

continue to engage their attention and support. (Gerald) McIntosh and (Harold) Nichols and (Pete) Silver were at that meeting.

(Harold) Nichols: It was very good and Sutton did a good job. It's good to have people present and make it real. I thought the students were particularly good. We appreciate your getting the study abroad numbers to us.

Sutton: The only serious inquiry that came up subsequently was about overseas properties. It was an issue that one regent was terribly concerned about it was refocused on the Oxford mansion that Richard Reiff and David Coker bought for themselves.

McIntosh: Why were the international properties an issue?

Sutton: They were concerned about where our money was going.

Silver: Did that tie into concerns about leased properties internationally and domestically? There had been concern that we were leasing properties when we could utilize sister institutions. Maybe this spilled over to the international.

McIntosh: You mentioned contracts. Is there some thinking that the Board will have to review contracts we have for our overseas programs and if so, are we going to have to seek System approval for contracts?

Sutton: It's my sense that there has not been a review of overseas policies. Several institutions have expressed limitations.

Coker: I don't think there's any Board interest in this area. That is basically delegated to the Presidents. Several regents, particularly those who come from a real estate background, any time the L-word, R-word is mentioned, and selected regents get concerned about it. I think there will be additional leasing of property as we expand internationally. The economies of various countries change and the situations at various sites change. They may begin ratcheting up their lease rates and at that point, you have to consider your fiduciary responsibility. If you are going to stay there, then you need to have it affordable. I don't think there's much for them to be responsible. Presidents have broad discretionary authority over funds allocated to the institution. Sometimes they question procedure rather than policy when they get into micromanaging.

V.

Sutton: They will occur within a Board focus and system approach, yet they will be driven by processes at your institutions. You want to think about ways you will be involved in these processes at your institution. I want to jump to technology and master planning first. It is a big, big, interest of a number of regents. The idea is that the system will develop an approach to technology development and institutions will develop their own master plan on technology. There is a real temptation to ignore the international implications in master planning. For example, if you're operating programs overseas, how will the campus master plan

Sutton: Anyone else? Let's think for a few minutes if there are international measures you want. Factors we could link.

Silver: Skiddish to micromanage Look at the dollars and cents that have been put into international and what is the impact. I would be afraid to do this at the microlevel.

(Harold) Nichols: It seems that what may be more important is to try to get the aspiring peer groups to have good international strength. The choice of peer institutions becomes very critical one.

McIntosh: How has international fostered collaboration across institutions to stretch institutional resources?

Sutton: That's good, but how are we going to put it into an accountability measure?

Keene: I want to go back to the study abroad and retention. I agree with Pete's (Silver) thought that looking at Study Abroad rates with general graduation rates. If we want to look good whatever the validity look at individuals who have studied abroad who graduate and could probably have some good numbers. Inspiring and .

Shumaker: Would that follow through to those who go on to higher degrees? The percentage that go on to graduate school?

Silver: Not to disagree with my colleague - is it the Study Abroad that did this validity are there some validity question while it might look good, we need to defend that position.

Keene: Even if small number of students study abroad it might still be useful.

Shumaker: Is there any way you can use international population? Some kind of factor more international students and study abroad link.

Keene: Waivers, we did a multiplier effect. It was substantial amount of money economic impact on the state.

Gille: Would the indicators chosen be institutional versus system? If the campus has no dorms or cafeteria, for example.

Nichols (Harriet): One would be resources what resources actually exist - human and monetary. Look at the Olympics impact on Atlanta. Program activities could be counted. What kind of leadership have you had? There are some more precise kinds of things that could be measured.

Davis: There's got to be an aggregate system-wide effort, but it is important that an institution also has some benchmarking that you can measure, number of credit hours in language instruction relatively easy to develop.

doing lots of campus based activity. I think this will be very positive. One of the things she is working on, the prime driver System says we want 2% abroad. We want to put some muscle behind that effort and have targeted seven campuses to build study abroad. I'll talk about that initiative a little later when we get to that agenda item.

Another change is we have a faculty associate appointed in the language and technology area. He works with Sam Marinov. That is Dezso Benedek. He is very talented. He has been in the newspapers for a hunger strike.

Two other appointments: Dan Papp has been appointed to head the Yamacraw initiative. It is to align business, industry, and education in Georgia. Not to create a second Silicon Valley, but illusions to that. It does not have immediate implications at the moment. Madelyn Hanes has been appointed as the Chancellor's special assistant. She has a strong international interest; she was a campus dean in the Penn State system.

VII.

Sutton: These efforts provide the context under which we are looking at Study abroad approval. We delayed because we wanted to work within the constructs of broad program approval. Program approval will be linked more closely to data justification. After the program is launched after three years, a report back to the Central Office about how the program is doing is needed.. The Program Review Process that will be newly implemented is a system-wide view of how programs will be reviewed once they exist. What does that mean for new study abroad programs and existing study abroad programs? If it plays out as it appears, we think it will lead to a less cumbersome process. It may lead to more forewarning of programs connected to the campus's strategic plan. A lot of times programs are developed because the opportunity is there.

Keene: It sounds like a five-year plan to me.

