will initiate and maintain the program through institutional resources and internal redirection.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2004, this program will be evaluated by the institution and the System Office to determine the success of the program's

implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, centrality, viability, and cost-effectiveness goals, as indicated in the proposal.

3. Approval of Associate of Applied Science Degree Programs, Georgia Southwestern State University in Cooperation With Middle Georgia Technical Institute

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael L. Hanes that Georgia Southwestern State University ("GSSU") be authorized to offer associate of applied science degrees in business, health, services, and technology in cooperation with Middle Georgia Technical Institute ("MGTI"), effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: 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 Annotations. In compliance with this agreement, GSSU and MGTI requested approval for the following associate of applied science degree programs and specific options:

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Approval of Associate of Applied Science Degree Programs, Georgia Southwestern State University in Cooperation With Middle Georgia Technical Institute (Continued)

Associate of applied science in business with options in:

- Accounting
- Business and office technology
- Computer information systems
- Marketing management

Associate of applied science in health with options in:

- Practical nursing
- Radiologic technology
- Surgical technology

Associate of applied science in services with options in:

- Cosmetology
- Culinary arts

Associate of applied science in technology with options in:

- Air conditioning technology
- Aircraft structural technology
- Automotive fundamentals
- Automotive technology
- Aviation maintenance technology
- Drafting
- Electronics fundamentals

Electronics technology
Industrial maintenance
Industrial maintenance technology
Machine tool technology
Welding and joining technology

To ensure program quality and compliance with the criteria of the Commission on Colleges of the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools, GSSU and MGTI have agreed to appoint a joint coordinating committee to manage the programs. Membership of the coordinating committee consists of the following individuals:

- Vice President of Academic Affairs, GSSU
- Vice President for Instructional Services, MGTI
- Two faculty members, GSSU
- Two faculty members, MGTI
- One student services/admissions officer, GSSU
- One student services/admissions officer, MGTI

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Approval of Associate of Applied Science Degree Programs, Georgia Southwestern State University in Cooperation With Middle Georgia Technical Institute (Continued)

The coordinating committee will meet annually to examine program offerings on a course-by-course basis and to ensure that criteria requirements have been satisfied; to ensure that the faculty members teaching courses in the program are qualified; and to determine the adequacy of educational support services. An annual report will be submitted to the presidents of GSSU and MGTI concerning the progress of the programs.

4. Major Program Revision: Major in Early Childhood Education Under the Existing Master of Education Plus Teacher Certification, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton that Georgia State University ("GSU") be authorized to make significant changes in the existing master of education degree program with a major in early childhood education plus teacher certification, effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: The Department of Early Childhood Education proposed major changes in the existing Master of education degree program with a major in early childhood education plus teacher certification. This program is for individuals who already hold a baccalaureate degree in a field other than education and who aspire to become early childhood teachers in an urban setting and simultaneously earn a master's degree. It is analogous to an master of business administration degree in that a variable number of prerequisites are required, dependent upon the student's undergraduate major. The changes proposed are intended to strengthen the program in ways that conform to the Regents' 1998 Principles and Actions for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools (the "Principles"). The Principles require the following major changes in early childhood education programs that lead to teacher certification:

- 12- to 15-semester-hour concentrations in reading and in mathematics
- Stronger emphasis on classroom management and use of technology
- Completion of the equivalent of a full academic year in field experiences in the schools
- Follow-up mentoring of new teachers during their first two years of teaching.

GSU will continue to offer two options through which individuals who do not have a higher education teacher preparation background may become certified to teach in early childhood education: 1) this master of education program plus teacher certification, and 2) the traditional baccalaureate degree program in early childhood education (also under revision to meet the Principles).

Need: A master of education degree program with a major in early childhood education plus teacher certification already exists at GSU for individuals without undergraduate education in the field. Since 1991, 240 individuals have graduated from the existing program. The current program does not conform to the Principles. It will be replaced with the revised program.

Objectives: Graduates of the revised program will be able to diagnose difficulties in reading and mathematics and know what to do about them, use telecommunication and information technologies as tools for learning, manage a classroom effectively, and bring students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

4. Major Program Revision: Major in Early Childhood Education Under the Existing Master of Education Plus Teacher Certification, Georgia State University (Continued)

Curriculum: The program consists of 30 semester hours of master's level work preceded by up to a maximum of 53 semester hours of prerequisites. The prerequisites include two required concentrations, one in reading and one in mathematics; the required field hours; development of classroom management and technology skills; and other courses needed for certification.

Students apply for admission to the master's program prior to beginning any prerequisites. The actual number of prerequisites each student needs (dependent upon the student's field of study at the undergraduate level) is determined at the point of admission to the program. If all prerequisites are needed, the program may be completed in two full academic years plus summers, beginning with the May inter-session.

After the successful completion of needed prerequisites, the student will be recommended for teacher certification and may exit the program at that time with a teaching certificate in early childhood education but without a master's degree. In order to remain in the program after receiving teacher certification, the student must be employed full-time as an early childhood teacher in an urban setting and concurrently complete program requirements for the master's degree.

Coursework in the master's program includes courses that all students take in common, individualized courses to meet individual needs, and one-on-one mentoring by GSU faculty in the school setting. Courses the students take in common are intended to reinforce and extend what was learned during completion of the program prerequisites. The individualized courses focus on areas of need by each first-year teacher in the program. GSU faculty provide extensive mentoring of these teachers while they are completing their master's degrees in order to help them become effective teachers with children from diverse ethnic, racial, cultural, international, and socioeconomic groups and to encourage them to continue teaching in an urban setting.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that approximately 30 students will complete the master's program each year beginning with the graduating class of 2002.

Funding: No new State allocation has been requested.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed major program revisions. In 2004, the program will be evaluated by the institution and the System Office to determine its success.

5. Restructuring of the Academic Division of Natural Sciences and Nursing to Establish Two Separate Divisions: Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Nursing and Health Sciences, Gordon College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Jerry M. Williamson to restructure the existing academic Division of Natural Sciences and Nursing to establish two separate divisions: 1) Mathematics and Natural Sciences and 2) Nursing and Health Sciences, effective June 14, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

5. Restructuring of the Academic Division of Natural Sciences and Nursing to Establish Two Separate Divisions: Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Nursing and Health Sciences, Gordon College (Continued)

Abstract: President Williamson requested permission to establish separate Divisions of Mathematics and Natural Sciences and Nursing and Health Sciences by splitting the existing Division of Natural Sciences and Nursing. This change was recommended due to the enrollment growth and increase in the size of faculty in the nursing and health science program areas. In addition, recent site visit reports by the Georgia Board of Nursing have recommended that a separate division be established to house the nursing program. The faculty and administration suggested that the reorganization will enable the institution to more adequately support students who are pursuing career and transfer degrees. Since the restructuring involves the splitting of an existing structure, no new costs will be associated with the development of the divisions.

The resultant Division of Mathematics and Natural Sciences will offer the following program areas: agriculture/environmental sciences, astronomy, biological sciences and biology, chemistry, computer science, forestry, geological sciences and geography, horticulture, mathematics, and physics.

The new Division of Nursing and Health Sciences will offer the following academic programs and areas: associate of applied science in health (with options in medical assistant, paramedic technology, and surgical technology), associate of science in nursing, dental hygiene, diagnostic medical sonography, health and physical education, health information management, medical technology, nuclear medicine technology, nursing, physical therapy, pre-pharmacy, radiologic technology, and recreation and leisure studies. This division will house the Medical College of Georgia-based external bachelor of science in nursing program.

6. Termination of the Major in Apparel Manufacturing Under the Existing Bachelor of Science in Manufacturing Degree, Georgia Southern University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Bruce F. Grube of Georgia Southern University ("GSOU") to terminate the major in apparel manufacturing, effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: GSOU requested approval to terminate the major in apparel manufacturing under the existing bachelor of science in manufacturing due to low enrollments and graduation rates for the past five years.

The program is no longer viable because there is no student interest in the program at GSOU. From its inception, the program has had low enrollments and has been unable to overcome a tremendous lack of interest among students. This lack of interest can be attributed to several factors, not the least of which is job availability. One must only scan the newspaper headlines to discern that the job market for the apparel industry is moving out of the continental United States. Additionally, GSOU students who are interested in manufacturing careers (e.g., apparel, plastics, metalworks, etc.) have the option of pursuing the existing major in industrial management offered under the bachelor of science in manufacturing. It is perceived that students choose the industrial management major because of its broader applicability and career potential.

