

**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 11 and 12, 2002**

CALL TO ORDER

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, June 11 and Wednesday, June 12, 2001 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, June 11 at approximately 9:10 a.m. Then, the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met as a Committee of the Whole at approximately 10:00 a.m. At 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, June 12, the Board held its regular Committee meetings. After the Committee meetings on Wednesday, the Chair of the Board, Regent Hilton H. Howell, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:40 a.m. Present at this meeting of the full Board, in addition to Chair Howell, were Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey.

INVOCATION

The invocation was given on Wednesday, June 12 by Regent Magill.

Chair Howell called upon the Chancellor to introduce a special guest at this meeting.

Chancellor Meredith introduced Dr. William L. Jenkins, President of the Louisiana State University System and former Chancellor of Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College. Dr. Jenkins is highly respected across the country as one of the nation's top higher education leaders, and he would be representing other system heads at the Chancellor's inauguration.

ATTENDANCE REPORT

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, June 12 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents George M. D. (John) Hunt III and Martin W. NeSmith had asked for and been given permission to be absent on both Board meeting days. Regent Connie Cater had asked for and been given permission to be absent on Tuesday, June 11.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Motion properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on May 7 and 8, 2002, were unanimously approved as distributed.

EXECUTIVE AND COMPENSATION COMMITTEE

The Executive and Compensation Committee met on Tuesday, June 11, 2002, at approximately 9:10 a.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr., Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris, and Regents Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith and the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, were also in attendance. Chair Howell reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which did not require action. That item was as follows:

1. Executive Session

At approximately 9:10 a.m. on Tuesday, June 11, 2002, Chair Howell called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel and compensation issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Howell, Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris, and Regents Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. The Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, was also in attendance during the Executive Session; Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith attended part of the meeting. 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 10:00 a.m., Chair Howell reconvened the Committee meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, at approximately 9:00 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair James D. Yancey, Vice Chair J. Timothy Shelnut, and Regents Connie Cater, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Joel O. Wooten, Jr. Board Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith were also in attendance. Chair Yancey reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed six items, five of 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 2003

Approved: The Board approved the institutional operating and capital budgets for University System of Georgia institutions and agencies. These budgets were reviewed by fiscal affairs staff for compliance with Board of Regents policies and directives and are on file with the Office of Fiscal Affairs.

Background: The recommended fiscal year 2003 educational and general operating budget for the University System of Georgia is \$3.97 billion. This represents a decrease of \$11.8 million, or 0.3%, from fiscal year 2002. The Systemwide auxiliary enterprise budget, which includes housing, food services, intercollegiate athletics, bookstores, and shops, is recommended at a level of \$318.9 million for fiscal year 2003, an increase of \$20.2 million over last year. The student activity budget, which supports educational, recreational, cultural, and social activities for students, is recommended at \$67.5 million for fiscal year 2003. Finally, the recommended fiscal year 2002 capital budget, including all sources of funds (auxiliary enterprise funds, interest income, institutional, and other funds), is \$90.6 million. This is a decrease of \$84.5 million from last year's approved amount.

The fiscal year 2003 operating and capital budget recommendations are the culmination of a process begun in late January 2002. The senior leadership group in the University System Office held regional budget conferences with all University System institutions attended by presidents and senior staff. From these meetings, which centered on key institutional budget priorities, enrollment trends, and tuition and fees, allocation recommendations for state appropriations were developed. These were approved by the Board of Regents in April 2002. Additionally, and also at the April meeting, the Board approved recommendations on tuition and mandatory student 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 or revenue.

The recommendations included 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 type of project. Capital projects to be supported by institutional funds will be subject to appropriate review as required by policy. The staff included a table that depicted the breakdown of the budget by functional category: instruction, research, public services, academic, student, and institutional support.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

2. Approval of Fiscal Year 2003 1% Holdback Allocation

Approved: The Board approved the prorated allocation of the 1% holdback instituted by the Governor for fiscal year 2003 among the institutions and operating units of the University System of Georgia. The direct instruction component of the formula is exempt from the holdback.

Background: In response to the downturn in the economy, the legislature approved budget reductions of 2.5% in fiscal year 2002 and 5% in fiscal year 2003, followed by an additional 0.82% reduction for fiscal year 2003. Due to the continuing uncertainty in the economy, the Governor has directed all agencies to withhold expenditures of 1% for fiscal year 2003.

Beginning with the first quarter of fiscal year 2003, the cash allotment for the University System will be reduced by 0.25%, for a cumulative cash allotment holdback of 1% for the fiscal year. The holdback applies to all state appropriations and special funding initiatives for “A” and “B” budgets.

The 1% holdback includes \$6.44 million in state appropriations for the University System institutions, \$348,100 in special funding initiatives, \$304,612 in research consortium, and \$2.33 million for the “B” units. The state appropriation holdbacks have been allocated proportionately for all institutions, “B” units, and special funding initiatives.

3. Approval of Parking Fee for Georgia College & State University

Approved: The Board approved a parking facility fee of \$44 per semester for Georgia College & State University (“GCSU”), effective spring semester 2003.

Background: The recommended parking facility fee is designed to support the lease of a parking deck built by private developers on private land near the college. The facility and property will revert to ownership by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia at the conclusion of a 20-year period. This facility will provide secure (gated) parking for 252 vehicles and will be available to GCSU students only; that is, no parking by faculty, staff, or the general public will be allowed. The new parking deck will be located approximately one block from the main campus, and card access will be required to enter the facility. If the new fee is approved, the facility should be ready for student use by spring semester 2003.

The GCSU Student Government Association unanimously approved the new parking facility fee in an effort to alleviate the massive parking problems on and around campus. This fee will be payable by the students attending the Milledgeville campus only and will not be mandatory for any student attending classes in Macon or at the Robins Air Force Base. With the construction of the new library, approximately 150 parking spaces were lost. This is the only reasonable and safe parking for students given the land-locked situation of the main campus.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

3. Approval of Parking Fee for Georgia College & State University (Continued)

It is recommended that this fee be considered not eligible for HOPE Scholarship program funding and that the Georgia Student Finance Commission be requested to exclude it from the list of HOPE-eligible fees in accordance with Board action taken at the March 2000 Board meeting.

4. Approval of Professional Program Tuition Increase for Georgia WebMBA™

Approved: The Board approved an increase of professional program tuition for the Georgia WebMBA™ program from \$250 per credit hour to \$350 per credit hour.

Background: In April 2000, the Board of Regents approved a new pilot program for the Georgia WebMBA™ consortium comprised of Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, Kennesaw State University, State University of West Georgia, and Valdosta State University. At this meeting, an increase in tuition from \$250 to \$350 per credit hour is being recommended along with a change from pilot status to permanent status, which appears as Item 20 of the agenda of the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension.

The recommended tuition is less than the comparable Web-based Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”) programs at Duke University and University of Phoenix, which charge \$1,542 and \$505 per credit hour, respectively. Funds will be used for quality enhancement of the program.

5. Approval of Renewal and Amendments of Agreements Between the Board of Regents and MCG Health, Inc. Regarding Medical College of Georgia Hospital and Clinics

Approved: The Board approved renewal of the Master Affiliation Agreement and all Associated Agreements for fiscal year 2003 between the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) and MCG Health, Inc. (“MCGHI”) regarding the operation of the MCG hospital and clinics, with amendments. These agreements, including amendments, are on file with the Office of Fiscal Affairs.

Background: In January 2000, the Board of Regents approved the Master Affiliation Agreement between the Board of Regents and MCGHI for the operation and management of the MCG hospitals and clinics. The Master Affiliation Agreement was the first of a series of agreements that cover facilities, assets, employees, and other elements involved in the transfer of operation and management, effective July 1, 2000. It embodies the fundamental understanding of the parties regarding the proposed affiliation and expresses the interests of the parties in negotiating the terms of the Associated Agreements.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

5. Approval of Renewal and Amendments of Agreements Between the Board of Regents and MCG Health, Inc. Regarding Medical College of Georgia Hospital and Clinics (Continued)

The Associated Agreements include the Master Lease; the Clinical, Educational, and Research Services Agreement; the Operations and Services Agreement; the Personnel Agreement; the Asset Transfer Agreement detailing the assets and liabilities to be transferred; and the MCG Health, Inc./Physicians Practice Group Agreement. All of these agreements are renewable at the end of the fiscal year with approval of the Board of Regents and the Board of Directors of MCGHI. The Associated Agreements provide for both parties to propose amendments to the agreements that may be negotiated with the renewal.

MCG and MCGHI have negotiated several amendments to the Master Lease; the Operations and Services Agreement; the Clinical, Educational, and Research Services Agreement; and the Personnel Agreement, as outlined in Appendix III. These amendments update and clarify the terms of the agreements and reflect minor changes in the exchange of services between the parties. The essential relationship between the parties remains unchanged.

Two additional agreements define the relationships between MCG and PPG and between PPG and MCGHI. These agreements do not require renewal each fiscal year, and the parties have submitted no amendments to the agreements between MCG and PPG. An amendment to the agreement between PPG and MCGHI has been proposed for approval of the Board of Regents and is also summarized in Appendix III. All agreements are on file with the Office of Legal Affairs.

6. Information Item: Addition to Policy Manual Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers

At the May 2002 meeting of the Board, a proposed change to The Policy Manual was continued for further study. The change would have granted residency status to dependent students whose supporting parents or court-appointed guardians had accepted full-time, self-sustaining employment in the State of Georgia for reasons other than gaining the benefit of favorable tuition rates. Meetings with University System institutional representatives resulted in a new proposal which will allow such students to obtain tuition rate benefits as a waiver of the out-of-state tuition differential, assuming appropriate supporting documentation is provided by the student to the enrolling institution.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS

6. Information Item: Addition to Policy Manual Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers (Continued)

The Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs, William R. Bowes, reported on the proposed change to the Committee on Finance and Business Operations. Action on this recommendation was taken by the Committee on Organization and Law.

The proposed language, which will modify Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers of The Policy Manual, is as follows:

- P. Families Moving to Georgia. A dependent student who, as of the first day of term of enrollment, can provide documentation supporting that his or her supporting parent or court-appointed guardian has accepted full-time, self-sustaining employment and established domicile in the State of Georgia for reasons other than gaining the benefit of favorable tuition rates may qualify immediately for an out-of-state tuition differential waiver which will expire 12 months from the date the waiver was granted. An affected student may petition for residency status according to established procedures at the institution.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, at approximately 9:15 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair Joel O. Wooten, Jr. and Regents Connie Cater, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey. Board Chair Hilton H. Howell, Jr. and Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith were also in attendance. Vice Chair Wooten reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed ten items, all of which required action. Item 10 was a walk-on item. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Major Capital Projects Presentations

Each year, the facilities 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 is 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, the Board actions were as follows:

Approved: The Board adopted the rank order of projects 20 to 22 for a cumulative cost of \$501,562,000 and added these projects to the fiscal year 2003-2007 five-year rolling capital outlay plan, as presented below:

	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Requested State Funds</u>	<u>Cumulative Costs</u>
20.	Armstrong Atlantic State University	Academic and Classroom Building	\$22.5 million	\$432,562,000
21.	University of Georgia	Special Collections Library	\$24 million	\$456,562,000
22.	Georgia Institute of Technology	Advanced Clean- room Building	\$45 million	\$501,562,000

Altogether, 11 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 17 to 30, "Committee on Real Estate and Facilities, 'Committee of the Whole.'"

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

2. Rental Agreement, 255 E. Hancock Avenue, Athens, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Slaughter Properties, LLC, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 8,800 rentable square feet located at 255 E. Hancock Avenue, Athens, Georgia, for a period commencing on June 17, 2002, and ending June 30, 2003, at a monthly rental of \$10,942 (\$131,300 per calendar year/\$14.92 per square foot) for the first year. For the first option period, the monthly rental is \$9,706 (\$116,472 per year/\$13.24 per square foot) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing 3% each year for the use and benefit of the University of Georgia (“UGA”).

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

Understandings: UGA’s Gerontology Center (the “Center”), a predominately research unit, will relocate to this location close to the UGA campus in order to release on-campus space for student-intensive programs. This lease is necessary to relocate the Center prior to renovation of its current facility for use by the School of Public and International Affairs.

Operating costs, including utilities, janitorial services, rubbish removal, pest control, and maintenance, are estimated to cost \$15,000 per year.

Rental and operating expenses will be paid from a combination of general operation funds and research overhead cost recovery.

3. Rental Agreement, 110 E. Clayton Street, Athens, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between Humanism Investment, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 6,000 square feet located at 110 E. Clayton Street, Athens, Georgia, for a period commencing on June 17, 2002, and ending June 30, 2003, at a monthly rental of \$6,062.50 (\$72,750 per calendar year) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for four consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing 3% each year for the use and benefit of the University of Georgia (“UGA”).

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

Understandings: UGA’s Office of Institutional Research and Planning (“IRP”), an administrative unit, is to be relocated to this location close to the UGA campus so that academic units can remain on the north campus to interact easily with students. This lease is necessary to relocate IRP out of academic space prior to renovation of its current facility for use by the School of Public and International Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

3. Rental Agreement, 110 E. Clayton Street, Athens, University of Georgia (Continued)

Operating costs, including utilities, janitorial services, rubbish removal, pest control, and maintenance, are estimated to cost \$36,640 annually.

Rental and operating expenses will be paid from UGA's operations budget.

4. Rental Agreement, Technology Engineering Center, Crossroads Business Park, Savannah, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between The University Financing Foundation, Inc., Landlord, and the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia, Tenant, covering 75,000 square feet of office space located at Technology Engineering Center, Crossroads Business Park, Savannah, Georgia, for the period July 1, 2003, through June 30, 2004, at a monthly rental of \$107,687.50 (\$1,292,250 per year/\$17.23 per square foot) with option to renew on a year-to-year basis for 24 consecutive one-year periods. At the first option year, the rentable square footage will increase to 96,899 square feet with a total rent of \$1,669,570 for use of the Georgia Tech Regional Engineering Program ("GTREP") and the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") Economic Development Institute ("EDI").

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

Understandings: In June 1998, the Board charged GIT with developing an initiative to expand educational opportunities in engineering throughout the state. A principal component of this effort is GTREP, an educational initiative led by GIT designed to meet identified needs in areas deemed critical to the state, particularly as related to economic development. GTREP is centered in Southeast Georgia and offers undergraduate engineering degrees in collaboration with Armstrong Atlantic State University, Georgia Southern University, and Savannah State University.

GTREP is currently located at the Chatham Business Park in Savannah, and EDI is located at the Coastal Georgia Center in Savannah, but due to the expanding space needs and growing enrollment, GTREP does not have sufficient space to meet its mission.

In January 2002, the Board authorized a memorandum of understanding with the Savannah Economic Development Authority to construct a building for GTREP and to assist the Board in locating additional lease space. At the May 2002 Board meeting, President G. Wayne Clough updated the Board on the status of the GTREP program and its associated facility needs.

Operating expenses are estimated to be \$474,500 per year for janitorial services, utilities, insurance, maintenance/repairs, and security.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

4. Rental Agreement, Technology Engineering Center, Crossroads Business Park, Savannah, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

The Landlord has agreed to give the land and buildings to the Board of Regents after the expiration of the last renewal option.

5. Rental Agreement, 10 Huntington Drive, Athens, Gainesville College

Approved: The Board authorized the execution of a rental agreement between GMAC Mortgage Corporation, Landlord, and the Board of Regents, Tenant, for approximately 24,580 square feet located at Perimeter Shopping Center, 10 Huntington Drive, Athens, Georgia, for the period July 1, 2002, through June 30, 2003, at a monthly rental of \$18,271 (\$219,254 per year/\$8.92 per square foot) with options to renew on a year-to-year basis for five consecutive one-year periods with rent increasing no more than 3% per year for the use and benefit of Gainesville College (“GVC”).