Sutton: I don't think it is that bad. Each institution updates its strategic plan each year.

Is that too cumbersome?

Coker: It is for me. It seems heavy-handed to all of the institutions that have faculty review to have someone from off-campus sanction a program like May-mester. If it passes through faculty review, it will be, "Daddy, can we do it?" I'm not going to play the game of study abroad programs. You have to have systematic approval. Once it happens, further steps seem bureaucratic.

McIntosh: If we are going to move in that direction, then we need a directive from Central to Vice Presidents of Academic Affairs about it.

Sutton: Let's go back to why we are at this point. Remember that Board policy requires this new study abroad review process.

Call: I agree with Dave that endorsing the study abroad guidelines as a system would need certification of adherence to those guidelines.

Sutton: What I was trying to say is this is a way to monitor program duplication on a systemwide level.

Biron: Two points I agree with David: we need to have some kind of agreement for the transfer of credit for study abroad from one institution to another.

Janis: Are you including exchanges?

Sutton: Yes.

Janis: When you have done it one year, is it new? Also, is there is a format for what the criteria should be?

Silver: This whole context is really driven by two areas: the authority of the Board to review programs and thorough institutional effectiveness. I happen to serve on the committee. Realistically, the BOPR does not have the staff to police the programs in the state anyway. They would develop a template and have certification at the institutional level. Program review with certain variables with a trigger on campus to have external review. This goes back to our initial discussion. I've been removed from the Central Office for two

my school. Their enthusiasm is the absolutely key ingredient.

Biron: I agree completely with that. On the other hand, we need to be sure the programs are sound

Spanish Ministry of Education. We asked them if there are opportunities for collaboration on a program that

have?

Sutton: This is the first one that has come in during my tenure.

Call: The reason that I ask, is to make certain that someone is responsible. Jiangsu is directly related to the EC and the Northumbria is directly related to the ECF.

Sutton: It was presented to us as a top-level proposal.

Welburn: Is there some funding that would follow the adoption of this proposal? Or would it be something we would adopt as a charitable act out of our hide.

Sutton: The Spanish Ministry is prepared to fund.

Welburn: But not the BOR.

Sutton: They might once Spanish ministry is involved. Right now it's unfunded.

Reiff: Assuming we could address the concerns and caveats, our romance language department has been grappling with the tremendous growth in Spanish language opportunities. You mentioned also professional development opportunities for faculty could be good. In terms of direct exchange for students, study abroad would perhaps work better since students over there are having trouble getting the money for one-to-one exchange.

Sutton: It seems the kind of thing that would work well for systems to be involved in Ministries. We would keep the memorandum as generic as possible. Is that reasonable?

McIntosh: The flagship is very attractive to the students to the US flagship institutions.

Sutton: Is it reasonable to get back to me within two weeks October 8th?

X.

Sutton: Despite the entrepreneurial efforts of faculty, it does not lead us to put our most strategic foot forward. We have taken the approach this past year to fund a variety of initiatives and put funding into all world regions. They must be collaborative and have potential for growth and development in the future. Soon the question will be what are the System priorities. If the Board of Regents came and said, "We want to launch a \$10 million initiative," we want to be prepared. I want to devote a substantial amount of time to this at our next meeting.

Webb: One of the things that Richard suggested was trying to make study abroad attractive to a broader base of students.

Sutton: That I can see as a goal. You can also look at it in terms of diversity.

Murphy: I think it would be logical to set up a few priorities and establish priorities within each category. Study abroad, curricular infusion, faculty development.

XI.

Sutton: Prioritizing leads to the next item budget. A quick review of last year: I thought we were extremely successful in capturing money that was not ours. We got about a third of the teaching and learning. We were able to fund fifty Chancellor's awards. We funded a lot of new initiatives, Africa, health professions, etc.

Look at this coming year. We have asked for some continuing funds for collaborative programs that came with a letter from Dr. Muyskens. We are asking for \$150,000 to continue those projects. If we do, those will be current year funds. We would get them earlier in the year. There is no guarantee that all of those projects would be re-funded. Persons would not automatically get re-funded. There is a thought that there are too many new initiatives that are not getting results. Some of these projects have only been going a few months. We are going to have a smaller allocation for Chancellor's Awards; that allocation is reduced by half as the money has gone to other programs.

XII.

Sutton: We have \$100,000 additional dollars for Global Partnerships program. We may try to develop grants in specific areas. If we give campuses six weeks to develop a proposal, we can get some pretty good things. The deadline would be early to mid-November. The hope is that we would get the proposals reviewed and funding out by the start of spring semester. In addition I want to mention a couple of other funding possibilities in the future. The teaching and learning grants will not be offered. The main point is they are moving grants away from individual grants. We have a chance to influence that discussion. I am hoping we can inject an international dynamism into that discussion. They are talking about the allocation of FY2001 the following year; there is \$400,000 on the table. There is some current faculty development money on the table - it is a bit more restricted in that it comes under the Distinguished Professor area. If funds are made available, we have a shot of getting some of that money. I do not have a sense of the guidelines, but think about faculty development for some money that may become available.

Call: I wonder if there is a report of the Global Partnerships progress, the projects titles, funding. I was one of the readers and I don't know which were funded. I think it would be helpful as we weigh where money should go.

Sutton: In the flurry of activity . I'm sorry. To recap we were able to support some projects with language components. I will try to get that out to you.

Keene: What are the characteristics of the grant for funding?

Sutton: The money for teaching and learning competition in the spring for \$400,000 will not be awarded as

in the past. We know it will be awarded for faculty development that results in a teaching and learning perspective.

Coker: Based on our difficulties with the Global Partnerships last year, I think we should give all of those funds for a contract for services which lifts off the awesome responsibility to construct a project that is forced into finishing with a report by June 30, 1999. It's a good tool and we should be using it the "fee for services."

Sutton: It does that and it is much more specific for outcomes. Maybe they don't want them out there.

Coker: Life is difficult. They may be reluctant, but it doesn't create a new financial tool. They know how to do it. On the Academic side of the house we talk about a grant. You cannot talk about a grant and ask for a contract. I am suggesting we talk about a contract rather than a grant.

Sutton: We would like to look at a competition next spring for the following year.

McIntosh: As part of the earlier discussion, did I hear you talk about continuation of funding?

Sutton: I did talk about AF Latin American studies and Russian studies, the procedures for that we don't know.

McIntosh: Another comment regarding professional development. It seems we ought to do something with faculty and staff who have been on the seminars. I think having the seminar participants come back together to see how their learnings are infused would be productive.

Sutton: I would be happy to receive the proposal.

Sutton: Regarding the international admissions, we did raise the TOEFL score.

Gille: 523? Am I correct that if an institution has .

Sutton: I have no idea about when or where that (ESL system approval) will come about. All ESL programs or learning support options will need to be recertified.

Shumaker: That request will be made to us?

Sutton: It will come through my office; I was hoping it would go somewhere else. One last thing about

Nichols (Harold): Not all of the data comes from one source.

Shumaker: Are we the responsible for the form being submitted?

Sutton: We are asking you to oversee the form getting to the individual that has the information.

Nichols (Harold): We need to know who the form is going to and is it working.

Call: And send it to schools where it is not working. We will assist IIE; when is the report due?

Lund: I'll try to get a print-out from IIE to ascertain exactly to whom the reports are being mailed and what the deadline is for submission.

Sutton: New procedures are in effect for this year. The deadlines are common. The campuses must decide how to nominate for scholarships. We will be giving you a template about what we need . We'll keep it as simple as possible. We will rely on your judgements on the campus level following our guidelines. It then becomes a numbers game at that point. How many students are you willing to nominate and match and then how far on our list? This gets more fun this year. We do have \$50,000 from the AIFS for this year. We are under favorable consideration from Coca-Cola Foundation but do not have a commitment yet. We do not know how many awards to make but be as optimistic as possible. The immediate question is for spring.

One complicating factor is the negotiation of the AIFS contract. They have placed some new restrictions. \$1,000 for semester length programs and \$500 for programs of 4 weeks or more. AIFS will not fund programs of less than 4 weeks.

Janis: If you have short-term 4 week programs, the institution would pay \$250 and AIFS money would be \$250?

Sutton: We want to insure campus process.

Call: Two comments. One thing that has to be determined is the definition of a semester. The other comment that I had to make is that we maintain the \$1,000 level because I think it is only grants of

Coker: What is the AIFS definition of a semester?

Sutton: This gives us appropriate flexibility. I would envision a semester as ten weeks or longer. You may be

Holloway: Length of time is very important at two-year when they have to leave jobs, but that's what they want to do. If they are pushed into longer programs.

Potts: Yes, the trip is nine days, the class is for a whole semester on campus, but the trip is a critical part of campus.

Call: Hypothetically, we should fund programs, whether you have a semester program or a nine day program.

Nick: It seems to me the fewer restrictions the money comes to the campus with the better.

Lund: The initial stance was no money except \$1,000 for 8, 18 for \$500 for less.

Coker: Is there another possibility to the way you presented? I prefer the model for flexibility at the institution.

Sutton: I am intrigued by your reaction. I would have thought you would want to grow the number of awards.

We are going to work with seven campuses [Georgia Southern, Augusta State, Columbus State, Fort Valley State, Georgia College and State, North Georgia College and State, and West Georgia] to target development and recruitment in study abroad and financing study abroad. These should emerge as a system specialist.

Shumaker: Lots of students live off campus and say, "I have to pay rent whether I am there or not. I cannot sublease."

Janis: How were those institutions identified?

Shumaker: We had a high school student at Georgia Southern.

Janis: I saw a minutes that said that the Georgia Tech disciplinary cannot be denied.

Holloway: Post-secondary options under 18 would be hard to do.

Sutton: Regarding the Web site, we'll try to get it updated as soon as possible.

Sutton: I think we are going to do something soon. Those of you that have it worked out on your campus, continue to do so. We are trying to avoid the use of out-of-state fee waivers. I think that is a wast

XXI.

We are adjourned.

© **Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia**

270 Washington Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30334

U.S.A.