There will be no impact on faculty teaching in the program. Faculty members with expertise in apparel manufacturing also teach in the industrial management major offered under the bachelor of science in manufacturing degree. There are currently no students declared as apparel manufacturing majors and none are in the pipeline. Students wishing to pursue a management/supervisory position in the manufacturing industry may pursue the bachelor of science in manufacturing degree with a major in industrial management.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

7. Termination of the Major in English Under the Education Specialist Degree, Georgia State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University ("GSU") to terminate the major in English under the education specialist degree ("Ed.S."), effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: In accordance with Board Policy 2.03.03, a program may be deactivated for a period not to exceed two academic years. GSU received permission to deactivate the Ed.S. with a major in English during fall 1998. At this meeting, GSU requested the termination of the major due to a restructuring of the academic programs, institutional self-studies, and strategic planning processes. This program termination will not have an adverse impact on faculty or students. The program was first deactivated to ensure that students already majoring in the program would have time to graduate or be accommodated through a restructured program. By combining concentration areas, faculty members feel that they can better serve students and manage resources.

8. Revised Institutional Statutes, Bainbridge College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Clifford Brock to revise the institutional statutes of Bainbridge College, effective June 14, 2000.

Abstract: The revision of the statutes reflects a thorough review and brings them into line with current Board of Regents policies and procedures. The revised statutes were presented as a result of a recent Southern Association of Colleges and Schools accreditation visit. The self-study committee recommended a change in the wording of the description of the Academic Council. The statutes were revised to allow the Academic Council to approve any institutional admission criteria that are more stringent than those minimums established by the University System of Georgia.

These changes were approved by the general faculty of Bainbridge College. They have been reviewed by the Office of Legal Affairs and were found to be consistent with the current organization and administrative process at Bainbridge College. The revised statutes are on file in the Office of Academic Affairs of the Board of Regents.

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

The following administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Education Committee Chair Juanita P. Baranco and were approved by the Board. All full-time appointments are on file with the Office of Academic Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

Summary of Full-Time Faculty Appointments

<u>System Institutions by Type:</u>	<u>Totals:</u>
Georgia Institute of Technology	32
Georgia State University	30
Medical College of Georgia	30
University of Georgia	48
Total Research Universities Appointments	140
Georgia Southern University	34
Valdosta State University	24
Total Regional Universities Appointments	58
Albany State University	11
Armstrong Atlantic State University	10
Augusta State University	5
Clayton College & State University	6
Columbus State University	11
Fort Valley State University	0
Georgia College & State University	16
Georgia Southwestern State University	4
Kennesaw State University	7
North Georgia College & State University	3
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	2
State University of West Georgia	13
Total State Universities Appointments	88
Dalton State College	2
Macon State College	4
Total State Colleges Appointments	6

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	0
Atlanta Metropolitan College	0
Bainbridge College	0
Coastal Georgia Community College	0
Darton College	2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	4
Gainesville College	1
Georgia Perimeter College	10
Gordon College	1
Middle Georgia College	6
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	1

Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments 25

TOTAL FULL-TIME FACULTY APPOINTMENTS 317

Summary of Part-Time Retiree Appointments

System Institutions by Type: Totals:

Georgia Institute of Technology	55
Georgia State University	9
Medical College of Georgia	6
University of Georgia	39

Total Research Universities Appointments 109

Georgia Southern University	2
Valdosta State University	0

Total Regional Universities Appointments 2

Albany State University	0
Armstrong Atlantic State University	7
Augusta State University	0

Clayton College & State University	0
Columbus State University	0
Fort Valley State University	0
Georgia College & State University	0
Georgia Southwestern State University	0
Kennesaw State University	0
North Georgia College & State University.	1
Savannah State University	0
Southern Polytechnic State University	0
State University of West Georgia	2

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

Total State Universities Appointments 10

Dalton State College	7
Macon State College	0

Total State Colleges Appointments 7

Abraham Baldwin Agric. College	0
Atlanta Metropolitan College	0
Bainbridge College	0
Coastal Georgia Community College	1
Darton College	0
East Georgia College	0
Floyd College	1
Gainesville College	0
Georgia Perimeter College	0
Gordon College	0
Middle Georgia College	0
South Georgia College	0
Waycross College	0

Total Two-Year Colleges Appointments 2

TOTAL PART-TIME RETIREE APPOINTMENTS 130

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

RICHMOND, EDMUN B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF MODERN LANGUAGES,
EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

ZALKOW, LEON H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF CHEMISTRY AND BIOCHEMISTRY,
EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

TOVEY, CRAIG A.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 16, 2000 THROUGH MAY 16, 2001,
WITH PAY.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

CLARK, THOMAS B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

CRAVEY, PAMELA A.: LIBRARIAN/ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS, PULLEN LIBRARY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 15, 2000.

DILLON, RAY D.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ACCOUNTANCY, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

ELLIOTT, MERWYN K.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

ELROD, ROBERT H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000

EL-SHESHAI, KAMAL M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

GARCHA, BIKRAMJIT S.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF DECISION SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, DEPARTMENT OF DECISION SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

HSU, FRANK: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PHYSICS AND ASTRONOMY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

JONES, JEAN: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ART AND DESIGN, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MADDEX, JAMES L.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, DEPARTMENT OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

NEVINS, ARTHUR J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS, COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

PIEPER, WALTER: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PSYCHOLOGY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

RATAJCZAK, DONALD: REGENTS' PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS,
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

RICHARDSON, W. KIRK: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PSYCHOLOGY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

SEARS, CURTIS: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CHEMISTRY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES,
EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2000.

SKOGSTAD, SAMUEL: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMICS, EFFECTIVE
JULY 1, 2000.

WILLIAMS, CHARLES: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS,
COLLEGE
OF BUSINESS, COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 14, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

DARSEY, JAMES F.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 12, 2000 THROUGH
MAY 10,
2001, WITH PAY

WITTA, PAUL J.: PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 THROUGH MAY 10, 2001,
WITH PAY.

MEDICAL COLLEGE OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ABRAHAM, EDATHARA C: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR
BIOLOGY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

BAILEY, JOSEPH P., JR.: CHARBONNIER PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, ASSOCIATE
DEAN

EMERITUS OF CLINICAL SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

BOCKMAN, DALE E.: CHAIR EMERITUS OF CELLULAR BIOLOGY AND ANATOMY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CELLULAR BIOLOGY AND ANATOMY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JUNE 15, 2000.

BOND, GARY C.: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITUS OF ADMISSIONS, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITUS, SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PHYSIOLOGY, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

CORMIER, RENE E.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EDWARDS, BARBARA H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY, SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EDWARDS, WALLACE S.: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITUS OF STUDENT AND ALUMNI AFFAIRS, SCHOOL OF DENTISTRY, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

EUBIG, CASIMIR: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF RADIOLOGY, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGIES, ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

GREEN, KEITH: REGENTS' PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF OPHTHALMOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

HUFF, THOMAS A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

KARP, WARREN B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF PEDIATRICS, BIOLOGY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ORAL BIOLOGY AND MAX PATHOLOGY, ORAL DIAGNOSIS AND PATIENT SERVICES, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

KILEEN, MAUREEN R.: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF MENTAL HEALTH PSYCHIATRIC NURSING, PROFESSOR EMERITA OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF NURSING, EFFECTIVE JUNE 15, 2000.

LEE, CAROL E.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY,
SCHOOL OF
ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, JULY 1, 2000.

LEVINE, MONROE I.: HENRY CHAIR OF ORTHOPEDICS EMERITUS, PROFESSOR EMERITUS
OF
SURGERY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JUNE 15, 2000.

MARTIN, RICHARD M.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, SCHOOL OF
MEDICINE,
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MASCARO, DAVID J.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICAL ILLUSTRATION,
SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MILLER, MAX D.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF
MEDICAL
EDUCATION, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MUNDY, WANDA M.: CHAIRPERSON EMERITA OF RADIOLOGIC TECHNOLOGIES, ASSOCIATE
PROFESSOR EMERITA OF RADIOLOGIC SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES,
EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

NAIR, CHERUKANTATH N.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MEDICINE, ASSOCIATE
PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF GRADUATE STUDIES, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, EFFECTIVE JULY
1, 2000.

NESBIT, ROBERT R.,JR.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SURGERY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE,
EFFECTIVE
JULY 1, 2000.