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

Understandings: GVC has been utilizing facilities of Piedmont College in Athens, Georgia, for the Athens Instructional Site (the “Site”). These facilities are no longer available for the Site.

The Site served 218 students in fall 2001 and 304 in spring 2002. Current projections for fall 2002 estimate enrollment of 460 students. By fall 2005, it is projected that the Site will serve 1,000 students. The 24,580 square feet of space provided by the above-referenced rental agreement are necessary to accommodate the Site.

The property will include ample parking spaces. This space will be utilized for faculty offices, classrooms, a computer lab, informal student gathering space, admissions, records, and an advising, computing, testing, and tutoring center.

Operating expenses, including taxes, insurance, utilities, maintenance, repair, janitorial services, pest control, and common area maintenance, are estimated to cost \$120,824 per year.

This property will be rented until a permanent facility is obtained for the Site.

6. Appointment of Construction Management Firm, Macon State College

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

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

6. Appointment of Construction Management Firm, Macon State College (Continued)

Following a selection process for a construction management firm, the following recommendation was made:

Project No. BR-91-0201, “Addition to and Renovation of the Thomas School for Warner Robins Campus,” Macon State College

Project Description: This project will renovate the 21,000-gross-square-foot Thomas School, constructed circa 1946, and an additional 24,000 gross square feet of classrooms will be built. The buildings will be used for the expanding programs offered by Macon State College in Houston County and will include classrooms for natural sciences, math, and information technology; a multimedia classroom; a lecture hall; and student and faculty support spaces.

Total Project Cost	\$5,000,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$3,960,000

Number of construction management firms that applied for this commission: 8
Recommended firms in rank order:

- 1) Chris R. Sheridan Construction Company, Macon
- 2) Piedmont Construction Group, LLC, Macon
- 3) Gilbane Building Company, Atlanta

7. Appointment of Design/Build Firm, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board appointed the first-named design/build firm listed below for the identified major capital outlay project and authorize the execution of a contract with the identified firm at the stated cost shown. Should it not be possible to execute a contract with the top-ranked firm, staff will then attempt to execute a contract with the other listed firms in rank order.

Following a selection process for a design/build firm, the following recommendation was made:

Project No. J-23, “UGA cGMP Facility,” University of Georgia

Project Description: The “current” Good Manufacturing Practices (“cGMP”) facility on the campus of the University of Georgia will be approximately 22,850 gross square feet and will include warehouse and storage areas, central weigh, quarantine, sterile manufacturing, biotechnology fermentation, isolation, purification, analytical testing, and phase I, II, & III manufacturing areas for tablet manufacturing and packaging.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

7. Appointment of Design/Build Firm, University of Georgia (Continued)

Total project funding is \$10,000,000 cash appropriated from the legislature.

Total Project Cost	\$10,000,000
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$6,210,000

Number of design/build firms that applied for this commission: 12

Recommended design/build firms in rank order:

- 1) Lockwood Greene, Atlanta
- 2) Whiting-Turner, Atlanta
- 3) Fluor Daniel, Greenville

8. Ground Lease Agreement, Armstrong Atlantic State University

Approved: The Board declared approximately 7.13 acres of land located at Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”), Savannah, Georgia, no longer advantageously useful to AASU or other units of the University System but only to the extent and for the purpose of allowing this land to be leased for the benefit of AASU.

The Board also approved Educational Properties, Inc. as the developer/operator to provide Phase II student housing at AASU and authorized the execution of an amendment to the Phase I ground lease agreement and contracts with this firm covering approximately 7.13 acres of land located at AASU for a period not to exceed 35 years to provide student housing.

The Board also authorized an assignment of the ground lease, amendment to the ground lease, and related contracts from Educational Properties, Inc. to Armstrong Atlantic State University Educational Properties, Inc., as Lessee.

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

Modified: This item was modified prior to the Committee meeting as presented below in bold.

Understandings: In October 1997, the Board passed a new student housing policy that requires the preparation of a comprehensive plan for student housing together with a financial plan to support the housing program objectives.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

8. Ground Lease Agreement, Armstrong Atlantic State University (Continued)

In accordance with the Board's housing policy, in May 2002, President Thomas Z. Jones presented an update to the Board, as an information item, of the AASU housing plan presented by Robert Burnett in March 1998.

The AASU updated housing plan provides housing for 5% (Phase I), 10% (Phase II), and 15% (Phase III) of AASU's student body to serve a specific, targeted segment of the student body. The targeted students include health professions students, applied sciences students, international students, student athletes, and honor students. **The Board of Regents will not consider any request to initiate AASU's Phase III housing plan before 2009 unless AASU's head count enrollment exceeds 7,000.**

Phase I (288 beds) is under construction and will open in fall 2002. This current Phase II request is for approximately 300 beds and student service support space.

9. Authorization of Project, "Micro-Electronics Research Center (MIRC) Nanolithography Cleanroom Fit-Up," Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: That the Board authorize Project No. BR-30-0206, "Micro-Electronics Research Center (MIRC) Nanolithography Cleanroom Fit-Up", with a total project budget of \$1,750,000.

Understandings: The project involves construction of approximately 1,100 gross square feet of new laboratory and office space within an existing building.

The project is located on the Cleanroom Level (ground floor) of the Pettit Microelectronics Research Center (MIRC), 791 Atlantic Avenue, Georgia Institute of Technology. The existing space is presently occupied by the Scanning Electron Microscope Laboratory (room 31) and the Ion Laboratory (room 38). Both rooms will be renovated to house the new nanolithography cleanroom. No new building additions will be needed to accommodate the improvements to the mechanical, electrical, HVAC, and plumbing systems.

The cleanroom fit-up space will be used by the research faculty of the MIRC Nanolithography Project for development and testing of electronic devices and systems. The project will create a "class 10" cleanroom space to support wet chemistry, stepper, and vectorbeam areas for nanolithography research. The specialized environmental requirements for this project will require a cleanroom with chemically clean air.

The project has an estimated stated cost limitation of \$1,502,237 with a total project cost of \$1,750,000. The total cost of the project is being funded by Georgia Tech Research Corporation, Inc. (private) funds.

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

9. Authorization of Project, “Micro-Electronics Research Center (MIRC) Nanolithography Cleanroom Fit-Up,” Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Programming and design will be initiated within a design-build project delivery methodology with a construction start anticipated in November 2002. The staff in conjunction with the Georgia Institute of Technology will proceed with the architectural selection process.

10. Resolution, 2002C and 2002D General Obligation Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia

Approved: The Board adopt the Resolution prepared by the Revenue Division of the Department of Law covering the issuance of 2002C and 2002D General Obligation Bonds (“G. O. Bonds”) by the State of Georgia through the Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission for use in funding projects for the University System of Georgia. This item was added by unanimous consent as a walk-on item to the Committee's agenda.

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution to cover the sale of 2002C G. O. Bonds for the following projects:

I-93	Special Collections Library University of Georgia	\$240,000
	Equipment for the Yamacraw Building Georgia Institute of Technology	\$4,090,000
	Dublin Campus Middle Georgia College	\$500,000
	Continuing Education & Economic Development Center Dalton State College	\$100,000
	Performing and Visual Arts Center, Ph. 2 University of Georgia	\$200,000
	Various Projects Georgia Research Alliance	<u>\$7,745,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$12,875,000

COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

10. Resolution, 2002C and 2002D General Obligation Bond Issue, Georgia State Financing and Investment Commission, University System of Georgia (Continued)

The Revenue Division of the Office of the Attorney General has prepared on behalf of the Board of Regents a Resolution to cover the sale of 2002 D G. O. Bonds for the following projects:

	MRR at Various Facilities	\$31,075,000
I-87	Bartow Center, Ph. 1 Floyd College	\$18,180,000
J-15	River Regional Center Bainbridge College	\$4,925,000
J-27	Coverdell Building University of Georgia	\$1,400,000
	Cancer Research Center Medical College of Georgia	\$1,400,000
I-83	Central Chiller Plant System Upgrade Clayton College & State University	\$4,600,000
	Replace West Campus Electrical Distribution System State University of West Georgia	\$3,500,000
	Purchase and Improve Warner Robins Facility Fort Valley State University	\$4,690,000
	Renovation of Jackson Hall Georgia Southwestern State University	\$2,735,000
	Physical Plant Renovation and Annex Georgia Southwestern State University	\$1,765,000
	Renovation and Expansion of Thomas School Macon State College	\$5,000,000
	Renovation of Talmadge Dormitory Middle Georgia College	\$4,000,000
	Academic Building Georgia Military College	<u>\$13,430,000</u>
	TOTAL	\$96,700,000

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

On Tuesday, June 11, 2002 at 10:15 a.m., Chair Howell 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 Wooten, Vice Chair of the Committee, in Chair Hunt’s absence. Board members in attendance at this meeting in addition to Regents Howell and Wooten were Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Joe Frank Harris, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Elridge W. McMillan, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, and James D. Yancey.

Regent Wooten explained that the Committee would be hearing 11 presentations on projects to be considered for addition to the major capital projects list. He then turned the floor over to the Chancellor.

Chancellor Meredith remarked that he was looking forward to seeing how the process worked himself. Although the Regents had a long day ahead of them, the Chancellor assured them that the staff had spent many long days coordinating these presentations, so that they could get the process to this point. The institutions worked from January through March defining and then refining their proposals, and then, the University System Office staff helped get them ready for Board consideration. The projects were tested against overall Systemwide needs and how they measured up against the Board’s principles for capital resources allocation as well as the new strategic plan. At this meeting, the Regents would be considering major capital projects only, those which will cost more than \$5 million. There were a total of 26 major capital projects valued at over \$500 million submitted to the University System Office for consideration in this year’s funding cycle. There were 40 additional major capital projects valued at over \$1 billion submitted as part of the five-year outlook planning process. There were also 108 minor capital projects with a value of \$400 million. A lot of behind-the-scenes work had taken place to get to this point. The process was difficult because there were many meritorious projects. The staff were bringing forward a slate of 11 projects for Board consideration. Each president would have a brief period to make his or her presentation, followed by a period of questions and answers. Following all of the presentations, the Regents would individually rank each project based on need and merit. Thereafter, the rankings would be calculated, and the resulting top projects will be added to the bottom of the Regents’ five-year rolling capital projects list. There are already 19 projects on the list. Like last year, the Regents would be using a computer-based voting and tabulation process. The Chancellor thanked the Interim Vice Chancellor for Facilities, George B. Wingblade; the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Design and Construction, Linda M. Daniels; and the Assistant Vice Chancellor for Real Properties, Peter J. Hickey, for their hard work in preparing for this meeting. He then called upon Mr. Wingblade to discuss related matters, including the current capital projects priorities list.

Mr. Wingblade noted that the existing 19 projects on the priorities list total approximately \$410 million, not including an outstanding request for equipment totaling about \$12 million. He said that the Board tries to keep the major capital projects priorities list at approximately \$500 million. Therefore, there is room to add approximately \$80 million to \$90 million to the bottom of the list

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

each year. The 11 projects to be presented at this meeting total approximately \$300 million. The total capital request, including both the major and minor capital requests, for this year was over \$730 million. The evaluation process the staff went through to narrow down to the level of presentations brought forward at this meeting was an enormous undertaking. One of the institutions with a project working its way up the list is the University of Georgia (“UGA”) Performing Arts and Visual Arts Complex for the School of Arts. UGA is proposing to add additional private funds of \$4 million to increase funding from \$8 million to \$12 million. Mr. Wingblade commended UGA for acquiring these private funds. Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”) is also on the priority list. Since this project will in all likelihood be funded for construction, he reminded the Regents that GPC will be adding a payback project of about \$1.1 million on the Regents’ annual budget request.

Each year, the staff also review the annual inflation rates. This year, in cooperation with consultants, the staff were recommending no increase for inflation because although labor costs have gone up, materials costs have gone down. Mr. Wingblade said that he hoped the Regents had the opportunity to review the briefing materials the staff had sent them the week before, as they included some background information on the process as well as details on all 11 projects. Each project included a chart that illustrated enrollment trends at each campus. He noted that the enrollment trends are shown in actual headcount and not full-time equivalence (“FTE”). Also in each briefing book, there was a green voting ballot. Each ballot has the 11 projects listed in alphabetical order. Each Regent would prioritize his or her priorities from 1 to 11, with number 1 being first choice. Once the ballots were cast, the staff would assist the Regents in voting using the computers. The computer software would provide the top rankings up to approximately \$100 million to keep the total of the list close to \$500 million. The process and the selection were very intense this year, Mr. Wingblade reiterated, and the staff considered every project carefully. With that in mind, he said, due diligence was conducted with significant credibility. Many issues were involved in evaluating campus needs and the budget formula to justify their needs and bring forth recommendations. Mr. Wingblade complimented his staff for their very hard work in making this happen. He then asked whether the Regents had any questions before the presentations began.

Regent White noted that although the enrollment figures were actually headcount figures, the resident instruction ratio for each campus was determined by gross square feet divided by FTE. He suggested that next year, the staff use consistent measures to make this information clearer.

Vice Chair Wooten noted that the FTE were also presented in the Regents’ information. So, the data were there, but the Regents would have to interpolate it themselves.

Regent White thanked him for the clarification.

Vice Chair Wooten thanked the Chancellor and the staff for this tremendous undertaking and their intense scrutiny of the proposed projects. He asked that each of the presidents keep their presentations to ten minutes so there would be time for an additional ten minutes of questions from the Regents.

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

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

<u>President</u>	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Project (Cost)</u>
Thomas Z. Jones	Armstrong Atlantic State University (“AASU”)	Academic and Classroom Building (\$22.5 million)
Peter J. Sireno	Darton College (“DC”)	Humanities, Learning Support, Classroom Building (\$16.5 million)
John Randolph Pierce	Floyd College (“FC”)	Bartow Center, Phase II (\$28.4 million)
Martha T. Nesbitt	Gainesville College (“GVC”)	Classroom Building (\$22.1 million)
G. Wayne Clough	Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”)	Advanced Cleanroom Building (\$45 million, plus \$35 million in private funds)
Jacquelyn M. Belcher	Georgia Perimeter College (“GPC”)	Health Sciences Building - Decatur Campus (\$20.35 million)
Carl V. Patton	Georgia State University (“GSU”)	Humanities Building
Betty L. Siegel	Kennesaw State University (“KSU”)	Academic Computing Commons
Edward D. Jackson, Jr.	South Georgia College (“SGC”)	Stubbs and Davis Hall Renovation
Lisa A. Rossbacher	Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”)	Mathematics and Engineering Building
Michael F. Adams	University of Georgia (“UGA”)	Special Collections Library

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:

Armstrong Atlantic State University

Regent Carter asked President Jones how he would keep the citation from the accrediting agency current in the years it takes the project to progress up the major capital projects list.

President Jones responded that AASU would have to submit a report to the accrediting agency this fall to address how the university is going to deal with the recommendations it received from the agency. He noted that AASU only received nine recommendations, which is excellent. AASU will be able to show the accrediting agency that the Board of Regents recognizes the facilities need as a serious issue and has placed the project on the major capital projects list for future development. That will not solve the problem, but it will certainly address the issue of good faith intent by the university and the University System of Georgia. The agency knows that many problems are not solvable immediately, but a failure to respond in a positive way would be very detrimental to AASU. Most assuredly, the university will have to provide annual reports to the agency on some of its recommendations, particularly the facilities recommendation. Still, a good faith gesture by the Board would speak volumes to its intent.

