

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE  
BOARD OF REGENTS OF THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA  
HELD AT  
270 Washington St., S.W.  
Atlanta, Georgia  
March 10 and 11, 1998**

**CALL TO ORDER**

The Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia met on Tuesday, March 10 and Wednesday, March 11, 1998 in the Board Room, room 7007, 270 Washington St., S.W., seventh floor. The following Committees of the Board of Regents met in succession on Tuesday, March 10: the Audit Committee; the Teaching Hospital Committee; the Committee on Finance and Business Operations; the Committee on Real Estate and Facilities; the Committee on Education, Research, and Extension; and the Committee on Organization and Law. The Chair of the Board, Regent S. William Clark, Jr., called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 11. Present on Wednesday, in addition to Chair Clark, were Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Shannon L. Amos, David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

**INVOCATION**

The invocation was given on Wednesday, March 11 by Regent Leebern.

**ATTENDANCE REPORT**

The attendance report was read on Wednesday, March 11 by Secretary Gail S. Weber, who announced that Regents Dahlberg and McMillan had asked for and been given permission to be absent on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 and Regents Jones and McMillan had asked for and been given permission to be absent on Wednesday, March 11, 1998.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Motion being properly made and duly seconded, the minutes of the Board of Regents meeting held on February 10 and 11, 1998 were unanimously approved as distributed.

## **PRESENTATION: PREVIEW OF STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

At 1:00 p.m. on Tuesday, March 10, 1998, the Board of Regents met as a Committee of the Whole for a special presentation by the Chancellor. In attendance at this presentation were Chair S. William Clark, Jr., Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., David H. (Hal) Averitt, Kenneth W. Canestra, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Charles H. Jones, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

Chancellor Portch announced that it was his pleasure to give an initial report on a massive student satisfaction survey conducted using a national firm. The survey results will be very helpful in establishing some benchmarks for the satisfaction of the University System's students. This is the only way for the System to know how it needs to improve and how to measure its improvement. Most businesses today are concerned about customer satisfaction, and the Chancellor thought it appropriate that the System also be concerned.

The Chancellor explained that the results which would be presented at this meeting were only initial results, as there remained much data yet to be analyzed. He stated that a more detailed report would be presented at a later date but that he and Associate Vice Chancellor for Planning and Policy Analysis Cathie M. Hudson would present to the Board the initial results. He invited Dr. Hudson to explain to the Board how the survey was conducted and some of the areas that were examined. The Chancellor would then share some of the initial results with the Board. Next, Dr. Hudson would explain what would be done with the resulting information, and then, the Chancellor would have a few concluding remarks. Chancellor Portch then turned the floor over to Dr. Hudson.

Dr. Hudson explained that the Regents had been given copies of the surveys that were used, including a four-year survey form (pink), a two-year survey form (blue), and some additional information. The University System has had various data systems in place over the years to collect information on students. Most information comes from processes that exist to register or enroll students, but there has never been much information about the students as people, so many assumptions have been made regarding what works well and what does not. This survey is the first ever in the University System to focus on students. It was conducted to learn more about the students, to understand what works well, to pinpoint areas for strategic improvement, and to create benchmarks for accountability.

Dr. Hudson stated that planning for this survey began over two years ago with the help of the institutions, various System committees, Director of System Policy Research Albertine Walker-Marshall, and the Regents Administrative Committee on Institutional Effectiveness, chaired by President Martha T. Nesbitt of Gainesville College. Many types of surveys were reviewed, and in the end, the American College Testing Service's ("ACT") Student Opinion Survey ("SOS") was chosen. In part, the SOS survey was selected because of the national norms available. Surveys were sent to 43,000 undergraduates at System institutions, with the exception of the Medical College of Georgia. Of these, there was a response rate of 60%, or approximately 26,000 students, which is a very high response rate for a survey of this type. The survey is accurate to plus or minus .04%, which is a very high accuracy rating. In surveying, ACT uses a standard five-point scale to measure satisfaction. A student is provided with an item about the college or university, and he or she is asked to respond and rank the item according to level of satisfaction. This is a well-accepted method of measuring satisfaction, remarked Dr. Hudson. The frequencies are then compiled and the means calculated. The surveys were organized into various sections, including background information on students, college services, college environment, etc. There were also 20 System questions and 10 questions of the **PRESENTATION: PREVIEW OF STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

respective institutions. There were over 20 questions on services, in which the students were asked

whether they used a particular service as well as their satisfaction with the service. Some services, such as veterans services or day care services, were not used by many students, but most of the services covered were used by a large portion of students. There were over 40 questions on college environment. For each area, a student could choose not to reply or to indicate level of satisfaction. Dr. Hudson stated that the Chancellor would next review the major findings of the study.

Chancellor Portch thanked Dr. Hudson and remarked that the most important question that was asked on the survey regarded overall satisfaction with the students' particular institutions. The results were that 78.2% of students were satisfied or very satisfied with their college experiences. The Chancellor commented that this was a very positive result. He recognized that there is still work to do, but overall he was extremely proud. He explained that at this meeting, he would only be reporting those items where at least seven out of ten students were satisfied and those items where fewer than half of the students were satisfied. The Chancellor stated that with regard to the issue of class size, 84.9% of students were satisfied. He was very pleased that two of the items with high satisfaction ratings related to faculty. Many national studies have shown that interaction with faculty is the most important factor in retention of students. With regard to faculty attitude toward students, 76.4% of students were satisfied. Also, 71.4% of students were satisfied with faculty availability outside of class. One of the best things about doing this type of survey, said the Chancellor, was that the Board of Regents and its staff typically hear only from dissatisfied students. Someone who is satisfied usually will not write a letter to that effect, so it is good to have a sense of overall student satisfaction. He commented that over time, it would be interesting to see how the increased electronic availability of faculty impacts student satisfaction. Increasing numbers of faculty are available via E-mail and chat pages on the World Wide Web, which may have an impact in time. The next item related to quality of instruction in the major, and 73.5% of students were satisfied in that regard. Additionally, 75.9% of students were satisfied with classroom facilities.

Next, the Chancellor turned his attention to the items with which fewer than half of the students were satisfied. Only 43% of students were satisfied with the availability of courses at times wanted. Chancellor Portch commented that as courses become available any time and any place as a result of technology, there may be a change in satisfaction with regard to this issue. At this time, however, he felt this might be cause for concern, which means that this item needs to be examined in more depth. With regard to the next item, the Chancellor reminded the Board that the Student Advisory Council has expressed that students want more involvement in the ways in which student activity fees are used. With regard to that issue, only 39.4% of students were satisfied. However, Chancellor Portch was pleased that those two items were the only ones in the academic area that fall into the category in which fewer than half of the students were satisfied.

Chancellor Portch next addressed the area of college services. He expressed that he was happy to report that 80.8% of students were pleased with the quality of the library facilities and services. Tutorial services also ranked high in student satisfaction at 76%. Recreational/intramural programs were rated highest in satisfaction level with 82.4%. He said this contradicts the anecdote that the athletic facilities are geared only towards the varsity athletes. Students are also well-satisfied with their cultural programs (76.2%) and college orientation programs (71.6%). The Chancellor was especially pleased with the latter of these, because national research suggests that the first six weeks of college, beginning with the orientation programs, dictate a great deal about whether students are retained and whether they feel good about their colleges. The stronger the orientation program and the first six weeks, the better the college experience.

### **PRESENTATION: PREVIEW OF STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

The Chancellor announced that next, he would be administering a pop quiz to the Regents. He asked them to think back to their college days and to circle on their quiz sheets the two services that they

thought students would be most dissatisfied with. When the Regents were finished marking their papers, Chancellor Portch announced that the two services with which students were most dissatisfied were parking and food services, which were rated satisfactory by only 39.5% and 35% of students, respectively. He stated that he was concerned about that, but in the grand scheme of things, he felt those two items will probably be on the top of the list indefinitely. He did not find these results to be surprising, but the data were useful. The Chancellor then asked Dr. Hudson to speak again on what the Central Office would do with these data, how the Board can use the results, and what was learned about the students.

Dr. Hudson expressed that she was very pleased with the information gathered about System students, especially the information about nontraditional students. At four-year colleges, 60% of the students work, and one-fifth of them work full-time. At two-year institutions, 76% of the students work, and one-third of them work full-time. Institutions can use this information as they try to design better programs to meet the needs of these students. Almost 70% of four-year college students receive financial aid, compared to about 60% of two-year college students. The data also show why students attend college. At the four-year college level, 75% of students attended seeking a bachelor's degree, only 1% attended college for self-improvement or to improve their skills for their jobs, and about 3% entered with no goal in mind. At the two-year college level, 52% entered to seek a bachelor's degree, another 25% entered to get an associate's degree, about 3% entered with no particular purpose, and about 2% entered to improve themselves or their job skills. From census data in the past, it can be determined that educational attainment levels in Georgia are improving. The HOPE Scholarship has given students opportunities that they have never had before in Georgia. However, before this study, there were no data on the impact of the University System on real families in Georgia. For the first time, it was established that about 25% of System students are the first in their families to attend college. Older students and two-year college students are more likely to be the first in their families to attend college.

“What next?” asked Dr. Hudson. She explained that over the next few months, the Central Office staff will fully analyze the results of the survey in order to merge the data with the other databases in the System to start following the students over time. They will compare the System's institutions with their peer institutions in the System and nationally. Then, they will study how satisfaction is related to retention and graduation rates as well as to academic performance. It has been assumed in the past that better students are happier students, but now, it can be determined if happy students become better students. The ultimate goal of the survey is to improve the System, to set benchmarks for accountability, to make students' college experiences better, and ultimately to improve student learning. The two major ways to do this are through the Board's setting priorities for action using this data and through the institutions' improving services and their environments in strategic ways. She then turned the floor back to the Chancellor, who would summarize the major points in this survey.

Chancellor Portch added that the demographic data were especially interesting. He was particularly struck by the fact that one-third of System students work full-time. This likely impacts time to graduation and retention rates, but part of the reason for that is Georgia's solid economy. Most of these students can work full-time if they wish to do so.

## **PRESENTATION: PREVIEW OF STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

There were five points that the Chancellor wanted to accentuate in concluding this presentation. They were the general satisfaction of students (78%), the attitude of faculty toward students (76%), out-of-class availability of faculty (71%), library facilities and services (81%), and college orientation programs (72%). He commented that these items were particularly pleasing in the initial review of the data and that a more in-depth report would be presented in two to three months. In closing, Chancellor Portch asked whether the Regents had any questions or comments.

Regent Cannestra remarked that this was obviously an overview of the whole System and asked whether the individual institutions would be informed of their specific results and where they stand.

The Chancellor reported that they will.

Regent Cannestra asked whether there will be follow-up with the institutions which appear to need to improve in certain areas.

Chancellor Portch said, "Absolutely." He further stated that the data are so rich in terms of comparisons with peers within the Systems. The institutions also had the opportunity to ask their own questions and address their own areas of concern on the survey. The attitudes toward this survey have been extremely positive, and the Chancellor assured the Board that once the data are analyzed, those results will certainly be shared and follow-up will be expected from the institutions.

Regent White asked about the satisfaction level of students with regard to academic advisement.

Dr. Hudson responded that they were fairly good but that, for the purposes of this initial presentation, only selected items were chosen.

The Chancellor added that he remembered being surprised that the student satisfaction with regard to academic advisements was not lower, as there are sometimes complaints on this issue. He remembered that the satisfaction level was moderate.

Regent White was also surprised. He further asked if the Regents could have copies of the data presented at this meeting.

Chancellor Portch stated that he would be happy to provide copies of the slides used in the presentation and restated that in a few months, he would be presenting more analysis of this data. He remarked that Regent White's question was a good one and that he felt comfortable with the survey results.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked whether the percentage of participation from the smaller colleges was as high as from the larger institutions.

Dr. Hudson replied that the two-year colleges had a high response level; in fact, it was slightly higher than the university response level.

Vice Chair Jenkins asked whether there were any questions or concerns of the institutions that were identical across the System.

## **PRESENTATION: PREVIEW OF STUDENT SATISFACTION SURVEY RESULTS**

Dr. Hudson replied that such data has not yet been analyzed.

Regent Cannestra asked if the data analysis is computerized.

Dr. Hudson replied that it is computerized. ACT will send a tape with the data on it, but the preliminary results were on paper. She explained that the computerized nature of the data would provide great flexibility in analyzing it.

The Chancellor added that the data will be able to be merged with the already existing student information system because of the implementation of BANNER.

Regent Howell asked how the salary levels and tenure procedures are weighted toward research and publication as opposed to teaching and whether that affected the response rate of students regarding faculty attitude and availability from the different kinds of institutions in the System.

Chancellor Portch expressed that this is the type of issue that the staff wants to examine in the next phase of analyzing the data. He commented that it will be very interesting to see if at the research universities there are as high scores as at the two-year institutions. Averages by sector will hopefully be determined from the data, so that sectors can be compared and analyzed.

Chair Clark thanked the Chancellor and Dr. Hudson for their report and expressed that all of the Regents would like to get a copy of the initial data that were presented. He commented that the results of the survey seem to be very positive.

## **AUDIT COMMITTEE**

The Audit Committee met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 10:15 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Vice Chair George M. D. (John) Hunt III and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, and J. Tom Coleman, Jr. Vice Chair Hunt reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed two items, neither of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Information Item: Summary of Audit Activity, 1998 Audit Plan**

The Committee had a thorough discussion of the status of the 1998 Audit Plan. Also discussed was a report on the findings and recommendations relating to an internal audit of Floyd College. Due to the serious nature of the audit findings, the Committee recommended that a letter be sent to President H. Lynn Cundiff expressing the Committee's concern and requesting a status report of the corrective action plan submitted by the institution.

### **2. Information Item: Report on the Fiscal Year 1999 Audit Plan**

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and Assistant Vice Chancellor for Management & Audit Advisory Services Levy G. Youmans reviewed the process of completing the annual risk assessment, and the Fiscal Year 1999 Audit Plan was presented. It was noted that the process is already underway and is expected to be completed in time for presentation and approval at the June 9, 1998 meeting of the Board of Regents.

## TEACHING HOSPITAL COMMITTEE

The Teaching Hospital Committee met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 11:15 a.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Thomas F. Allgood, Sr. and Regents Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Canestra, S. William Clark, Jr., Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chair Allgood 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. Report on Teaching Hospital Study and Chancellor's Recommendations**

Approved: The Board approved the recommendations made by the Chancellor concerning the findings of the Medical College of Georgia ("MCG") Strategic Review Summary Report, which was compiled by Arthur Andersen. The recommendations were as follows:

- **The Board of Regents should clarify the vision, mission, goals, and strategies of MCG.**

The Chancellor recommended that the Committee form a commission to examine these issues. The commission would consist of the members of the Teaching Hospital Committee, the president of MCG, two MCG faculty members (one elected by the clinical chairs and one elected at-large for the other schools), a member appointed by the Governor, a member appointed by the Lieutenant Governor, a member appointed by the Speaker of the House, a member appointed by the Georgia Medical Association, and a member appointed by the Chancellor. The commission would examine background materials on the challenges facing academic medicine nationally and how other institutions have responded, conduct public hearings to gather input on future directions for MCG, and make recommendations to the Board of Regents at its September 1998 meeting on the vision, mission, goals, and strategies of MCG.

- **The Board of Regents, in collaboration with MCG, will engage Arthur Andersen to recommend to the Board of Regents, within 45 days, no less than two options to ensure that there is sufficient flexibility for MCG to provide an adequate patient base for its academic mission.**

While MCG Health, Inc. has many of the characteristics necessary to allow MCG to compete for patients, it is still in its infancy and may not have the correct structure and Board membership to provide adequate flexibility. It is very important to move quickly to get the best possible vehicle for providing a sufficient patient base.