PORTERFIELD, SUSAN P.: ASSOCIATE DEAN EMERITA OF CURRICULUM, PROFESSOR
EMERITA OF PHYSIOLOGY, PROFESSOR EMERITA OF GRADUATE STUDIES, EFFECTIVE
JULY 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

RINKER, GERALDINE: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF MEDICAL TECHNOLOGY, SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

SWIFT, THOMAS R.: CHAIRPERSON EMERITUS OF NEUROLOGY, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF NEUROLOGY AND CELLULAR BIOLOGY AND ANATOMY, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

TRUEBLOOD, JON H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF RADIOLOGY, SCHOOL OF MEDICINE, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF RADIOLOGIC SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

WINKLEY, GAIL P.: CHAIRPERSON EMERITA OF ASSOCIATED DENTAL SCIENCES, ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF ASSOCIATED DENTAL SCIENCES, SCHOOL OF ALLIED HEALTH SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

PLESS, BETSY S.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, SCHOOL OF NURSING, ADULT NURSING, FROM NON-TENURE TRACK TO TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 14, 2000.

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ALLEN, JOSEPH D. III: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

KATZ, STUART B.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS, PSYCHOLOGY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

MADDUX, ESTORIA: PROFESSOR EMERITA, HOUSING AND CONSUMER ECONOMICS, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

NEWMAN, LOUIS: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, TIFTON DIAGNOSTIC LAB, VETERINARY MEDICINE,

EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

SCHWARTZ, BARRY: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, SOCIOLOGY DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BLACK, CHARLENE: ASSOCIATE VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS EMERITA, DEAN EMERITA OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDIES, PROFESSOR EMERITA, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

BRANCH, ROGER G.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF SOCIOLOGY AND CHAIR EMERITUS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY AND ANTHROPOLOGY, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

GILES, TIMOTHY D.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 1, 2000 THROUGH MAY 31, 2001, WITH PAY.

COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

HAWKINS, AMANDA B.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

NORTH GEORGIA COLLEGE AND STATE UNIVERSITY

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BELDEN, GEORGE B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF EDUCATION, DEPARTMENT OF TEACHER EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

COLBERT, V. KAY: DIRECTOR OF ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROGRAMS EMERITA, PROFESSOR EMERITA OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

CRANNELL, WINSLOW G.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF FINE ARTS, DEPARTMENT OF FINE ARTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

EWING, JAMES M.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ENGLISH, DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

BENTON, KIM HUDSON: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

BOONE, KAREN Y.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

SAMTER, JEANNE A.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF NURSING, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

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

(Continued)

COASTAL GEORGIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

BOYD, R. VIRGINIA: ASSOCIATE LIBRARIAN/ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITA OF LIBRARY SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

RIDGLEY, RONALD H.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY AND GEOGRAPHY, SOCIAL SCIENCE AND PHYSICAL EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

WATSON, WILLIE F.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, BUSINESS STUDIES DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JUNE 1, 2000.

GEORGIA PERIMETER COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

ARMBRECHT, BRENDA: PROFESSOR EMERITA OF READING, DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

BRADFORD, JAMES: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MUSIC, FINE ARTS, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

HENRY, PEARL: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF READING, DEVELOPMENTAL

STUDIES, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

HICKMAN, JAMES: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, SOCIAL SCIENCE DEPARTMENT, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE APPROVALS:

MORTIMER, BARBARA A.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, LEAVE FROM AUGUST 14, 2000 THROUGH MAY 12, 2001, WITH PAY.

SOUTH GEORGIA COLLEGE

TENURE STATUS CHANGE APPROVALS:

ELY, THOMAS H.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR OF BIOLOGY, DIVISION OF NATURAL SCIENCES/MATHEMATICS, FROM TENURE TRACK TO NON-TENURE TRACK, EFFECTIVE AUGUST 11, 2000.

WAYCROSS COLLEGE

EMERITUS APPOINTMENTS:

HARRIS, TED C.: VICE PRESIDENT AND DEAN EMERITUS, PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 2000.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

10. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training

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

Georgia State University		Pharmacy	1R
Kinesiology and Health	1	Psychology	1
Nursing	3	Recreation and Leisure	2
Physical Therapy	4, 1R	Social Work	1R
Social Work	1		
		Georgia Southern University	
Medical College of Georgia		Family & Consumer Sci.	4
Allied Health Sciences	16, 14R	Health and Kinesiology	14, 1R
Medicine	5, 1R	Leadership/Human Dev.	1R
Hospitals & Clinics	1, 1R	Nursing	3, 1R
MCG Research Institute	1	Sociology & Anthropology	5
		Armstrong Atlantic State University	
University of Georgia		Medical Technology	1
Child and Family Dev.	6	Nursing	2
Communication Sciences	1, 1R	Physical Therapy	4
Foods and Nutrition	3		

		Physical Therapy	1, 1R
Augusta State University			
Nursing	2R	State University of West Georgia	
Psychology	1, 3R	Nursing	3R
Georgia College & State University		Coastal Georgia Community College	
Health Sciences	12	Surgical Technology	1
Georgia Southwestern State University		Darton College	
Nursing	2, 3R	Health Sciences	3, 1R
Kennesaw State University		Total	139
Nursing	1, 2R		
North Georgia College & State University			
Nursing	2	R = Renewal	

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

11. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Georgia State University			
Support Reading Challenge program	Georgia Dept. of Education	3/21/00 - 9/1/00	\$97,387
University of Georgia			
Provide training center	Georgia Dept. of Education	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$11,580
Conduct diabetes control program	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	3/15/00 - 9/29/00	\$68,950
Conduct performance and management reviews	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	4/3/00 - 11/30/00	\$99,967
Police Academy	Georgia Public Safety Training Center	7/1/99 - 6/30/00	\$11,265
Train voter registrars	Office of Secretary of State	7/1/97 - 6/30/00	\$85,000
McPhaul Child & Family Development Center Pre-K	Office of School Readiness	7/1/00 - 6/30/01	\$61,500
Evaluate superior courts in child deprivation cases	Supreme Court of Georgia	6/1/99 - 9/30/00	\$25,000
Georgia Southern University			
Provide Georgia vocational staff	North Georgia RESA	3/31/00 - 6/30/01	\$16,500

development			
-------------	--	--	--

TOTAL AMOUNT - JUNE	\$ 477,149
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 2000 TO DATE	\$25,106,814
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99 - TO JUNE	\$31,358,479
TOTAL AMOUNT FY 99	\$31,358,479

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Wednesday, June 14, 2000 at approximately 9:40 a.m. in the room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Elridge W. McMillan and Regents Joe Frank Harris, Martin W. NeSmith, and Joel O. Wooten. Chair McMillan reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had nine applications for review. Additionally, the Committee recommended for approval the Resolution Welcoming Public Library Services Personnel. Chancellor Portch noted that there would be a full briefing on the public library system at the Board's August meeting. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Applications for Review

- a. In the matter of Marlan Holland at Savannah State University, concerning the department's refusal to allow him to graduate in May, the application for review was remanded to the president with instructions to permit Mr. Holland to graduate upon successful completion of his summer internship.
- b. In the matter of Kent Ellington at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning suspension from Dental School, the application for review was granted and Mr. Ellington was permitted to continue his studies in fall 2000.
- c. In the matter of Natasha Dial at the University of Georgia, concerning reimbursement of tuition, the application for review was denied as moot.
- d. In the matter of Barbara Love at the University of Georgia, concerning the denial of her readmission to the Veterinary School, the application for review was continued.
- e. In the matter of Theodore Hill at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning his grievance of June 2, 1999, the application for review was continued.
- f. In the matter of Robert Becker at Georgia Perimeter College, concerning requests for transfer, salary recalculation, and job description, the application for review was denied.
- f. In the matter of the Alpha Pi Chapter of the Phi Beta Sigma Fraternity, Inc. at Fort Valley State University, the application for review was denied.
- h. In the matter of Rhonda Morgan at Gordon College, concerning her request to be absent from registration, the application for review was denied.
- i. In the matter of William Pollard at Valdosta State University, concerning his grievances, the application for review was continued pending the results of mediation.

j. Resolution Welcoming Public Library Services Personnel

Approved: Pursuant to House Bill 1187 in which the Governor transferred responsibility for the State system of public libraries from the Department of Technical and Adult Education to the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, the Board approved the following resolution:

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

2. Resolution Welcoming Public Library Services Personnel (Continued)

RESOLUTION

WELCOMING PUBLIC SERVICES PERSONNEL

WHEREAS, public libraries serve a vital role in the education of the people of Georgia;

WHEREAS, the state governance of Georgia's system of public libraries formerly was vested in a State Library Commission, the Department of Education, and, more recently, the Department of Technical and Adult Education;

WHEREAS, the Governor and the General Assembly of the State of Georgia have, by enacting House Bill 1187, invited this Board to provide the necessary state governance and oversight to Georgia's system of public libraries;

BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia does hereby welcome to the University System of Georgia the Office of Public Library Services.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia does hereby accept, as the property and assets of the Board of Regents, the assets, property, contracts, and liabilities formerly owned by the Department of Technical and Adult Education in its Office of Public Library Services.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that, as of this date,

1) personnel transferring from the Department of Technical and Adult Education's Office of Public Library Services shall be agents and employees of the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, with all rights and responsibilities of such employment,

2) the Board of Regents hereby adopts such rules, regulations, and policies which, prior to the adoption of this Resolution, governed the employment relationship between such personnel and the State of Georgia, and

LASTLY, BE IT RESOLVED THAT, notwithstanding anything in this Resolution to the contrary, the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia hereby adopts and accepts as the policy of this Board the letter and language of Georgia House Bill 1187 (2000).

