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AGENDA

FACULTY SENATE

THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY

Meeting Notice: Monday, September 26, 1988, 126 Clinton Hall
3:30 p.m.

Order of Business:

I. Calling of the Meeting to Order

II. Informal Proposals and Statements

1. Report from Board of Regents, Chairman Dodderidge

III. Approval of Minutes for the meetings of September 12
(Vol. XXV, No. 2)

IV. Old Business:

None

V. New Business:

* 1. Transfer and Articulation Agreement (Attachment B). For information only.

* 2. Report from Faculty Support Committee on Travel
(Attachment C). For information only.

# Motion from Faculty Support Committee.

3. Interim report from Faculty Affairs Committee on Promotion and Tenure

VI. Adjournment

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

NAME BOX PHONE
Peter Zoller, Senate President 14 3130
Gary Greenberg, Senate Vice President 34 3171
Tom Izbicki, Senate Secretary 68 3591
Elmer Hoyer, Senate President-elect 44 3415
Gayle Davis, Elected by Senate 82 3358
Ben Rogers, Elected by Senate 74 3125
Jack McCormick, Appointed by Senate President 51 3120
September 15, 1988

To: Kansas Board of Regents
    Chancellor and Presidents
    Stanley Z. Koplik

From: Richard Dodderidge

Subject: AN ISSUE AGENDA FOR 1988-1989

* * * * * * * * *

For the past several weeks I have visited our campuses, met with staff, faculty and students and clearly learned a lot. Indeed, I feel well on the way to an advanced degree in higher education! But the most important benefit of these hours spent on campus is the resulting improved visibility for the Board of Regents and its representation as an effective voice on behalf of Kansas higher education.

THE PAST YEAR REVISITED

Special thanks are due to Don Slawson and his outstanding Chairmanship during the past year. Don's persistent activities on behalf of The Margin of Excellence and related issues of academic quality provide us with momentum for the continuing challenges we must confront. We are a stronger organization today as a result of several focused efforts but at the same time, we have yet to reach our full potential. The prospects are encouraging and contribute substantially to my excitement regarding our continuing agenda.

The Governor first recognized the two most critical elements of The Margin of Excellence by fully funding the base budget and then addressing our salary request. The Legislature went a step further by considering each institution's mission-related program improvements. Together, the Governor and Legislature provided us with 92 percent of our overall request; 1988 was a very good year.

Present economic conditions permit me to be guardedly optimistic for sustaining our budgetary success. The state has a formidable treasury balance of unencumbered money, sales and income tax collections continue to be robust and unemployment is under 5 percent. This climate will be necessary to accommodate Kansas' many competing interests and needs in education, social services, public safety and highways. However, I am sure you will agree that we would much rather compete for available funds than struggle over reductions and an uncertain future.
The past year allowed us to accomplish much in the way of improved campus attitudes and morale. I have observed this refreshing change on each campus. There is no doubt that the improved morale will contribute to a more productive workforce. Both faculty and students feel positive about the environment, with both groups expressing fewer frustrations and more hope for the future. The Margin of Excellence remains our top priority.

AN AGENDA FOR THE CURRENT YEAR

The Margin of Excellence - It appears that among the more important outcomes of last year's Margin of Excellence program is the widespread acceptance of the term "Margin of Excellence" into the popular vocabulary of Kansas higher education. Once again we must focus attention on The Margin of Excellence increment to our base budget. This second year is crucial for maintaining the competitive advantages resulting from FY 1989. Success will require a redoubling of our unified, cohesive and targeted approach of last year. I expect teamwork from all directions and encourage frequent communication between Regents, Presidents and Board staff. The Margin of Excellence represents our top priority and then some.

Qualified Admissions - I have asked each President to revisit this issue over the next few weeks to determine whether any "fine-tuning" to our proposal is necessary. In any event, our desire to move away from the state's present open admissions policy is motivated by the need to better prepare students for the rigors of college level work. Yet, in our enthusiasm for this push, we must not let qualified admissions get in the way of The Margin of Excellence. A carefully conceived strategy for better informing the legislature and public is essential for lifting debate on this issue.