- **The Chancellor will work with the president of MCG to recommend to the Board of Regents an administrative reorganization for MCG.**

Over the last decade, MCG has changed significantly; however, during the same period, the basic structure of the organization has changed very little. Other academic medical centers and research universities are increasingly changing the focus of their presidents' activities. The initial reorganization recommendation will be made to the Committee at its April 1998 meeting.



## **TEACHING HOSPITAL COMMITTEE**

### **1. Report on Teaching Hospital Study and Chancellor's Recommendations (Continued)**

These recommendations have an aggressive timetable and will be addressed during the next several Board meetings. All recommendations will require final action by the Board. They will further strengthen MCG and enable it to respond to the changing healthcare environment for academic medical centers and to continue to be an asset for the University System as well as the State of Georgia.

The above-referenced report concerned MCG's current ability to achieve its stated mission and vision as well as its current strategies, governance, and management structure. The report was presented to the Committee by Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers.

**COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

The Committee on Finance and Business Operations met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 1:20 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Kenneth W. Cannestra, Vice Chair Glenn S. White, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Charles H. Jones, and Donald M. Leebern, Jr. Chair Cannestra reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed four items, two of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

**1. Amendments to Fiscal Year 1998 Budget**

Approved: The Board approved the consolidated amendments to the Fiscal Year 1998 Budget of the University System of Georgia, as presented below:

<b>UNIVERSITY SYSTEM OF GEORGIA</b>				
<b>FISCAL YEAR 1998 BUDGET AMENDMENT REPORT</b>				
<b>SUMMARY</b>				
<b>FOR THE MONTH OF MARCH 1998</b>				
	<b>ORIGINAL</b>	<b>APPROVED</b>	<b>REQUESTED</b>	<b>AMENDED</b>
<b>BY BUDGET</b>	<b>BUDGET</b>	<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	<b>AMENDMENTS</b>	<b>BUDGET</b>
<b>Operating</b>	\$3,197,544,095	\$32,965,721	\$375,811	\$3,230,885,627
<b>Capital</b>	149,262,649	8,869,639	436,197	158,568,485
<b>Auxiliary Enterprises</b>	264,943,337	19,870,564	(63,825)	284,750,076
<b>Student Activities</b>	42,881,116	4,851,796	(26,126)	47,706,786

Background: In accordance with current policy, the Board of Regents approves all budget amendments submitted by System institutions. The monthly budget amendment report highlights and discusses amendments where changes exceed 5% of the budget or add significant ongoing expenses to the institutions. The following amendment was presented for review by the Board of Regents in accordance with these guidelines:

Operating: Waycross College requested authority to increase its budget by \$117,192 in nonpersonal services to reflect an increase in projected HOPE Scholarship revenue and private foundation funding for the PREP Program (“Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program”).

## **COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND BUSINESS OPERATIONS**

### **2. Acceptance of Declaration of Trust at the University of Georgia**

Approved: The Board accepted on behalf of the University of Georgia \$200,000 to establish the Jack F. and Susan Rissman Scholarship Fund to benefit students of the university.

Background: Board policy requires that any gift to a University System of Georgia institution with an initial value greater than \$100,000 must be accepted by the Board of Regents.

The donation establishes the scholarship fund initially at \$200,000, with provisions for future contributions to the fund. It is to be used to provide one or more scholarships for needy, underprivileged, and deserving students enrolled at the University of Georgia.

### **3. Information Item: Presentation by Peachtree Asset Management on Investment Performance (Health Insurance Reserve Funds)**

Mr. Dennis Johnson, President and Chief Investment Officer of Peachtree Assets Management Co., reported to the Committee on the investment performance of the Health Insurance Reserve Funds. The performance exceeded the Solomon Index, which it is measured against.

### **4. Information Item: Second Quarter FY 1997-98 Financial Report**

Senior Vice Chancellor for Capital Resources Lindsay Desrochers and Associate Vice Chancellor for Fiscal Affairs William R. Bowes presented to the Committee the second quarter financial report for the University System of Georgia for the period ending December 31, 1997. The report provides tables which compare actual and budgeted revenues and expenditures through December 1997 for educational and general funds, auxiliary enterprise funds, and student activity funds. In addition, the report contains charts which compare December 1997 financial data with financial data from December 1996.

The report shows the University System of Georgia to be in sound financial condition overall. Revenues and expenditures, relative to budgeted amounts, are at levels expected through this period for all funds. They are also consistent with levels recorded in prior-year reports for the same midyear period.

It was noted that expenditures for athletics programs exceed revenues Systemwide for December 1997. This can be attributed to the higher cost of programs operated in the first part of the fiscal year, especially football. Athletic revenues and expenditures are expected to become balanced in subsequent reporting periods. It was also noted that instructional expenditures and expenditures for scholarships and fellowships under "Other Organized Activities" appear to be high for the midyear period. However, this simply reflects the manner in which funds are disbursed for certain programs (e.g., resident capitation grants which are paid in lump sums at various times during the fiscal year by the Joint Board of Family Practice ) and is not an indication of potential overexpenditure. Finally, it was noted that actual non-fee revenues in student activity funds appear to be higher than expected. The volatility of non-fee revenue for student programs and the difficulty of making very accurate budget projections as a result account for this.

This report is on file with the Office of Capital Resources.

## COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES

The Committee on Real Estate and Facilities met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 1:50 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Vice Chair Charles H. Jones, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Kenneth W. Cannestra, George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Edgar L. Jenkins, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., and Glenn S. White. Chair Coleman reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed four items, all of which required action. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Appointment of Architect, University System of Georgia**

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

Background: At the June 1997 meeting, the Board rank ordered 27 major capital outlay projects, and the staff has commenced the process that will result in the selection of a project design firm for each project. This process included the placement of an advertisement for the first 14 projects in 7 newspapers of general circulation throughout the State, together with a personal letter enclosing a copy of the advertisement to over 200 architectural firms that had previously submitted their credentials. A process was identified for all firms that were interested in pursuing a design commission for one or more of the first 14 projects. This process included the firm's submittal of a standardized qualification questionnaire, followed by a staff/campus group identifying the three or four firms that appeared to be most qualified to perform each particular project.

Each of these firms was then offered the opportunity to submit a more complete statement that included its team's qualifications to the staff/campus committee who compiled the recommendations included below. This process resulted in over 515 firms' being considered for the 14 projects (although some firms competed for more than one project).

Eight of the first 14 were presented in October, and 2 were presented in February. This item presents the eleventh of these 14 projects:

#### **Project No. I-11, "Environmental Sciences & Technology Building" Georgia Institute of Technology**

Project Description: 200,000 gsf. facility that will include a lecture hall, a distance learning classroom, 2 standard classrooms, 10 dry labs, 20 wet labs, 20 research labs, and 70 offices as well as technical support, together with ancillary support services.

Total Project Cost	\$45,993,000*
Construction Cost (Stated Cost Limitation)	\$35,000,000
A/E (fixed) Fee	\$2,250,000

\*Includes \$12,500,000 from campus donations.

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **1. Appointment of Architect, University System of Georgia (Continued)**

Number of A/E firms that applied for this commission: 47

Recommended A/E design firms in rank order:

1. Hellmuth Obata Kassabaum of Atlanta
2. Henningson, Durham & Richardson, Inc. of Atlanta
3. Lockwood Green of Atlanta

### **2. Establishment of Campus Student Housing, Armstrong Atlantic State University**

Approved: The Board approved the investigation and development of a concept to construct a student housing complex at Armstrong Atlantic State University with the understanding that on-campus, purpose-built facilities are anticipated through a lease agreement with a private entity.

The result of this investigation will be reported to the Board as a “refined concept proposal” prior to the final development of terms and conditions.

Background: In October 1997, the Board passed a new student housing policy that requires each housing campus to prepare a comprehensive plan for student housing, together with a financial plan to support the housing program objectives. Armstrong Atlantic State University has developed a comprehensive student housing plan that is consistent with the policy.

The campus housing plan’s objective is to house approximately 5% of the current student enrollment, with the financial projections based on 90% occupancy rate of the proposed housing facilities.

The campus is planning to seek proposals by a private entity to construct a student housing complex on the campus of Armstrong Atlantic State University.

It appears that a student housing facility that is capable of accommodating 300 students in apartment-style units could provide convenient, high-quality, and safe housing units at an affordable cost to the students via a ground lease arrangement (similar to that used at Southern Polytechnic State University) that includes the operation of the facility by a private company.

### **3. Authorization of Project “Campus Services Building,” Kennesaw State University**

Approved: The Board authorized Project “Campus Services Building,” Kennesaw State University, with a total project budget of \$1,700,000 from institutional funds.

The project (14,900 gsf.) will provide space for approximately 60 staff in Procurement, Business Services, Personnel, and Campus Police. This project is necessitated by Kennesaw State University’s utilization rate, which is currently the highest classroom utilization rate in the System at 52% and the least square footage assigned to each equivalent full-time student (“EFT”) at 73 sf./EFT.

The project has an estimated construction cost of \$1,393,000 (\$85 per square foot for finished space and \$30 per square foot for unfinished space).

## **COMMITTEE ON REAL ESTATE AND FACILITIES**

### **3. Authorization of Project “Campus Services Building,” Kennesaw State University (Continued)**

Funding for the project includes \$500,000 of fiscal year 1998 interest income, \$500,000 of fiscal year 1998 operating budget, and \$700,000 fiscal year 1998 auxiliary funds.

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

As a result of this project, approximately 10,600 sf. will be vacated in the core campus, for which renovation will be requested as a minor capital project in fiscal year 2000. If the minor capital project is approved, the renovation will permit the space to be used for the development office, library services, faculty offices, classrooms, and academic support services.

### **4. North Metro Center, Georgia State University**

Approved: The Board approved the North Metro Center, subject to the City of Alpharetta’s providing a letter of intent with specific commitment from the community for land, infrastructure, and endowment contributions.

In December 1997, the Board discussed proposals for off-campus centers in Bartow County, Gwinnett County, Camden County, and north metropolitan Atlanta (“North Metro”). In discussion on the North Metro Center proposal, the Board had several questions regarding the long-term service goal for the center, collaboration of other institutions, and the terms for participation of the community in acquiring land and other financial support for the center. At this meeting, President Carl Patton of Georgia State University presented a revised proposal for the center. Alpharetta Mayor Chuck Martin was also present at the meeting to show his support for the North Metro Center.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

The Committee on Education, Research, and Extension met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 2:55 p.m. in the Board Room. Committee members in attendance were Chair Edgar L. Rhodes, Vice Chair David H. (Hal) Averitt, and Regents Shannon L. Amos and Hilton H. Howell, Jr. Chair Rhodes reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had reviewed 18 items, 11 of which required action. Additionally, 84 appointments were reviewed and recommended for approval. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

### **1. Presentation/Discussion Item: Common Admission Application**

President DePaolo of Georgia College & State University introduced Dr. Larry A. Peevy, Associate Vice President for Enrollment Services at Georgia College & State University. Dr. Peevy was assisted by Dr. John Albright, Senior Associate Director of Admissions at the University of Georgia; Mr. Brad Bacon, the University System of Georgia Webmaster; and Mr. Les Janis, Director of the Georgia Career Information System, in his presentation of the Georgia Application and Electronic Advisement System ("GA EASY") to the Committee. GA EASY is an electronic common admission application which makes accessing information on System institutions possible through the World Wide Web from home, from school, from a library, from out of the State, and from out of the country. It helps students with their college selection and allows them to apply for admission to any System institution electronically. Dr. Peevy and Mr. Janis demonstrated to the Committee how GA EASY is used and discussed its advantages for students as well as for the System. Some of the advantages of GA EASY are that it supports the high school guidance programs, provides specific and accurate information about System institutions, reduces application data entry time, makes it easy to apply to more than one System institution, allows students to access their admission statuses sooner, is high-tech and user-friendly, will allow faster response time to students, will save money, and will increase the number of applications to System institutions, among others.

### **2. Revision to Faculty Contract Forms Contained in Board Policies 803.1202, 803.1301, 803.1302, 803.1303, 803.1304, 803.1305, and 803.1306**

Approved: The Board approved revised faculty contract instructions and forms contained in Board Policies 803.1202, 803.1301, 803.1302, 803.1303, 803.1304, 803.1305, and 803.1306, effective immediately.

As the University System prepares to move to the semester system, it is necessary to revise faculty contract forms to remove references to the quarter system. In addition, Section 803.1306 has been added to clarify compensation and responsibilities of administrators who hold faculty rank.

The revised faculty contract instructions and forms are on file with the Office of Human and External Resources and are available electronically on the Faculty Information System. Copies were also sent to all of the Chief Academic Officers at all System institutions.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **3. Approval of Biomedical Engineering Department to Offer the Existing Major in Bioengineering Under the Doctor of Philosophy Degree and the Existing Master of Science in Bioengineering Degree, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology (“GIT”) that the Biomedical Engineering Department be authorized to offer the existing major in bioengineering under the doctor of philosophy degree and the existing master of science in bioengineering degree, effective March 11, 1998.

At its September 1997 meeting, the Board authorized GIT to establish a Department of Biomedical Engineering jointly with Emory University. As the coordinator of GIT’s participation in this interdisciplinary and interinstitutional effort, the department will now offer the currently existing major in bioengineering under the doctor of philosophy degree and the existing master of science in bioengineering degree.

As reported to the Board in September 1997, the biomedical engineering field combines traditional engineering expertise with knowledge of medicine and biology to analyze and solve problems related to the improvement of health care. Biomedical engineers may be called upon to design instruments, sensors, devices, and software that bring together knowledge from many technical sources to develop new procedures. The mission of the Biomedical Engineering Department is to educate and prepare students to reach the forefront of leadership in the fields of biomedical engineering and to influence health care by assembling a world-class faculty who are in the forefront of research in key biomedical areas.

### **4. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Horticulture Degree, Dalton College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President James A. Burran of Dalton College to establish an associate of applied science degree in environmental horticulture, effective March 11, 1998.

Abstract: For the past year, Dalton College has offered a certificate course in environmental horticulture with approximately 20 majors. There have been numerous requests for the associate of applied science degree by those enrolled. That vertical mobility can be provided for the students at no additional cost to the institution.

Need: In 1993, environmental horticulture faculty in area high schools expressed a need for establishing this program at Dalton College. Results of 1,019 distributed interest surveys showed that over 50% of the high school seniors expressed an interest in one-year, two-year, or four-year environmental horticulture programs. Of 40 prospective employers, 77.5% said that Dalton College should offer such programming. In fall 1996, Dalton College was approved to begin a one-year certificate program in environmental horticulture. Prospective employers, high school faculty, and students affirmed that this was the first step on a career ladder leading to a two-year degree.



## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 4. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Horticulture Degree, Dalton College (Continued)

Objectives: The objectives of the program are to provide current curriculum, instructional materials, and equipment which teach knowledge, skills, and attitudes appropriate to the industry needs; provide educational facilities which foster learning and provide safe, healthy environments available and accessible to all students who can benefit from the program; provide academic instruction which supports effective learning within the program; and enhance professional performance on the job. Students will acquire the knowledge to work in such areas as greenhouse/nursery production, landscape contracting, garden center management, and golf course management.

Curriculum: The associate of applied science in environmental horticulture will be housed in the Department of Environmental Horticulture which is part of the Technical Division of the institution.

Projected Enrollment: It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 8, 9, and 15.

Funding: No additional funding is required to support the program. The institution will utilize internally redirected funds to initiate and maintain the program.