Witnesseth this 14th day of June, 2000.

s/ STEPHEN R. PORTCH
Chancellor, University System of Georgia

s/ KENNETH W. CANNESRA
Chairman, Board of Regents

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

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

Chair Leebern explained that there were two items on the agenda of the Strategic Planning Committee at this meeting. The first item was a final report on the technology master planning initiative. After a question and answer session, the technology master planning report would be on the table until the August 2000 Board meeting so that the Regents’ suggestions and recommended changes can be incorporated into the final document before the Board votes on it in August. Each of the Regents had been sent an executive summary of the report and its recommendations, and copies of the complete report were in their folders at this meeting. Chair Leebern called upon Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Beheruz N. Sethna to begin this presentation.

Dr. Sethna thanked Chair Leebern and said that he was pleased to bring to the Board the final report of the technology master planning initiative. He asked the members of the project steering committee who were present at the Board meeting to stand and be recognized. He reiterated that the Regents should ask questions and make comments on the report so that the consultants will have their input in framing the final draft of the report for approval in August. He then introduced Mr. James H. Roth, Head of the Higher Education Division, and Mr. Peter Eschenback, Senior Manager, both of Arthur Andersen LLP (“Andersen”).

Mr. Roth greeted the Regents. He reminded the Board that he is the partner in charge of Andersen’s higher education practice. Mr. Eschenback works extensively in the area of information technology (“IT”) within the practice. Between them, they have worked at over 80 colleges and universities in the nation and have a broad-based understanding of many of the issues and complexities relevant to the topic. He noted that this is a very challenging area right now, and he wanted to give the Regents a bit of the context as they begin to review the report over the next 60 days. He explained that the pink document was the master plan, and the blue document was the campus master planning template. These documents were in draft form, pending suggested revisions by the Regents and subsequent approval.

Mr. Roth explained that the challenges of IT are more complex today than even five years ago. If there is one issue that Andersen’s clients are typically grappling with, it is how to integrate technology into everything they are trying to do. In some respects, it used to be simple. Mainframe computers helped researchers do what they needed to do and the administrative tasks of the institution. Now, everything that gets done somehow has IT at its base. It is that context in which this report needs to be viewed, said Mr. Roth. For example, Andersen has seen a dramatic increase in universities’ looking for IT as a way to enhance external revenues that are coming into the system. There are some clients who want to create separate organizations through which they can use IT either through service arrangements or through access to other individuals or joint collaborations trying to use technology to bring in new revenues for the organization. There are many issues associated with this, but technology is at the core of the matter. At the same time, there is dramatically more competition right now for academic and administrative services on the campuses. The concept of distance learning has an enormous impact on what the University System can do, as well as what others can do for students in the State of Georgia. Adding to that are the very strong expectations of students, faculty, staff, and alumni. What services are they expecting, and what is the System able to provide? Looking at all of these converging issues and limited resources and trying to figure out what to do and how to approach it provide the context in which this report should be considered. Mr. Roth said in his 20-year career, there has never been such an important focus on IT as there is today, and it will **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE**

OF THE WHOLE”

continue to accelerate at a rapid pace. There are far more challenges at this point in time than there are answers. The purpose of the technology master planning initiative is to begin the process of figuring out how all of this ties together and informing people. Mr. Roth stressed that the issue of communication is also very important. There are individual expectations in the community and on the campuses about what the priorities are and how to address them, and there are limited resources. So, there is typically a disconnect between how the people who control the resources and make decisions apply those decisions to the campuses. He encouraged that the process be communicated better. A master planning exercise such as this provides an enormous base from which to begin.

Mr. Roth explained that the objective of this project was to develop a master plan for technology for the University System of Georgia. This entailed identifying the services best provided by the System. In other words, where should the services that are expected and required be provided? It was also necessary to identify the appropriate technical architecture at the System level. In other words, what should the size be and what should the technical arrangements with PeachNet be to ensure that it is providing the kinds of services that are expected? The consultants also needed to identify the appropriate Office of Instructional and Information Technology (“OIIT”) organizational structure, because it is essentially the central organization of technology support for the University System. Lastly, it was necessary to create a master planning template for use at the campus level. Mr. Roth reminded the Regents that they had been given copies of the master planning template.

Next, Mr. Roth discussed the processes involved in this project. In the last four months, the consultants met with more than 100 representatives from OIIT, the Governor’s Office, the Central Office, System institutions, vendors, and other university systems. They collected and reviewed relevant information from those representatives. Then, they developed the technology master plan and implementation plan for the University System as well as a template for campus-level technology master planning. Throughout the process, the consultants were careful to do proper due diligence, working with the institutions and the project steering committee to ensure that they had very good insight. Mr. Roth explained that there are 25 recommendations in the technology master planning report, broken into five broad categories: PeachNet, the University System, OIIT, Systemwide applications, and campus master planning templates. He then turned the presentation over to Mr. Eschenback, who would be going over some of those recommendations.

Mr. Eschenback began with the recommendations regarding PeachNet. He said that PeachNet is perhaps the single most important thing that OIIT does on behalf of the System. It is the wide area network (“WAN”) that has the capacity to touch all faculty, students, and staff around the System. It provides the connectivity around the State on a single network, and it is unique to the University System of Georgia. Some states and university systems have networks, and others do not. In today’s environment, PeachNet differentiates the University System of Georgia from others because often they do not have networks. Increasingly, other states and university systems are investing money and time to develop comparable networks. In that way, PeachNet is a strategic asset. It is used to run many programs, including the Georgia Application and Electronic Advisement System (“GA EASY”), Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education (“Georgia GLOBE”), the WebMBA, and countless other distance learning programs at the institutions. It is also used by the citizens of the State through Georgia Library Learning Online (“GALILEO”), and it also helps place students in jobs after graduation through the Georgia Hiring Initiative for Recruiting Excellence (“GeorgiaHIRE”). The first four recommendations regarding PeachNet deal with the demand for network services that currently exists within the System. They are to increase PeachNet backbone capacity, upgrade PeachNet’s connection to the Internet, evaluate and adjust campus connections to PeachNet, and create a stabilized backbone engineering strategy.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

The next set of recommendations regarding PeachNet has to do with a cultural change that may need to occur, explained Mr. Eschenback. The consultants observed that PeachNet is viewed as an unlimited resource, which is clearly not the case. Regardless of the size of the University System's investment in the future, the demand at the institutions will likely exceed the availability of the network. There are new technologies created every day that are requiring more and more space just for single applications. So, the combination of new technologies and the increased usage of the Internet and other technologies places a lot of strain on the network and requires that the University System examine the size of the network and determine how to best use that resource.

Mr. Roth noted that the more demands put on the network, the worse its performance will become. This is a critical issue because it creates frustrations and limitations.

Mr. Eschenback stated that implementing a suite of robust network management tools will provide the hard data necessary to make decisions such as what type and how much traffic and at what time. The Board can make management decisions from there. Another recommendation is that the System perform a WAN security review. This is important because as technology increases in sophistication, so do the "hackers" around the country who enjoy breaking into systems. A network security review is a proactive way to identify potential areas of concern and address them before problems occur. The consultants also felt it was important to recognize the impact of the State technology authority. The Governor recently enacted legislation to create a technology authority to handle the IT side of the State agencies. The University System was exempted from it largely because the IT function is managed by the Board of Regents. Nonetheless, it serves as a sizable resource that the University System can use to gain increased access to resources. Additionally, the technology authority can take advantage of the skills within the University System. Mr. Eschenback said that the final recommendation relating to PeachNet focuses on managing the network for the long term by developing and implementing a long-term networking strategy.