Governance - This issue has two principal components: Washburn and the community colleges. The Washburn issue is far less complex than the community colleges. The Board should be willing to discuss affiliation with Washburn but only on terms which will in no way diminish the fundamental financial support necessary to sustain and improve the present array of public institutions in Kansas. For example, there can be no compromising The Margin of Excellence.

The community college question is more difficult simply because the state's 19 community colleges may have 19 different views on the meaning of coordination. We should approach this issue willing to take a fresh look at ways in which traditions can be preserved (local control) and the future improved for students. Greater consensus will be essential if we expect results in this matter.

Institutional Assessment - We are on the right track here by relying on faculty participation to develop individual campus plans. I have found it encouraging to hear faculty support for these efforts. At the same time, I am sure there are dissident voices. For the long term we must be willing to openly measure ourselves and evaluate increments of student performance and learning in the academic environment. To be certain, much of the collegiate experience represents imprecise
development likely to reward the student in future life. Nonetheless, the public needs to know more about the value of a college education if we expect them to pay more for its cost. I am looking forward to our October discussions on this subject and expect meaningful campus plans forwarded to the Board in January 1989. Institutional assessment gives us an exciting opportunity to show all Kansans we consider public accountability among our foremost responsibilities.

* * * * * *

There will be other items of importance demanding our attention during the next year. I am sure we will spend considerable time discussing: (1) maintenance of our facilities; (2) telecommunications and distance learning; (3) private fund-raising campaigns; and (4) appropriate levels of tuition, fees and student financial aid.

Our agenda will be full and I expect it will be relevant. We can accomplish much and continue to build a stronger higher education system in Kansas. We must be willing to expend considerable energy and use one another's strengths rather than embark on separate pathways. I intend to coordinate our activities in a manner which benefits the entire enterprise and will need your continued support. I am looking forward to nothing less than another successful year.
The Council of Chief Academic Officers recommends that the Kansas Board of Regents pursue the revision of the Kansas Public Community College - State Colleges and University Transfer and Articulation Agreement which was negotiated in 1975. COCAO recommends revision on the basis of the following considerations:

1. The initial agreement did not satisfy the general education requirements which were in place at Regents universities at the time the agreement was originally negotiated.

2. Regents universities have increased the number of hours of general education requirements since 1975. Today Regents universities' general education requirements range from 42-48 credit hours, which are no longer remotely equivalent to the 30 credit hours contained in the current agreement.

3. Under the current agreement, conferring the status of junior upon the transfer student who has earned an Associate of Arts or Associate of Science is deceptive. While the current agreement insures that courses transfer, it does not insure that the transfer student’s course work is commensurate with that of the resident student as far as progress toward a degree is concerned. A transfer and articulation agreement with an increased number of hours in general education will insure that junior transfer students are more commensurate with junior resident students.

4. The current transfer and articulation agreement must be evaluated in light of trends in higher education pertaining to general education and in the functions of community colleges. Higher education has been moving away from a "smorgasbord" approach to general education and toward the identification of appropriate specific courses.

Furthermore, the Regents universities determine their own general education package in accordance with their institutional mission, and this makes the fulfillment of the current agreement impossible since Kansas community colleges cannot offer six variable general education packages for transfer students. Therefore, it is important to revise the transfer and articulation agreement in a manner which would allow the community colleges to offer a package of specific courses acceptable to Regents universities as meeting general education requirements although the courses will not be identical.
5. The missions of Kansas public community colleges have changed since 1975 and this, too, suggests a change in the transfer and articulation agreement. Today, community colleges provide an array of services and are no longer limited to instruction of the first two years of a baccalaureate oriented sequence. A package of courses within an identified distribution of areas would allow community colleges sufficient flexibility to meet the general education needs of transfer students and to fulfill other educational functions such as programs in vocational-technical education, remedial education, personnel development and service to business, community groups and government.

6. Any agreement on student transfer needs a life span. Any agreement must be periodically re-evaluated to determine its relevance to current degree requirements.