Assessment: The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2001, the program will be evaluated by the institution and the System Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

#### **DALTON COLLEGE**

Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Horticulture Degree  
Sample Program of Study

#### **Quarter Credit Hours**

#### **General Education (Choose for a total of 35 - 36 hours)**

English 101: Composition	5
History 251 OR 252: American History	5
Mathematics 100: College Algebra OR Mathematics 106 and 107: Algebra I and II OR Mathematics III: Technical Mathematics	5 - 6
Political Science 101: American Government	5
Speech 108: Fundamentals of Speech	5
Biology 101 or 203: General Biology or Botany	5
Management 260: Principles of Management	5

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 4. Establishment of an Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Horticulture Degree, Dalton College (Continued)

**DALTON COLLEGE**  
 Associate of Applied Science in Environmental Horticulture Degree  
 Sample Program of Study  
 (Continued)

**Major Field Courses (Choose for a total of 63 hours)**

Environmental Hort 100:	Horticulture Science	5
Environmental Hort 101:	Plant Identification	5
Environmental Hort 103:	Greenhouse Management I	5
Environmental Hort 104:	Horticulture Construction	5
Environmental Hort 105:	Nursery Production	2
Environmental Hort 106:	Landscape Design	5
Environmental Hort 107:	Landscape Installation	5
Environmental Hort 108:	Pest Control	5
Environmental Hort 110:	Greenhouse Management II	5
Environmental Hort 112:	Landscape Management	3
Environmental Hort 114:	Garden Center Management	3
Environmental Hort 215:	Environmental Horticulture Internship	15
Physical Education 100:	Standard First Aid/Adult CPR	1
Electives		5

**TOTAL HOURS:** **104 - 105**

**5. Establishment of a Major in African-American Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, Georgia State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University to establish a major in African-American studies (“AAS”) under the existing bachelor of arts degree, effective March 11, 1998.

Abstract: Currently, in the nation’s universities and colleges, the discipline of AAS is undergoing a second renaissance. Since the establishment of the Department of African-American Studies at Georgia State University in 1994, 24 courses focusing on the African-American experience have been added to the curriculum, bringing the total offerings to 34 courses. Given the substantial number of courses and faculty expertise, a major is being proposed under the current bachelor of arts degree.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **5. Establishment of a Major in African-American Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, Georgia State University (Continued)**

**Need:** A major in AAS offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of African-American people nationally and globally. It offers critiques of knowledge presented in other disciplines and professions and provides accounts of the realities of African-Americans' lives and visions for empowerment. Since 1994, over 500 students have taken AAS courses at Georgia State University. During the past five quarters (fall 1994 through fall 1995), a total of 584 students enrolled in the 20 AAS undergraduate courses. Courses taught during this period generated 1,529 credit hours. Presently, 20 students are minoring in AAS and 10 individuals have contacted the department expressing an interest in earning a bachelor of arts degree in AAS. Over 90% of all AAS courses are cross-listed with other departments in the College of Arts and Sciences.

**Objectives:** The objectives of the bachelor of arts major in AAS are to further the university's mission of providing a curriculum reflective of the multicultural components of the State and the nation, to provide students with historical and cultural grounding, to advance interdisciplinary inquiry at the university, to promote the university's commitment to service learning and community outreach, and to enhance faculty diversity and provide opportunities for faculty professional development. Students will have the opportunity to pursue graduate study or become involved in community service outreach through such organizations as the American Red Cross, the Atlanta Outreach Center, the Atlanta Urban Ministry, and other agencies. Students will also have opportunities to grow professionally with such organizations as the Atlanta University Center, the Martin Luther King Center, The Herndon Home, the Hammonds House Gallery of African-American Art, the APEX (African-American Panoramic Experience) Museum, and the Auburn Avenue Research Library.

**Curriculum:** The program will be administered by the Department of African-American Studies of the College of Arts and Sciences. The entire program of study will be 180 quarter hours (120 semester hours). It is anticipated that the institution will admit the first class of students in the spring quarter of 1998. Students majoring in AAS are required to take two AAS courses (10 credit hours) at the lower division under the rubric of courses appropriate to the program of study and 40 hours of upper-division AAS courses for the major.

These upper-division hours are comprised of three core courses (15 credit hours) and five courses distributed over two areas of concentration: humanities and social and behavioral sciences. The major will facilitate dialogue about the substantive nature of the role that people of African descent have played in the generation of knowledge and their contributions to human civilization. The program will also acquaint students with the broad array of issues, theoretical models, and research methods of the discipline of AAS. Opportunities are available for Georgia State University to collaborate with Savannah State University in this discipline.

**Projected Enrollment:** It is anticipated that for the first three years of the program, student enrollment will be 15, 20, and 35.

**Funding:** No additional funding is required to support the program. An in-depth curriculum, distinguished faculty, sufficient budgetary resources, as well as adequate facilities are currently in place to offer the proposed program.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **5. Establishment of a Major in African-American Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, Georgia State University (Continued)**

**Assessment:** The Office of Academic Affairs will work with the institution to measure the success and continued effectiveness of the proposed program. In 2001, the program will be evaluated by the

institution and the System Office to determine the success of the program's implementation and achievement of the enrollment, quality, viability, and cost-effectiveness, as indicated in the proposal.

**GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY**

Major in African-American Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree  
Sample Program of Study

Courses Appropriate to the Major Field (30 hours)

1. AAS 114/HIST 114: Introduction to African and African-American Culture (5)  
AAS 201: Introduction to African-American Studies (5)
2. Foreign Language 103, 204 (10 hours)
3. Electives (10 hours) from the following:

ANTH 202	EC 201,202	SOC 201, 202
HIST 111, 112, 113	PSY 203, 204	MATH 107
GEOG 101	PHIL 201, 241	PSY 101; 202
WST 201		

Required Core Courses (15 hours)

AAS 312: African Diaspora (5); AAS 412: African-American Political Thought (5); and AAS 498: Senior Seminar and Practicum (5)

Required Major Courses (25 hours)

A minimum of 25 hours must be taken from African-American Studies courses at the 300-400 level which must include three (3) courses from one of the two (2) areas of concentration: Humanities and Social/Behavioral Sciences:

**Humanities Courses**

**Social/Behavioral Science Courses**

AAS 308/PHIL 308: History of African-American Philosophy	AAS 300/SOC 352: African-American Family
AAS 331/HIST 331: Eastern and Southern Africa	AAS 305/PSY 352: Introduction to African-American Psychology
AAS 350/MUS 250: Jazz History	AAS 324/ANTH 324: Peoples and Cultures of Africa
AAS 388/ENG 388: African-American Literature	AAS 348/SPCH 450: African-American Rhetoric
AAS 425/RELS 425: African-American Religion	AAS 400/SOC 401: Issues in the African-American Community
AAS 430/AH 400: African Art	AAS 408/WST 411: African-American Female Activism

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**5. Establishment of a Major in African-American Studies Under the Existing Bachelor of Arts Degree, Georgia State University (Continued)**

**Humanities Courses**

**Social/Behavioral Science Courses**

AAS 431/AH 401: Art of Egypt, Nubia and Maghrib	AAS 410/SOC 410: African-American Women in the United States
AAS 432/AH 462: African-American Art	AAS 416/POLS 416: African-American

	Politics
AAS 465/TH 409: African-American Theatre	AAS 418/POLS 418: Politics of the Civil Rights Movement
AAS 475/PHIL 475: African-American Ethical and Legal Issues	AAS 428/ANTH 428: African-American Anthropology
AAS 485/ENG 485: African-American Women's Fiction	AAS 453/WST 401, SPCH 452: Voices of African-American Feminists

**6. Establishment of the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Electro-Optics, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology to establish the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Electro-Optics, effective March 11, 1998.

The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. has established endowment funds in the principal amount of \$1.5 million for the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Electro-Optics at GIT.

Mr. Robinson graduated from GIT with a bachelor's degree in physics in 1948 and a master's degree in physics in 1950. He is trustee emeritus of the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. and trustee emeritus and former chairman of the Georgia Tech Research Corporation. The chair bears Mr. Robinson's name in recognition of his commitment to GIT.

**7. Establishment of the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Nonlinear Science, Georgia Institute of Technology**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President G. Wayne Clough of the Georgia Institute of Technology ("GIT") to establish the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Nonlinear Science, effective March 11, 1998.

The Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. has established endowment funds in the principal amount of \$1.5 million for the Glen P. Robinson Research Chair in Nonlinear Science at GIT.

Mr. Robinson graduated from GIT with a bachelor's degree in physics in 1948 and a master's degree in physics in 1950. He is trustee emeritus of the Georgia Tech Foundation, Inc. and trustee emeritus and former chairman of the Georgia Tech Research Corporation. The chair bears Mr. Robinson's name in recognition of his commitment to GIT.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **8. Establishment of the Karl E. Peace Endowed Chair in Mathematics/Computer Science, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Nicholas L. Henry of Georgia Southern University to establish the Karl E. Peace Endowed Chair in Mathematics/Computer Science, effective March 11, 1998.

The Georgia Southern University Foundation has a commitment of \$500,000 from Dr. Peace to establish the Karl E. Peace Endowed Chair in Mathematics/Computer Science. The establishment of this endowed chair will assist in recognizing the contributions of Dr. Peace.

Dr. Peace earned a bachelor of science degree in 1963 from Georgia Southern University. He holds a master of science degree from Clemson University and a doctor of philosophy degree from the Medical College of Virginia. Dr. Peace taught mathematics at Georgia Southern University from 1965 until 1969. Dr. Peace has become a distinguished scientist in the field of biostatistics and biopharmaceutical research.

### **9. Institutional Reorganization, Macon State College**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President David A. Bell to reorganize Macon State College, effective March 11, 1998.

Macon State College's new administrative organization will reduce from 13 to 4 the number of offices reporting directly to the president, shift resources to the college's academic core by moving student affairs under academic affairs, and consolidate institutional advancement functions (public relations, publications, development and alumni affairs, community relations, and grants and contracts) into a single, coherent unit. The bachelor of science program in information technology will be established as an independent unit (apart from the Division of Economics and Business) to enhance its institutional identity and accelerate its potential for growth.

Several changes in personnel will coincide with the streamlining of the organization. The position of Vice President for Student Affairs has been eliminated. A successful search for the new Vice President for Fiscal Affairs has been completed, and a national search is underway for the new Vice President for Academic Affairs. The position of Vice President for Institutional Advancement will be assumed by the Director of College Relations. In addition, the person who serves as Director of Admissions and Acting Director of Enrollment Management will no longer be considered acting, but rather, will be considered permanent in those capacities.

### **10. Institutional Reorganization, Kennesaw State University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Betty L. Siegel to reorganize Kennesaw State University, effective July 1, 1998.

Kennesaw State University's faculty have explored ways to improve the focus and effectiveness of the learning community and to strengthen collaborative linkages across disciplines. The institutional changes involve the strategic redirection and realignment of several academic units at Kennesaw State University.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

### **10. Institutional Reorganization, Kennesaw State University (Continued)**

The three organizational improvements are as follows:

- Realignment of Interrelated Professional Programs and Departments Into a College of Health and Human Services, Replacing the School of Nursing

The faculty and departments that offer health and human service programs at Kennesaw State University have been dispersed across several different colleges and divisions of the University. The scattered placement of the disciplines has restricted the impact and visibility of the programs. The proposed realignment will involve the Baccalaureate Nursing Department, the Primary Care Nursing Department, all contract service programs of the School of Nursing with the Department of Health, Physical Education and Sport Science (previously in the College of Education), the Department of Public Administration and Human Services (previously in the College of Arts, Humanities, and Social Sciences), and the Wellness Center (redirected from the Student Services Division). The resultant College will have 52 full-time faculty and staff, programs involving 1,524 majors, and increased prospects for growth in programs, contract services, and grants.

- Realignment of the Special Education Programs and Faculty Into a Department of Special Education

Kennesaw State University's faculty and Master's programs in special education have grown rapidly in response to this being cited as a critical area by the State Department of Education. Departmental visibility is desirable for this discipline. Special education is currently a unit within the Department of Elementary & Early Childhood Education. The proposal redirects four of the 14 full-time faculty from the department, and one position from the Secondary & Middle Grades Department to the New Department of Special Education. This proposal redirects four of the 14 full-time faculty from that department, and one position from the Secondary & Middle Grades Department to the new Department of Special Education.

- Realignment of Social Science Faculty Into a Department of Sociology, Geography and Anthropology

Six social science faculty who specialize in sociology and anthropology and who are in the Department of Public Administration and Human Services, three social geographers in the Department of Political Science and International Affairs, and the Director of the Center for Excellence in Teaching & Learning are working collaboratively on curricular initiatives. These projects involve creative applications of technology, innovative general education and undergraduate majors and certificate programs. The instructional effectiveness of their work would be improved through this departmental realignment. A total of nine full-time faculty would form this new department.

All of the proposed realignments involve redirection of existing institutional resources. No special funding is required or requested. Improved instructional effectiveness and collaboration associated with these redirections can be expected to result in increased productivity and responsiveness to State needs and employer demands.

#### **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

#### **11. Renaming of the Departments of Nursing and Accounting to the School of Nursing and School of Accountancy, Georgia Southern University**

Approved: The Board approved the request of President Nicholas Henry to rename the Departments of Nursing and Accounting to the School of Nursing and School of Accountancy, effective March 11, 1998.

Georgia Southern University requests that the current Department of Accounting be renamed a School of Accountancy within the College of Business Administration. The school would be headed by a director reporting to the Dean of the College of Business Administration. The School of Accountancy will have a distinct, visible professional identity within the college, the university and the professional accounting community. The school will have an accounting advisory board comprised of practicing professionals. Some benefits associated with this change are the fact that a School of Accountancy will create an esprit-de-corps for accounting students and a School of Accountancy will enhance fund-raising activities due to its separate identity. Although autonomous, the School of Accountancy has a mission that is consistent with that of the college and university. The discipline of accounting is recognized as a profession by various professional certifications that its graduates can obtain. These include the designation as Certified Public Accountant, Certified Management Accountant, and Certified Internal Auditor. There are no budgetary considerations related to this change.

The institution requests approval for a School of Nursing within the College of Health and Professional Studies to replace the existing Department of Nursing. The School of Nursing would be headed by a chair reporting to the dean of the College of Health and Professional Studies. Motivation for this change comes from recommendations of external review agencies, programs in peer institutions that house nursing units within a college of health, and the desire to retain national stature and visibility for an outstanding program. There are no budgetary considerations related to this change.

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

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

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

(A) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY

BATTEN, ROBERT W.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT & INSURANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

BERRY, LEONARD E.: PROFESSOR AND DIRECTOR EMERITUS OF ACCOUNTANCY, SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

BROWN, JOHN E.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF ACTUARIAL SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT & INSURANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

## **COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

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

(Continued)

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS (CONTINUED):

(A) GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY (CONTINUED)

BURDEN, CHARLES A.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

GREENE, MYRON TYRONE: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEMS, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.



GREER, JOHN T.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL POLICY STUDIES, COLLEGE OF EDUCATION, EFFECTIVE AUG 18, 1998.

HERMANSON, ROGER H.: REGENTS' PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, SCHOOL OF ACCOUNTANCY, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

SMITS, STANLEY J.: PROFESSOR AND CHAIR EMERITUS OF MANAGEMENT, DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

TRUSLOW, JOHN W.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF LEGAL STUDIES, DEPARTMENT OF RISK MANAGEMENT & INSURANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

VERNOR, JAMES D.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR AND CHAIR EMERITUS OF REAL ESTATE, DEPARTMENT OF REAL ESTATE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, EFFECTIVE JUN 18, 1998.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

FERRE, FREDERICK: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1998.