The second series of recommendations relates specifically to the University System, explained Mr. Eschenback. The first recommendation is that the Chair appoint a Board of Regents Technology Committee consisting of Regents to be advised by the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and the Chief Information Officer. A Technology Committee would help manage the IT function of the System and the policy and budgetary decisions being made regarding IT. The next recommendation is to revise the funding formula to include a technology provision, because technology is essential to the strategic direction of the University System. The funding formula has not changed significantly since the 1980s, but technology is now a much more integral part of the University System. It must be supported by a stream of constant funding, so this is a significant change in philosophy that will require both the Board's and the State's approval. Many OIIT and University System technology initiatives are currently funded through strategic initiative funding. One of the limitations of this kind of funding is that it does not provide any provision for ongoing maintenance. In the last fiscal year, over 40% of OIIT's budget was related to special initiative funds. This means that the funds to maintain those initiatives come out of OIIT's or the University System's operating budget, which creates a strain on the budget over time. So, the consultants feel it is very important to create a budget and plan for technology.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Mr. Eschenback stated that the next series of recommendations relates to OIIT in particular. The consultants have made a number of managerial recommendations to improve the efficiency of OIIT operations. The first recommendation is that OIIT partner with the institutions to add functionality to Systemwide applications. An example of where this has already happened is the PeopleSoft implementation. When the human resources module was first implemented, the process was driven by OIIT but implemented by the institutions. In some cases, there was a specific module called Applicant Tracking that was not included in the initial rollout or in a time line that was suitable to the institutions. OIIT worked with the small institutions that had the capability and willingness to dedicate resources to implement the module on a schedule different than originally anticipated and then used that implementation as a pilot to roll out that module to other institutions. This illustrates a powerful way to leverage the expertise from the campuses into System-level initiatives. The consultants were also recommending that the Board dedicate resources to strategic planning and policy making, because it is important that someone is ensuring that the needs of both the short term and long term are being met.

The fourth category of recommendations were Systemwide applications, said Mr. Eschenback. The consultants' review also focused on the needs of the Central Office in terms of its data requirements. There are many requests to the Central Office for information about the System as a whole, and the need to collect that data is very real and ultimately beneficial to all of the institutions. So, the consultants were recommending evaluating those data systems as well as the ability to support the users of those systems.

Mr. Eschenback stated that the final element of the report is the campus-level technology master planning template. The objective of this part of the project was to serve as a jumpstart to the next phase of IT master planning. When the University System first contemplated creating a technology master plan at the System level, the idea was to then do master planning at the campus level. So, the consultants were to provide a work plan as well as some templates to serve as the basis to start that part of the initiative. The campus-level plan should reflect the individual needs of the campuses, and the templates the consultants developed are flexible enough to support that purpose. They modeled the process for these templates on the same process the institutions have used for their facilities master planning, which is currently underway.

The costs for the recommendations that the consultants made are significant, and Mr. Eschenback shared them with the Board. They are almost entirely related to PeachNet, and within PeachNet, the costs are mostly associated with the cost of adding capacity to meet current demand. The costs would specifically go to carriers for telephone circuits to support the increased size of the network. The implementation costs were included in the Regents' packets of information. Mr. Eschenback said that they are notable for both what they include and what they do not include. Some of the costs are not known at this time, and they were therefore not included in the estimates. For example, there are a number of distance learning initiatives around the System that will require funding to implement and support in the long term, and at this time, it is not clear what those costs will be. The consultants did, however, include estimates for numbers that made sense. The total cost of the estimated implementation cost is \$8.6 million, and PeachNet accounts for almost 90% of that cost. Mr. Eschenback then turned the floor back to Mr. Roth, who would conclude their presentation.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Mr. Roth stated that throughout the System, OIIT is considered a very hard-working and dedicated organization. Its accomplishments are very significant, and it is well managed. PeachNet is a strategic asset for the University System that should be strengthened for the future. It has differentiated the University System of Georgia from other university systems in the past, and the question is whether it will continue to be a differentiator and what resources and direction are necessary to maintain the differentiation. The consultants were recommending strengthening the System’s focus on instructional and information strategic planning, because planning is critical in this increasingly complex environment. Mr. Roth encouraged these types of discussions because they would be very useful in the long term. He also noted that the System should provide appropriate production-level support for distance learning technologies to make distance learning a successful venture. Finally, Mr. Roth said that there is a strong need for dependable systems and improved data collection systems at the Central Office. The ability to manage a very disparate group of institutions with a significant budget is critical. The ability to obtain information and the ability of senior management to manage will also be important to focus on in the future. None of these technology solutions are simple. The consultants hope that the Board of Regents Technology Committee will be able to surface some of the key strategic issues and focus on them at a critical level, which will be very important going forward. In closing, Mr. Roth said that the campus-level technology master planning effort is essential to create consistent strategic plans that are effective and bought into at the campus level. Every institution has its own needs and wants, and to get them through this process in a consistent manner is very important. Mr. Roth asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Chair Leebern asked whether the institutions were sharing their technological needs and wants with the Central Office and how the staff would draw the line between needs and wants.

Dr. Sethna responded that this phase of the initiative had dealt with the System-level issues. The next phase will be campus-level master planning. However, he did not think there would be any disagreement that technology is the heart of the System’s core educational functions. Therefore, the Board’s attention to this matter is commendable. Dr. Sethna thanked the Regents for their insight to focus on technology. PeachNet is where the System needs to put its immediate focus. Right now, the network is actually impeding future progress. Whether from a campus perspective or a Systemwide perspective, PeachNet will come out at the top of the System’s priorities. At the individual institutions, there will be many needs, and some campus-level issues may need to be considered in the Systemwide context.

Chair Leebern noted that one of the consultants’ recommendations related to creating a more deeply skilled help desk. He asked Mr. Eschenback to expound on this.

Mr. Eschenback explained that the strategic planning process is difficult because there are both needs and wants. In this case, the consultants had to determine where the true needs are and in what priority they should be placed. The help desk was identified as a specific need of the System. The help desk itself has only been in existence approximately 18 months, and it has done a good job with the resources it has. However, there is a significant need for a more comprehensive help desk, and this is something the System should address in the short term. So, the consultants identified some things OIIT could do on behalf of the System to improve that operation, which ultimately means that a student has a resource to turn to in the event he or she needs technical support.

Dr. Sethna stressed that students need a help desk that is available around the clock every day.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Regent Yancey asked how long the upgrades to PeachNet will last. He noted that the upgrades were

estimated to cost \$6.3 million.

Mr. Eschenback replied that this is a difficult question to answer, but he estimated the period would likely be 12 to 24 months.

Dr. Sethna added that the upgrades would really only help PeachNet catch up to the current needs. This is a result of the University System's successes and all that it is doing with Georgia GLOBE, the WebMBA, etc.

Mr. Eschenback agreed. He reiterated that PeachNet is considered to be a strategic asset of the System. It provides connectivity to all of the institutions, and it is used as a delivery mechanism for PeopleSoft, GALILEO, and other applications that were created for a delivery tool like PeachNet.

Chancellor Portch added that even with the upgrades, the System will still have to manage the network much more aggressively and prioritize its uses. Otherwise, the costs would be even greater.

Regent Hunt asked whether the technology is available at this time to spend a little more on upgrades that will last 36 or 48 months instead.

Dr. Sethna responded that 24 months from now, we will know something we do not know today. For that reason, it is probably best to make upgrades in this way.

Mr. Roth agreed. The reality is that IT usage everywhere is increasing so dramatically that the types of usage are putting enormous constraints on networks. There may be other solutions that would provide the University System with possibly longer relief, but that does not preclude other uses, like some of the streaming technologies. He asserted that the best solution would probably be to make the suggested upgrades and then manage those limited resources the best way possible. That is no different than the way most other organizations are doing it, both in higher education and elsewhere. It is ultimately a matter of managing resources and accepting that one cannot do everything.

Mr. Eschenback remarked that this is a good example of the type of issue that could be examined by the proposed Board of Regents Technology Committee.

Mr. Roth said that there are other upgrades available, but it comes back to the question of how and when to do that. The cost and impact could be significant. Again, strategic issues such as these would require much more research and consideration by such a committee.