Regent Howell asked President Jones whether this was the same project that was presented the previous year.

President Jones responded that it was.

Regent Howell asked Mr. Wingblade how the Board goes about having a project built on the fast-track program.

Mr. Wingblade said that once the project is approved, the fast track is the type of process the project goes through from the design, bid, and build process to shorten the process. Once a project is on the five-year major capital projects list, the period after it is approved can be shortened if it is put on the fast track.

Regent Howell asked how it is decided which projects are done by the Georgia State Finance and Investment Commission (“GSFIC”) and which are done on the fast track.

The Senior Vice Chancellor for External Affairs and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, responded that any project constructed with state bonds is a GSFIC project. The Board must go to the GSFIC and ask permission for a fast-track project, but if it is using state bonds, the Board must have GSFIC permission. Mr. Daniel explained that the Board must petition for a fast-track approach, but the GSFIC has been granting them to date.

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

Regent Coles asked whether it would make sense, because of the critical need, to consider leasing space until this project could be built.

President Jones responded that AASU may very well have to do so out of necessity after the coming year, because the enrollment projections for fall 2002 are well over 6,000 and the campus is only designed to accommodate about 4,000 students.

Vice Chair Wooten noted that this project addresses existing need and the core academic mission of the institution.

President Jones agreed that this is the core value of the university. There is an existing need, and even with the building, the gap between the square footage and enrollment will still be greater by 2008, but without this facility, it will be untenable.

Darton College

Regent Carter asked President Sireno whether the facility would have up-to-date information technologies built into it.

President Sireno responded that the entire building would be prepared for today’s technologies and projected future technologies. In fact, over \$500,000 of the total cost of the building was set aside for the requirements established by the Georgia Technology Authority.

Regent Cleveland asked whether there are plans to use leased or other space until this project is built.

President Sireno replied that DC is looking at leasing space contiguous to the campus and is also looking into making conference rooms into small classrooms to open up larger classrooms for additional students.

Floyd College

Regent White noted that the headcount at FC is approximately 2,400.

President Pierce responded that it is closer to 2,500.

Regent White noted that there are four different locations for FC and asked President Pierce to break down the enrollment at each of the locations.

President Pierce responded that more than half of the students are at the Rome campus, and slightly less than half (1,159) are at the two Bartow locations, including both the Cartersville location and the North Metro Technical College site. There are a couple of hundred students at the Bremen location.

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

Regent Coles asked whether there are problems with the center being located as far away from campus as it is.

President Pierce responded that the center will actually be a full-service campus of the institution, and as that campus grows, it will have its own staff. It has not thus far been a problem. Faculty come to FC with the understanding that they will teach at all locations. It is part of the culture of the institution.

Gainesville College

There were no comments or questions.

Georgia Institute of Technology

Regent McMillan asked how much of the required funding for the project would go on the major capital projects list.

President Clough responded that it would be \$45 million.

Regent McMillan asked whether there has ever been any thought given to special projects of this nature going through another kind of process in the legislature for funding, because obviously, for GIT, UGA, and the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) in particular, there are all kinds of worthy projects that need to be done, but to do any one of them is very costly. There should be another process for funding these types of projects, he said.

Regent Harris responded that the Pettit Microelectronics Research Center (“MIRC”) was one project that was funded through the Georgia Research Consortium, which evolved into the Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”). Other projects were also part of separate appropriations administered through the Board of Regents. So, this has happened with certain other projects. He did not know how this was being handled by the current administration.

Regent Coles said that if the Board was able to approach appropriate projects in this way, it could potentially accelerate the construction process, which would be essential for a project such as this.

President Clough remarked that this was a very good question and perhaps should be discussed with the Governor and the leadership of the legislature because this type of project should not be competing with the standard classroom project. This project presents an economic development and industry interaction opportunity. While it is a huge educational resource, it has many other dimensions, including national visibility for the university and the state, and it is a reasonable question to ask.

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

Chancellor Meredith agreed that this project was more about economic development than a daily academic venture on campus. He asked the Senior Vice Chancellor for External Affairs and Facilities, Thomas E. Daniel, whether there is any other funding avenues for such projects.

Mr. Daniel responded that Regent Harris was correct that the Georgia Research Consortium led to the development of the GRA. When Governor Barnes was first elected, he had the idea of the Yamacraw Building, a facility which has tremendously benefitted the University System. Now, Governor Barnes' cancer initiative will build a facility at MCG. Those kinds of examples are the ones that are part of the Governor's agenda. There is no mechanism to go to the Governor to put this project before him. So, the Board must use the only mechanism available to it. This project was selected to be brought before the Board for consideration. Considering the current economy, Mr. Daniel suggested that for the immediate future, the Board should stick with its available options.

Regent Carter asked how this project ties with the Governor's technology and cancer initiatives.

President Clough responded that the project ties into all of the missions of the GRA. It clearly is tied to Yamacraw and its legacy. It is also tied to the cancer initiative because this kind of facility will be essential to the development of designer drugs for people with specific DNA types and the research goals of the initiative.

Regent Coles asked whether there is tobacco settlement funding available to help build this project.

Vice Chair Wooten asked whether such funding was already included in the \$35 million of private funding on the table.

President Clough responded that it was not. The private funding was obtained from discussions with the companies that would use the facility and user fees from other institutions that want to use the facility. So, there are no state funds included in the proposal other than the \$45 million being requested.

Regent Howell said that it looked as though the Board has only one funding choice at this time. He wondered how the Board funded building the first cleanroom.

Mr. Daniel responded that the Georgia Research Consortium funded four projects through a public-private partnership. Approximately \$12 million to \$14 million state dollars were invested in the MIRC, and users and corporations brought private resources to the table. That was the model used to build the center, and it was the model envisioned for the biosciences building at UGA. There were two other projects funded by the consortium, one at Emory University and one at Southern Technical Institute.

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

President Clough noted that the GRA has not been building facilities in the past several years, though it has funded some renovation projects.

Regent Howell noted that at the time, there was not an established capital projects funding process.

Mr. Daniel noted that the GRA situation actually led to the development of this process, which has been working extremely well. During the Miller administration, the University System received over \$1 billion for capital projects, and it is well on the way to breaking that record under Governor Barnes.

Regent Leebern noted that this project will really benefit all of the System. The GRA has attracted distinguished scholars and researchers over the years.

Regent Howell asked what this facility will do for GIT as an institution.

President Clough explained that if GIT does not get the facility, industry will go to other institutions with such facilities and top faculty may also be lured away. GIT has talked with its industry partners, faculty, and the GRA, and they all said that this is the most important thing GIT could do. The reason is that GIT already has excellence in this area. Yamacraw was designed to build on this excellence. If the facility is built, GIT will maintain this preeminence. In addition, there are other needs that have grown up around this area. This facility will allow not only GIT to be successful, but also other institutions that will need access to special facilities. It is preferable to have a single facility than to have duplicative cleanroom facilities all over campus with lots of technical support necessary for each of them. GIT felt that it would be wiser to concentrate the cleanroom facility and get superb technical support for internal and external users. GIT would really run the risk of falling behind in some crucial areas without this facility.

Regent Yancey said that he was on an economic development project team last year with President Clough and that he was certain this cleanroom would be an asset to economic development in the State of Georgia. Georgia was very close to attracting a semiconductor company last year, and GIT was instrumental in getting that close. This kind of facility would put Georgia ahead of other states in the Southeast in the area of technology.

President Clough added that one of the perks of attracting the semiconductor company would have been that it would have helped GIT build a facility like this. The company was developing an entirely new generation of facilities and felt GIT was falling behind in facilities.

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

President Clough responded that what was proposed was based on a reasonable financial pro forma that requires a certain amount of state funds to start the project. It is difficult to ask industry for \$80 million. There is a certain amount of state funding required to make the pro forma work.

Regent Cleveland asked whether there is anything the Board can do to approve it another way.

Regent Coles responded that it is very difficult for the Board to get payback projects because they still require the same bond issuances as other projects. That is why payback projects are generally done privately and separately so that the institution basically becomes a tenant of the facility.

Vice Chair Wooten stated that the income stream on this project would be more tenuous than something like a parking deck that would earn an anticipated amount each year.

President Clough agreed that GIT had given its best estimate of the gifts and income it can raise in the amount of \$35 million. There will have to be an advanced funding of the \$35 million because it is a flow over time. It would be great to have payback funds, but the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. will have to help get this project underway.

Vice Chair Wooten said that the Board appreciated the \$35 million commitment the foundation is willing to make.

Regent Howell asked whether the Board would be the first in the country to approve such a project if it approved the project for the list.

President Clough deferred to Senior Vice President Robert K. Thompson.

Dr. Thompson responded that some projects are already funded and under construction and others are in the planning stages.

President Clough stated that GIT would be the first in the Southeast.

Georgia Perimeter College

Regent Cleveland asked what would be the expected increase in enrollment that this expansion would be able to handle in the Nursing and Dental Hygiene programs.

President Belcher responded that the college would be able to double the enrollments. In the upcoming year, there will be approximately 200 students in these programs. The only thing that may interfere with doubling this enrollment would be clinical space. It would not be for want of facilities if the health science building is approved.

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

Chancellor Meredith noted that the programs are only accepting approximately 6% of the applicants.

President Belcher agreed and noted that applications have gone up 65% overall in Nursing.

Georgia State University

Regent Wooten asked how many square feet are in Sparks Hall, which is slated to be demolished.

President Patton responded that Sparks Hall, which serves several different uses, in terms of usable space is about 100,000 square feet, but it is totally inadequate space built in the 1950s.

Kennesaw State University

Regent Carter asked whether this facility would have state-of-the-art information technology.

President Siegel called upon KSU’s Chief Information Officer, Randy C. Hinds, who responded that it would certainly be state-of-the-art.

Vice Chair Wooten asked about the chart President Siegel distributed comparing KSU and the University System of Georgia. He asked whether the System figures were gross square footage or only resident instruction space.

President Siegel called upon her Associate Vice President for Facilities, Lee Richey, who responded that the figures were gross square footage.

Ms. Daniels confirmed that to be the case. She explained that the gross square footage at KSU and the resident instruction space are almost the same number because the new dorms are not yet completed. In the University System as a whole, those figures are very different.

South Georgia College

Regent Coles asked whether the proposed project could not have been broken into two projects so that one or both of them could have made the minor capital projects list.

President Jackson responded that the Stubbs Hall project would have been over the \$5 million mark for the minors list. The Davis Hall project could have been proposed for the minors list, but because the buildings are so closely located, this seemed to be a more effective way to do it. The total cost will be \$7.4 million.

Regent Wooten asked whether SGC has ever had a major capital project.

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

President Jackson responded that SGC had its last brand new building in 1976, and he did not believe that in the history of SGC there has ever been a facility built that cost \$5 million.

Southern Polytechnic State University

Regent Coles asked what the current enrollment is.

President Rossbacher responded that current enrollment is approximately 3,600 students.

Regent Coles asked whether the enrollment had increased slightly from last year.

President Rossbacher replied that it had. She said that enrollment has increased dramatically this summer and that she anticipates it to increase another 5% in the fall.

Regent Coles asked when President Rossbacher anticipates the college will return to its highest enrollment of about 3,900.

President Rossbacher responded that, realistically, it would be about three more years.

Vice Chair Wooten asked how important the facilities are to the attraction of students to SPSU.

President Rossbacher replied that she hears that a lot from students and parents who are visiting campus. She tries to show them the newer buildings when she gives tours, and they typically ask if they will have classes in those buildings, and the answer, depending on their major, is probably not many.

University of Georgia

Regent Shelnut asked where the special collection items are housed now.

President Adams responded that they are housed in several places. Most of them are kept in the Hargrett Rare Book and Manuscript Library on the third floor of the Main Library, but they are not in the kind of climate-controlled environment they need. Some of the Peabody collection is in the Grady College of Journalism and Mass Communication, and the political memorabilia is housed in several locations, including a warehouse.

Regent Coles asked whether this facility would be open to the public.

President Adams assured him that it would.

Regent Coles asked whether the facility would be available to store the archives of other universities.

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

President Adams responded that he did not know whether UGA had accepted the responsibility of storage for other universities’ archives. UGA is the repository for the political papers of the state, and UGA provides access to its collection to every researcher in the University System.

Regent Leebern said that this project is for the benefit of the entire System and all of Georgia.

President Adams responded that as the flagship university and the oldest institution in the System, UGA has a number of major statewide responsibilities, of which this is but one. Of course, UGA also has the largest number of researchers who work with the materials. UGA produces the overwhelming majority of graduate degrees in Public Administration, Political Science, History, and related fields in the state, particularly at the doctoral level.

* * * * *

After all of the presentations and discussions of the presentations were concluded, Vice Chair Wooten called for a brief break, which would give the staff time to prepare for the voting process.

After the break, Vice Chair Wooten called upon Mr. Daniel to explain how the voting process would work. After Mr. Daniel, Chancellor Meredith would give the Regents some instruction on the guiding principles they should consider as they place their votes.

Mr. Daniel thanked the Regents for their patience throughout the capital projects selection process and thanked the presidents for their outstanding presentations. He explained that the Regents should rank the 11 projects numbers 1 through 11, with number 1 being the greatest priority and most deserving of being added to the capital projects priority list. Once each Regent had marked his or her ballot, one of five staff members would come to him or her to assist in putting these votes into the computer system. Mr. Daniel called on the Director of System Office Technology Support, Matthew Kuchinski, who had created the tabulation program, to explain the process to the Regents.

Mr. Kuchinski explained that each Regent would submit his or her votes via a laptop computer with the assistance of a staff member. Once all the votes were submitted on behalf of all of the Regents, the computer program would then tally up the votes and prioritize them in the order of 1 through 11, at which time the order of priority would be presented to the Board.

Chancellor Meredith noted that the principles for capital resources allocation were included in the Regents’ notebooks. He stressed the fifth principle, which is as follows:

In setting priorities for the use of state resources, highest weight will be given first to instructional facilities (e.g., classrooms, laboratories) followed by academic support facilities (e.g., libraries, computer centers), student support facilities (e.g., housing, recreational and student activities centers), and finally administrative facilities and infrastructure needs.

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

Critical infrastructure needs may take precedence in some cases, especially where cost-effectiveness is a major rationale. Special consideration for the role of the state support for research facilities will be evaluated in light of the unique research mission of certain institutions.

With that, the Regents began the voting process. After the votes were electronically tabulated, Chancellor Meredith read aloud the projects that were added to the five-year rolling major capital projects list at the numbers indicated:

	<u>Institution</u>	<u>Project</u>	<u>Requested State Funds</u>	<u>Cumulative Costs</u>
20.	Armstrong Atlantic State University	Academic and Classroom Building	\$22.5 million	\$432,562,000
21.	University of Georgia	Special Collections Library	\$24 million	\$456,562,000
22.	Georgia Institute of Technology	Advanced Clean-room Building	\$45 million	\$501,562,000

After the results were presented, Vice Chair Wooten thanked all of the presidents and their staff, as well as Mr. Wingblade, Mr. Daniel, and the University System Office staff for their superb job in this process. He then called for a motion to approve the placement of these projects on the list. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the placement of these projects on the five-year rolling major capital projects priorities list.

Vice Chair Wooten then asked for a motion to recess the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities as a Committee of the Whole. Motion properly made and seconded, the meeting was adjourned into its regular session.