(C) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

BOXER, ROBERT J.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CHEMISTRY, DEPARTMENT OF CHEMISTRY, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

BROGDON, FREDERICK W.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF HISTORY, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

JOHNSON, RICHARD B.: ASSOCIATE EMERITUS PROFESSOR OF COMMUNICATION ARTS, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION ARTS, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

KARRH, JOHN B.: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF CIVIL ENGINEERING TECHNOLOGY, SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

LAVENDER, D. EARL: ASSOC PROF EMERITUS OF MATHEMATICS AND DEPARTMENT CHAIR EMERITUS OF MATH & COMPUTER SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS & COMPUTER SCIENCE, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 12. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions (Continued)

CONFERRING OF EMERITUS STATUS (CONTINUED):

(C) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY (CONTINUED)

MANRING, JAMES E.: PROF EMERITUS OF ENGINEERING STUDIES AND DEAN EMERITUS OF ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF TECHNOLOGY, SCHOOL OF TECHNOLOGY, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

MAUR, KISHWAR M.: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR EMERITA OF BIOLOGY, DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGY, THE ALLEN E. PAULSON COLLEGE OF SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

SMITH, SUE L: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR EMERITA OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY AND CONSUMER SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF HEALTH & PROFESSIONAL STUDIES, EFFECTIVE APR 1, 1998.

(D) AUGUSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

WALKER, RALPH H.: CHAIRMAN AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, SCHOOL OF ARTS & SCIENCES, EFFECTIVE SEP 1, 1998.

(E) GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY

LONG, JOSEPH GORDON: PROFESSOR EMERITUS OF MARKETING DEPARTMENT OF MARKETING, J. WHITNEY BUNTING SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, EFFECTIVE MAR 11, 1998.

(F) DARTON COLLEGE

EDWARDS, CHARLES T.: DIRECTOR OF ENROLLMENT MANAGEMENT EMERITUS, DIVISION OF SCIENCE-MATHEMATICS, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1998.

HEWETT, DAVID G.: CHAIR AND PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1998.

WALTON, JERRY ALEX: PROFESSOR OF HISTORY AND EDUCATION POSTHUMOUS EMERITUS, DIVISION OF SOCIAL SCIENCE, EFFECTIVE JUL 1, 1998.

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

(A) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

DATTA, NEERAJ: ASSOC RESEARCH SCI, DEPARTMENT OF BIOCHEMISTRY AND MOLECULAR BIOLOGY, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM JUN 1, 1997 TO MAY 31, 1998, WITHOUT PAY.

LIPSON, MARC LARSO: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF BANKING & FINANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, LEAVE FROM JUN 1, 1998 TO JUN 30, 1999, WITH PAY.

MEGGINSON, WILLIAM LEON: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF BANKING & FINANCE, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION, LEAVE FROM AUG 20, 1998 TO MAY 7, 1999, WITHOUT PAY.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 12. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions (Continued)

APPROVAL OF LEAVES OF ABSENCE (CONTINUED):

(B) GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY

FALL, LISA T.: ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION ARTS, COLLEGE OF LIBERAL ARTS & SOCIAL SCIENCES, LEAVE FROM AUG 1, 1998 TO MAY 31, 1999, WITHOUT PAY.

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

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

FARILL, TRENT G.: SR RESEARCH ENGINEER, ELECTRO-OPTICS ENVIRONMENT & MATERIALS LABORATORY, GEORGIA TECH RESEARCH INSTITUTE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEB 3, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

SHARKEY, MILDRED: PROGRAM COORDINATOR, COLLEGE OF SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 9, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

FREE, WILLIAM JOSEPH: ASSOCIATE PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 6, 1998 AND ENDING MAR 20, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

JOHNSON, BILLY JACK: PROFESSOR, DEPARTMENT OF CROP & SOIL SCIENCES, COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAR 27, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 11, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

JOHNSTON, MARGARET MIMS: INSTRUCTOR, GEORGIA CENTER FOR CONTINUING EDUCATION, VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1997 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

STICHER, CHARLES R.: PROJECT COORDINATOR, VICE PRESIDENT FOR ACADEMIC AFFAIRS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JUL 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1999, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

WISE, ALFRED PAUL: ASOP EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS, COLLEGE OF JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATIONS, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEB 3, 1998 AND ENDING MAR 3, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(C) VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

JONES, GRACE D.: CLERK I, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEB 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

LAMPERT, LARRY: BUS OPERATOR, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING MAR 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(D) ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY

JENKINS, MARVIN VERNON: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF LANGUAGES, LITERATURE & DRAMATIC ARTS, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 11, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

## COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION

### 12. Administrative and Academic Appointments and Personnel Actions, Various System Institutions (Continued)

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

(D) ARMSTRONG ATLANTIC STATE UNIVERSITY (CONTINUED)

LANIER, OSMOS: PROFESSOR EMERITUS, DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 1, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 11, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(E) DEKALB COLLEGE

DURHAM, SANDRA B.: PART-TIME PROFESSOR, DEKALB COLLEGE (CENTRAL), AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 26, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

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

(A) GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY

MARSHALL, HOLCOMBE T.: DIRECTOR ADMINISTRATIVE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING  
JAN 2, 1998 AND ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(B) UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA

DOWLING, JOHN CLARKSON: PROFESSOR EMERITUS & DEAN OF GRAD SCHOOL EMER,  
DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES, FRANKLIN COLLEGE OF ARTS AND SCIENCES, AS  
NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 6, 1998 AND ENDING MAR 20, 1998, AT LESS THAN  
HALF TIME.

HALE, WILLIAM HARVEY JR.: PART-TIME ASSOC PROFESSOR, INSTITUTE OF GOVERNMENT,  
VICE PRESIDENT FOR SERVICE, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING NOV 17, 1997 AND  
ENDING JUN 30, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(C) VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY

EVANS, MILDRED: ADMINISTRATIVE SECRETARY, AS NEEDED FOR PERIOD BEGINNING FEB 13,  
1998 AND ENDING APR 10, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

(D) FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY

SIMMONS, JULIUS C.: COUNSELOR, DEPARTMENT OF DEVELOPMENTAL STUDIES, AS NEEDED FOR  
PERIOD BEGINNING JAN 5, 1998 AND ENDING MAR 19, 1998, AT LESS THAN HALF TIME.

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

GEORGIA INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY	25
GEORGIA STATE UNIVERSITY	2
UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA	14
GEORGIA SOUTHERN UNIVERSITY	7
VALDOSTA STATE UNIVERSITY	3
ALBANY STATE UNIVERSITY	1
CLAYTON COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	1
COLUMBUS STATE UNIVERSITY	3
FORT VALLEY STATE UNIVERSITY	1
GEORGIA COLLEGE & STATE UNIVERSITY	1
KENNESAW STATE UNIVERSITY	1
STATE UNIVERSITY OF WEST GEORGIA	1
ATLANTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE	2
MACON STATE COLLEGE	1
MIDDLE GEORGIA COLLEGE	3

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**13. Information Item: Southern Association of Colleges and Schools Reaffirmation, South Georgia College**

President Edward D. Jackson, Jr. has informed the Board of Regents that South Georgia College has received reaffirmation by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges.

As part of the reaffirmation process, the college conducted a two-year self-study which examined every aspect of the institution's operation and enlisted the active participation of faculty, staff, students, and members of the community. The comprehensive self-examination yielded suggestions which strengthened the institution and improved its effectiveness. No recommendations for follow-up reporting were requested in the areas of planning and institutional effectiveness.

**14. Information Item: Establishment of an Interdisciplinary Certificate Program in East Central European Studies, University of Georgia**

President Michael F. Adams has informed the Board of Regents that the University of Georgia will establish an interdisciplinary certificate program in East Central European studies.

The certificate program in East Central European studies is designed for students who wish to study various sociopolitical, economic, cultural, and spiritual aspects of East Central Europe as an historically distinct region. It develops interdisciplinary programs of instruction and offers students an opportunity to earn an East Central European studies certificate in conjunction with their work for the bachelor's degree in a large number of disciplines, including anthropology, art history, business, comparative literature, education, geography, Germanic and Slavic languages and literatures, history, Italian language and literature, journalism, music, philosophy, political science, religion, and sociology. Many students majoring in some of these disciplines can satisfy the certificate requirements with few or no additions to their regular program of study.

The certificate program consists of 18 credit hours, divided into 9 hours of core courses and 9 hours of electives. Some of the core courses include East Central European Literature and Culture (CMLT 4400), Nazism and Fascism in Europe 1919 - 1945 (HIST 4410), Comparative Political Analysis (POLS 3300), and Politics of International Economic Relations (POLS 4230).

**15. Information Item: Establishment of the Center for Healthcare Improvement, Medical College of Georgia**

President Francis J. Tedesco has informed the Board of Regents that the Medical College of Georgia will establish a Center for Healthcare Improvement.

The Center for Healthcare Improvement will assist the Medical College of Georgia in enhancing the current educational programs by offering exposure to practice in integrated health care systems. These systems will consist of multi-disciplinary patient care teams comprised of physicians and other health care professionals. The center will allow the patient care teams to keep abreast of changing knowledge by having access to statewide patient populations and practicing primary care physicians for training and systems and databases for research to support that training.

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**15. Information Item: Establishment of the Center for Healthcare Improvement, Medical College of Georgia** (Continued)

This center will assist the Medical College of Georgia in supporting the physicians of Georgia in the practice of cost effective and clinically effective medicine and in documenting the effect of management care on health outcomes and access to medical care. Concurrently, another objective of the center is to develop educational programs emphasizing population health so that medical students, residents and practicing physicians are prepared for leadership roles in evolving health care systems. Partial funding for the center has been provided by Blue Cross Blue Shield of Georgia, Inc.

**16. Information Item: Applied Learning Experiences/Clinical Training**

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

<b>Georgia State University</b>		Nutrition	3
Allied Health	6	Physical Therapy	1
Cardiopulmonary Care	1	Psychology	1
Nursing	9, 1R	Social Work	4

<b>Medical College of Georgia</b>		Nursing	1, 1R
Allied Health	2R	<b>Columbus State University</b>	
Dentistry	2, 15R	Dental Hygiene	1
Health Information	1R	Nursing	1R
Neurology	1	Physical Educ./Recreation	1
Nursing	4, 2R	<b>Georgia College &amp; State University</b>	
Occupational Therapy	1, 3R	Health Sciences	5
Physical Therapy	1, 2R	<b>Georgia Southwestern State Univ.</b>	
Physician Assistant	1, 2R	Nursing	1R
Psychology and Health	1, 1R	<b>Kennesaw State University</b>	
Radiologic Sciences	1R	Nursing	5
Telemedicine	1R	<b>North Georgia College &amp; State Univ.</b>	
<b>The University of Georgia</b>		Nursing	1
Communication Sciences	3	Physical Therapy	7R
Counseling & Human Dev.	2, 1R	<b>Darton College</b>	
Pharmacy	5	Allied Health	1R
Recreation & Leisure	1, 1R	Emergency Medical Svcs.	4R
Social Work	1	Health Information	2, 5R
<b>Georgia Southern University</b>		Physical Therapy	1, 2R
Family & Consumer Sci.	6	Respiratory Care	2R
Health & Kinesiology	5	<b>DeKalb College</b>	
Leadership, Technology	1	Nursing	1R
Nursing	2, 1R	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>141</b>
Recreation & Sports Mgmt.	2		
Sociology & Anthropology	1		

R = Renewal

**Armstrong Atlantic State University**

**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION, RESEARCH, AND EXTENSION**

**17. Information Item: Service Agreements**

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

Purpose	Agency	Duration	Amount
<b>University of Georgia</b>			
Provide market risk management program for Georgia corn growers	Georgia Commodity Comm. for Corn	7/1/96 - 6/30/98	\$ 5,000
Provide services to Gwinnett Technology Training Center	Georgia Dept. of Education	7/1/97 - 6/30/98	\$ 45,000
Provide services to South Central Georgia	Georgia Dept. of Human Resources	1/1/98 - 9/30/98	\$ 64,950
Assist juvenile counseling and assessment program team	Georgia Dept. of Juvenile Justice	10/17/97 - 6/30/98	\$ 8,550
Provide services to GDТАЕ to determine employer satisfaction with former students	Georgia Dept. of Technical & Adult Education	11/1/97 - 6/30/98	\$ 107,200

Provide historical account of Georgia Emergency Management Agency	Georgia Emergency Management Agency	1/5/98 - 3/15/98	\$ 21,935
Provide Georgia GIS transportation base map database	Georgia Information Technology Policy Council	11/21/97 - 11/20/98	\$ 176,532
Assist with Georgia farmstead assessment system program	Georgia Soil/Water Conservation Commission	10/1/97 - 9/30/99	\$ 123,067
Assist with Georgia comprehensive passenger safety education program	Governor's Office of Highway Safety	10/1/97 - 9/30/98	\$ 518,900

<b>TOTAL AMOUNT THIS MONTH</b>	<b>\$ 1,071,134</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 98 To DATE</b>	<b>83,723,066</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 97 (TO MARCH)</b>	<b>16,656,235</b>
<b>TOTAL AMOUNT FY 97</b>	<b>20,173,291</b>

## **COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION AND LAW**

The Committee on Organization and Law met on Tuesday, March 10, 1998 at approximately 3:55 p.m. in the Board Room. The only Committee member in attendance was Edgar L. Jenkins. Other Board members in attendance were Regents Shannon L. Amos, David H. (Hal) Averitt, S. William Clark, Jr., J. Tom Coleman, Jr., Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, and Edgar L. Rhodes. Regent Clark, as Chair of the Board of Regents, appointed those Board members in attendance as an ad hoc Committee on Organization and Law. Regent Jenkins reported to the Board on Wednesday that the Committee had five applications for review. He also reported that the Committee had reviewed a letter requesting a change in policy relating to the right of faculty and staff of the University System to run for political office without having to take a leave of absence. Current Board of Regents policy prevents that, and the writer of the letter felt that this was a violation of Constitutional rights. While the Committee supports the Board's policy, it has solicited the Attorney General's opinion. With motion properly made, seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board approved and authorized the following:

1. In the matter of Sandy Cohen at Albany State University, concerning a salary increase, that the application for review be denied as moot.
5. In the matter of Kananur V. Chandras at Fort Valley State University, concerning a 1994 performance evaluation, that the application for review be denied.
6. In the matter of Vickie Alexander at the Georgia Institute of Technology, concerning suspension, that the application for review be denied.
7. In the matter of Helen Godbee at the Medical College of Georgia, concerning failure to receive a promotion, that the application for review be denied.
8. In the matter of Timothy E. Yorkey at Valdosta State University, concerning a reverse discrimination matter, that the application for review be denied.



## **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD**

At 9:20 a.m., Chair Clark called upon Chancellor Portch to present his report to the Board, which was as follows:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. We've all heard the expression "March Madness." Well, it applies at this time of year to the legislative session, where all 40 days are not created equally. We are now at day 35, and while we have a lot of work to do in the remaining 5 days, I am well satisfied so far.

On the budget front, you will recall that the Governor presented the legislature with a very strong budget for the University System of Georgia. I am now pleased to report that, on the whole, the House of Representatives' budget version is also an expression of support for the Board of Regents.