Dr. Sethna added that the profound implication of this issue is that there is no reasonable one-shot expenditure of money that can take care of this situation. That is why the consultants have placed emphasis on the funding formula. There needs to be a constant stream of resources, because technology will require a continuous investment.

Regent White commended the consultants on their draft report. He said there is no doubt technology will have a major impact on education. He asked them how they would rate the University System's approach to technology in education against the other university systems with which they have worked.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Mr. Roth replied that the University System of Georgia is clearly ahead of the curve because of PeachNet and its complexities. For instance, there are 34 different institutions, which creates a complexity not seen in other systems. Secondly, the fact that the Board is currently addressing these issues puts the System ahead of the pack. There are many other issues that weigh into measuring this, but in general, the IT

function has been well managed. Having said that, he stressed that there are still major challenges ahead.

Regent Howell noted that PeachNet was initiated prior to many recent technological advances. He asked whether it would be wiser to start transferring to a new network.

Mr. Eschenback replied that the hardware and design of PeachNet are current and use state-of-the-art technology. The real issue is capacity. So, it is not a legacy system, and the consultants' recommendations with regard to PeachNet are not in that vein. Rather, the System should augment the current design and capacity rather than replacing PeachNet.

Regent Howell asked about PeachNet's hardware.

Mr. Eschenback explained that the two primary hardware vendors for PeachNet are Cisco Systems, Inc. and Nortel Networks, the two largest network providers in the country. The greatest cost associated with PeachNet is not the hardware; rather, it is the communications cost, the cost of BellSouth to provide the connectivity among the campuses.

Mr. Roth agreed that the primary issue with PeachNet is the bandwidth, not the hardware.

Regent NeSmith noted that the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") has a third-party Internet service provider. He asked why.

Mr. Roth did not know the history behind that decision, but he noted that the research institutions have expressed their own needs and desires in terms of access.

Mr. Eschenback stated that the real issue is that GIT has better capacity through the third-party provider, which reflects the matter at hand, which is the capacity of PeachNet.

Regent NeSmith asked whether it was likely GIT would use PeachNet if it were upgraded to the recommended standards.

Mr. Eschenback replied that it would be possible. After adding the capacity, the Board would have to decide how to use that capacity. It could be distributed among the currently participating institutions, for new technologies, or to bring other institutions on board.

Chair Leebern remarked that this was another resource management issue.

Regent Hunt asked where PeachNet would be ranked compared to other states' networks.

Mr. Eschenback responded that of states that have established networks, PeachNet ranks around the middle. There are a number of states that do not have networks but are planning to implement them.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Regent Hunt asked which university system has the best network.

Mr. Eschenback replied that the best network is probably that of the California State University System.

Chair Leebern noted that California has more than one university system. He said that it would be hard to compare. He asked the Chancellor what the total budget for the University System would be.

Chancellor Portch responded that it is approximately \$3.69 billion.

Chair Leebern remarked that \$6.6 million is not a lot of money, considering the size of the overall budget. He stressed that there must be an ongoing investment in IT to keep the University System ahead of the curve.

Mr. Roth said that it is hard to make comparisons between systems because of the differences among them and their circumstances. That is why the consultants are suggesting a Technology Committee, so the Regents can revisit these legitimate issues.

Regent Cannestra asked whether it would be better to have each of the research institutions use third-party service providers with an interface to PeachNet and distribute the remaining PeachNet capacity to the rest of the institutions.

Mr. Roth said that there are strong economic issues associated with this proposal, including how to fund this.

Regent Cannestra stated that it may be better to pay for separate service providers than to upgrade PeachNet for use by the entire University System when many of the needs of the institutions are not compatible.

Mr. Eschenback stated that the consultants had considered this matter, and at this time, they were not certain that it would be the right way to go because of hardware costs associated with the idea.

Regent Cannestra said there could be a master purchasing agreement within the System that could overcome this stumbling block, if it is the best approach to the issue. He stated that when the needs are different within the System, there may be more difficulty and expense.

Dr. Sethna stated that anything the System builds needs to be compatible both in terms of communications and the actual data. With the Governor's emphasis on accountability, there is a need to be compatible.

Regent Cannestra said that compatibility is not a hindrance in today's technology.

Dr. Sethna said that it should not be a hindrance. Unfortunately, even today, it still is.

Chair Leebern asked whether there were any further questions or comments. Seeing that there were none, he thanked the presenters. He also thanked Dr. Sethna on behalf of the Board for all he has done in his role as Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs.

Dr. Sethna thanked Chair Leebern and the Board for their support.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"

Chancellor Portch asked that the Regents call or E-mail Dr. Sethna with their input on this report, so that it will be reflected in the final report and recommendations to be approved at the August 2000 meeting.

Chair Leebern stated that this was one of the Board's initiatives undertaken this year within the Strategic Planning Committee. In tandem with the technology master planning initiative was the undertaking of the extensive benchmarking and management review initiative under the direction of the Pappas Consulting Group, Inc. (the "Pappas Group"), Andersen, and MGT of America. At this time, Dr. Alceste

T. Pappas, President of the Pappas Group, would be delivering her report on the progress of this initiative. This has been a complex initiative, undertaken in partnership with the Governor's Office, to establish an ongoing approach to assessment and accountability. At the August 2000 meeting, the final report on this initiative will be presented to the Board.

Chancellor Portch noted that this presentation would be short, because Dr. Pappas's full report will be given in August.

Dr. Pappas reminded the Regents that the objectives of this review were to continue to increase System and institutional effectiveness and efficiency, to develop a baseline for the System and institutional performance, and to begin to put in place a sustainable process to support the Governor's and the Board's long-term accountability agenda. The bottom line for the benchmarking and management review initiative is how the Board of Regents should establish a long-term effort of self-improvement. In that capacity, the consultants have focused on three areas of study, and she would discuss one of those areas at this meeting. The first scope of the project was benchmarking, and this is the one she would discuss. Scope two is the management review, and in this process, the consultants looked at 110 administrative and financial processes. In August, they would go through the details of the process and conclusions in that area. Scope three is the capacity of the System and the institutions to begin to address how to collect meaningful indicator and benchmark data so that the Board will be able to address over the long term the specific outcomes and impact on the State of Georgia.

At this time, Dr. Pappas would focus on the benchmarking scope of the initiative, because it was clear that the Regents want to know how the University System compares with others. She explained that the project steering committee is comprised of people from the Central Office and the Governor's Office of Planning and Budget ("OPB"). They both want to accomplish a viable, long-term series of ways in which to measure what impact the University System has on the State. First, the committee came to an agreement on 18 criteria or variables for peer/comparator selections. Because institutions of higher education are mission based, the 18 criteria focus on the missions of the institutions. Those criteria or variables include the number of degrees awarded, total research expenditures, number of full-time faculty, and the like.

The next step was to come to identify the cohorts of Georgia institutions as they relate to identifying peers, explained Dr. Pappas. The 34 institutions were classified into four cohorts, and comparators were identified. For the 4 research universities, 48 comparators were identified. For the 15 regional and state universities, 60 comparators were identified. Dr. Pappas noted that among those regional and state universities, there are four historically black colleges and universities ("HBCUs"). There are 16 HBCU comparators identified as part of that tier. For the 2 state colleges, 30 comparator institutions were identified. Finally, for the 13 two-year colleges, 57 comparator institutions were identified. In total, 195 institutions were identified for thorough comparator analysis. So, there will be an extraordinary amount of data presented to the Board as **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

a result of this process. The consultants will interpret, analyze, and summarize that data so that it is meaningful for the Regents and their colleagues. Dr. Pappas noted that the Regents had been given information which included an overview of institutions by cohort. In Exhibit I, the four major research universities are matched with their comparator institutions. Exhibit II lists comparators for the regional and state universities, including HBCUs such as Winston-Salem State University and Norfolk State University. The consultants have been very sensitive about incorporating as much diversity in this cohort as possible. Exhibit III is a peer list for state colleges. Dr. Pappas noted that this list includes many Pennsylvania State Universities, because Georgia's state colleges are more like those satellite campuses than others in a vast array of over 3,000 colleges and universities. Exhibit IV is a peer list for the two-

year colleges. Dr. Pappas noted the vast array of institutions across the country that represent similar institutions. She suggested that the Regents look at these lists on their own to get a sense of the thoroughness of the analysis and what it took to get there. She underscored how sensitive and time-consuming this work is. The consultants are confident that they have done due diligence to provide the Board with a baseline for the System.