Board Chair Howell thanked Regent Wooten for chairing the Committee as a Whole for this process. He reminded the Regents that there would be a function that evening in honor of Chancellor and Mrs. Meredith at 7:00 p.m. at the Four Seasons Hotel ballroom. Also, Wednesday, June 12, would be a historic day for the Board of Regents and the University System of Georgia because of the inauguration of the tenth Chancellor, Thomas C. Meredith. As a token of the event, Chair Howell presented to the Chancellor a gift of cufflinks of the University System of Georgia seal, and for Mrs. Meredith, pendant of the seal. At approximately 4:00 p.m., Chair Howell recessed the Board until 9:00 a.m. Wednesday, June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, at approximately 9:00 a.m. in room 6041, the Training Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Allene H. Magill, Vice Chair Martin W. NeSmith, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, Elridge W. McMillan, and Wanda Yancey Rodwell. Chair Magill reported to the Board that the Committee had reviewed 23 items, 22 of which required action. Additionally, 557 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. Renaming of the Existing Master of Science in Management to the Master of Business Administration, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to rename the existing Master of Science in Management to the Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”), effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: GIT began awarding the Master of Science in Industrial Management degree in 1945. To reflect the content of the degree, its name was revised in 1985 to the Master of Science in Management. The institution is now requesting approval to change the name of the degree to the Master of Business Administration. Although in the past it was important to differentiate GIT’s programs with names that implied the engineering focus of the institution, the M.B.A. is the industry standard among graduate business programs, including those at other engineering universities.

The Master of Science in Management program required additional explanation when marketing the degree to prospective students and employers. In turn, students were disadvantaged when they had an additional hurdle, that of degree recognition, to overcome in gaining employment. The DuPree College of Management polled visiting recruiters (e.g., United Parcel Service, Inc., Southern Company, Barclays, and Infosys Technologies) concerning the degree name and was informed that a revised name would enhance the college’s ability to attract campus employers and improve student options. Currently enrolled students voted for the name change by a margin of 125 to 5. In meetings held in four cities with over 75 recent alumni and at the spring meeting of the Corporate Advisory Board, the majority of persons representing both groups supported the renaming.

GIT’s program will differ from existing programs because it is targeted toward engineering students and will only enroll full-time matriculants. The institution has steadily shaped its curriculum for preparing leaders for technological environments. In April 2001, the existing program received reaccreditation from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, along with a recommendation for the industry standard renaming of the degree.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

2. Renaming of the Existing Master of Science With a Major in Administration to the Master of Business Administration, Georgia Southwestern State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael L. Hanes that Georgia Southwestern State University (“GSSU”) be authorized to rename the existing Master of Science with a major in Administration to the Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”), effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: GSSU proposed the renaming of its Master of Science with a major in Administration to the Master of Business Administration. The proposal was a response to requests from the business community in Southwest Georgia and from current and interested graduate students. According to GSSU, an M.B.A. program is more appealing to the business community and is a more widely accepted graduate program in business than the Master of Science with a major in Administration. The School of Business Administration is currently in candidacy status for accreditation by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business. Currently, there are 62 students enrolled in the Master of Science with a major in Administration program. The enhanced, new M.B.A. program is intended to serve the same sample population at the beginning of its implementation. Enrollment is projected to increase significantly by attracting regional students. The program will be restructured and redesigned to be more attractive to prospective graduate students and potential employers of graduates.

3. Renaming of the Existing Master of Science With a Major in Management (Formerly Management of Technology) to the Master of Business Administration, Southern Polytechnic State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Lisa A. Rossbacher that Southern Polytechnic State University (“SPSU”) be authorized to rename the existing Master of Science with a major in Management (formerly Management of Technology) to the Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”), effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: The School of Engineering Technology and Management at SPSU proposed a renaming of the Master of Science with a major in Management to the Master of Business Administration. The M.B.A. curriculum will consist of graduate courses that lead to tracks in marketing, operations management, management of technology, and management information systems.

The Atlanta metropolitan area has experienced tremendous growth over the past ten years. The population of the area is almost the equivalent of the rest of the state. Increasingly, educational preparation occurs at higher levels in the immediate metropolitan area. Simultaneously, significant developments have occurred in aerospace, information technology, medical, and financial services. Students at SPSU and other regional organizations in industries ranging from banking to hospitality have expressed a strong interest in having a permanent M.B.A. program at SPSU. The existing

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

3. Renaming of the Existing Master of Science With a Major in Management (Formerly Management of Technology) to the Master of Business Administration, Southern Polytechnic State University (Continued)

major in Management has approximately 200 declared majors, and it is anticipated that interest will rise with the authorization for substantive modification and renaming. The program will be targeted toward recruiting international students. Based on an internal SPSU survey, it was found that students and employers recognize the M.B.A. more readily than the Master of Science with a major in Management.

The overall market for management education in Atlanta is growing among public, private, and proprietary institutions. The M.B.A. degree at SPSU will serve a market of students who are attracted to the institution for its engineering technology environment. The engineering technology market niche affords SPSU an opportunity to provide management training to engineering technologists. The program's name change will enhance SPSU's degree programs for potential students.

The existing management program is nationally accredited by the Association of Collegiate Business Schools and Programs. SPSU plans to seek accreditation from the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business and will apply for precandidacy in the accreditation review process.

4. Establishment of the Master of Industrial Design, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") be authorized to establish the Master of Industrial Design, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: As defined by the Industrial Design Society of America, "Industrial design is the professional service of creating and developing concepts and specifications that optimize the function, value, and appearance of products and systems for the mutual benefit of both user and manufacturer." Industries that employ industrial designers include, but are not limited to, automotive, computer, medical, assistive, and software technologies. The intent of the degree is to create a professional master's program with specific content areas that support the industrial design profession in industries residing within and outside of the state.

Need: Bureau of Labor Statistics findings project a growth rate of 11.5% for the industrial design profession through the year 2005. A 1997 *Time* magazine article entitled "Where the Jobs Are" predicted that 76,000 new product design employment opportunities will develop by the year 2005. In 1998, the Industrial Design Society of America commissioned Drexel University to conduct a survey to determine the outlook for industrial design employment in the country. The findings indicate "the total number of employed industrial designers increased by 47% between 1993 and

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

4. Establishment of the Master of Industrial Design, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

1998. The percentage of designers hired with graduate degrees over the past five years has increased by 56%.” The 1997 U.S. Economic Census Bureau listed 36 industrial design service firms in Georgia; 27 of those firms are located in the Atlanta area. In addition to local design service firms, design departments are resident in such companies as The Coca-Cola Company, NCR, Philips, Lucent Technologies, Siemens, IBM, and Motorola.

Objectives: The specific objective of the program is to facilitate student learning of design activities at an advanced level; to incorporate aesthetic, ethical, social, ergonomic, and environmental sustainability values in formulating industrial design approaches; and to prepare students for professional practice.

Curriculum: The 48-semester-hour curriculum will require a degree-hour waiver due to the graduate studios and design courses that form the core of the program.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates new enrollments of 20, 40, and 40 during the first three years of the program. All projected enrollments will be new to the institution.

Funding: The institution will reallocate resources to implement the program.

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

5. Establishment of the Master of Science in Prosthetics and Orthotics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish the Master of Science in Prosthetics and Orthotics, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: The field of prosthetics and orthotics encompasses all aspects related to devices that replace lost limbs or augment musculoskeletal structures. Prosthetics involves the study of the artificial replacement of body parts. Orthotics is concerned with the design of artificial replacements and their custom fitting to accommodate patient needs and simultaneously promote well-being. The design and manufacture of artificial limbs and braces, the clinical fitting of these devices to patients, and the management of patient care facilities require a complex and multidisciplinary set of skills. Patient care in prosthetics and orthotics in the United States is conducted by certified prosthetists and orthotists. The proposed Master of Science in Prosthetics and Orthotics, one of the first such

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

5. Establishment of the Master of Science in Prosthetics and Orthotics, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

programs in the country, would prepare students to receive professional certification in prosthetics and orthotics while obtaining a thorough knowledge of the growing complexities in the field. Concurrent with the proposed new degree is a request to establish a School of Applied Physiology. (See Item 12, page 40.)

Need: A 1996 study prepared by the National Commission on Orthotic and Prosthetic Education highlighted data concerning the future demand for individuals in this field. The report sites “a projected 25% increase in total number of persons with paralysis, deformity, or orthopedic impairment by 2020; a projected 47% increase in total number of persons with an amputation by 2020; and the inability of adequate numbers of clinicians to serve a population where a projected 25% of patients require clinical services from qualified practitioners.”

Objectives and Curriculum: The main objective of the two-year program is to provide students with the theoretical and practical understanding as well as clinical training they need to become leaders in the prosthetics and orthotics industry. Students will be prepared for careers in professional practice, device design and manufacture, and academe. The 48-semester-hour curriculum requires a degree-hour waiver because of the clinically intensive context of the program. At least 27 semester hours of clinical instruction are required. Courses taken in the program include Biomechanics and Kinesiology, Medical Imaging Systems, Gait Analysis, and Clinical Pathology.

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

Funding: The institution will reallocate resources to implement the program.

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

6. Establishment of the Existing R.N. to Master of Nursing as an External Degree at Columbus State University, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the existing R. N. to Master of Nursing (“M.N.”) as an external degree at Columbus State University (“CSU”), effective June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

6. Establishment of the Existing R.N. to Master of Nursing as an External Degree at Columbus State University, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

Abstract: In response to the request to provide nurses in West Georgia an opportunity to complete a master's level nursing degree, during fall 1999, MCG offered nursing programs on the campus of CSU. In addition, a satellite campus was created to establish a School of Nursing at CSU. The collaboration between MCG and CSU concerning the M.N. was initially established in January 1999 with the approval of the major in Family Nurse Practitioner via Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System ("GSAMS") delivery. MCG offers four majors under the M.N. degree: Nursing Anesthesia, Family Nurse Practitioner, Pediatric Nurse Practitioner, and Neonatal Nurse Practitioner. A collaborative arrangement was developed between MCG and CSU so that students would be provided access to the resources of the host institution, such as the library, student activities, and student services. Based on prior existing arrangements and the request to meet specific regional needs, MCG requested approval to again offer its M.N. program on the campus of CSU. The curriculum will be equivalent to the existing R.N. to M.N. program at MCG.

In the spirit of collaboration, MCG will offer its R.N. to M.N. program externally on the campus and through distance technologies to students located at CSU. MCG and CSU will complete a memorandum of understanding detailing the operational aspects of this collaboration.

7. Establishment of the Existing R.N. to Bachelor of Science in Nursing as an External Degree at Columbus State University, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") be authorized to establish the existing R.N. to Bachelor of Science in Nursing ("B.S.N.") as an external degree at Columbus State University ("CSU"), effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: In response to the request to provide nurses in West Georgia an opportunity to complete a baccalaureate nursing degree, during fall 1999, MCG offered nursing programs on the campus of CSU. A collaborative arrangement was developed between MCG and CSU so that students would be provided access to the resources of the host institution, such as the library, student activities, and student services. Due to prior existing arrangements and the request to meet specific regional needs, MCG requested approval to again offer its R.N. to B.S.N. program on the campus of CSU.

An interest survey completed with several hospitals in the Columbus area indicated that at least 42 nurses were very interested in enrolling in a technology-assisted R.N. to B.S.N. program. The curriculum will be equivalent to the existing R.N. to B.S.N. program at MCG. The curriculum of study requires 120 semester hours of course work.

In the spirit of collaboration, MCG will offer its R.N. to B.S.N. program externally on the campus and through distance technologies to students located at CSU. MCG and CSU will complete a memorandum of understanding detailing the operational aspects of this collaboration.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

8. Establishment of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Nursing as an External Degree at Gwinnett University Center, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the existing Bachelor of Science in Nursing (“B.S.N.”) as an external degree at Gwinnett University Center (“GUC”), effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: In May 2001, the State of Georgia Health Strategies Council released a report entitled Code Blue: Workforce in Crisis. The report documents that there is an insufficient number of nurses in the current Georgia workforce. The report defined the shortage as a 13% average vacancy rate in hospitals and nursing homes with a higher (19%) vacancy rate reported for the Atlanta area. As the health sciences university of the University System, MCG seeks to meet the educational needs of the state in the area of nursing.

The MCG School of Nursing receives applications from various geographic locations within the state. As of January 2002, over 250 applications were received for the B.S.N. program. Of those, approximately one-third of the applicants listed Gwinnett County or an adjacent county as their permanent address. MCG’s School of Nursing consistently has twice as many students desiring to attend the MCG program at Athens than can be accepted. MCG projects that students who are not accepted to the Athens campus will elect to attend a program offered at GUC.

The admission requirements for the external degree program will be identical to the admission criteria for the existing “two plus two” B.S.N. at MCG. In addition to traditional classroom instruction, upper-division courses will be taught via distance education technologies, including Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) from Athens or Augusta, WebCT™, Internet, and other online opportunities. Each student will have access to faculty based on the Augusta and Athens campuses and to the associate dean for academic programs.

In the spirit of collaboration, MCG will offer its B.S.N. program externally on the campus and through distance technologies to students located at GUC. MCG and GUC will complete a memorandum of understanding detailing the operational aspects of this collaboration.

9. Establishment of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences as an External Degree at Gwinnett University Center, Medical College of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Daniel W. Rahn that the Medical College of Georgia (“MCG”) be authorized to establish the existing Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences as an external degree at Gwinnett University Center (“GUC”), effective June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

9. Establishment of the Existing Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences as an External Degree at Gwinnett University Center, Medical College of Georgia (Continued)

Abstract: As the health sciences university of the University System, MCG seeks to meet the educational needs of the state in the area of radiologic sciences. MCG recognizes that as technologist shortages increase, the responsibilities of active practitioners seemingly increase. An institutional needs assessment survey was conducted in various sites around the state including the cities of Augusta, Columbus, Athens, Macon, Milledgeville, and Rome. In addition, an Internet survey was conducted, and the institution received 148 responses. Of the completed surveys, 70% of the respondents reported they would complete their baccalaureate degree if it was delivered over the Internet, and 26% of the respondents said they would be interested in a continuing education program if delivered in a similar format.

The Department of Radiologic Sciences at MCG requests approval to implement a distance learning curriculum based on a multiple technology or blended delivery platform. The request is twofold. First, instead of relying on Georgia Statewide Academic and Medical System (“GSAMS”) as a delivery platform, MCG proposes to incorporate Internet-deliverable WebCT™, videotape, and CD-ROM as equally viable delivery platforms, beginning fall semester 2002. Second, MCG proposes to make this blended delivery concept possible for the Radiologic Science majors in addition to the associate to baccalaureate “bridge” program. A combination of online and classroom instruction will be provided at GUC. MCG offers the following four majors under the Bachelor of Science in Radiologic Sciences: Nuclear Medicine Technology, Medical Dosimetry, Diagnostic Medical Sonography, and Radiation Therapy Technology. The program offerings have the support of administrators at both institutions.

In the spirit of collaboration, MCG will offer the program externally on the campus and through distance technologies to students located at GUC. MCG and GUC will complete a memorandum of understanding detailing the operational aspects of this collaboration.

10. Establishment of the Associate of Science in Cardiovascular Technician, Darton College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Peter J. Sireno that Darton College (“DC”) be authorized to establish the Associate of Science in Cardiovascular Technician, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: DC proposed the establishment of the Associate of Science in Cardiovascular Technician to meet a societal need in Southwest Georgia. The program will provide a formal educational setting for those demanding opportunities in this allied health field. National data points such as the Bureau of Labor Statistics suggest that the number of cardiovascular technicians will increase 35% by 2010. Demographic trends confirm that as the population ages, there is an increase in heart disease, stroke, peripheral vascular disease, and the complications of diabetes mellitus and obesity. Cardiovascular

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

10. Establishment of the Associate of Science in Cardiovascular Technician, Darton College (Continued)

technicians are educated to intervene with clients' experiencing such illnesses by assisting with diagnostic procedures, performing therapeutic interventions, teaching clients, monitoring compliance levels, and promoting wellness.