Let me highlight the House's recommendations and spotlight a few areas of concern. The House:

- Supported the 6% pay increase, although they recommended delaying the implementation for administrators and staff to September 1. The reasoning for the delay, though, was to fund an important improvement to the retirement system (relative to the accruing of sick leave towards TRS [Teacher Retirement System] retirement).
- Supported the full \$10 million increase for the formula. I am particularly appreciative for that support, since we asked for allowances regarding Olympic and Paralympic enrollment losses.
- Supported the endowed chairs at Armstrong, Columbus, and Macon (two), plus funding for the one at Georgia Southern, pending your approval.
- Supported the \$2.4 million increase in MRR (major renovation and rehabilitation).
- Supported the technology base increase but reduced the amount from \$6 million to \$4 million.
- Supported the Partners in Success initiative, recommending full funding for the gifted academies, slightly reduced funding for PREP (Post-secondary Readiness Enrichment Program) and mentoring, and no funding for the Math Placement Test.
- Supported the overall capital project list but with some changes:
  - √ Removed our number four project, Gainesville College.
  - √ Removed the student housing study from the minors list.

## **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD**

√ Added design dollars for the next project on the priority list, a technology facility at Columbus State.

√ Added our two payback projects at Georgia Tech (parking deck) and Valdosta State University (student center) for a total of \$19.75 million.

√ Added a facility design at UGA.

√ Added a \$2 million buyout of leased facilities at Georgia Southern.

This is a very good capital response, but we are working on two of the issues. The removal of the Gainesville project is a break with the historic respect for Regents' priority setting. This respect has served the State enormously well for years. It is of concern that in the year that the Regents gave the most responsible attention to establishing the list, plowing through 115 pages of data in their notebooks and sitting through an exhaustive two days of presidential presentations, changes would be made.

I also have questions about the addition of design dollars for a project that didn't even make the University of Georgia's priority list sent to us.

All other additions were entirely consistent with your priority list, although I do have to note we have still not been able to move forward on GEAU (Georgia Education Authority University), our ability to issue bonds for paybacks.

We now move to the Senate for its recommendations. We are hopeful of some further modifications, as the Senate brings its wisdom to bear. We will also continue to work with the House leadership to make our cases in selected areas, respecting their overall fairness to us.

We have miles to go before we can sleep, but we can be proud that, so far, the response to your budget request on behalf of our students has been positive.

On the legislative front, I am pleased to report that the divisive affirmation action debate is over this session, with no limiting of the Board's ability to make its own decision about compelling State interests. I am less pleased to report that the home school admission debate has been focused on what's wrong with the SAT IIs, not on responding to my offer to pilot an alternative. I have read that this is to "embarrass" us to back off our position or to "pressure" us. I need to be clear right now on admissions standards: we will not be embarrassed by expecting more from all students, however they are schooled. We have taken a more than reasonable position. We will continue to take that position a little longer, but if there are no reasonable alternatives offered soon, we will remove that offer from the table.

On the whole, though, I have great admiration for the level of discussion on serious issues with our legislative colleagues. By the time we meet again, sine die will have been sung.

## **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD**

Meanwhile, we “march” on with good news:

- Last week, Air Force 2 was dispatched to check out ICAPP, our Intellectual Capital Partnership Program, pioneered at Columbus State University. Governor Miller and Representative Calvin Smyre led Vice President Gore, Education Secretary Riley, and Senator Cleland in a roundtable briefing with Total System Services executives and ICAPP architects. Total System need for 1,200 computer programmers over three years was solved by the ICAPP partnership and secured their \$100 million corporate investment in Georgia. ICAPP graduate, Henry Byrd, capsulized the ICAPP concept as an “excuse eradicator,” because the program created a sure way to get an education and a good high-tech job of the future.

- The Fiscal Year 1997 Annual Report of the Georgia Lottery is out. The Lottery’s total contribution to the “Lottery for Education” account was almost \$2 billion. Because of this success, they were able to transfer more than \$581 million to the State for Georgia’s HOPE Scholarship program, the voluntary pre-kindergarten program and numerous technological upgrades and capital outlay projects throughout the State.

- University Union, the University of Georgia’s student programming board, was awarded the 1997 Excellence in Programming Award by the National Association for Campus Activities. This was the fourth year in a row UGA has won, an unprecedented record.

- Columbus State University has been awarded their eighth Fulbright grant in eight years. This one involves a faculty study to Indonesia and Singapore.

- Georgia State University’s School of Policy Studies will advise the Russian government on fiscal policy during the next four years as part of a \$19.6 million grant, the largest ever received by Georgia State. Jorge Martinez, Professor of Economics and Director of the International Studies Program, won the grant for the university and will direct the project from Atlanta. Sally Wallace, Associate Professor of Economics, will head the new six-person office in downtown Moscow.

- In the recent edition of *U.S. News & World Report’s 1998 America’s Best Graduate Schools*, Georgia Tech’s College of Engineering ranked fourth behind MIT, Stanford, and Cal-Berkeley and tied with Illinois, Michigan, and Carnegie Mellon. In that same report, Georgia State University was ranked fourth in part-time M.B.A. programs.

- Thanks to a collaborative venture between the Medical College of Georgia, Georgia Tech, and a group of telecommunications executives, healthcare providers soon will be able to examine patients in their homes electronically. This new venture, called CyberCare, Inc., will commercialize and distribute the electronic house call system. The prototype development and initial clinical testing were funded by a \$916,000 grant from the Department of the Army and a \$950,000 grant from the Georgia Research Alliance.

## **CHANCELLOR'S REPORT TO THE BOARD**

- Waycross College was awarded the "Best Programming Council" this year from the National Association for the Promotion of Campus Activities.
- Regent McMillan has been chosen by Georgia College & State University's Distinguished Service Award Committee to receive this year's Distinguished Service Award.
- Regent McMillan has also been chosen to receive an honorary degree from Xavier University at its commencement exercises on May 9.

Before I conclude, a quick weather update. As you have probably heard, the Flint River is misbehaving again. You will recall, however, that thanks to your insistence on professional master planning, all new buildings were placed on high ground. This is a good lesson, though, that a hundred-year flood is an expression based on new math. The campus is closed not because of flooding but because of utility and sewerage problems. While the lower campus may yet get some flooding, President Shields is getting lots of help filling sandbags. We will, of course, get a first-hand look next month when we hold our meeting in Albany.

So, we are able to cope with March Madness in the legislature and from the skies because our students are well satisfied, because the Governor and the legislative are responding to our initiatives, because of a widely acclaimed and new duly inaugurated president at the University of Georgia, because for the third time in 15 months either the President or Vice President of the United States has singled out University System of Georgia higher education programs for praise and emulation, and because good things are being done by fine people on our campuses each and every minute. All that helps your sanity.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

At approximately 9:35 a.m., the Board took a brief recess.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

At approximately 10:00 a.m., the Board reconvened and Chair Clark convened the meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee as a Committee of the Whole. He welcomed the Board’s distinguished guests, Chair of the State Board of Education Johnny Isakson and State Superintendent of Schools Linda Schrenko. He then turned the chairmanship of the meeting over to Regent Leebern.

Chair Leebern thanked Regent Clark and reminded the Board that this meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee was the fifth session of the year-long focus on teacher preparation. He explained that the study phase of the teacher preparation initiative has been completed and that the Committee is now beginning the second phase of this initiative. He then introduced Senior Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs James L. Muyskens.

Dr. Muyskens reminded the Board that it has many partners in the teacher preparation initiative and that some of its key partners were present at this meeting. In addition to Mr. Isakson and Superintendent Schrenko, Heath Garrett, Mr. Isakson’s assistant, and Holly Robinson, Deputy School Superintendent, were also present at the meeting. Dr. Muyskens expressed his appreciation to them for joining the Board at this meeting. He reiterated that the first phase of the teacher preparation initiative was a study of the System’s current practices, and he recapitulated the first four sessions of the initiative. The second phase of the initiative is the development of principles. Dr. Muyskens explained that the “Principles for the Preparation of Educators for the Schools” had been sent to the Regents. These principles were developed out of the discussions of the Board during the first phase of the initiative and reflect the wisdom of the many partners in the initiative. An ad hoc committee has been working with the Central Office staff in the development of these principles. The committee not only has presidents, vice presidents, and deans from the System institutions, but it also has the executive secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, the Deputy State Superintendent of Schools, principals, and teachers. Dr. Muyskens explained that the committee was as all-encompassing as possible. He thanked the committee as well as Superintendent Schrenko for allowing the committee members to work on this initiative. The Central Office staff has also been working with the P-16 councils. These combined efforts resulted in the development of nine principles which are bold and not only represent the thinking of the broad group, but also represent a forward-looking approach in the State of Georgia.

Dr. Muyskens explained that at this meeting, Assistant Vice Chancellor for Academic Affairs Jan Kettlewell would present the principles. This would be the Board’s first reading, but it would review the principles again at its April 1998 meeting in Albany. In the meantime, there will be a chance for considerable input from the Regents. Following Dr. Kettlewell’s presentation, Mr. Isakson would respond to this effort and related issues. Following Mr. Isakson, Superintendent Schrenko would discuss the principles. Following that, the Regents would go back over the principles so that they could contribute their thoughts to the process. They would be joined in their discussion by the two Master Teachers in Residence, Ms. Kay Cribbs and Ms. Sheila Jones. Dr. Muyskens then introduced Dr. Kettlewell.

Dr. Kettlewell thanked Dr. Muyskens and commented that the principles do not reflect her work alone. Rather, she represented the ad hoc committee and many other people who helped prepare the principles. She added that while the principles take the System in new directions, they build upon some important work to strengthen teacher preparation that is already going on in System institutions, in schools, in the Department of Education, by the Professional Standards Commission, and through the P-16 councils. The principles are organized into three categories: quality assurance, collaboration, and responsiveness. They emphasize two things: the knowledge and skills that educators need to teach and administrate effectively and the assurance

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

that graduates of System institutions can teach what they know in positive ways to children before they receive recommendation for certification. Dr. Kettlewell said that in the past, the focus of teacher preparation was on inputs, what courses teachers take and what kinds of field experiences they should have. The words “teacher candidate” refer to an undergraduate or graduate student who is in a program preparing to become a teacher. The focus was on the teacher, not the learner. Now, the emphasis is being shifted to results. Obviously, the knowledge and skills that teachers have will continue to be important, but as much as the inputs are emphasized, there has been an assumption that if teachers know those things they can go into the schools and produce positive results with children. The effectiveness of a teacher preparation program should be judged not only on what the teacher candidate knows and can do, but also on what the children learn as a result of what the teacher candidate knows and can do.

Dr. Kettlewell then addressed the nine principles. The first one, she said, was like a “University System guarantee.” The first principle was “The University System will guarantee the quality of any teacher it graduates.” This means that the System will stand by the quality of its graduates; maintain its obligation to its teachers once they graduate, move into the schools, and begin teaching; and take back any teacher within the first two years whose school district finds less than effective in promoting student progress. If the district does send the teacher back, further training would be at no cost to the teacher or the district. Dr. Kettlewell explained that teacher candidates would have sufficient subject matter knowledge in all subjects listed on the teaching certificate. The challenge would be to make sure that the content that future teachers should know is closely aligned with the K-12 curriculum that children are going to learn and to make sure that teacher candidates have sufficient depth in their subject areas to teach them in many different ways to many different learners. This is a fundamental principle because what a teacher knows about the field that he is teaching determines how he structures courses, how he plans lessons, and how he selects material. On the elementary level, this means emphasizing that all teacher education graduates have sufficient depth in the subject of reading to have a positive effect on children. It also means that before a teacher receives a recommendation for certification, she is able to demonstrate success in helping children from different socioeconomic, international, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds. Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board that when the deans came to speak before the Board, the Regents learned a great deal about courses in education and field experiences that teacher candidates take. Those are important aspects of teacher preparation, she stressed; however, they are not enough. If the shift is to be made from inputs to results, teacher candidates need not only know what to do, but also be able to demonstrate accomplishment in helping children from diverse groups to learn. This guarantee would also ensure that a candidate who is recommended for certification is able to use telecommunication and information technologies as tools for learning. This is important in all subjects, but it is critically important in the preparation of teachers.

The second principle, which also falls under the category of quality assurance, was “Graduate programs for teachers will adhere to the general principles of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.” This principle would apply to teachers who have already taught for a few years and are returning to System institutions for further study. The principle would mean that graduate programs will ensure that teachers are committed to students and their learning, recognize differences, and treat students equitably; know their subjects and be able to teach them to students; manage and monitor student learning through regular assessment; reflect and seek advice on their teaching; and use community resources and work effectively with parents and colleagues. Again, the focus of the principle is that teachers know their subjects and can effectively teach their subjects to their students.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

The third principle, which still falls under quality assurance, focused on the preparation of school administrators and was “The University System will assure that graduates of its programs for school leaders and counselors are able to create learning environments that support teacher success in bringing students from diverse groups to high levels of learning.” Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board that in its December 1997 meeting, Dr. James Jenkins, Superintendent of White County Schools, talked about the importance of school administrators in creating an environment in which teachers continue to learn, participate in shaping school policies and goals, and become more effective in bringing students to high academic standards. She told the Regents that those administrators are also prepared by System institutions. This principle suggests that before a school administrator is graduated from a System institution, she should be able to create such an environment. This principle would be the companion to the first principle; what would be guaranteed for teachers would also be guaranteed for school administrators. Universities will stand by their graduates and support their continued development.

The second category, collaboration, emphasized the shared responsibility for preparing teachers. Under this category, the fourth principle was “Teacher preparation programs will be the shared responsibility of education faculty, arts and sciences faculty, and classroom teachers in the schools.” Dr. Kettlewell depicted this collaboration between these groups as a “three-legged stool” and explained that, as a group, they would have responsibility for ensuring subject matter competence and the ability to connect the subject matter with children’s learning needs to promote student learning.

Also under the second category of collaboration was the fifth principle, which addressed the System’s responsibility in continuing to help teachers, principals, and other school leaders move into the schools. The fifth principle was “Through partnerships with P-12 schools, universities that prepare teachers will have an ongoing responsibility to collaborate with schools in mentoring, induction, and professional development programs for classroom teachers and school leaders.” This principle suggests that the colleges and universities would have continued responsibility to help their graduates. Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board that 35% of teachers in Georgia leave teaching within their first five years and that at the December 1997 meeting, Dr. Jenkins had suggested that if the System had these types of programs in place, there would be less chance of teachers’ leaving the profession in their first few years. With this principle, teacher preparation and development could be enhanced through school-university collaboration.

Under the third and final category of principles, responsiveness, the sixth principle focused on recruitment. Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board of the October 1997 presentation by Dr. Margaret M. (Peggy) Torrey, Executive Secretary of the Professional Standards Commission, which emphasized the importance of recruitment. The sixth principle was “All teacher preparation programs will implement aggressive recruitment policies to increase the numbers, to raise the caliber, and to expand the diversity of teacher candidates, and to balance supply and demand.” This principle stresses that the qualifications in teacher preparation must be comparable to the institution as a whole and that teacher candidates must be representative of diverse cultural groups so that children have effective role models. It also suggests that special efforts will be mandatory in shortage fields, supply and demand must be balanced, programs must be balanced with geographic needs, and a clearinghouse and back-up system to access qualified teachers are necessary.

The seventh principle, also under the category of responsiveness, has to do with programs for individuals who are already in a career and who decide they want second careers in teaching. The emphasis is on trying **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

to attract individuals from other careers into alternative teacher certification programs, particularly in

areas

of teacher shortages. The seventh principle was “The University System will expand the number of teacher certification programs offered to individuals who already hold bachelor’s degrees from accredited colleges in order to increase opportunities for individuals seeking second careers in teaching.”

The eight principle was “The University System will work with the Department of Education and the Professional Standards Commission to bring an end to out-of-field teaching in Georgia.” Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board that at its December 1997 meeting, Dr. Richard Ingersoll, Sociology Professor at the University of Georgia (“UGA”), had emphasized the high percentage of teachers in some fields without even academic minors in their subjects. Dr. Kettlewell also stated that accreditation laws allow high school teachers to teach a minor portion of their day out-of-field, that middle school teachers may teach any subject regardless of subjects they have studied, and that higher student achievement occurs when teachers are well prepared in their subjects.