COCOA recommends to the Council of Presidents and the Board of Regents the attached statement and points of clarification on community college transfer and articulation and seeks permission to negotiate a new agreement with representatives of the Kansas public community colleges, effective July, 1989.
1. This agreement applies only to Associate of Arts and Associate of Science degree transfers from state and regionally accredited public community colleges in Kansas. The agreement does not include transfers from nonaccredited community colleges or any other colleges.

2. Transfer students accepted for admission at Kansas Regents universities with the Associate of Arts or Associate of Science degree will automatically be given junior standing with the understanding that:
   a) Each receiving institution has the right to determine admission standards to the various majors in their institutions.
   b) Transfer students are subject to the same institutional assessment policies and procedures as resident students of the receiving institution.

3. General education is defined as follows:
   General education provides students with facility in the use of the English language and a broad intellectual experience in the major fields of knowledge. It insures that each graduate will have experienced some of the content, method and system of values of the various disciplines which enable humanity to understand itself and its environment at a level of abstraction beyond that found in secondary school studies.

   Although the following distribution of courses do not correspond to the General Education requirements at any Kansas Regents Institution, it will be accepted as having satisfied the lower division general education requirements of all Kansas Regents universities.

   A minimum of 45 hours of cumulative general education credit hours will be required with distribution in the following fields:

   12 hours of Basic Skills including: 6 hours of English Composition
   3 hours of Speech Communication
   3 hours of college level Mathematics (statistics will be required of transfer students where University curriculum requires it)

   12 hours of Humanities courses from at least three of the following disciplines:
   Art*  Theatre*  Philosophy
   Music*  History  Literature
   *Performance courses are excluded.

   12 hours of Social and Behavioral Sciences courses from at least three of the following disciplines:
   Sociology  Psychology
   Political Science  Economics
   Geography

   9 hours of Natural and Physical Sciences courses from at least two of the following disciplines:
   Biology - lecture with lab
   Chemistry - lecture with lab
   Physics - lecture with lab

   Transcripts of students fulfilling the requirements of this agreement will be appropriately coded by the sending institution.

4. Other associate degrees and certificates may be awarded for programs which have requirements different from baccalaureate-oriented sequences or a primary objective other than transfer. Students in such programs wishing to transfer to Kansas Regents universities are to be considered outside this agreement.

   Students attempting to transfer into Technology, Engineering and Architecture programs are considered outside this agreement. It is recommended that 2 + 2 and 2 + 3 arrangements be developed for the above programs of study.

   Acceptance of course credit for transfer from such programs will be determined by the receiving institution on the basis of application of the courses to the baccalaureate program in the major field of the student.

5. Each institution will define its own graduation requirements. The receiving institution may build on the program completed by including educational experiences designed to satisfy the students' objectives as well as meeting the degree requirements in a minimum amount of time.

6. Foreign language requirements are viewed as graduation requirements and not as general education requirements for purposes of this agreement.

7. A transfer student may be required to take freshman or sophomore courses to meet particular requirements or course prerequisites of a given major or minor.

8. Transfer students may be required to take general education courses normally required of junior and senior students during the last two years of their senior college experience.

9. Transfer students preparing for teacher certification must meet the general education requirements as outlined by the State Board of Education. Teacher certification requirements have been incorporated into the degree requirements of Kansas Regents universities.

10. The spirit of the Agreement indicates that transfer students are to be judged academically in the same way as non-transfer students.
Corrections:

1) On back of first page under "Recommendations" (1), second sentence: "This should be done in such a way as to protect the autonomy of the individual colleges as they make their funding decisions."

2) On back of last page, "Colleges' Travel Policies," the word "Same" under columns 3 and 4 should read Some.
Memorandum

To: Peter Zoller, President, Faculty Senate
Date: May 16, 1988

From: John E. Dreifort, Chair, Travel Subcommittee of Faculty Support Committee

Subject: Subcommittee Report

In February 1988, Faculty Senate President Ben Rogers asked the Faculty Support Committee to consider the issue of University-wide travel. A subcommittee comprised of Professors John Dreifort (Chair), Nancy Bereman, Donald Blakeslee, and Donald Homertzheim was assigned to undertake the study. The committee met on nearly a weekly basis throughout the spring semester. What follows is the preliminary report of the committee.

Charge

I. Determine the sources and amount of all travel money and determine who decides-how to use the funds and what policies are utilized in such decisions;

2. Determine whether scholarly travel is receiving a fair share of available funds and whether there is a reasonable equity in the distribution and use of such funds;

3. Recommend such changes in administrative structure, funding levels, and policies as are deemed appropriate by the committee's findings.

Findings

The committee solicited information from each of the colleges regarding policies, sources, and expenditures for scholarly travel in those units. Vice President Scott's office provided invaluable information that had been assembled by Gerald McDougall within the previous six months. The committee found that the issue is a very complicated one in virtually every respect, that policies and decision-making about travel expenditures varies greatly across campus, and that the amount of resources available for scholarly travel is woefully inadequate, thereby further complicating the issue.

1. Purposes of Travel: A wide range of travel activities is funded on campus from travel funds. National and regional conferences, workshops and seminars, contract research, national society officer meetings, music tours, dance festivals, guest artists, recruiting new faculty, administrator meetings, accreditation visits, and research peer review panels are among the most prominent, though not the only, travel activities funded.

2. Sources of Travel Funds: Many sources of funding for scholarly travel exist on campus, including state travel funds from OOE, faculty enrichment monies from the mill levy, donations, telephone campaign, research contracts, and funds generated from workshops and seminars constitute the main sources used for travel. State travel funds are those that are authorized to be drawn from the OOE budget. In tight years, however, the University may not elect to use such funds for travel, and such funds cannot be carried over to the following years. For FY 87, the last year for which statistics are available for this study, state funds amounted to $78,580. Faculty enrichment monies (FE) are obtained from the city-county mill levy, but are not used only for faculty travel (seminars, workshops, teacher evaluations, etc. also are drawn from such funds). For FY 87, this source contributed $89,420 to faculty travel. These funds can be carried over to the following fiscal year. The total amount of travel funded from these
two sources amounted to about 30% of the total amount spent for travel for FY 87. The remainder came from the other sources listed above. The amount of such monies available to each academic unit varies greatly and is not easy to determine, although a rough estimate is possible by subtracting the state and FE monies expended from the total amount. But research contract money, telephone campaign money, etc. can vary widely in terms of availability and use.

3. Distribution of travel funds: Policies and the decision-making process regarding travel funds vary greatly. There is no uniform procedure for obtaining travel funds across the colleges of the University. In some colleges the distribution of such funds is centralized in the office of the Dean, while in others it has been placed in the hands of the department or other unit within the college. Some colleges have written policies and procedures (though not always adhered to in practice), while others do not. Indeed, in some colleges the policy is solely in the head of the dean. The types of expenses paid for by the colleges also varies considerably. All pay air fare or car expenses for approved travel. Some pay per diem expenses, while others pay no per diem expenses. Some colleges pay for some but not all per diem expenses. Payment for registration fees also varies. Expenses paid for by the colleges relates directly to the amount of available funding, but this returns to the issue of sources of funding—some colleges simply have more avenues than others for alternative sources of funding beyond that provided for by the state and FE.

4. Matters of equity in funding: While it appears that there are no serious abuses in the allocation of the travel funds, the data is too raw to draw more than tentative conclusions in this area. For example, a substantial amount of nonfaculty travel is supported ($293,193) compared to faculty travel that is funded ($274,724). But the data is not sufficient to explain such differences—i.e., how much nonfaculty travel is administrative travel. Is the same scrutiny as to the nature and cost applied to administrative travel as to scholarly travel for faculty?

Recommendations
1. Given the disparate nature of the policies regarding travel funds across campus, an attempt should be made to develop some type of standardized procedure based upon written policies that would be made available to faculty in each college. This should be done in such a way as to protect the autonomy of the individual colleges so that makes its funding decisions. Priorities and guidelines developed by each college should be distributed to the faculty and should be reviewed periodically by the colleges.

2. Since the faculty generate as much as 70% of the discretionary funds used to support travel, they should have a role in the determining of such policies and guidelines, and they should be periodically informed as to how and on what basis such funds are allocated. In this way it might be possible to allay some of the suspicion and criticism about funding for scholarly travel that currently exists on campus.
Overall Travel Request for FY87 (Through June 87)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number of trips</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average cost per trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>$274,724</td>
<td>$522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonfaculty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>402</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No cost to Univ.</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>293,193</td>
<td>578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,033</strong></td>
<td><strong>$567,917</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Basic data compiled by Dr. Gerald McDougall
**Faculty Travel Request Analysis (FY87 Through June 87)**
(Does not include administrative type travel)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Total Amount</th>
<th>Average/trip</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>$31,263</td>
<td>$651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>38,519</td>
<td>428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>51,033</td>
<td>773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19,663</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>29,301</td>
<td>505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>82,117</td>
<td>464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other units</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22,822</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>526</td>
<td>$274,718</td>
<td>$522</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Basic data compiled by Dr. Gerald McDougall*
### Distribution of State Plus Faculty Enhancement Funds by Unit (FY87)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Allocated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business School</td>
<td>$14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Professions</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberal Arts &amp; Sciences</td>
<td>51,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All others (VPs, Graduate, Research office, etc.)</td>
<td>50,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$168,000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>College</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Written Policy</th>
<th>Air/car Registration</th>
<th>Per diem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Business</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engr.</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine Arts</td>
<td>Centralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Pr.</td>
<td>Decentralized</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Same</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAS</td>
<td>Central</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Varies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FACULTY SENATE

The Wichita State University

Minutes of the Meeting of September 26, 1988 (Vol. XXV, no. 3)


Members Absent: Armstrong, Brinkman, Christ, Elizondo, Feleppa, Lynch, Mays, Olson, Windham

Guests: Pangburn, Curry, Rohn, Wesche, Fitzgerald

Summary of Senate Action

1. Motion: To accept the report from the Faculty Support Committee on Travel. Passed.

2. Motion: To implement the recommendations in the report. Passed as amended.

Call to Order, "Informal Proposals and Statements."
President Zoller called meeting to order at 3:30. He called attention to Attachment "A", a report from Richard Dodderidge. President Zoller reported on the most recent Regent's meeting and where we are in regard to these matters:

MARGIN OF EXCELLENCE - Regents seem to be fully committed to the second year of funding.

QUALIFIED ADMISSIONS - State institutions' Faculty Senates have been asked to 'revisit' this issue. EVP Scott has sent a copy of the Faculty Senate's report of last year to the Executive Committee which will begin discussion at its next meeting. Zoller noted that KU and KSU support Qualified Admissions.

GOVERNANCE - Dodderidge would favor bringing Washburn into the state system, but only if it doesn't affect adversely the Margin of Excellence. Changes in Community Colleges, especially their being placed under the Regents, are a long time away.

INSTITUTIONAL ASSESSMENT - We have been working on this on our campus. EVP Scott has appointed a steering committee with the following members:

Randolph Ellsworth (Chair)          Bert Smith
Carl Adamson                        Melvin Zandler
John Belt                           Donald Blakeslee
Laura Eells                         Harold Veeser
Mary Sue Foster                     Judith Pier
James Jackson                       William Richardson
Jeanette Jeffers                    Ralph Henard
James Kelly
Greenberg asked the difference between the Steering Committee on Assessment and the Ad Hoc Committee on Assessment. Zoller said the ad hoc committee could serve as the Senate's liaison with the Steering Committee.

There will be a live Teleconference Workshop on Assessment October 7, and President Zoller will attend. It will be video taped; and, if it seems worthwhile, it will be shown to the Faculty Senate.

President Zoller introduced Anne Fitzgerald, replacement for Gardner Selby, reporter for Wichita Eagle Beacon, who has been transferred to another assignment. He also introduced Scott Curry, the new ombudsperson on campus. Mr. Curry spoke briefly on his position and gave the hours that his office will be open - 9:30-12:00; 1:00-5:30 M-F and one evening a week. Mr. Curry hopes to resolve problems for students or faculty on an individual basis in a nonconfrontational style.

Senator Karen Brown, a member of the Advisory Board of the University Preschool, spoke on several problems that are facing the school. They have to move by April 1, because of the opening of the new section of the library. A $300,000 bond issue has been approved to help make the move; but the location hasn't been determined, and the sum does not permit improvements and expansion from 44 to 80 children. The Preschool is funded from two sources only - the SGA and fees paid by the parents. Both KU and KSU provide staff support for childcare centers on campus. Senator Brown asked the Faculty Senate to look into the possibility of some University support on this campus. President Zoller said that the Executive Committee will discuss whether to send this matter to a standing committee or form an ad hoc committee.

Senator Mark Dotzour gave information on increases in health premiums of HMO Kansas and suggested that an investigation into other avenues of securing health insurance on a longer time basis with a pre-timed announcement of increased premiums. President Zoller ask Senator Dotzour for a copy of the information he had presented to be reviewed by the Executive Committee on Tuesday. Dreifort suggested that the University become a health insurance group, distinct from the State group.

EVP Scott said that there is a recommendation coming out that the Governor include in his next budget a remedy for last year's increase in premiums for Blue Select; but the HMO increase is not covered by that proposal. Zoller noted that fringe benefits and the needs of classified staff also need to be addressed.

Minutes
There were five corrections to the minutes:
Page 2, paragraph 3, last sentence: President Armstrong will be meeting with the members of the commission on the Liberal Arts.
Page 2, paragraph 4, sentence 3: President Zoller and the Executive Committee will appoint an ad hoc committee.
Page 3, paragraph 5, sentence 2: President Zoller asked...
Minutes of September 12 then were accepted.

Old Business  None

New Business

Articulation Agreement (Attachment B)
For information only, the Senate reviewed the new Articulation Agreement. The document had been considered confidential earlier because of efforts then underway to negotiate changes with the Community Colleges. It was made public at the last Regent's meeting, but the document was deferred for approval until the next Regents meeting in October.

President Zoller then recognized EVP Scott who reported on the Transfer and Articulation Agreement. Council of Chief Academic Officers believes that the 30-hour requirement no longer is relevant to General Education. Since the document was coming up for renewal, it was decided to introduce a 45-hour plan that would take into account new developments in General Education. That would correct problems in the old agreement. COCAO believes this document should be approved by the Regents and adopted by the community colleges, or each Regents' school should negotiate with community colleges in a special and individual way.

Senator Sutterlin questioned the exclusion of Geology and Anthropology from Natural Sciences. EVP Scott responded that it may have been because few of the community colleges offer these courses. (Religion is another subject in the same state.) Clark asked about quality of community college instruction, and Scott noted the possibility of competence testing. Rogers observed that some students transfer with no problems, but others do have difficulty because of the inconsistency of education in the community colleges. Dr. Zoller stated that it was hoped that the Regents would pass this document at the next meeting.

Report from Faculty Support Committee on Travel (Attachment C)
Senator Dreifort spoke on what might be considered inequities in the amount of travel funds available. Some colleges have access to more money for travel than others. State money plus Faculty Enrichment make up only about 30% of the money spent each year on travel. The committee found no serious abuse in use of funds. Concern was expressed about non-faculty travel, but that is not to be addressed at this time.
Dreifort moved acceptance of the report from the Faculty Support Committee on Travel, and Gosman seconded. Discussion followed concerning disparate procedures and standards for distribution. The motion to accept the report passed.

Dreifort then moved acceptance of the recommendations in the report, and Laptad seconded. Discussion focused on disparate needs of different colleges, the distinction between state monies and grants, and faculty control over policies adopted by colleges and departments. Colleges will need guidelines, but a department may have its own policies within those boundaries. The main motion was clarified to mean that "standardized" policies and procedures are those "appropriate to a college or department." Senator Rogers moved that the Faculty Support Committee be charged with an overview of the implementation of the recommendations and make a progress report back to the Senate. Senator Clark seconded. Motion passed as an amendment to the main motion. The main motion then passed.

Report from Faculty Affairs committee on Promotion and Tenure
A progress report was given by Chairperson Art Rohn on behalf of the Faculty Affairs Committee on Tenure and Promotion. He stated that he could not give a definite date when the committee would be ready to present a final report because of the heavy workload of committee members. Also, other charges given to the committee last spring were yet to be completed. These involved salaries for teaching summer school courses and minimum enrollments in summer courses.

Meeting adjourned.