Need: According to *Planning for Tomorrow*, the Georgia Department of Labor's industry and occupational outlook, the state's need for cardiovascular technicians is estimated to increase by 61% by 2006. In Southwest Georgia, there is an estimated increased need of 44% personnel in this allied health area.

Objectives: The primary objective of the program is to educate cardiovascular technicians who can assist with meeting the health needs of Southwest Georgians by working with physicians and surgeons in acute care facilities, outpatient areas, cardiac catheterization laboratories, stress testing, and physicians' offices and clinics.

Curriculum: The 71-semester-hour program is designed to meet the accreditation standards of the Joint Review Committee on Education for Cardiovascular Technicians. The program of study requires that students complete practicums and coursework in cardiology, pharmacology, and cardiovascular disease processes.

Projected Enrollment: The institution anticipates new enrollments of 16, 21, and 27 during the first three years of the program.

Funding: The institution has redirected resources to establish the program and has been approved for a Title III grant under the Strengthening Institutions Program. The program will be housed in the existing Nursing and Allied Health Divisions.

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

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

The administrative and academic appointments were reviewed by Committee Chair Joe Frank Harris and were approved by the Board. The full list of approved appointments is on file with the Office of Faculty Affairs in the Office of Academics and Fiscal Affairs.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

12. Modification to Organizational Structure With the Establishment of the School of Applied Physiology, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to modify its existing organizational structure with the establishment of the School of Applied Physiology, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: GIT’s Department of Health and Performance Sciences has made several changes in the past few years in its efforts to move from a service-oriented unit to one involved in the offering of academic programs. GIT proposed that the existing Department of Health and Performance Sciences be renamed and reconstituted as the School of Applied Physiology. The School of Applied Physiology’s focus is based on biomechanics, neural control, and systems muscle physiology. This is consistent with the institution’s mission, as outlined in its strategic plan.

Approximately ten years ago, during GIT’s reorganization, departmental faculty successfully lobbied to be included as a unit within the newly formed College of Sciences. Given this change in administrative structure, the existing department’s objective was to progress to a degree-granting academic unit. In that regard, GIT hired four new faculty, three since 1997. All of these faculty are dedicated to teaching, service, and research. They have moved into a newly renovated laboratory and administrative space in the Weber/SST Building, acquired significant increases in extramural funding and developed an emerging unit that contributes to the educational and research community through collaborations with faculty at Emory University, the University of Georgia, Georgia State University, and the Medical College of Georgia. Additionally, the existing department has completed staff reorganization to support the growing research and teaching demands relative to the proposed degree.

GIT’s request was part of the overall institutional plan to offer a Master of Prosthetics and Orthotics degree contingent upon Board of Regents approval. (See Item 5, pages 34 to 35.) Funding for the unit will come from a variety of sources, including the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and other agencies. No new state-allocated operating funds are required to establish the institutional unit.

13. Modification to Organizational Structure, Macon State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell that Macon State College (“MSC”) be authorized to modify its existing organizational structure, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: MSC requested Board approval for modifications to the institution’s organizational structure. These changes respond to recommendations made by the Southern Association of Colleges and Schools (“SACS”) during a regular reaffirmation visit conducted in February 2002. The realignments strengthen MSC’s administrative configuration in two areas: technology support services and student development.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

13. Modification to Organizational Structure, Macon State College (Continued)

MSC proposed that technology support services for both academic and administrative computing be consolidated under a director of technology services reporting directly to the president. This model charges a chief information officer with responsibility for this critical area and assigns clear authority to manage services, quality assurance, provisioning, planning, and budgeting. A current member of MSC's administration who has extensive experience in information technology management in both the public and private sectors is available to fill this position.

The visiting SACS team recommended that MSC identify an administrative unit responsible for the overall planning and implementation of student development functions and establish a position at a level commensurate with other major administrative areas within the institution. MSC proposed to bring student activities and organizations, professional counseling, career planning and placement, and health, wellness, and recreation under the direction of the dean of students and include this administrator as part of the president's cabinet.

14. Modification to Organizational Structure, Gainesville College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Martha T. Nesbitt that Gainesville College ("GVC") be authorized to revise its existing organizational structure to establish the position of Vice President for External Programs to head the GVC Athens and Forsyth sites, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: GVC requested approval to modify its existing organizational structure to establish the position of Vice President for External Programs to head the GVC Athens and Forsyth sites. With the growth in Athens, needs will arise to add various support services, and subsequently, a need exists for a full-time administrator to manage operations at both external sites. The vice president for external programs will coordinate activities associated with all aspects of the operation of GVC in Athens to include academic programs, business functions, student support services, and community relations. In addition, the responsibilities of the position will include management of the GVC presence in Forsyth. Management and control of academic areas reside with the vice president for academic affairs. The institution will absorb costs associated with this organizational change by transferring the incumbent who holds the position of Associate Vice President for Academic Affairs into the new position.

15. Revised Institutional Statutes, Dalton State College

Approved: The Board approved the request of President James A. Burran that Dalton State College ("DSC") be authorized to establish revised institutional statutes, effective June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

15. Revised Institutional Statutes, Dalton State College (Continued)

Abstract: The revision of the statutes reflects a thorough review and brings the statutes into line with current Board of Regents policies and procedures. The DSC statutes were last revised and approved by the Board of Regents in August 2001. At its April 2002 meeting, the Board of Regents approved a revision of DSC's administrative structure, essentially reducing the number of vice presidents from four to three. A change of this significance needs to be incorporated into the statutes. DSC is currently completing its Southern Association of Colleges and Schools self-study in preparation for a March 2003 reaffirmation visit.

As a result of several internal recommendations, DSC has incorporated the following changes into the statutes:

- Article I, Section C: The Organization section has been revised to include all of the chairs, directors, and coordinators that appear in the college's organizational chart.
- Article III, Section D: The Officers of General Administration section has been revised to depict three vice presidents instead of four, as approved by the Academic Council.
- Article IV: This article is new and depicts the job descriptions of the directors who respond to the president. This revision rectifies a self-study noncompliance item.
- Article VI, Section J: The organizational change, as approved by the Academic Council, in which the number of vice presidents was being reduced from four to three is reflected throughout.

The name of the Student Affairs Council has been changed to the Student Activities Council.

The name of the Enrollment Services Council has been changed to the Enrollment and Student Services Council.

The Committee on Faculty Evaluation Process and the Promotion and Tenure Review Committee have been replaced by a Faculty Evaluation Committee, as approved by the Academic Council.

16. Establishment of the Norman Giles/Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Molecular Genetics and Functional Genomics, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia ("UGA") be authorized to establish the Norman Giles/Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Molecular Genetics and Functional Genomics, effective June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

16. Establishment of the Norman Giles/Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Molecular Genetics and Functional Genomics, University of Georgia (Continued)

Abstract: The Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) has designated half of the endowment fund for the professorship. The University of Georgia Foundation, Inc. has designated \$375,000 in private funds for the endowed chair, and the University of Georgia Research Foundation, Inc. has designated an additional \$375,000 for this position. The foundation contributions total the \$750,000 match required for GRA funding. The position is important to both the GRA and UGA because it will enhance the institutional focus areas in genomics and the Biomedical Health Sciences initiative.

Biographical Sketch: Dr. Norman Giles was born in Oakland City, Georgia. He received his undergraduate degree from Emory University in 1937. Dr. Giles completed his graduate work at Harvard University and received a Doctorate in Cytogenetics studying under eminent geneticist Professor Karl Sax. Upon finishing postdoctoral studies, Dr. Giles accepted a position at Yale University as an instructor in the Botany Department. He was later appointed as the Eugene Higgins Professor of Genetics. Dr. Giles was elected a member of the National Academy of Sciences and a fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He served as President of the Genetics Society of America and of the American Society of Naturalists. Dr. Giles returned to UGA in 1972 as a Fuller E. Callaway Professor and later assisted in the creation of the Department of Genetics. Dr. Giles has been responsible for creating and promoting programs that have helped bring the field of genetics into everyday applications.

17. Termination of the Doctor of Education With a Major in Research Design, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to terminate the Doctor of Education with a major in Research Design, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to terminate the major in Research Design under the existing Doctor of Education degree because the program had experienced low enrollment and because a decision was made to discontinue the program concurrent with the conversion to the semester system. Currently, there are no students matriculating in the program. Termination of the program will have no adverse impact on the faculty or other programs. There are no plans to reinstate the major.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

18. Termination of the Master of Arts for Teachers With a Major in History, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to terminate the Master of Arts for Teachers with a major in History, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to terminate the major in History under the existing Master of Arts for Teachers degree because the program had experienced low enrollment and because a decision was made to discontinue the program concurrent with the conversion to the semester system. Currently, there are no students matriculating in the program. Termination of the program will have no adverse impact on the faculty or other programs. There are no plans to reinstate the major.

19. Establishment of the Department of Educational Administration and Policy, University of Georgia

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Michael F. Adams that the University of Georgia (“UGA”) be authorized to establish the Department of Educational Administration and Policy, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: UGA requested approval to establish the Department of Educational Administration and Policy in response to changing conditions both in terms of the expectations within the profession of educational leadership and in state and national educational environments, including efforts to reform educational leadership programs in Georgia. The department will be characterized by its focus on scholarship and its preparation of individuals to assume executive leadership positions in P-12 schools, faculty positions in higher education, and research and leadership roles in other agencies, such as state departments of education or legislative policy analysis teams. The department will create an environment to stimulate, foster, and support inquiry into the legal, economic, historical, philosophical, social, political, and international context of educational policy and practice. Staffing for the department will include interested faculty invited to join the department from other departments and individuals recruited nationally from available faculty lines. No new funding is requested for the establishment of this unit. Currently, three faculty members have expressed an interest in joining the proposed department. The College of Education is holding three vacant faculty lines against which it will recruit after the new department has been ratified by the Board. The department will foster an environment to engage in intellectual discourse and research in multi-disciplinary issues associated with educational policy and practice in diverse settings.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

20. Permanent Status of the Georgia WebMBA™ Program, Consortium Institutions: Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, Kennesaw State University, State University of West Georgia, and Valdosta State University

Approved: The Board approved the request of the Consortium — Georgia College & State University, Georgia Southern University, Kennesaw State University, State University of West Georgia, and Valdosta State University — to extend permanent status to the existing Master of Business Administration (“M.B.A.”) program, otherwise known as the Georgia WebMBA™, via a consorial arrangement using the Internet as the primary mode of delivery, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: The Consortium, a group that consists of five University System institutions that are accredited by the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, proposed a collaborative, exclusive Web-based M.B.A. program to reach disparate markets in Georgia. The Board approved the Georgia WebMBA™ at its April 2000 meeting with the understanding that advances in technology could provide new opportunities for educational institutions to serve markets that existed but were inaccessible using traditional delivery systems. Upon its ratification, it was decided that in academic year 2002, the pilot tuition rate, associated costs, and programmatic outcomes would be revisited to further determine the solvency of the program.

The request that the program move from pilot to permanent status was based on the following outcomes:

- The Georgia WebMBA™ program will graduate its first class in December 2002. The average retention rate of 90% over two cohorts reflects the success of the program. Enrollments are distributed across the five institutions with each admitting five to seven students. The program now serves two cohorts of 27 students each.
- The Georgia WebMBA™ program began its second cycle January 2002 and is recruiting a third cycle of students to begin August 2002. Curricular modifications will enable the program to accept a new cohort of students annually.
- The Georgia WebMBA™ program was included in the System’s successful distance education substantive change review.

The request to revisit the pilot tuition rate will be addressed through the Committee on Finance and Business as Item 4 of its agenda. (See page 5.)

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

21. Establishment of the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Analytic Genomics, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Analytic Genomics, effective June 12, 2002.

Abstract: The Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Analytic Genomics, a position combining computational biology and bioinformatics to be housed within the School of Biology, will be a leader in the development and application of computational tools to examine structure-function relationships in biomolecular systems. Funds for the chair consist of \$750,000 from the Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) and \$750,000 from GIT’s foundation. Computational biology and bioinformatics are the application of modern mathematical, computational, and physical sciences to gain new insights into the molecular mechanisms of life and the processes that control the replication and health of all organisms. The recruitment of a GRA eminent scholar in this area will help bring new and important expertise essential to biotechnology and pharmaceutical research to the state.

New developments in targeting drug therapies at bacterial and virus infections, cancer, and degenerative diseases are demonstrating the crucial importance of understanding the relationship between the three-dimensional structure and the function of targeted biological macromolecules. The Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Analytical Genomics will bring a major research effort in modeling the structures of biomedically important proteins and nucleic acids. The scholar is expected to develop strong collaborations with experimental efforts in understanding structure-function features of complex systems, such as a cell’s protein synthesis machinery, the ribosome, and protein-ribonucleic acid molecular complexes involved in virus replication and cancer. This work will focus on developments targeting drug therapies, bacterial and virus infections, cancer, and degenerative diseases. Each of these targets requires a deep understanding of the relationship between the three-dimensional structure and the function of molecules of critical importance. This GRA eminent scholar will perform research in the computational and structural biology of proteins and nucleic acids in an effort to understand features of these complex systems.

22. Establishment of the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Biological Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough that the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) be authorized to establish the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Biological Systems, effective June 12, 2002.

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

22. Establishment of the Georgia Research Alliance Eminent Scholar in Biological Systems, Georgia Institute of Technology (Continued)

Abstract: This eminent scholar position is part of the Georgia Research Alliance (“GRA”) allocation in the area of bioinformatics. It was also considered to be in support of a major grant proposal to The Whitaker Foundation for the development of the GIT/Emory University Department of Biomedical Engineering. The Whitaker Foundation proposal was funded at \$16 million, and the pledge of the GRA to provide an eminent scholar was an important factor in the success of the grant application. Funds for the chair consist of \$750,000 from the GRA and \$750,000 from the Georgia Tech Foundation.

The search has commenced for an internationally recognized scholar in either of two broad areas: 1) computational bioinformatics, functional genomics, and proteomics or 2) technologies underpinning bioinformatics, functional genomics, and proteomics. Examples of the first of these areas include research into gene-finding methods, computational models of functional genomics and protein function, and modeling of complex biological systems at the cellular level. Examples of the second area include micro- and nanotechnologies for microarrays and protein chips and molecular imaging. In addition, scholars are sought whose interests overlap with cancer applications. This strategy will enable GIT to leverage its partnership with Emory University’s School of Medicine, in particular, the Winship Cancer Institute.

A search committee has been formed and potential laboratory space identified in the U. A. Whitaker Biomedical Engineering Building, to be completed in July 2003.