Dr. Pappas said that the third step in the process was to come to agreement on the performance indicators/benchmarks for use with the comparator institutions. The consultants' first objective was to determine the key measures in the first analysis. In the end, 31 indicators were agreed upon. These too were included in the Regents' information packets. Dr. Pappas suggested that the Regents examine this information from a policy perspective and what it means to the University System given its strategic goals and the Governor's agenda for post-secondary education in the State of Georgia. She noted that some of the indicators do not apply to all institutions. For example, the average Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") composite score applies to all institutions except the Medical College of Georgia, because the Medical College Admission Test ("MCAT") is used for consideration for medical school admissions. Another indicator or benchmark is the percentage of total undergraduate credit hours taught by tenured and tenure-track faculty. The reason this is so important is because many research universities in large state university systems are criticized for heavily using research assistants and teaching assistants to teach undergraduate courses. Dr. Pappas stated that it is very important to track carefully what the System is doing to ensure that full-time faculty are providing the core of the educational programs. Another important indicator is the number of unrestricted instruction and related expenditures (e.g., academic support and student services) per full-time equivalent student. This means looking at all of the expenditures related to what goes on in the classroom as well as what expenditures are associated with the offices of the provost, vice president for academic affairs, deans, department chairs, and student affairs. By looking at the total cost, the Board will be able to consider whether the University System is putting major resources into the academic core of the institutions. Another important benchmark is the freshman to sophomore retention rate. In higher education, a lot of money is spent on recruitment, and it is very important to retain those students. So, the first year is a very critical measure of retention for colleges and universities. Another important benchmark is the distribution of enrollment by level and race/ethnicity in order to provide access and diversity. Another indicator is the presence of formal ties to business and industry. This gets to issues of economic development and the impact of the University System and its institutions on the State and its various municipalities. Another benchmark is the percentage of entering freshman at state and two-year colleges who complete an associate degree or certificate program and/or transfer to a four-year institution. This is important as you examine articulation agreements. Dr. Pappas recommended that those agreements constantly be reviewed and fine-tuned from a policy and planning perspective. Another important benchmark is the percentage of graduating students employed or pursuing further education within one year of graduation. Again, this is a benchmark of outcome. What kind of impact are the System institutions **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

having within the State of Georgia in terms of employment? The final benchmark Dr. Pappas discussed was the dollars associated with private giving received annually. It is one of the growing responsibilities of foundation boards related to each of the institutions going forward.

Dr. Pappas said that these benchmarks should give the Regents an appreciation of the depth and level of analysis that is now taking place using the data gathered in the benchmarking and management review initiative. She explained that with 18 variables, 195 comparator institutions, and 31 outcome measures, there is a great deal of data to be analyzed. The consultants are now sharing with the institutions the raw national data collected as part of the process to get their perspective on what the data tells them about themselves relative to their peers. The consultants have learned that obtaining the national data has been an important objective for them to meet. Interestingly, another important issue the consultants discovered

is the importance of looking at some very new ways to identify outcome measures. In other words, what are those things that are specific to the 34 System institutions and to the State of Georgia that have a longer-term impact? So, the consultants are working with the project steering committee to identify the key questions about the impact that these institutions have on the State and how to begin to collect that data. This is not an easy task, and there are very tough questions to be framed, Dr. Pappas stressed. Between this meeting and the August 2000 Board meeting, the consultants have the continuing task of sharing data with the institutions and getting their responses, writing the final report, and presenting that report in August. The same is true of the scope II endeavor. In August, the consultants will have two large reports as well as a 20-page summary of those reports. Dr. Pappas asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Pappas for her presentation and remarked that he would appreciate the summary of the reports.

Regent McMillan reminded the Regents that he had concerns early on in this initiative, but his comfort level had been raised significantly. He felt that this initiative was right on target.

Regent NeSmith asked whether the student satisfaction data had already been collected.

Dr. Pappas replied that many System institutions collect student satisfaction data on a regular basis. However, this needs to be done on a sustained basis across the System. Among the key issues that will have to be considered is who will collect the student satisfaction data. In collecting their data, the consultants learned that many institutions do not have an institutional research function. One of the great implications is what impact this has on the institution as it relates to staffing, to the Central Office, and to OPB. Of course, this requires technology. As it was noted earlier, the technology master planning initiative ties into the issue of generating and sustaining all sorts of data.

Regent McMillan noted that he did not see graduation rates for athletes among the 31 indicators.

Dr. Pappas responded that the project steering committee did not believe the matter was significant enough to be part of this stage of benchmarking. However, if it is an important policy or strategic issue for the Board, it can be added at a later date.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Pappas again, and seeing that there were no further questions or comments, he then adjourned the Committee of the Whole and turned the floor back to Chair Cannestra.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

After the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole, Chair Cannestra gave his report on the highlights of the year, which was as follows:

Thank you for your support and hard work, especially the Chairs of the Committees and the new Regents. Thanks to the staff. Together, we have maintained – built upon the momentum generated in previous years. It has been a year of challenges – but challenges met. Or to use an analogy from my professional life, we've got a great flight path mapped out. It has personally been very rewarding. I have enjoyed this opportunity and appreciate your confidence. When I began my term as Chairman, I proposed it was timely for the Board to undertake a benchmarking review of the System.

Our thinking – to better understand where we stand in relationship to our regional and national peers – coincided with the goal of the Governor to initiate management reviews

of all State agencies. And so, I am proud that the Regents stepped forward and volunteered to work with the Governor and be the first State agency to undertake this management review and benchmarking process. We are now well into this process, and the results will provide next year's leadership with mileposts and challenges!

Just think of these challenges as the old barnstorming stunt pilots viewed wing-walking: all in a day's work. But the past year has been one of other significant achievements as well.

First our students. Last fall, the SAT [Scholastic Aptitude Test] scores of our freshmen students were not only the highest in the System's history, but matched the national average for the first time. Eight institutions reported SAT scores above 1,000, and the System average reached 1016. This is just one key piece of evidence that our actions to raise standards and promote academic excellence is paying off.

And this news came as the implementation of our new admissions standards came closer and closer to the fall 2001 implementation date. Coupled with news that the numbers of freshmen requiring learning support or having CPC [college-preparatory curriculum] deficiencies has dropped, this is good news.

We also learned that there has been no substantial decrease in the percentage of African-American students in the System. This is important in that it is a sign that our new admissions policy is not restricting access. We will need to remain vigilant, however.

The overall improvement in student preparation also demonstrates the importance of our partnerships with the State's educational agencies through programs such as P-16 and PREP [Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program]. Finally, it is a testament to the power of the HOPE Scholarship to drive academic improvement.

We continue to move ahead with the integration and expansion of technology throughout the System. Development of technology master plans for the System and our campuses is well underway.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

The GeorgiaHIRE [Georgia Hiring Initiative for Recruiting Excellence] program, unveiled in the spring of 1999, has seen heavy use by both System graduates and Georgia employers; 500 employers used Georgia HIRE to review resumes this April alone.

More than 9,000 potential students have used GA EASY [Georgia Application and Electronic Advisement System] to apply to one of our institutions. This new online application service debuted just this past November.

The Georgia GLOBE [Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education] project is moving ahead, and we have strengthened this effort targeted at nontraditional students with a new partnership with the SREB [Southern Regional Education Board] Electronic Campus. I was pleased to participate in the joint announcement of this new collaboration at a recent national conference of education reporters.

Our efforts to work closely with the business community continue to strengthen the image of the System as a key player in the State's economic development.

ICAPP's [Intellectual Capital Partnership Program] latest survey of the State's business leaders, released last September, indicates the percentage of those ranking the quality of the System as "good" or "very good" continues to increase from earlier surveys. It is now at 94%.

Our participation in the Governor's Yamacraw Mission is on schedule and is already attracting top faculty to the State, as we heard from Dan Papp and Jim Foley last month.

We also have dealt with other – sometimes difficult – issues.

The Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") has occupied much of our thoughts and time. Want to thank Regent Tom Allgood and Senior Vice Chancellor Lindsay Desrochers for their hard work. We have made the decisions that will enable MCG to continue to fulfill its mission of training the State's doctors and other health professionals. The transition of the hospitals and clinics to MCG Health, Inc. management has largely been completed.

There is still much to be done in this area, and we cannot be complacent. The healthcare environment is too unstable and competitive for us to relax our vigilance. I want to thank the Governor and General Assembly for their assistance on MCG issues.

And we are dealing with healthcare coverage for the System's employees. Again, no easy answers, no easy decisions. But we have taken the necessary steps to keep our plans whole, with considerable support from the Governor, legislature, and legislative staff.