The ninth and final principle focused on the kinds of issues that University System institutions should emphasize. This principle was “The University System will encourage institutions that prepare teachers to give added emphasis to policies that support the efforts of faculty to model effective teaching, give same status and value to teacher preparation research as is given to basic and applied research, and support increased participation of teacher preparation faculty in the public schools.” Dr. Kettlewell reminded the Board that many student teachers pattern their teaching styles after their professors, which gives an added reason for the Board to pay special attention to that issue. She also reminded the Board that when System faculty teach in the P-12 schools, it both helps their students to learn and helps the faculty to keep in close touch with what is going on in the schools.

Dr. Kettlewell concluded that these principles were presented for the Board’s consideration. They represented the work of the ad hoc committee and many other groups that have participated. She then turned the floor back to Dr. Muyskens.

Dr. Muyskens thanked Dr. Kettlewell and reminded the Board that this was a first reading of the principles to which he did want to get Regents’ reactions, but first, he wanted to get the reactions of two other people. He then turned the floor to Chancellor Portch, who would introduce the Board’s special guests.

The Chancellor thanked Dr. Muyskens and said that he was pleased to introduce the two guests and ask them to comment on the principles. He also thanked Dr. Kettlewell and all of the people who had a hand in developing the principles. He stressed that he wanted ten or fewer principles that were in language which could be easily understood, not full of education jargon, and he felt that the principles were coming to that point, but there was still work to be done. This was the time for input from others as well as from the Board. Chancellor Portch stated that in Governor Zell Miller’s biography, what was claimed to have been one of his boldest moves was that he appointed a republican to head the Board of Education. The Chancellor said this was one of the Governor’s decisions that has been most widely acclaimed in the State as being centrally important to education. Chancellor Portch commented that the Board knows that it is necessary that there be a unified board working in partnership with the chief executive officer and for the members of the Board to have a little fun while they do serious work. Mr. Isakson has done just that with his own board. He is a great politician, a fine realtor, and a great friend, said the Chancellor. With that, he introduced Mr. Isakson.

#### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Mr. Isakson thanked the Chancellor and the Board for inviting him and Superintendent Schrenko to speak to the Board. He commented that almost every Regent has had a hand in the great experiences and



lessons he has had in his political life. Additionally, he said that in his 25 years in politics, there have been a handful of people he has seen come to State government and make a meaningful and lasting difference, and Chancellor Portch is one of those very few people. The evidence of that to him was when he attended four System commencements last year and, at each one, he met the president of the institution. At the meeting of each president, the following three things happened in sequence: 1) each president showed his institution's strategic plan, 2) each president talked about the guiding principles, and 3) all of the presidents used the word "collaboration" a great number of times. According to Mr. Isakson, Chancellor Portch "dusted off a word and made it reality in Georgia." He expressed his thankfulness for the great communication efforts the Chancellor has made. Mr. Isakson stated that he would briefly address four of the nine principles that he wanted to elaborate on, but in doing so, he wanted to express his appreciation for all nine, in particular the guarantee stated in the first principle. Superintendent Schrenko has shared with Mr. Isakson her dream of a guarantee to the Board that every graduate of a college preparatory curriculum would be able to enter a unit of the University System without need of remediation. That is their goal, in addition to the goals of the Board. He stressed that it is an integral part, because the children that are in our schools are taught by the graduates of the System's colleges of education. So, it is a partnership in which the Board of Education and the Board of Regents are together.

Mr. Isakson said that he would like to comment in particular on principles four, five, seven, and eight. He said that principles four and five mean that the classroom and the classroom teacher are being integrated into the process of teacher preparation. He stressed that the classroom that he attended and the Regents attended is not the classroom of today. He said that if he had his way, every professor who taught in a college of education would teach in a public school at least once every five years. The classroom is so radically different, and it is very important to understand the real environment in which teachers work. He said that it was important to note that the public school system loses 35% of its teachers in the first five years of teaching, which dispels the oversimplification that tenure is the problem and manifests the fact that on the threshold of tenure, teachers leave. He said this issue must be addressed through mentoring and through a better understanding of the classrooms in which teachers teach. He commended this principle's effort to address the issue.

On the seventh and eighth principles, Mr. Isakson remarked that there are two classrooms. One is the classroom bounded by walls, time clocks, and schedules. The other is the classroom of the world around us. There are many successful people practicing in life what is taught in school who in seeking second careers deserve the opportunity for them (which is also an opportunity for the children) to be able to be quickly certified so that they can share "not only the experience of their knowledge but also the knowledge of their experience." Nothing would help education more than to improve the opportunity and the number of teachers coming into the schools. On the eighth principle in particular, Mr. Isakson said that he encouraged what the Board is trying to do, but he asked the Regents to consider that there is a reality in the State that 50% of the population lives in the metropolitan Atlanta area. The resource pool from which teachers are drawn is in the largest geographic state east of the Mississippi River. The proximity of the resource pool to those schools is far more limited outside Atlanta than it is within Atlanta. This Board of Regents years ago expanded the concept of a cooperative extension service, and Mr. Isakson stressed that it would be important to consider, as the System develops courses to bring about certification of teachers teaching out-of-field, the accessibility of those courses throughout the University System so that geography and distance are not an **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

impediment to a teacher's driving to a night class or attending a summer school program. He remarked that such an effort may do more for education than any other single thing the Board can do to lower the rate of out-of-field teaching.

Mr. Isakson recommended that a tenth guiding principle be that every teacher graduated in early

childhood development or elementary or primary education be taught to teach children to read without regard to prejudice of theory or philosophy. He explained that his department is focusing on two things. First of all, it is graduating the best qualified college preparatory student it ever has, but 40% of the children who enter the ninth grade do not graduate from the twelfth grade in four years. The reality is that most of them do not leave the third grade knowing how to read and they cannot compete when they get to the high school years. Secondly, the fact of the matter is, with regard to theory, one size does not fit all. Teachers must be prepared to teach the methods that work for the individual children. In other words, there are times when phonics work better for a child, and there are times when the whole language approach works better. Teachers must no longer be advocates for theory. Rather, they must begin to practice what works. If those who graduate in early childhood development or primary or elementary education are taught to teach children to read without prejudice toward a particular method and with knowledge of all methods, it will do more to eradicate Georgia's biggest problem, which is those dropping out of school and even out of society, and it will have made a major and lasting contribution.

Mr. Isakson commended the Board for what it is doing to improve teacher preparation. He related a story in which Chair Clark grabbed him by the elbow as they were leaving the commencement of Georgia Southern University last year. Chair Clark asked Mr. Isakson if he did not agree that there should be a focus on improving the education of those who teach in the schools. Mr. Isakson replied that if that could be done, it would be one of the most important things ever done for education. He told this story in order to amplify its meaning to the Board.

Next, Mr. Isakson said that he wanted to speak about something that he was not asked to address at this meeting. He commended the Board for its efforts to do away with remediation in the University System. However, he also stressed that education is not an event; it is a process. He quoted Browning as saying, "It is a journey, not a destination." The Board's efforts to do away with remediation are in line with Mr. Isakson's goal to see that no one needs it. He stated that he went to the University of Georgia in 1962 with a 931 on the Scholastic Aptitude Test ("SAT") and a low B average. He stressed that he would not be accepted with those credentials today. He credited this to the fact that the quality of the students who are graduating and going to college is so much better. When he went to UGA, students who could not compete were culled in English 101. Today, he said that the students going to UGA could exempt the English 101 that was used to cull the students of 1962. He concluded that remediation is a threshold that is different at a research institution than it is at a general university. He said that remediation does not mean that someone is dumb and does not know the subject. Rather, it may be that the student is not as competitive as the brightest that are the threshold for the entrance to that college or university. So, it is a challenge for the Board of Education to ensure that the University System gets its best graduates. He applauded the higher standards that the Board is reaching for. He was happy that this year, the Board of Education has been coordinated to raise the standards for graduation by 2001 in concert with what will be the admission requirements for the University System. It only makes sense to have the rules and standards coordinated when the Board of Education's students will next be the University System's students. Mr. Isakson recognized that public education in K-12 is a right, whereas the ability to attend college is a privilege. He said that Georgia is fortunate to have a governor who has given hope to every child in Georgia. We must add **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

to that hope and the perseverance of ability, he said, so that the hope of an education becomes the reality of a diploma. It is the Board of Education's job to send the University System students who are qualified to proceed.

In conclusion, Mr. Isakson stated that the Board of Education has tried to focus on the classroom teacher, to keep its eye on the ball, and not to overcomplicate the situation, but rather focus on a few things. One of these things was curriculum, with the rewriting of the Quality Core Curriculum. Secondly, the Board

of Education raised the goal for Georgia's children to get to 1000 on the SAT by 2001. This year, Georgia's children's SAT scores were the second best in the United States in the rate of increase of all systems that test more than 50% of their graduates. They were best in the Southeast among all 13 Southeastern states, and they were third best overall in the U.S. Math scores went up four points, while verbal scores went up two points. The DOE is trying to raise students' expectations of what their SAT scores are going to be. He encouraged the Regents to call the DOE anytime to encourage it to focus on things that are important to the Board and to call on the DOE anytime to participate in the Board's decisions, because education is a team sport. He commented that the Chancellor has helped to bring about an attitude of seamless education from pre-kindergarten through college. He said there must likewise be a seamless attitude that the Department of Technical and Adult Education, the pre-kindergarten program, the Department of Education ("DOE"), and the Board of Regents are a team that together prepares the future of Georgia. In closing, Mr. Isakson said that every other agency of State government exists in small measure because of this team's failures. Where there are corrections, human resources, and the need for economic development and job training, it is because the education was not good. "We deal with Georgia's future," said Mr. Isakson. He expressed that he was proud to be a partner with the Board and to work with a great superintendent, Linda Schrenko. With that, he thanked the Board and stepped down.

The Chancellor commented that he was excited about Mr. Isakson's leadership, and he asserted that Mr. Isakson is a great educator. Then, Chancellor Portch introduced Superintendent Schrenko, who he said has been a great ally in raising standards and has had a very consistent message that DOE would raise its standards as the University System has raised its standards. He further commented that she has been an ally in getting the P-16 initiative off the ground and that she has been very supportive of many of the Board's initiatives. He said that he has traveled often with Superintendent Schrenko and Ken Breeden to many public settings to send the message of working together. He then turned the floor over to Superintendent Schrenko.

Superintendent Schrenko thanked the Chancellor and the Board for the opportunity to speak about education both at the K-12 level and at the teacher preparation level. She reiterated that they have worked together over the past several years to improve the schools of Georgia. One of the first things they talked about years ago was the idea that to have better students, they must coordinate the standards so that children coming out of the K-12 system are ready for the colleges and universities and are ready to further their careers and so that teachers are prepared to come out and teach those students to be prepared for the University System. So, the effort is interlocking to create an atmosphere for teachers to learn and for students to learn. To that end, Superintendent Schrenko, who oversees 1,800 schools, 1.3 million students, and 90,000 teachers, goes into the school systems, holds open meetings, and asks the teachers what the DOE can do to help the teachers better prepare the students of tomorrow. Many teachers say that they not only need to know how to discipline children and how to take appropriate action to ensure that students behave, but they also need to know how to manage their classrooms, how to keep their grades, and what can they do with technology that will help them as classroom teachers and that will make their jobs easier and less filled with paperwork and administration. So, classroom management and discipline comprise the number one need for teachers .

#### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Teachers say that they learn some techniques in their colleges of education, but those techniques are not as applied. In other words, they learn the theories, but they need to be in the classrooms before they graduate to know what real classrooms are like when they are in the field.

The second thing teachers say is that they have to know content, stated Superintendent Schrenko. It is not enough just to be able to manage a classroom. Teachers must know what they are talking about in order to be able to teach it. They need to be able to teach children, no matter what backgrounds the children are

coming from. If children need phonics, the teachers need that tool. If they need a literature approach, teachers need that tool, too. All approaches need to be in the teachers' experience. It is especially critical that teachers know their subjects on the middle grades level. Students can move ahead of teachers who do not adequately know their content, and they will challenge everything those teachers say. So, it is not enough just to have the degree; a teacher must have the content knowledge to be able to challenge those students. In elementary schools, this is most applicable to reading and math. At the higher levels, teachers must know their specific content areas extremely well.

Superintendent Schrenko said that the third thing that teachers say they need is special education training. The model being promoted throughout the United States is inclusion. This means that instead of taking the special education students into a separate classroom two or three hours a day, they are included in the regular classroom almost all day. So, now a teacher who has a classroom of 27 or 28 students has 8 or 9 of those who are special education students. So, teachers need to know special education techniques for dealing with those students in a large classroom so that both the teachers and the students can be successful.

Superintendent Schrenko encouraged the Board to think along the lines of alternative certification. The DOE would welcome people who have retired from the military or business to come into the schools and teach the children and share with them their expertise. Superintendent Schrenko also recommended that, whether a person is a teacher preparation graduate, an alternative certification graduate, or a leadership graduate, his or her certificate needs to be based on whether the teacher can teach or whether the leader can lead. In other words, he or she should have demonstrated competency. No matter how many years of course work a person takes, if in that first year a teacher cannot positively effect student achievement or a principal cannot positively create the environment for teachers to teach, then that person does not need to be certified year after year. In addition to Mr. Isakson's recommendation that college education faculty go back into the classroom every so often, she suggested that every time a person in education leadership renews his or her certificate, he or she should also go back in the classroom. She expressed that she would like to see all teaching faculty and leaders go into the classroom at least one day a year and teach all day on their own and rotate through as they get recertified to teach a full year in a classroom so that they keep up with what is really going on in the schools' classrooms.

Superintendent Schrenko commended the Board for its quality assurance efforts. She said that the DOE would like to work with the Board to make certain that the schools offer the same quality assurance for their college preparatory students. She suggested that they work together to develop the standards for teachers as well as for students so that what the University System produces then creates the kind of teaching that produces what the schools want to produce in their students. That way, the System gets a better quality product coming into its institutions and the schools get a better quality product coming out. She stated that this was her only addition to the Board's recommendations. As a final note, she asked the Board to work with the DOE on the issue of professional development, because when teachers need to be recertified, many

#### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

of them do not have the skills and the technology training to be successful. The DOE would like to partner with the System to ensure that even as teachers go back for recertification and reeducation, the courses that are provided to them are quality-based courses.

Chancellor Portch thanked Superintendent Schrenko for her comments, and he asked her and Mr. Isakson to stay and answer questions if they had time.

Chair Leebern then asked if the Regents had any questions.

Regent Dahlberg asked whether, in the classroom, it would be helpful to have an education student who

may already have some expertise in technology come into the school and teach technology as part of the her own course work. He also asked whether technology was a current limitation of the schools and whether a strategy like this could be helpful.

Mr. Isakson replied that there is a technology-related problem in the schools where older teachers do not have the technology experience and therefore are not getting the maximum benefit from the technology that the Governor provided to the schools. Any assistance the schools can get to relieve this problem would be beneficial. He agreed that if there were some way that students could get credit for teaching teachers to use the technology, it would move the schools much further ahead.

Regent Baranco prefaced her question by explaining that it was both a question and a comment directed at both the principles and some of the comments made by Mr. Isakson and Superintendent Schrenko. She stated that in one of the principles, there was an emphasis on reading in elementary schools, and she expressed that she had a problem with that. She said that the schools have a serious problem with math that starts as early as kindergarten and that one of the greatest myths that has harmed math is that in order to do word problems, a student must be able to read. Regent Baranco contended that this line of thinking sells that skill very short. The one thing that a student really needs to do word problems, she asserted, is the ability to think analytically and abstractly. She further stated that teachers do not know how to teach analytical and abstract thinking, and that must start in kindergarten. She stressed that she could not sign off on a principle that does not have something to that effect in it. She noted that the DOE has put four years of math in high school, and she commended that effort. However, she reiterated that the issue starts in elementary school and that this needs to be acknowledged; it is a cyclical kind of issue that begins very early. She felt this comment was applicable to both the proposed principles and the comments of the two guest speakers to the Board.

Regent White commented that at the February 1998 meeting of the Strategic Planning Committee, there was a panel of three first-year teachers. One of the things he found interesting was that these teachers felt that they had to take leadership roles in their schools. He asked for the speakers' comments on that issue.

Superintendent Schrenko responded that those teachers were probably hand-chosen among some of the best in the State and one of the things she has found is if that first-year enthusiasm can be captured, they do need to take a leadership role. Things change so quickly in today's world that teachers who graduated 5 to 15 years ago, unless they have gone back and taken the professional development courses, do not have the technology knowledge they need. That was the reason why she asked for the System's assistance in professional development. She stressed that recertification courses are not enough; there should also be update courses to bring veteran teachers the knowledge of the new developments in technology. The longer teachers stay in education, the more removed they are from the real world of change. So, beginning teachers **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

are more in tune with the new technology and other new developments. Superintendent Schrenko reiterated that the DOE and the System need to work together to ensure that veteran teachers have the same kind of knowledge as the newer teachers so that they can take leadership roles too.

Mr. Isakson commended the efforts of the fifth principle to address teacher retention. In that principle, it is stressed that the teacher have a hand in the curriculum, lesson plans, staff development, and decision making processes. It was his opinion that there are administrators who have a "one size fits all" mentality, which does stifle teacher creativity. So, he deduced that the principle hits on the main reason that 35% of teachers leave teaching. He remarked that if this principle were to become a reality, it would come a long way towards addressing that problem.

Chair Leebern asked at what point the schools begin to measure student achievement and at what point the schools refuse to promote students who cannot read and write. He asked what could be done to save such students.

Superintendent Schrenko replied that there is a kindergarten assessment test that is a measure of whether a student can progress. By the end of kindergarten, teachers know if their students are where they should be with respect to their reading and math skills. If a student is not where he should be at the end of kindergarten, or even sooner if the teacher sees there is a problem, remediation should be started as soon as possible. The purpose should be that every child attains a grade level or above every year. The competency tests that the DOE is currently developing are for kindergarten, third, fifth, and eighth grade levels and are really benchmarks. Those tests should be combined with teacher judgement, grades, and day-to-day performance. Superintendent Schrenko asserted that she did not think children should be socially promoted. She explained that it does the children a disservice when they are put in grade levels that are over their heads and that create atmospheres in which they cannot succeed, which eventually may lead to their dropping out of school. She said that it is the schools' job to raise those students up to the standards.

Chair Leebern asked what her feelings were with regard to holding students back.

Superintendent Schrenko responded that her personal reaction as a second grade teacher is that there have been many instances when she has told parents that their children can be promoted but they will fail third grade because they cannot read and that it was the parents' choice whether they want their children to be the top of the second grade by repeating that year or the bottom of the third grade. She explained that she did that on a child-by-child basis. Some children were physically bigger and really would not have benefitted from being held back, so every situation must be examined individually and the teachers must talk with the parents.

Mr. Isakson added that he wanted to make two comments. The first was that as a father and a businessperson, he felt that educators tend to confuse time with accomplishment. In other words, they believe that a child who is in a certain grade should accomplish a certain level. There are some children who are held back by the perception that they are a certain age so they should be at a certain level, which is why the DOE is allowing college-level credit in middle school for certain subjects. He asked, "Why should not a child be able to progress and take more content? Why should they be stifled?" The problem is that time is confused with accomplishment. Secondly, he stated last year, when Special Instructional Assistance had grown out of proportion and the Governor and everyone were upset about 16% growth a year, the DOE developed assessment for kindergarten through third grade. (The kindergarten assessment has one more year **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

of beta testing before it will be in place.) The DOE reduced the appropriation and increased the effectiveness by putting in actual measurement rather than subjective judgement. He stated that needs to be done in many programs. Finally, he said that it is most effective to hold students back in first through third grade. He stressed that the DOE would like to see that no child leaves the third grade without reading and computing competently on the third-grade level, but it must also deliver the resources in terms of money for summer school programs and additional programs so that it can make the period of holding students back as short as possible. The best thing that can be done to prevent holding students back is to put reading as a tenth principle and to add Regent Baranco's suggested emphasis on math to raise the visibility of those disciplines, because those are the two foundations on which all the other content is based. The better job the schools do in kindergarten through third grade, the less they will have to worry about holding students back.

Regent Baranco asked what was the status of the proposed longer school days and longer school year.

She commented that many studies have shown that the longer students are in school, the better they perform. She asked whether that was being considered.

Mr. Isakson replied that Superintendent Schrenko and he felt that if the schools want to do it, they will let them do it. College Park currently has year-round schooling. Schools in Georgia can now elect to do that, and the DOE will give them a waiver and approve it. It is not a monetary issue, because the capital expenditure for the improvement is sitting there since the school is still physically maintained during the summer. If children have the elective of which of the four quarters of the year they take their break, then the school operates full-time or the children have the opportunity to move ahead. He said if that decision were made at the DOE, it would be a disaster. Counties should be able to decide on their own schedules. The DOE simply tells the counties how many days students must be in school and how many hours, but the counties have great flexibility in determining their schedules. As long as a county's schedule fits within the parameters of raising student performance and achievement, the DOE will allow the local school systems to do it. He added that Superintendent Schrenko has done a great job of supporting that.

Regent Jenkins remarked that it seems very traumatic for parents at the end of the school year to learn that their children should not be promoted and suggested that maybe the assessment should be made in the middle of the school year so that the decision can be made before the end of the year whether to give those students additional help. He asked whether that had been considered or whether it was perhaps already being done.

Superintendent Schrenko responded that there is not any one criteria for promoting students and that there are many ways of determining a child's progress. Because of that, teachers look at their grades and the daily performance of the students combined with test scores and standardized scores over the entire year and let the parents know from the very beginning of the year if the child has not developed a skill that he should have at that level. If the parents are brought in on the problem from the beginning as a collaborative effort to help the child, then at the end of the year, there will be no surprise if the student has not progressed to the level he should and the teacher recommends retention. The problem that Regent Jenkins described happens when only one test or one criteria is used to measure a student's preparedness for promotion. So, teachers are encouraged to use several different indicators of student progress.

Regent Amos asked what was the maximum number of students that can be in a classroom with a single teacher. She said that she had understood Superintendent Schrenko to say that 27 or 28 students could be in a classroom and that the teacher should be prepared to teach special education students.

### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Superintendent Schrenko replied that in Georgia schools, per grade level, teachers are funded at a different level than the maximum class size. So, one certified person is being funded for every 15 kindergarten students; however, there is no way that most schools can go to a class size of 15, because they do not have the space. So, paraprofessionals are hired and classes are increased, but there are two adults in the classroom to help the students move ahead. The maximum class size set by the Board of Education is 28 in the elementary grades, 33 in the middle grades, and 35 in the high school grades. In physical education and similar classes, there can be as many as 40 students. If schools go beyond that, they are in jeopardy of losing their State funding.

Regent Amos asked whether there were statistics to support the idea that fewer children in a classroom with one professional teacher will promote higher achievement.

Superintendent Schrenko responded that there are studies from all over the United States that suggest that lowering class sizes does not make a significant difference until the class is reduced to under 16 students. In classes of 14 or 15, there is a significant difference, but a reduction from 25 to 20 does not make as significant a difference. So, class sizes would have to be reduced to 15 or fewer students to have a great

impact.

Mr. Isakson agreed with Superintendent Schrenko, but he added that when the number of disruptive students is reduced, there is a significant improvement. Last year, new school safety measures gave teachers the ability, if they are sued by a parent for discipline, to pay court costs if they win. This was an attempt to give classroom teachers backing to be able to enforce more discipline in the classrooms. If teachers are aware of special education identification, children who are being disruptive out of frustration can be more easily identified and put into the right classrooms. So, the most effective thing that can be done with regard to the ratio of students to teachers is to reduce the number of discipline problems in the classroom.

Chancellor Portch added that relating that to the way people teach, at the university level, there is some of the same issue on classroom size. If there is a small class of 15 students and all the professor does is lecture, he might as well have 1,000 students in there. A teacher must adjust his teaching style to the size of the class, or there will not be any benefit from having a smaller class.

Chair Leebern asked the Regents if they had any further questions for Superintendent Schrenko and Mr. Isakson, and seeing that there were none, he turned the floor over to Dr. Muyskens.

Dr. Muyskens thanked the guests for getting the Board off to a good start on the principles. He explained that he would now scroll back over the principles so that the Regents could make comments or ask questions they had regarding any of the principles in particular. He invited the two Master Teachers in Residence to join the Board in this discussion. He reiterated that Mr. Isakson had said that he did not simply want to be an advocate for theory but to have practice that works, and that was the key for why the Board had these two teachers: to test the principles by reality. He reminded the Board that these principles will develop into concrete action. With that, he returned to the beginning of the list of principles.

The first principle was the guarantee. Dr. Muyskens asked if there were any comments on that issue. He said that one of the important things here is that when a college of education knows that the Board is making this kind of guarantee, it will look carefully at the teachers it graduates.

### **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

Regent Clark stated that the guarantee should apply only to preparing teachers to teach in the fields in which they have been trained. He further commented that if they are assigned to teach subjects out-of-field, the Board of Regents cannot guarantee them.

Regent Howell asked if the guarantee applies to wherever teachers go to teach.

Dr. Muyskens replied that it would refer to the State of Georgia only.

Regent Amos asked who and what determine whether a teacher would need to be sent back to school.

Dr. Muyskens replied that the district would determine whether teachers are meeting the subject matter requirements, whether they teach well, and whether they can use technology. If the district judges that a teacher is just not working out, the Board of Regents would accept that judgement. He further stated that Regent Clark's suggestion would certainly be kept in mind as the principles are revised for the April 1998 meeting.

Regent Dahlberg asked whether the issue of classroom management was included in this principle, and he



asserted that classroom management may be as important as content knowledge.

Dr. Muyskens asked Ms. Cribbs to comment on that.

Ms. Cribbs replied that the issue of classroom management is included in the first principle. She said that what Superintendent Schrenko had said regarding this issue is very true. Ms. Cribbs explained that she had a student intern about three years ago who was the best student intern she had ever had. When she took over the classroom, Ms. Cribbs could leave the classroom knowing that the student teacher would be fine. However, when the student began teaching, she was placed in a different setting, and even though her classroom management skills were extremely strong and her content knowledge and delivery to students were very good, she did not succeed in that classroom and she ended up quitting before the year was over. Ms. Cribbs said that if this guarantee had been in place, the student could have had extra help and she might still be teaching today. So, classroom management will vary from classroom to classroom and county to county because of the diversity of students.

Chair Clark suggested that it might be worthwhile to look into the possibility that there could be some conflict of personalities involved between administrators and teachers. The Board of Regents may need to consider the idea of getting a second opinion on teachers who are deemed to be ineffectual in some capacity. He asserted that he supported the guarantee of the quality of teacher education graduates, but he also said that the guarantee needs to be fair to teachers.

Dr. Muyskens explained that both of the Master Teachers have supervised new teachers. He solicited their ideas on how many teachers like this they might expect and what types of teachers they might think need to be sent back.

Ms. Jones replied that when she read this principle, she thought of only one person in her last ten years of experience that would fall into this category, and she felt the guarantee could work in two ways. First of all, new teachers need good mentoring. The teacher she was thinking of had a strong mentor (Ms. Jones), and she also had support from her department chair and from a buddy teacher. So, it would not be just the **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, "COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE"**

administration making this type of decision. The second thing that the teacher needed was more field training before she was given certification. If this guarantee had been in place, she might have been able to go back and get that training.

Ms. Cribbs said that from what she had seen, the percentage of this type of teacher would be very small.

Chancellor Portch added that this was one of the attractive points about the first principle. It will give the System a chance to quantify the anecdotal complaint that the System graduates poor teachers. This guarantee will produce numbers of just how many such teachers the System actually graduates. To be able to benchmark this will be very helpful to the System.

Regent Dahlberg commented that he felt the reality of the situation was that it would be very difficult to get administrators and mentors to tell teachers that they work with all year that they really need to go back and get some more training. He expressed that he did not believe that the guarantee would give an accurate number of teachers who need more training; it will only get the number of teachers who are actually returned to the colleges.

Dr. Muyskens commented that this is an issue that would certainly need to be examined. He hoped that it could be done in a way that would not be negative, but that would rather be positive.

Regent Dahlberg said that this situation is not any different than business, and as he saw it, administrators are going to give their teachers a critical review, but it is hard to send employees back for additional training. He supported the goal of the principle, but he doubted that it would produce an accurate number of such teachers.

Regent Jenkins reiterated that 66% of science teachers, 49% of history teachers, and 23% of math teachers are teaching out-of-field. He reminded the Board about the panelist at the February 1998 meeting who had applied all over North Georgia and could not get a teaching position. He asked what the requirements of the local boards of education are about showing why they have turned down someone from maybe outside the particular county who was a qualified math or science teacher. In other words, can the board simply say that it is taking an out-of-field teacher for practical purposes?

Mr. Isakson responded that the particular teacher may have applied to high-demand counties, because the experience in many systems that have out-of-field teachers is that they cannot get teachers to teach there. The DOE now has all job availability on the Internet, and that will hopefully help this situation. Before, there were 180 systems in Georgia and it was difficult to know if there was an in-field availability in a particular system. So, that information is now on the Internet for the second year, and teachers are being hired whose first contact with the hiring systems is through the Internet. In his experience, the out-of-field teaching problem is in direct relationship with the proximity of the school to the bigger pool of potential teachers. The competition in certain systems in the metropolitan Atlanta area for certified teachers is fierce. Those teachers are not necessarily mobile or able to teach in a system 100 miles away.

Regent Jenkins asked whether there are any requirements for the local boards of education that if they have qualified applicants, those applicants must be considered before out-of-field teachers are considered.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Superintendent Schrenko explained that if a new teacher applies for a math position and there is a teacher already there teaching math out-of-field in that area, then the board has to consider by midterm (January) that either the out-of-field math teacher with seniority is going to have to take two credits (ten quarter hours) toward his subject area or the board can hire the certified teacher. If out-of-field teachers are not at least provisionally certified by Christmas, that system will not be paid for that position. So, there is a hard choice between the out-of-field teacher who is working toward getting the required math or the already certified teacher. It still comes down to local board decision, but if they make the wrong decision and the out-of-field teacher does not pass the two courses before Christmas, that system is out one teacher salary for the year.

Regent Jenkins questioned whether the DOE does in fact deduct that salary from the system.

Superintendent Schrenko replied that yes, it does. She explained that this was particularly a problem on the high school level, where a person with a degree in chemistry who is teaching biology is considered out-of-field even though both subjects are sciences. A teacher must have 25 quarter hours in the particular subject she is teaching in order to be considered in-field. So, science in particular is a problem for the DOE, because there are teachers who have general science degrees who do not have the 25 hours in the specific subjects they are teaching.

Regent Baranco asked whether the out-of-field teachers clearly understand this or whether there should be a policy that if someone is found who is qualified to teach in that subject, the out-of-field teacher would be replaced. She commented that out-of-field teachers should know up front that they are being hired in desperation, because once someone is hired and teaching who is not doing a poor job, it would be difficult to push that person aside when an in-field teacher comes along.

Superintendent Schrenko explained that this is understood up front, and most of the hiring superintendents and principals will tell out-of-field teachers that they are required to take two courses per year toward getting their certification. If an out-of-field teacher is unsuccessful and an in-field teacher comes along, then the out-of-field teacher is subject to being removed from the position. However, a teacher is subject to losing his or her position in the first three years anyway depending on student enrollment. So, it is kind of a general caveat that is given to all new hires that should enrollment decrease, they could lose their positions in a sort of “last hired, first to go” situation. She did not think this situation was specific to the out-of-field teaching problem, because the problem generally lies with the geographic situation. If the math and science teachers who are looking for jobs in Cobb, Gwinnett, and DeKalb Counties moved to South Georgia, they would have jobs tomorrow. It is a problem of location. There are critical shortages, but for the most part, they are in rural parts of the State, while there are oversupplies of teachers in the metropolitan Atlanta area.

The Chancellor asked Superintendent Schrenko how “out-of-field teacher” is defined for the policy.

Superintendent Schrenko replied that “out-of-field” on the high school level is when a teacher teaches more than two periods out of five that he or she is not certified in. In other words, a teacher who is certified in math who teaches three math classes and two English classes is considered in-field.

Chancellor Portch said that a teacher could spend his entire career teaching 40% of his students in a field he does not even have a minor in and the policy would never touch him.

Superintendent Schrenko said, “That’s right. That’s basically it.”

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Regent Dahlberg added that in theory, a student could go through a full four years of high school and never have an in-field teacher.

Superintendent Schrenko replied that it does happen, particularly in schools where there is only one science teacher and that person is having to teach science as well as a period of math. The scenario conceivably could happen.

Mr. Isakson reiterated that this was also why he suggested that the Board's approach to this be more of an extension service type of approach to make programs more available in the areas in which they are needed. Then, there would be no excuses or distances, and then, the requirements might be changed to reflect that change in resources.

Dr. Muyskens noted that the Board was still on the first principle and that the Board's discussion had already touched on a number of other principles. He asked if there were any further comments before he moved on to the next principle, and seeing that there were none, he moved on to the second principle. He restated that this principle said that teachers going back for graduate degrees will be held to the highest standards, those of the National Board for Professional Teaching. He further commented that there are only 19 National Board-certified teachers in this State, one of whom is Ms. Cribbs. He said that these graduate courses would meet the highest standards to help student learning.

Seeing that there were no comments on the second principle, Dr. Muyskens moved on to the third principle, which he said had been touched upon by several people already in this discussion. He remarked that it is important that the System does its part to make sure that the leaders in the schools, including the principals and superintendents, know how to create environments which enable teachers to do what they can do best to educate their students. He said that when he interviewed Ms. Jones for the position of Master Teacher, he was very impressed with her description of how the teachers in her school feel about teaching and how they want to stay there. He called upon Ms. Jones to explain to the Board why it is that, when teachers have principals and superintendents who can create such environments, it makes such a difference.

Ms. Jones reminded the Board that at the February 1998 meeting, she had addressed this issue. An effective principal is a facilitator. She said that graduate programs need to be restructured to create effective leadership in the schools. The atmosphere in her school, where she has taught for 21 years, was created by the previous principal, and the faculty helped mold the new principal to be like that administrator. She said that the teachers have grown as professionals and have dealt with the hard-hitting issues that the Board has discussed. They can argue in meetings and still remain friends. They created their own ongoing professional development plan. The teachers are the experts in the school who decide how they need to be trained and who train each other. So, this is an ongoing process, and the school has gains to prove it. Ms. Jones is the action research coordinator at the school, and some gains have been made with regard to student achievement. The school is not where it wants to be or where it needs to be, but Ms. Jones has witnessed improvement in the students. School leaders will recognize that creating other responsibilities for teachers, such as Ms. Jones' action research coordinator position, gives teachers an incentive to stay in teaching as well as provides a career ladder. She said it was extremely important to have this principle.

Dr. Muyskens asked if the Regents had any comments, and seeing that there were none, he went on to the fourth principle. He restated that this was Dr. Kettlewell's famous "three-legged stool," emphasizing the cooperation among the faculty of arts and sciences, the education faculty, and the classroom teachers in schools. He asked if the Regents had any comments or questions regarding this principle.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Since there were no comments or questions, Dr. Muyskens went on to the fifth principle. He reiterated that this principle implies that the System’s responsibility does not end when it graduates education students. This principle stresses the partnership between the System and the P-12 schools to provide professional development. He asked if there were any questions or comments.

Ms. Cribbs stated that her high school provides an example of this, because it has a partnership with Clayton College & State University (“CCSU”). She goes to CCSU to teach math labs to the education students, and CCSU’s education students are interns in her high school. When those students come to her class, she knows that they have been exposed to many teaching strategies and methods, and therefore, they are going to look for the strategy that best fits their students. They better meet the needs of the students because they have been exposed to so many strategies. The professors from CCSU also come to Ms. Cribbs’ high school and provide professional development for the teachers. When the student teachers take over the classrooms, it frees the teachers to go into other classrooms to be mentors to other teachers. So, the partnership is a benefit to the pre-service teachers, student interns, and teachers at the school as well as the professors at the college.

Regent Clark asked whether this was something that would just happen or whether it would need direction.

Dr. Muyskens replied that it would need direction.

Regent Clark commented that he would encourage the colleges to collaborate with the schools.

Dr. Muyskens added that Dr. Jenkins had suggested some good programs when he spoke to the Board in December 1997. However, those programs did not involve the University System. He stressed that the System could be much more helpful with regard to professional development.

Regent Clark said that it needed to be made known to the local school leaders that the System institutions will be doing this.

Dr. Muyskens agreed. He then asked for other comments on the fifth principle. As there were none, Dr. Muyskens continued with the sixth principle. He reiterated that this principle dealt with recruitment and getting the best people into the teaching profession. The principle also has to do with issues of supply and demand, directing candidates to those areas where there is need and away from those areas where there is not need. Dr. Muyskens stated that he had discovered that Ms. Jones has been one of the best recruiters through her teaching. In fact, one of the panelists at the February 1998 Strategic Planning Committee meeting, Fhonda Danley, had gone into teaching because of Ms. Jones.

Ms. Jones asserted that one of the ways to raise the caliber of teachers is by what is going on in a school. There are 3 teachers in her department of 12 who she taught. Ms. Danley would like to teach there, but she cannot because her father teaches there. Ms. Jones commented that seeing good teaching and knowing that teachers have a say in the way a school is operated raise the caliber by attracting students into teaching.

Chancellor Portch directed his question at the Board’s special guests. He stated that he has seen the apprenticeship programs, such as Teacher Corps, where high school students apprentice as teachers. He asked if they felt this idea should be one of the Board’s action items.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Mr. Isakson responded that he felt this was a great idea.

Dr. Muyskens asked if there were any further comments or questions about the sixth principle.

Chair Leebern asked how teachers are given incentive to help their students achieve academically and whether it is up to the local school district to create such an incentive.

Mr. Isakson responded that Chair Leebern’s question reminded him of “Pay for Performance.” In this program, schools have to commit to a game plan to increase academic achievement. If they succeed in meeting the increased levels of academic achievement that are approved, the schools get the money rather than the teachers. If the schools do not meet the approved levels of achievement, they do not get the money. He explained that this encourages more competitiveness for achievement based on approved criterion.

Regent Hunt asked whether the State would be taking over education from the local systems so that all systems are the same and have the same pay scales. He asserted that making the pay rates equitable from district to district might help the supply and demand issue.

Mr. Isakson expressed that he felt it would be a disaster to manage education from Atlanta. He further stated that it is appropriate to set policies and goals as well as the parameters under which school systems should operate, which the DOE currently does, but site-based management has proven most successful because the best administrators produce the best schools at the local level. When things are governed centrally, there is a sense of mediocrity being the goal instead of excellence. So, the reason there is so much of a supplement in metropolitan Atlanta is because of the demand and competitiveness for the best teachers. The reason there is less of a supplement in the rural areas is because it does not make any difference in terms of the geographic distance between the pool of resources and the job availability. If the management of education were centralized in Atlanta, it would do more to harm than good. Local management provides the ability for schools to strive for excellence rather than accept mediocrity when thrown into a much larger pool.

Regent Hunt again asked Mr. Isakson to speak about the issue of salary and asked whether it was possible to make teacher salaries consistent across all counties. He asserted that the difference in pay was hurting South Georgia and the rural areas of the State because those areas do not have the tax base to have the supplement.

Mr. Isakson admitted that although he was not certain, he suspected that the deficiency between the supplemented starting salary in the metropolitan Atlanta area and given salaries in the job market is greater than starting salaries in a nonsupplemented rural system and other available jobs. He remarked that Governor Miller should be given credit for moving teacher salaries from the lower third to above the national average in the last four years. So, he understood Regent Hunt’s suggestion from the business standpoint, but in those areas where there are more out-of-field teachers and the resource pool of qualified teachers is geographically distant, it does not matter what the salary level is if the teachers are not there. Secondly, he added that many teachers are in two-career households where the other spouse’s career dictates to a large extent the flexibility the teacher has to be mobile.

Regent Baranco commented that for \$40,000 a year, she would move to Willacoochee, Georgia.

## **STRATEGIC PLANNING COMMITTEE, “COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE”**

Mr. Isakson responded that Willacoochee is one of the finest places in Georgia and that he had been there many times.

Regent Baranco reiterated that for that salary, certainly somebody would be willing to move for a teaching position.

Dr. Muyskens moved on to the seventh principle, which deals with alternative certification. He remarked that although this topic has been talked about a great deal, it will take some creative thinking to do it. He reminded the Board that two of the three first-year teachers on the panel at the February 1998 meeting had received alternative certification. Ms. Cribbs also received alternative certification. Dr. Muyskens expressed that this demonstrated the importance of the issue, and he asked if the Regents had any comments on this principle.

The Regents had no comments or questions with regard to the seventh principle, so Dr. Muyskens went on to the eighth principle. He speculated that no one would have anything further to add to the discussion on the topic of out-of-field teaching, but Ms. Cribbs wanted to make a point.

Ms. Cribbs said that it was important for teachers to transfer their love of learning and enthusiasm about their subjects to their students. She expressed that if she were teaching in a subject that was out of her field and that she did not like, it would be difficult for her to transfer any enthusiasm or love of learning to her students. When she teaches her subject, math, she loves it so much and is so excited about it that her students know it and it permeates throughout the classroom. She could not convey those feelings about social studies, though, because the subject does not excite her. She said this was an important aspect of out-of-field teaching that no one has touched on before.

Dr. Muyskens then moved on to the ninth principle, which emphasizes the importance of modeling effective teaching in the System institutions and the importance of having System faculty in the schools. He asked if the Regents or Master Teachers had any thoughts on this principle.

Ms. Jones commented that over the years, she has had several student teachers, and she reminded the Board that one of the first-year teachers on the panel at the February 1998 meeting had said that he was never observed. She said that faculty from the colleges come and observe the student interns and sometimes will conference with those students, but she stressed that not enough of that is done and that there needs to be a true collaboration among college faculty, supervising teachers, and student interns. This needs to be a widespread effort, which would likely result in better teacher candidates.

Dr. Muyskens asked if there were any further comments or questions. Seeing that there were none, he reminded the Regents that this was the first reading. His staff would take the comments that had been made at this meeting and incorporate them into the next version of the principles. He encouraged the Regents to share any thoughts or insights they may have with Dr. Kettlewell, the Master Teachers, or himself in the weeks following this meeting so that those too could be incorporated into the second reading of the principles. Dr. Muyskens then turned the floor over to Chair Leebern.

Chair Leebern thanked Dr. Muyskens and his staff as well as Superintendent Schrenko and Mr. Isakson for their participation in this meeting. He then recessed the meeting of the Committee of the Whole.

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

## **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Regarding the Board's recent visit to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Congressional district institutions, Regent Hunt remarked that there was a good turnout for the trip. He thanked the Regents who went on the trip and said that the institutions as well as their faculties were very excited by the Board's visit.

Chair Clark also thanked Regent and Mrs. Hunt for organizing and conducting the visit.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Regent Baranco commended Secretary Gail S. Weber for her choice in minutes writers. She complimented the minutes' new format and said, "They are so much fun to read." Jennifer E. Fairchild, Assistant Secretary to the Board of Regents, writes the monthly minutes.

Chancellor Portch reminded the Regents that they had been given a copy of the fiscal year 1997 annual report of the University System of Georgia, which had been recently completed and which would be followed by the 1998 annual report in August 1998. He commented that the report was well done and represents a great deal of activity under Regent Allgood's leadership. He added that if any of the Regents needed additional copies, they would be provided.

Senior Vice Chancellor for Human and External Resources Arthur N. Dunning announced that there were two nominees for honorary degrees. The first nomination was from President Carl V. Patton of Georgia State University for Mr. Franklin Garrett. Mr. Garrett has been a Georgia resident since 1906. He has been a leader in the preservation of Georgia's and Atlanta's history. Mr. Garrett is currently the official historian for the city of Atlanta and Fulton County. He has also been a member of the Board of the Atlanta Historical Society since 1932. During his career, he has served as official historian of the Coca-Cola Company (1940-1964). He has also won a number of awards for historical and civic organizations, and in 1993, he was the recipient of the Shining Light Award. In addition to all of this, he has authored two volumes on the history of Atlanta.

The second nomination was from President Nicholas L. Henry of Georgia Southern University ("Georgia Southern") for Ms. Jackie Strange. She is a 1947 graduate of Georgia Southern, where she started her career as an assistant at the Georgia Southern mail center. After leaving Georgia Southern, she held a number of managerial positions with the United States Postal Service ("USPS"), and she finally ended her career there as Deputy Postmaster General. In that position, she managed the nation's largest workforce. After retiring from the USPS, Ms. Strange held the position of President and Chief Executive Officer of the Dole Foundation for Employment of People With Disabilities. She has also held more than 50 offices in church and civic organizations. In addition to all of the public service she has given, Ms. Strange is also a published poet, and she has been declared a Distinguished American Penwoman. In support of Georgia Southern, she has established the Jackie Anderson Strange Scholarship.

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



## **PETITIONS AND COMMUNICATIONS**

Secretary Gail S. Weber announced that the next Board meeting would take place on Tuesday, April 7 and Wednesday, April 8, 1998 in Albany, Georgia at Albany State University and Darton College, respectively.

## **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

At approximately 12:00 p.m., Chair Clark called for an Executive Session to discuss personnel issues. With motion made, variously seconded, and unanimously adopted, the Board closed its regular session. The Regents in attendance for the Executive Session were Chair Clark, Vice Chair Edgar L. Jenkins, and Regents Thomas F. Allgood, Sr., Shannon L. Amos, David H. (Hal) Averitt, Juanita P. Baranco, Kenneth W. Cannestra, J. Tom Coleman, Jr., A. W. "Bill" Dahlberg, Hilton H. Howell, Jr., George M. D. (John) Hunt III, Donald M. Leebern, Jr., Edgar L. Rhodes, and Glenn S. White.

At approximately 12:20 p.m., Chair Clark reconvened the Board meeting in its regular session and announced that no actions were taken in the Executive Session. The action items discussed in Executive Session were the delegation of reappointment of presidents to the Chancellor and the reappointments of Gail S. Weber as Secretary to the Board and Dr. Lindsay Desrochers as Treasurer of the Board.

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

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Board, the meeting was adjourned at 12:20 p.m. on March 11, 1998.

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

s/ \_\_\_\_\_  
S. William Clark, Jr.  
Chair, Board of Regents  
University System of Georgia