23. Information Item: Service Agreements

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

University of Georgia			
Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
Provide Georgia Corn Extension education program support	Georgia Commodity Commission for Corn	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$4,000
Provide technical support for corn improvement team	Georgia Commodity Commission for Corn	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$36,400

Use selected fungicides for brown rot control on peaches	Georgia Commodity Commission for Peaches	1/1/02 - 12/31/02	\$2,500
Provide support to Americorps	Georgia Department of Community Affairs	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$620
Provide diversity in nutrition education program	Georgia Department of Human Resources	10/1/01 - 9/30/02	\$426,359
Track local tobacco-related ordinance in Georgia	Georgia Department of Human Resources	5/1/02 - 3/30/03	\$89,000
Direct organizational development project	Department of Labor	2/28/02 - 9/30/02	\$129,988
Provide services for Georgia postsecondary skills	Georgia Department of Technical and Adult Education	10/1/01 - 7/20/02	\$21,750
Present symposium on the South and globalization	Georgia Humanities Council	1/1/02 - 8/31/02	\$8,000
Georgia State University			
Evaluate home care satisfaction	Georgia Department of Human Resources	12/1/01 - 9/28/02	\$49,480
Study electronic court filing	Georgia Courts Automation Commission	1/1/02 - 6/30/02	\$70,000
Provide education workforce development	Georgia Professional Standards Commission	1/7/02 - 8/16/02	\$23,800
Contribute to the historic American building document	Georgia Building Authority	12/31/01 - 12/1/02	\$31,350
Provide support to welfare reform	Georgia Department of Community Health	7/1/01 - 6/30/02	\$63,000
Develop oral health prevention program	Georgia Department of Human Resources	2/1/02 - 6/30/02	\$10,000
Georgia Southern University			
Direct Leadership Summit 2002	Georgia Council for the Arts	1/1/02 - 6/30/03	\$5,125

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, at approximately 9:30 a.m. in room 7019, the Chancellor's Conference Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Hugh A. Carter, Jr. and Regents William H. Cleveland, Joe Frank Harris, Allene H. Magill, Martin W. NeSmith, and Wanda Yancey Rodwell. Chair Carter reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed one item, which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. Addition to Policy Manual Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers

Approved: The Board approved an addition to Section 704.041 to The Policy Manual regarding out-of-state tuition waivers.

Background: At the May 2002 meeting of the Board, a proposed change to The Policy Manual was continued for further study. The change would have granted residency status to dependent students whose supporting parents or court-appointed guardians had accepted full-time, self-sustaining employment in the State of Georgia for reasons other than gaining the benefit of favorable tuition rates. Meetings with University System institutional representatives resulted in a new proposal which will allow such students to obtain tuition rate benefits as a waiver of the out-of-state tuition differential, assuming appropriate supporting documentation is provided by the student to the enrolling institution. The proposed language modifies Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers of The Policy Manual. The current policy, plus the proposed addition (P), is as follows:

Section 704.041 OUT-OF-STATE TUITION WAIVERS

An institution may waive out-of-state tuition and assess in-state tuition for:

- A. Academic Common Market. Students selected to participate in a program offered through the Academic Common Market.
- A. International and Superior Out-of-State Students. International students and superior out-of-state students selected by the institutional president or an authorized representative, provided that the number of such waivers in effect does not exceed 2 percent of the equivalent full-time students enrolled at the institution in the fall term immediately preceding the term for which the out-of-state tuition is to be waived.
- C. University System Employees and Dependents. Full-time employees of the University System, their spouses, and their dependent children;
- D. Medical/Dental Students and Interns. Medical and dental residents and medical and dental interns at the Medical College of Georgia (BR Minutes, 1986-87, p. 340);

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

1. Addition to Policy Manual Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers (Continued)

- E. Full-Time School Employees. Full-time employees in the public schools of Georgia or of the Department of Technical and Adult Education, their spouses, and their dependent children. Teachers employed full-time on military bases in Georgia shall also qualify for this waiver (BR Minutes, 1988-89, p. 43);
- F. Career Consular Officials. Career consular officers, their spouses, and their dependent children who are citizens of the foreign nation that their consular office represents and who are stationed and living in Georgia under orders of their respective governments.
- G. Military Personnel. Military personnel, their spouses, and their dependent children stationed in Georgia and on active duty, unless such military personnel are assigned as students to System institutions for educational purposes;
- H. Research University Graduate Students. Graduate Students attending the University of Georgia, the Georgia Institute of Technology, Georgia State University, and the Medical College of Georgia, which shall be authorized to waive the out-of-state tuition differential for a limited number of graduate students each year, with the understanding that the number of students at each of these institutions to whom such waivers are granted shall not exceed the number assigned below at any one point in time:

University of Georgia	80
Georgia Institute of Technology	60
Georgia State University	80
Medical College of Georgia	20

- I. Border County Residents. Residents of an out-of-state county bordering a Georgia county in which the reporting institution or a Board-approved external center of the University System is located.
- J. National Guard Members. Full-time members of the Georgia National Guard, their spouses, and their dependent children. (BR Minutes, April, 1998, pp. 16-17);
- K. Students enrolled in University System institutions as part of Competitive Economic Development Projects. Students who are certified by the Commissioner of the Georgia Department of Industry, Tourism and Trade as being part of a competitive economic development project;
- L. Students in Georgia-Based Corporations. Students who are employees of Georgia-based corporations or organizations that have contracted with the Board of Regents through University System institutions to provide out-of-state tuition differential waivers;

COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW

1. Addition to Policy Manual Section 704.041 Out-of-State Tuition Waivers (Continued)

- M. Students in Pilot Programs. Students enrolled in special pilot programs approved by the Chancellor. The Chancellor shall evaluate institutional requests for such programs in light of good public policy and the best interests of students. If a pilot program is successful, the tuition program shall be presented to the Board for consideration;
- N. Students in ICAPP[®] Advantage programs. Any student participating in an ICAPP[®] Advantage program;
- O. Direct Exchange Program Students. Any international student who enrolls in a University System institution as a participant in a direct exchange program that provides reciprocal benefits to University System students; and
- P. *Families Moving to Georgia. A dependent student who, as of the first day of term of enrollment, can provide documentation supporting that his or her supporting parent or court-appointed guardian has accepted full-time, self-sustaining employment and established domicile in the State of Georgia for reasons other than gaining the benefit of favorable tuition rates may qualify immediately for an out-of-state tuition differential waiver which will expire 12 months from the date the waiver was granted. An affected student may petition for residency status according to established procedures at the institution.*

REPORT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Chair Howell called upon the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, and System Policy Research Analyst Jonathan Gordon to give the Board a report on the System's student satisfaction survey.

Dr. Hudson explained that in 1997, the University System administered for the first time a Systemwide survey of student satisfaction. At that time, the System chose as its survey instrument the Student Opinion Survey ("SOS") administered by ACT, Inc. ("ACT"). The intention was to establish some benchmarks so that the System could use the survey repeatedly to track changes over time. The SOS was also chosen because it would allow the System to make comparisons with its peers. This year, during the current administration, there were over 200 public institutions in the peer group, which is called a national users group, and they represented approximately 150,000 students. In fall 2001, the University System administered the SOS again at each institution during a two-week period in late October and early November. ACT sent the results back to the institutions, and Dr. Hudson would be presenting the highlights of the SOS at this meeting.

Dr. Hudson explained that conducting the survey is a substantial undertaking that is difficult to organize across the System, but the importance is in learning more about the students. The administration needs to understand what works well from their perspective and what does not work as well. It is also important for the purpose of monitoring changes over time and comparing the System to its peers. Satisfaction is an important thing for students because students who are well satisfied are more likely to be retained and therefore more likely to graduate. The institutions also need the SOS results to pinpoint problem areas and to make decisions in strategic planning. In some cases, the answers are very easy. For example, if the SOS shows that an institution is weak in registration, it may be very easy to fix that problem. In other cases, however, the SOS may raise more questions rather than providing answers. For example, if daycare services were very weak and the institution did not know that the students needed daycare, it might be more difficult to find the answer. Each of the Regents had been given copies of two SOS: one for the four-year colleges and one for the two-year colleges. The versions are slightly different, but each of the surveys focus on student services and the college environment. Student services questions included issues like cafeteria services, parking, computer services, daycare, orientation, and sports programs. Environment questions addressed issues such as testing, grading, student voice in campus politics, and out of class availability of faculty. In that section, there were five different areas — academics, admissions, rules and policies of the institution, facilities, and registrations — as well as some very general questions at the end. Each institution chose a mode of administration. For the most part, institutions chose in-class administration of the SOS. Three of the four-year colleges for the first time chose Internet administration. Approximately 33,000 surveys were distributed, and 23,552 were returned. The resulting response rates were about 57% at the four-year colleges and 68% at the two-year colleges, together representing about 9% of four-year college students and about 17% of two-year college students. Dr. Hudson noted that this is a very good sample size for a student survey.

REPORT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Next, Dr. Hudson discussed how student satisfaction was measured. For each question, students were asked to rank their satisfaction on a 1 to 5 Likert scale, with 1 being very dissatisfied and 5 being very satisfied. For service questions, they were also asked to identify whether or not they used the service. Overall, eight of ten System students are satisfied or very satisfied with the college they attend. Two-year students are slightly more satisfied than four-year students. Compared to the 1997 SOS results, System students are slightly less satisfied than they were four years ago, but the results are very similar. The University System's students are slightly less satisfied than their national peers at both the two-year and four-year levels, but they students are remarkably similar to national students on the SOS survey. Dr. Hudson then called upon Dr. Gordon to discuss some highlights of the survey results. Then, the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs would lead a discussion of the results.

Dr. Gordon thanked the institutional coordinators at the campuses who drew their samples and ensured that faculty worked with them and the University System Office to administer the survey. He first presented the results of the four-year institutions. Four-year college students were most satisfied with class size, attitude of faculty over students (improved over 1997 average), out-of-class availability of instructors, recreational programs and service, and library facilities and services (also improved over 1997 average). Four-year college students were less satisfied with course availability and convenience. Dr. Gordon noted that there was a slight improvement in this area over the 1997 average; however, the System is still lagging the national average for satisfaction in that measure. Four-year students were also less satisfied with the purposes for which student activity fees are used; however, this area also showed improvement over 1997. Finally, four-year students were still less satisfied with parking facilities and services, but again, satisfaction had improved since 1997 and in this regard, the University System is slightly above the nation average.

Next, Dr. Gordon discussed the SOS results at the two-year colleges. Two-year college students were most satisfied with similar things as the four-year students, including class size and the attitude of faculty toward students. In addition, they were also satisfied with a host of campus facilities, including libraries, athletic facilities, classrooms, and student centers. Dr. Gordon noted that these facilities were all listed as separate items in the SOS, and the System's two-year college results rated significantly higher than national averages. In addition, two-year students were more satisfied with college-sponsored tutorial services and computer services. Like the four-year students, two-year students were less satisfied with student activity fees and course availability, although there was significant improvement in the latter area over the 1997 results. They were also less satisfied with opportunities for student employment and student voice in college politics.

Then, Dr. Gordon discussed the most notable findings of the 2001 SOS results. The System as a whole saw large increases in satisfaction in enrollment services over the 1997 survey, including financial aid services, registration procedures, college catalogs and admissions publications, and the assistance provided by college staff. One possible explanation for these increases is that much more business is now being conducted over the Internet, including registration and financial aid processes.

REPORT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

It is possible that this is relieving some of the pressure off front-line staff so that they can provide better customer service to those students who really need that kind of attention. On the other hand, the System is seeing a serious decline in satisfaction with the availability of student housing, particularly at the four-year institutions. The satisfaction with housing availability in the System is much lower than the national average. Dr. Gordon said that this is an issue in which the Board and its staff will have to examine particular institutions and particular geographic areas to see if that might explain the results. Finally, satisfaction with campus daycare services has declined. This is a somewhat complicated issue because only 2% of students responded as having used these services, so it is unclear whether they are dissatisfied with the services they use or whether they are dissatisfied with not having access to campus daycare. This is another issue that will need to be examined at the institutional level. Dr. Gordon then turned the floor over to Dr. Papp.

Dr. Papp thanked Drs. Hudson and Gordon for their hard work coordinating the survey process. He also congratulated and thanked all of the presidents and their staffs. The SOS results were available about two months ago, but he asked them to hold the results internally at their respective campuses until the University System Office staff had the opportunity to present the results to the Board. Having conducted the survey a second time means that the University System now has time series data, absolute value data, and comparisons to national averages. The staff intend to, among other things, focus on areas that need improvement, which Dr. Gordon had already highlighted. They will have to look at the institutional level to determine what issues are affecting these areas at each institution. The staff also intend to link the results of these surveys to the Board's strategic plan and the implementation plan being developed for the coming year, which Chancellor Meredith would be presenting later in the meeting. The staff would also like the Regents' advice and guidance on any other uses to which they believe the SOS could be put.

Regent Coles asked whether the response rates for the surveys were high and how they compare to the 1997 response rates and the national average response rates.

Dr. Papp responded that the System's 2001 SOS response rate was incredibly high in comparison to most other kinds of surveys and then called upon Dr. Hudson to elaborate.

Dr. Hudson stated that the response rate for four-year college students was slightly lower in 2001 than in 1997; however, overall the response rates are comparable to the national averages and they are very good response rates. Administering the SOS in class means that a student can refuse to fill out the survey, but it is much more likely that he or she would respond than if the survey were administered through the mail.

Dr. Papp reiterated that the SOS is administered on the Internet as well.

Regent Carter asked how a sample of students is selected.

REPORT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Dr. Hudson replied that it is not a random sample on the student level. Each institution is asked to draw a sample of classes, since the survey was generally administered in classes. The institutions used a method to get a representative sample of classes. They also sampled evening classes to achieve a representative result even if they had a large number of nontraditional students.

Regent Carter asked whether the staff feel the sample is in fact representative.

Dr. Hudson responded that the staff feel very positive about the sample. It is not a mirror image of a population, especially at the two-year level, where the sample was slightly younger than the population of students. Nonetheless, the sample was checked against gender, race, ethnicity, age, and student level, and the staff concluded that the sample was indeed representative of the general student body.

Regent Yancey asked whether the overall satisfaction was almost identical from 1997 to 2001.

Dr. Papp responded that it was.

Regent Yancey asked how Dr. Papp would grade the System based on the findings, and if Dr. Papp was not satisfied, what the System's satisfaction level should be.

Dr. Papp responded that he would give the University System a B to a B+. He explained that the satisfaction has not increased in part because expectations have increased. He asserted that the System's performance has improved considerably over the past several years, but at the same time, expectation levels have also gone up. For example, student housing in the University System is better than it has ever been. However, many students also have never shared a bedroom with somebody. So, those students may not be as satisfied with housing, even though the overall quality of housing in the System has gone up.

Chancellor Meredith added that record enrollment means that students are competing for the same number of rooms, so many students are dissatisfied if they cannot get into residence halls.

Dr. Papp stated that the SOS has been a very useful tool and that the System would continue to conduct this survey on a periodic basis and report back to the Board. He asked the Regents again to let the staff know if they see particular areas the staff should focus on.

Regent Carter asked how the staff would use the data.

REPORT ON STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY

Dr. Papp responded that the staff would work with the individual institutions to see if they can get a better understanding at the institutional level. The colleges have had their survey results for two months. Their institutional research staff, their vice presidents of academic and student affairs, and others have been considering the results. The staff would be meeting with both the vice presidents for academic affairs and student affairs to see how they view their institutional data. The University System Office staff would then apply those opinions to some of the System-level action items for the strategic plan. The staff also expect the institutions to incorporate the results into their own strategic plans.

Chancellor Meredith complimented the staff for this very well done survey. He noted that there are not many systems in the country doing this kind of survey. He said that one of the areas the Board will focus on in the coming year or so as part of its strategic plan is adding to this kind of process by surveying students who have graduated and are now in the workplace to determine how satisfied they are with their education now that they are using it. He said this would be part of the process of listening more to the communities the University System serves, including students, government, and business. We need to learn more about whether the students are prepared. Some research is already underway, but the research efforts will be formalized and widespread.

Chair Howell thanked the presenters for their report.

ANNUAL ADMISSIONS UPDATE

Chair Howell then called upon the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, to update the Board on the University System's 2001 admissions.

Dr. Papp explained that as the System began to phase in its new admissions standards, the Board asked the staff to report back on an annual basis with an admissions update. He stated that the raised admission standards were part of a Board policy adopted in 1996, phased in over a four- to five-year period and fully implemented during summer 2001. The reason the Board decided to phase in the standards was to provide an opportunity for high school and middle school students to prepare themselves and to begin to perform at the new standards level. Before 1996, many students were not prepared to succeed in college. As a result, the University System did not have a very good graduation rate for a period of time. At the same time, institutional admissions policies did not necessarily conform to institutional missions. For example, at research universities, a significant percentage of entering freshmen required learning support. So, there seemed to be a disconnect between admissions standards and mission. These were some of the reasons for the implementation of the Board's new policy.

The most important goal of the increased admissions standards is to improve the preparation of students for college, said Dr. Papp. The Board wanted to break the cycle, in high schools in particular, of students' just getting by. The Regents sought to increase the average Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") score, fully recognizing that there are complex issues associated with the SAT. They also sought to increase the percentage of students entering the System with a full college-preparatory curriculum ("CPC") in place. In doing so, they also increased the number of required CPC courses from 15 to 16. They wanted to reduce throughout the System the percentage of students requiring learning support. The whole point of the improved standards was to increase the chances of student success once they entered System institutions. Other goals included the concentration of learning support programs at the two-year colleges and eventually a virtual elimination of learning support programs at research, regional, and state universities. The System would continue to support Georgia's diverse population.

To achieve its goals, the Board set higher standards for admissions and established a freshman index that was a combination of the high school grade point average and SAT scores. The Regents also developed a layered level of performance, explained Dr. Papp. To be admitted to a research university, the freshman index of a student needed to be higher than if the student were seeking admission to a regional or state university, and in turn, the freshman index would have to be higher to gain admission into a regional or state university than if the student were seeking admission to a two-year or state college. The Regents also established minimum SAT or American College Test ("ACT") scores as well. Moreover, they established a goal for each of the research, regional, and state universities to reduce by 5% per year the percentage of their freshman class requiring learning support. Dr. Papp remarked that this was a very ambitious agenda as the Board phased in its admissions standards, and there were some caveats. One of the caveats was that the heightened

ANNUAL ADMISSIONS UPDATE

admissions standards did not apply to nontraditional students, defined by the University System as students who enter as freshmen at the age of 25 or older. The Board also established presidential exceptions and limited admissions programs for colleges and universities in smaller percentages at the research universities and larger percentages at the two-year colleges of students who did not quite meet either the CPC or freshman index requirements. For those parts of the state that did not have two-year colleges, had the Board instituted exclusively the programs of heightened admissions standards throughout the state, place-bound students may not be able to enter four-year institutions. So, the Board established pilot admissions programs at those institutions where university colleges were established as separate segments attached to the universities so that students who were place-bound could in fact enter that specific unit of the institution. For some universities with very high percentages of students requiring learning support in 1996 and 1997, the Board granted them an extended period of time to fully phase in the admissions standards, particularly in the area of learning support.

Dr. Papp stated that from 1995 to fall 2001, the number of traditional freshmen in the University System has increased by approximately 11%. The System's average SAT score has also increased, while the percentage of students requiring learning support has decreased from 27% to 15% and it has been concentrated at the two-year colleges as the Board intended. The percentage of students fulfilling the CPC requirements has increased from 76% to 89% in spite of the additional CPC course requirement. In 1995, most regional, research, and state universities had at least 5% of students requiring learning support, and some even had over 60%. Over the course of the phase-in, the System has made significant strides in reducing the number of students requiring learning support at the university level. Two institutions are on target to meet the goal of 0% to 5% by 2005, which was the Board's target date, and only one institution still has some significant reductions to make. Dr. Papp remarked that, all in all, the Board's admissions initiative has moved the University System of Georgia ahead.

Going forward, the System needs to continue to emphasize to high school students that they need to take more academic courses and they need to work hard and do well in those courses, said Dr. Papp. Students should not relax during their senior year of high school and act as though they are just waiting for the prom. The Board's staff will continue to monitor the policies and report back to the Board to examine issues that may arise. They will consider whether the System is providing adequate access to two-year institutions and whether the pilot programs are working. In the coming year, the staff will be performing a study about those pilot admissions programs.

Regent Cater asked how the pilot programs are working and whether there has been a difference in retention rates since the implementation of the increased standards.

Dr. Papp responded that the staff performed a study of the pilot admissions programs last year, and the study revealed that they were generally working well. However, at a couple of institutions, participation in those programs had risen to levels greater than intended, and at a couple of

ANNUAL ADMISSIONS UPDATE

institutions, they were also attracting students from beyond the intended service area. So, the staff had talked with those institutions and were going to perform a study this coming year to follow up on the findings. Dr. Papp stated that the retention rate has not yet noticeably changed yet, but he stressed the word yet because the admissions standards were only fully implemented in fall 2001. He fully expects the retention rate to begin to increase over the course of the next two to three years now that the increased standards are fully implemented.

Regent McMillan remarked that so many of the University System admissions standards are contingent on a student's performance in grades K-12. He was interested in knowing how the staff assess the quality of CPC courses throughout the state. He noted that there are still many out-of-field teachers on the K-12 levels, and he was concerned about the quality of these important courses. He said the quality of the courses may affect retention once students are admitted to college. Though this is not the Board's domain, he asserted that the Regents and staff must continually examine what progress is being made on the K-12 level to prepare students for college admissions. He wondered whether there had been any improvement in that regard to ensure the consistent quality of CPC courses. He also wondered whether the four-year institutions routinely refer students they do not accept to two-year institutions or send the names of those students to the two-year institutions in order to help those students gain access to higher education elsewhere.

Dr. Papp responded that he would have to respond "no" to the word routinely. The System is moving toward routinizing a referral process, but it is not yet routine. There are some issues that arise with such a routinized referral process, he said, and one of those issues is privacy. There are some students who, when they are not admitted to a particular institution, would prefer that this information not be shared with other institutions, and some see a referral process as telling others that they were not admitted to their institution of choice. This is a very important issue to be resolved, and the staff are looking into this and other issues. One of the things the staff are trying to do is move more institutions toward an online admissions process through the Georgia Applications and Electronic Advisory System ("GA EASY"). Most institutions already participate in this uniform process so that students can learn about and apply to multiple institutions rather than filling out separate applications. Addressing Regent McMillan's first question, Dr. Papp said that one of the objectives of Governor Barnes' Education Reform Act that is beginning to take effect is requiring teachers at the high school level to have degrees in their disciplines. Over time, as more and more teachers enter the field with both teaching certificates and degrees in their disciplines, this should improve the quality of the CPC. There is beginning to be some improvement in this regard, but it will be a long-term effort.

Chancellor Meredith noted that the Southern Regional Education Board ("SREB") recently completed a study to determine whether high school algebra is delivered consistently across schools and systems, and they have found that it is not. So, there is some research being done in that regard that will be expanded to other courses. Also, the Associate Vice Chancellor for Strategic Research and Analysis, Cathie Mayes Hudson, has a feedback system that he would like to expand to give

ANNUAL ADMISSIONS UPDATE

some details by discipline back to the high school on those students comparing how they performed in high school to how they perform in the same kinds of subjects in college. If the system finds that the same high schools repeatedly graduate students who are ill-prepared, then it will illuminate the problems in those particular schools. There will be a mechanism set up so that math professors in the System institutions will talk to the math instructors in the high schools to find out what is going wrong in that regard. The Chancellor remarked that this problem can be solved through communication across the two systems. This effort will enhance students' chances for success and may also be able to help determine if in fact there is a problem of grade inflation.

Chair Howell stated that he has always been concerned that students will be so concerned with earning a good grade point average so they can get the HOPE Scholarship that they avoid taking the more difficult classes that will really help them prepare for college.

Dr. Papp replied that this tendency has been minimized by being very specific about what courses must be taken.

Chair Howell asked whether the System requires a calculus course for admission.

Dr. Papp responded that it does not.

Chair Howell stated that he once heard that high school calculus is one of the greatest predictors for college success.

Dr. Papp responded that performance in the series of high school math classes is in fact the best predictor of success. He noted that when one institution offered calculus under a different name, student performance improved.

Chair Howell thanked Dr. Papp for this update.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

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

Chair Leebern explained that at this meeting, the Chancellor would present the proposed first year action plan of the Board’s new strategic plan. He noted that the Regents had been mailed a copy of the action plan in advance of the meeting.

Chancellor Meredith greeted the Regents. He reminded them that on May 10, he and 30 senior staff members spent the day at Kennesaw State University’s Jolley Lodge for a staff retreat. They had a session with the full group and then broke into several smaller groups to develop and prioritize an action plan for the implementation of the Board’s 11 strategic planning goals. The first-year action plan is the result of the work done that day. The first-year plan is an ambitious one, and it touches on each of the 11 goals in the strategic plan. It sets the tone for some aggressive attempts to create a more educated Georgia. It also gives the Board the opportunity to continue to set target goals for retention, pass rates on professional licensure exams, and international study-abroad opportunities and to use the benchmarking study to further refine our business and other practices. While the Board will continue to focus on quality, which was the theme of the Board’s 1994 strategic plan, the focus of the new strategic plan is on responding to the state’s needs by providing access and increasing retention with the intent that the University System will eventually see graduation rates improve. The Board will not only focus on what the institutions teach, including ethics and diversity, but also where and how they teach. The methods need to cut across disciplinary lines within the institutions and System and also reach out into the communities and regions of the state.

The Chancellor explained that he would point out the highlights of the first year action plan, but he reminded the Regents that this is the first year of a five-year plan. Some things will not be accomplished until 2007, but some can be accomplished in less time. He began by discussing the first goal, which addresses the System’s core mission of teaching. The Board will look at how to make System graduates leaders and contributing citizens of the state. One way to do that is to continue to refine the process of interdisciplinary learning, to teach through learning communities and highlight how the knowledge from one curriculum connects with others. Another way of accomplishing this is to integrate both ethics and diversity into the core curriculum. It will be a challenge to make sure the System is teaching not only American ethics, but also the broader universe of ethics. After all, this is the essence of diversity. The plan also encourages institutions to work more closely with business and industry to ensure that System graduates are the employees they need. The Board’s ICAPP® liaison officers will assist in this, as are the Knowledge Is Power tours currently being conducted around the state. The staff are also recommending that the System further expand internships and co-ops in order to give students work experience and help industry grow. Along with that, the System must ensure that its graduates are prepared for the workforce. That is why this plan has the Board setting target pass rates for professional licensure exams. The Board needs to be sure the professions can certify the graduates the System produces. In December,

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

the System will be required, in a report card format, to show both the institutions’ and System’s current pass rates. The Board will also be posting those rates and the other postsecondary indicators, including graduation, retention, and Regents’ Test pass rates, on the University System Web site. This will give the public access to information they need when making choices.

With regard to the second goal, Chancellor Meredith stated that the System will also increase access by providing programs where students are. This means providing more four-year degree programs on two-year college campuses and at off-campus centers. It also means finding ways in which the public library system can provide higher education opportunities. There are 366 libraries around the state, and the University System can make good use of those locations and its partnership with them. Staff continue to study the problems that face the Hispanic population accessing our institutions. They are now beginning a study of the barriers that nontraditional students and African-American males experience in accessing System institutions. They have gathered national research data on what other states and systems are doing to tackle this issue. This month, a request for proposals will be sent to hire a consultant to help shape the research instruments and communication strategies that the Board will employ to implement this strategic initiative. Conversations are taking place with potential partners to support the System’s efforts, and a work group will recommend strategies to the Board to attract these two groups who are currently significantly underrepresented in the System.

With regard to the third goal, Chancellor Meredith noted that the action plan sets a new target for the percentage of students taking advantage of international study-abroad programs. If the Regents approve the plan at this meeting, they would be setting a goal of 4% by 2007. The System is now at 2%, so doubling the rate is a lofty goal. This goal is one that will be affected by the international climate, so the Board will be mindful of world events as it monitors the System’s progress. Additionally, comprehensive program review, which began during the 1994 strategic plan, will be expanded. This will certainly continue the Board’s efforts to provide quality programs for System students.

The Chancellor next addressed the fourth goal, noting that the System will step up its efforts to retain students. He explained that a system is being developed that will share best practices in freshman and sophomore experience programs and said that the Board will hear a report on that in February. The Board will also set target retention rates at that time. The System will want to demonstrate progress toward those targets each year with the goal of reaching them by 2007. All of these actions are related to instruction and the quality of the System’s curriculum. There will be many committees at work over the next several months which will report to the Board with recommended targets. Chancellor Meredith noted that all of the items he just mentioned can’t be achieved without people. There are excellent professionals throughout the System, but like any major corporation, the System is vulnerable to shortages due to retirements, or simply put, the supply not meeting the demand. The Board will implement some strategies to help us smooth out large peaks and valleys.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

With regard to the fifth goal, the Chancellor highlighted some of the other actions the Board would be taking in the human resources area. The Board will examine how the System can use its ICAPP® model to predict where the System will have shortages and to develop strategies to deal with them. Recently, when the System experienced shortages in the information technology (“IT”) area, policies were instituted to help recruit and retain IT employees. There are other areas where the System can apply the same innovation. This year, the state provided additional funding for the System to focus ICAPP® on shortages in the healthcare professions. It is a proven method of solving shortages in critical fields, and the System should use this model to solve some of its own projected shortages. There are other strategies that the Board is going to implement, too. One is to improve utilization of continuing education departments on the campuses to provide education and training to Systemwide staff. The System should be making better use of its own resources. The University System of Georgia will be facing, as will many other states, a large number of faculty retirements over the next few years. The Board needs to develop a strategy to deal with that. The institutions have some best practices in the recruitment and hiring of faculty that can be shared. Chancellor Meredith will be asking the presidents to help him with this initiative. Another strategy the Board will begin implementing is a mentoring program for new employees throughout the System. Also, institutions will be creating more internships and cooperative programs so students can have meaningful work experiences while they are students. At the end of this year, there will be an expanded program to recognize outstanding faculty and staff. If the Board wants to keep its good people — and it has outstanding professionals — it should recognize them and the Regents should meet some of them.

The Chancellor had already mentioned strengthening the System’s ties with business and industry by providing a curriculum that meets their needs. With regard to the sixth goal, the staff will be bringing to the Board in August and September policy recommendations for continuing education that will assist Georgia’s citizens and companies in receiving the education and training they need from the University System. He also stressed the importance of listening and explained that he plans on continuing his trips across the state even after he completes the Knowledge is Power tour to find out from business leaders what is on their minds. The Board needs to know what they want from their University System. Coupled with that will be new efforts to market the System’s assets so that citizens and companies know what it has to offer and how to access its programs and services. In February 2002, the Board heard a compelling report by the Washington Advisory Group, a nationally known consulting firm. What the report revealed to the Board was that the System has a lot of unmet potential. The group estimated that the patent flow of the System’s research universities could increase two to three times the current level and the income generated from three to five times the current rate. However, to get there, the System will have to maximize its opportunities. Some institutions, such as the Medical College of Georgia, will be dramatically expanding their research activities, and the System needs to be in a position to capitalize on this expansion. So, some effort will be made to get funding to assist in this effort, though the Chancellor was not sure how yet. It was suggested that the Board put in a budget request for funds, or the Governor’s cancer initiative be considered a funding source, but this is an opportunity the System cannot let slide. It has long-term benefits, both for the University System and for the state.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Chancellor Meredith next addressed business, finance, and facilities issues as they pertain to the seventh goal. He noted that this strategic plan focuses on finding best practices, sharing them, and implementing them. The System is doing many things very well, but some things need to be improved. This next year, work groups will be finding ways to share what works and does not work throughout the System. Along with that will be an effort to look at the possibility of regionalizing certain business operations throughout the state. It is time, he said, to look at finding the most cost-effective and efficient way to get the work done without compromising the System’s commitment to students.

The Board is also going to be laying the groundwork for a revised funding formula, which relates to the tenth strategic goal. Much has changed since this formula was instituted. Chancellor Meredith remarked that one thing that impresses him most about the formula is that it is funded. In all the other states in which he has been, there have been formulas, but they were not funded. He asserted that this goes back to when Joe Frank Harris was Governor. Governor Harris made certain that the understanding with the Board and the legislature was that if the System was going to have a formula, it would be funded. Now things are coming full circle; Governor Harris is now a Regent. It seems only natural that the Board seek his guidance on this very important next step, that of revising the formula. The Chancellor asked Regent Harris for his assistance in this endeavor. As the Regents begin to explore needed revisions to the formula and alternate allocation strategies, he asked them to keep the following philosophy in mind: “Rewards drive behavior.” He explained that this simply means if the Board is expecting quality from the institutions, then the formula and allocations should reward that.

Moving on to the eighth goal, Chancellor Meredith stated that, in line with funding and best practices, the Board will also be continuing its efforts to provide the best facilities possible to the students, faculty, and staff. The System campuses are centerpieces in the communities which they serve. The Board needs to ensure that they are constructed with quality materials and maintained properly. The Regents are stewards of the state’s resources, said the Chancellor, and it is incumbent on them to take that responsibility seriously.

Chancellor Meredith reiterated that this is an ambitious plan. There will be many people working on the Board’s goals, but the Board will also have some responsibilities, particularly with regard to the ninth and eleventh goals. Part of the focus over the next five years is for the University System to make sure that students can appropriately move from K-12 to postsecondary institutions. The Board will play a role in ensuring that happens. The Chancellor will ask this Board to meet either in a Board setting or a social event with both the State Board of Education and the State Board of Technical and Adult Education. Getting together will go a long way in understanding each other’s mission and how they can work together in carrying out those missions. Of particular interest to the Chancellor is the supply and demand of teachers in the state. The 1994 strategic plan focused on strengthening the quality of teacher preparation programs. The Board adopted 14 principles, including one that guarantees the preparation of our teachers and another that establishes the

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

University System as a partner with the Professional Standards Commission, Georgia Partnership for Excellence in Education, state government, and the Department of Education, as well as corporate leaders in the development of the Georgia Leadership Institute for School Improvement. The Board also set as a goal an 80% pass rate by 2006 on the PRAXIS II exam, the state’s primary test used for certification of teacher and educational leader candidates. In November, the Board will be updated on those activities and specifically hear how the System is doing in meeting the state’s demand for K-12 teachers. Along with that will be an increased effort on the System’s part to supply both high schools and two-year colleges with expanded feedback on how well their students are doing when they enter college or transfer among them. This information can be a helpful decision-making tool for principals and two- and four-year college presidents.

In closing, Chancellor Meredith stated that he is committed to carrying out everything included in this action plan. Each and every item is important and moves the System further toward a more educated Georgia. It will all be done, but realism demands that the Board should be prepared to be flexible on the timetable. The Board will not be meeting in July, but the staff certainly will. As work gets started on these goals, data and other information will be uncovered that may alter the established timetable. The Chancellor also reminded the Regents that the System uncovered some invaluable information from the benchmarking study that was conducted a few years ago. The staff will ensure that information is included as the Regents focus their eyes on the future, moving toward reaching all of these goals. Chancellor Meredith thanked the staff for their hard work on the first year action plan, particularly the Special Assistant to the Chancellor, Shelley C. Nickel, who had put it all together. With that, he asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent White stated that reading the first-year action plan, he gets a sense that he would like to see some more specific numbers. For example, in the 1994 strategic plan, there were specific objectives listed under each goal. He asked whether developing specific objectives would be part of the first-year action plan.

Chancellor Meredith stated that it would. He noted that many specific objectives of the 1994 strategic plan had to be adjusted in the course of its implementation. So, this time, the staff were presenting an action plan first and would gather benchmarks along the way as the plan is being implemented.

Regent White asked whether the staff will have identified all of the specific objectives of the strategic plan by the end of the first year.

The Chancellor responded that they would certainly have specific objectives identified before then, and he called on the Senior Vice Chancellor for Academics and Fiscal Affairs, Daniel S. Papp, to address this.

STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”

Dr. Papp explained that there are a number of specific issues that will require working groups to target the percentages and goals. For example, the staff would be looking for a specific percentage of a graduating class that has an internship or co-op experience. When it comes to something like infusing the curriculum with diversity and ethics, however, it would be more difficult to put a figure on an issue like that.

Chancellor Meredith added that the staff want to develop hard numbers rather than setting unrealistic goals that will need later adjustment. He would like to see a 95% pass rate on nursing tests, but he is not certain whether that is appropriate for the full System, so research must be conducted to determine what is appropriate for the System as a whole.

Chair Leebern thanked the Chancellor for presenting the first year action plan to the Board. He then recognized Mrs. Elizabeth Harris, Regent Harris's wife. He next called for a motion to approve the first-year action plan. Motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the first year action plan.

Seeing that there was no further discussion, Chair Leebern adjourned the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole.

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

Because the Regents had a long day the previous day and an exciting day ahead, Chair Howell explained that he would keep his comments very brief. The Board had quite an extraordinary year in many ways. There had been a change internally from Chancellor Emeritus Stephen R. Portch to Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith, and there had been challenges presented by state budget cuts. These events had made it a fascinating year to serve as Chair, and he had thoroughly enjoyed it. Looking back to his remarks in August 2001, Chair Howell had highlighted three primary priorities the Board would focus on this year. The first, obviously, was choosing a new Chancellor. The second was increasing college completion rates without reducing admissions standards, and at this meeting, the Regents had heard about some of the accomplishments in that regard. The third was to manage the transition from a 16-member to 18-member Board of Regents as a result of reapportionment in the State of Georgia. Obviously, the Board does not have its two new Regents yet, so that priority will be turned over to the new Chair and Vice Chair to look over in the next year. However, with regard to the second priority, there is exceptional news to report, said Chair Howell. The process begun by the Board in 1994 and 1995 has produced outstanding results. The University System now has the smartest class in its history with an average Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") score that is higher than the national average, and the System experienced record enrollment in fall 2001. The Regents and former Regents should be exceptionally pleased with these results. He expressed confidence that in time, retention rates will improve. When the University System raised expectations for its students, they responded, and they are the better for it. Chair Howell stated that it was happenstance that the full implementation of the admissions standards occurred during his tenure as Chair of the Board. Each of the Regents, former Chairs, and former Regents all worked to see that the key elements necessary to make this System and this Board successful were put in place. One of the things Chair Howell enjoyed the most in preparing for the inauguration of Chancellor Meredith was that he had the opportunity to view the videotape of the inauguration of Chancellor Emeritus Portch. Regent Leebern and Joe Frank Harris were in the video with the Chancellor Emeritus. What Chair Howell enjoyed most about the video was that in 1994, they said that this was what they were going to do. As the University System in its seventieth year prepares to inaugurate its tenth Chancellor, he was pleased to report that those gentlemen succeeded. Everything that was articulated was executed. His fondest hope is that the goals and aspirations Chancellor Meredith and the Board articulate at this inauguration will be looked back upon in the future and they will have achieved those goals and aspirations just as the Board of Regents, the presidents, the institutions, the students, the people of the State of Georgia, and the legislature have collectively executed the aspirations and goals of 1994.

With regard to his first priority, hiring a new Chancellor, Chair Howell reminded the Regents how Regent McMillan had responded when Chancellor Emeritus Portch retired. Paraphrasing Shakespeare from *Julius Caesar*, Regent McMillan had said, "Here was a man! When comes such another?" Chair Howell stated that the Board had answered this rhetorical question in fine form. It is a great credit, he said, that the Regents were able to bring Chancellor Meredith to Georgia. If there is one legacy that this year has, it will be him and his efforts. In the five short months that he has been in service, Chancellor Meredith has represented the University System exceptionally well

CHAIRMAN'S REPORT ON HIGHLIGHTS OF THE YEAR

before all of its constituents: the legislature, higher education faculty, and most importantly, students. This day would be a truly exciting and landmark event as the System culminates that priority in his inauguration as the tenth Chancellor of the University System of Georgia.

Chair Howell said that he would be remiss if he did not say thank you, but it is exceedingly difficult for anyone in his position to say thank you to everyone, because so many people make this System a success. He had never been as impressed as he was with the quality, dedication, hard work, consistency, and genuine goodness of the individuals in the University System Office. He thanked the Senior Vice Chancellors. He also said that every Chair before him had said they could not make it without the Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, and he agreed that this is certainly true. This Board would grind to a halt without her. He also recognized the Senior Vice Chancellor for Support Services, Corlis Cummings, who worked tirelessly through Christmas to facilitate the hire of the new Chancellor. Due to the hard work of all the individuals who preceded him, the University System of Georgia is now one of the most preeminent systems of higher education in the country. No state should have more pride in its university system than Georgia. Chair Howell was enormously thankful for the opportunity he had been given to serve on the Board of Regents, and he was truly thankful to each of the Regents for the opportunity to serve as their Chair. Former Chair Edgar L. Jenkins once said that serving in this position was one of the greatest honors he had ever received during his many years of public service. For a man who has received so many honors to say something like that is just amazing, said Chair Howell. However, now that he had done it, he understood that Regent Jenkins was speaking truthfully. It is a great honor. He said that he is not a man who has had many public honors, but of the honors he has received, only one supercedes this, and that was the honor of his wife accepting his proposal. It has been a great year, and Chair Howell said that he looked forward to this exciting day when Georgia would inaugurate his first priority.

Chancellor Meredith said that it had been a joy to work with Chair Howell, who always found a way to deal with everything in good humor and in the right way. Even more than that, he had enjoyed Chair Howell's friendship and getting to know Mrs. Howell. He then presented Chair Howell with a photo of the American flag that Secretary Weber's husband, Bill, had taken in Boston. It had been framed with an inscription commemorating Chair Howell's service to the Board.

ELECTION OF CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003

Chair Howell noted that at the May 2002 Board meeting, the Nominating Committee had made a recommendation to the Executive and Compensation Committee that Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris be elected Chair and Regent James D. Yancey be elected Vice Chair for the upcoming fiscal year, beginning July 1, 2002. He asked whether there were any other nominations at this time. Seeing that there were none, he called for a vote on the office of Chair. With motion properly made and seconded, the Board unanimously elected Regent Joe Frank Harris as Chair of the Board of Regents for fiscal year 2003. He next called for a vote on the office of Vice Chair. With motion properly made and seconded, the Board unanimously elected Regent Yancey as Vice Chair of the Board of Regents for fiscal year 2003.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

There was no unfinished business at this meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

Chair Howell announced that there would be no July 2001 meeting of the Board of Regents. He then asked for a motion to authorize Chancellor Meredith to take any actions necessary on behalf of the Board between this meeting and the August 2002 Board meeting with such actions to be ratified by the Board at the August meeting. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved this authorization.

Chancellor Meredith said that although he would not give a full report to the Board at this meeting, he would in the future be bringing the Regents good news about the System. He just wanted to mention some exciting things briefly:

- Ray Charles gave the eighty-third commencement address at Albany State University and donated \$2 million to the institution.
- At Darton College, President Peter J. Sireno just received a 2002 Workforce Leadership Award for his work with the Georgia Hospital Association.
- Three University System faculty have been named Fulbright Scholars this year:
 - Dr. Sara H. Schweitzer, Associate Professor of Wildlife Ecology and Management at the University of Georgia (“UGA”), will be studying forest resources in Bulgaria.
 - Dr. Sheila Schulte, Senior Coordinator, Office of International Education at the Georgia Institute of Technology, will be on an international education administrator’s exchange to Korea.
 - Dr. Ganiyu T. Oladunjoye, Chair of the Department of Business Information Systems and Education at Albany State University, will be studying in Kingston, Jamaica.
- For the second time in six years, the Georgia Teacher of the Year is a graduate of the State University of West Georgia (“SUWG”): Lorraine Johnson teaches seventh grade at Arnall Middle School in Coweta County.
- SUWG’s Rashad Evans is one of two American college students in an elite group touring Eastern Europe with his debating skills.
- Dalton State College is the eighth University System institution to receive a Goizetta Foundation grant to help with academic programming and scholarships for Hispanic students.

NEW BUSINESS (CONTINUED)

- The Medical College of Georgia just recruited three anesthesiologists from Harvard University and Massachusetts General Hospital.
- UGA's Islamic Studies Web site (<http://www.uga.edu/islam>) has been nominated for a 2002 Webby Award. The Web site was developed by Dr. Alan A. Godlas, Associate Professor of Religion.
- Six students from Valdosta State University, Kennesaw State University, North Georgia State College & University, and UGA are participating in the European Union Studies program. They have been meeting with firms throughout Europe studying the Euro.
- For the second year in a row, four UGA students were awarded Goldwater Scholarships. This is the maximum number of such scholarships ever awarded to a single institution.
- Columbus State University just won the Division II baseball championships.
- The Georgia Institute of Technology is in the World Series. GIT also finished second nationally in NCAA golf and had the NCAA medalist.

PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, August 6 and Wednesday, August 7, 2002, in the Board Room in Atlanta, Georgia. She noted that this was a week earlier than usual. Immediately after the meeting on August 7, Regents will fly to Augusta for the dedication of Allgood Hall at Augusta State University. She thanked Kennesaw State University for lending art to the University System Office in honor of the Chancellor's inauguration. She also noted that after the Executive Session, the Regents would board a bus for lunch at the Rialto Theatre.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

At approximately 11:25 a.m. on Wednesday, June 12, 2002, Chair Howell called for an Executive Session for the purpose of discussing personnel and compensation issues. With motion properly made and variously seconded, the Regents who were present voted unanimously to go into Executive Session. Those Regents were as follows: Chair Howell, Vice Chair Joe Frank Harris, and Regents Hugh A. Carter, Jr., Connie Cater, William H. Cleveland, Michael J. Coles, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Allene H. Magill, Elridge W. McMillan, Wanda Yancey Rodwell, J. Timothy Shelnut, Glenn S. White, Joel O. Wooten, Jr., and James D. Yancey. The Secretary to the Board, Gail S. Weber, was also in attendance during the Executive Session; Chancellor Thomas C. Meredith attended part of the meeting. 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.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (CONTINUED)

At approximately 11:35 a.m., Chair Howell reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in Executive Session. Chair Howell called for a motion that Chancellor Meredith be given a 3% state-funded base salary raise for fiscal year 2003, beginning October 1, 2002. With motion properly made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved this motion.

Next, a motion was made to reappoint Dr. Richard Skinner as the Chief Executive Officer of Georgia Global Learning Online for Business and Education (“Georgia GLOBE”). This motion was seconded and unanimously adopted.

Finally, with motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved the Chancellor’s recommendations for the fiscal year 2003 salaries for the presidents and Dr. Skinner.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at approximately 11:40 a.m. on June 12, 2002.

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

s/ _____
Hilton H. Howell, Jr.
Chair, Board of Regents
University System of Georgia