We survived Y2K – again, thanks to the hard work and preparation by our institutions and our staff.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

Critically, we continue to build our strong partnership with the Governor and General Assembly.

In the recent session, the System's budget as adopted by the General Assembly had a number of solid recommendations, including:

- Funds for the HBCUs [historically black colleges and universities] and for our Hispanic Initiative,
- Continued support for eminent scholars,
- Strong support for the Yamacraw Mission,
- Funding for our technology efforts, including GALILEO [Global Learning Online for Business and Education] and Georgia GLOBE,
- Money for 28 capital projects,
- And help for the formula.

The Chancellor's staff played an important role in the Governor's education reform process. We had visits here at the Regents' meetings by the Governor, Senator Jack Hill, and Representative Dubose Porter.

All of my work, efforts, have been supported by Regent Tom Coleman, who didn't let a few roads distract him from his focus on the System.

This is a great group – different perspectives, wisdom, experience – but I continue to be impressed by your dedication to the State and to providing quality higher educational opportunities to all citizens. Thank you for the opportunity to lead, for the opportunity to serve.

After his remarks to the Board, Chair Cannestra thanked the University System presidents, the campus representatives, and the Board of Regents staff, particularly Assistant Vice Chancellor for Development & Economic Services Annie Hunt Burriss, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Media & Publications Arlethia Perry-Johnson, Director of Communications/Marketing John Millsaps, Vice Chancellor for External Affairs Thomas E. Daniel, Vice Chancellor for Facilities William K. Chatham, Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes, and Associate Secretary to the Board Christina Hobbs. In closing, Chair Cannestra also thanked Chancellor Portch and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Chair Cannestra next called upon the Chair of the Nominating Committee, Regent Leebern, to make nominations for the fiscal year 2001 Chair and Vice Chair.

Regent Leebern reported that the Nominating Committee was recommending Regent White for the Chair and Regent Howell for the Vice Chair. He then made a motion to approve the nomination.

Regent Yancey seconded the motion.

Chair Cannestra asked whether there were any other nominations or any discussion. Seeing that there were none, he called for a vote. With motion properly made and seconded, the Board unanimously approved the election of Regent Glenn S. White as Chair and Regent Hilton H. Howell, Jr. as Vice Chair of the Board of Regents for fiscal year 2001. He then asked them to say a few words.

Chair-Elect White thanked Chair Cannestra and said that he was very honored to be elected Chair. He remarked that it was a bit intimidating to follow in the footsteps of Chair Cannestra and former Chairs Jenkins and Allgood. However, he was reassured by the quality of Regents. He asked for the Regents' help going forward and said that he looked forward to working with each of them.

Vice-Chair Elect Howell thanked the Regents for electing him Vice Chair and for their confidence in him. He said that he would be looking on the next year as an opportunity to learn things he has yet to master, because it takes a long time to learn the intricacies of the University System. He stated that he was humbled and surprised by the nomination and enormously grateful. He looks forward to working with the Regents closely going forward.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Cannestra next called upon Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Michael F. Vollmer to present to the Board two honorary degree nominations.

The first honorary degree proposal was for Ms. Nikki Giovanni by State University of West Georgia. Ms. Giovanni received her bachelor of arts degree in 1967 from Fisk University. In 1971, she released *Truth Is On Its Way* (record) and received the Highest Achievement Award from *Mademoiselle* magazine. *Truth* went on to receive NATRA's (National Association of Television and Radio Announcers) Award for Best Spoken Word Album. Ms. Giovanni served a professor of creative writing at the College of Mount Saint Joseph on-the-Ohio from 1985-1987. She went on to become a Commonwealth Visiting Professor of English at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University. In 1988, Ms. Giovanni published *Sacred Cows...And Other Edibles* (essays), which received the Ohioana Library Award. She also received the Silver Apple Award from the Oakland Museum Film Festival for *Spirit to Spirit* (PBS film) and the Children's Reading Roundtable Award for *Vacation Time* (children's poetry). In 1989, She accepted a permanent position as Professor of English at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

The second honorary degree proposal was for Mr. Herman J. Russell by Georgia State University. Mr. Russell received a bachelor of building sciences degree from Tuskegee University in 1953. After graduating from Tuskegee, he returned to Atlanta to work alongside his father as a plastering subcontractor. He expanded this business into H.J. Russell & Company, a general contractor. H.J. Russell & Company is listed fifth on the *Black Enterprises* "Top 100" minority business enterprises ("MBEs") in America and number one among construction MBEs. With more than 42 years of growth and development, the company serves a broad range of clients in construction, program management, property management, and brokerage. Some of Russell's more visible projects include Atlanta Hartsfield International Airport, the Olympic Stadium, Atlanta Federal Center, Atlanta City Hall, the Georgia Dome, and the Fulton County Jail.

On behalf of Acting President Thomas J. Hynes and President Carl V. Patton, Dr. Vollmer submitted these nominations for the Board's approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the honorary degrees.

Next, Chair Cannestra called upon the Chancellor to make a special presentation.

Chancellor Portch noted that the Board had conducted a national search for the new Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs. Dr. Daniel S. Papp, Educational Director for the Yamacraw Mission, was the best candidate and had accepted the position. He noted that the Board was very grateful to Interim Senior Vice Chancellor Beheruz N. Sethna, who would be returning to his presidency at State University of West Georgia. He then presented a resolution honoring Dr. Sethna. With motion properly made, duly seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the resolution, which reads as follows:

NEW BUSINESS (Continued)

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Beheruz Sethna was drafted by the Chancellor from his position as Professor of Business Administration and President of the State University of West Georgia to assume the role of Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs for the University System of Georgia; and

WHEREAS, without missing a beat, he ascended to the likes of PowerPoint presentations, agenda reviews, and the role of technology guru for the Board; and

WHEREAS, Beheruz' Ph.D. in business (marketing), his master of philosophy degree and master's of business administration prepared him well for the subtleties of life in the Chancellor's Office; and

WHEREAS, his indefatigable spirit, work ethic, and analytical mind have permeated the environment so that his colleagues can expect a 4:00 a.m. or 11:00 p.m. E-mail, a probative question, or a well-reasoned response on any issue; and

WHEREAS, his congeniality has been contagious and we shall miss his energetic! presence;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Board of Regents and the Chancellor extend to Beheruz our sincere appreciation and good wishes as he returns to the State University of West Georgia and **ORDER** that he build some relaxation into his summer schedule.

ORDERED this 14th day of June, 2000.

s/ STEPHEN R. PORTCH
Chancellor, University System of Georgia

s/ KENNETH W. CANNESRA
Chairman, Board of Regents

Dr. Sethna thanked Chancellor Portch and the Regents for the opportunity to serve as Interim Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs and for their continued support.

Next, Chancellor Portch reminded the Board that it has been his tradition to recognize each chair in a unique way. He then presented Chair Cannestra with a plaque with an original poem commemorating his distinguished service as Chair of the Board of Regents.

Chair Cannestra thanked the Chancellor for this plaque.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that there would be no Board meeting in July. The next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, August 8 and Wednesday, August 9, 2000 in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 12:15 p.m., Chair Cannestra called for an Executive Session for the purpose of

discussing compensation issues. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Cannestra and Regents Connie Cater, Joe Frank Harris, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Martin W. NeSmith, Glenn S. White, and Joel O. Wooten. Also in attendance were Chancellor Stephen R. Portch and Secretary to the Board Gail S. Weber. In accordance with H.B. 278, Section 3 (Amending O.C.G.A. § 50-14-4), an affidavit regarding this Executive Session is on file with the Chancellor's Office.

At approximately 1:00 p.m., Chair Cannestra reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. A motion was made by Regent NeSmith that Thomas Z. Jones be appointed President of Armstrong Atlantic State University. The motion was seconded by Regent Howell. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the appointment was approved.

Next, a motion was made, seconded, and unanimously adopted that the Chancellor's State salary for fiscal year 2001 be at an annual rate of \$265,000, with a housing allowance of \$62,500, effective October 1, 2000. This was an action resulting from the meeting of the Executive Committee on Tuesday, June 13, 2000.

Finally, with motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the Chancellor's recommendations for the fiscal year 2001 salaries for the presidents, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources, the Secretary to the Board, and the Chief Executive Officer of Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education ("Georgia GLOBE").

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 1:10 p.m. on June 14, 2000.

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

s/
Kenneth W. Cannestra
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia