Volume V

Agenda and Minutes of the Meeting of May 11, 1992

Additional information: Digitized by University Libraries Technical Services and archived in SOAR: Shocker Open Access Repository at: http://soar.wichita.edu/handle/10057/14177
Agenda
OLD FACULTY SENATE

3:00 P.M.  
NOTE SPECIAL TIME!
ROOM 126 CH
MAY 11, 1992

I. Call Meeting to Order

II. Resolution from the Executive Committee (Attachment A)

III. Committee Reports
   (a) Traffic Policy Committee (April 27 Attachment)
       1. Proposed University Traffic Committee (see memo from
          President Armstrong (Attachment B)
   (b) Rules Committee
       1. Nominations for Committees and Senate Vacancy
       2. Annual report (Canary Attachment C)
   (c) Planning and Budget Committee (Attachment D)
   (d) Faculty Support Committee (Green Attachment E)
   (e) Library/MRC Committee (Attachment F)
       1. Ad Hoc Library Planning Committee (Attachment G)
   (f) Proposed Smoking Policy (Attachment H)
   (g) Ad Hoc Task Force on Faculty Perception of
       Administrative Performance (Handout)

IV. Final Comments

V. Adjournment

* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *

NEW FACULTY SENATE

(NOTE: the 1992-1993 Senate will not convene prior to 3:30, even if old Senate
business is completed early.)

I. Call to Order

II. Election of Officers and members of the Planning and Budget Committee

III. Adjournment
RESOLUTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

RESOLVED: That the Senate charge the four past presidents of the Faculty Senate to serve as an ad hoc committee to review the development of faculty governance since the founding of the Faculty Senate and report its findings and recommendations to the Senate at an early date in the fall.

Past Presidents

1. Ben Rogers
2. Peter Zoller
3. Elmer Hoyer
4. David Alexander
MEMORANDUM

TO: Classified Senate, Mardith Hammond, President
Faculty Senate, A. J. Mandt, President
Student Senate, Jennifer Volz, President
Unclassified Professional Staff Senate, Dale Valentine, President

FROM: Warren B. Armstrong

DATE: April 29, 1992

SUBJECT: University Traffic Committee

To recognize the interests of the various constituencies on campus, I am proposing a new University Traffic Committee to make recommendations to me in keeping with the charge shown below.

Composition - 12 members

The composition of the committee should include the following:

- 2 classified staff--recommended to the University President by the Classified Staff Senate
- 2 faculty members--recommended to the University President by the Faculty Senate
- 6 students--recommended to the University President by the Student Senate
- 1 unclassified professional staff--recommended to the University President by the Unclassified Professional Staff Senate
- 1 Chief of Police, Chair--non voting

Charge

The Traffic Committee is to review and make recommendations on:

1. Traffic regulations regarding traffic flow and parking for the University's students, faculty, staff, and visitors.
2. Traffic regulations regarding violations, violation fee schedules, and appeals procedures for those cited for violations.

Committee recommendations are to be made to the University President. The University President will review such recommendations and forward approved changes in the written traffic regulations to the Board of Regents who will then take appropriate action and forward them to the Revisor of State Statutes.

Administrative Responsibilities

Policies pertaining to new parking lots, financing of new lots, reserved spaces, registration of automobiles, enforcement of traffic regulations and other general administrative matters will be carried out administratively and are not a part of the charge of the Committee.

Please send comments to my office on or before June 1, 1992.
The Faculty Senate Rules Committee consists of four faculty members chosen from rotating divisions, the President Elect of the Senate (Chair), the Vice President of the Senate and a student. They are:

Roger Berger, Humanities
Bertil van Boer, Fine Arts
Dharam Chopra, Mathematics & Natural Science
William Terrell, Business Administration
James Clark, Senate Vice President
Kathryn Griffith, Senate President Elect, Chair
Laurie Smith, Student

Committee Nominations:

The Committee is charged to make nominations to the Senate to fill vacancies on Committees and to make nominations to fill unexpired terms of Senators. The Rules Committee made seven nominations to fill vacancies on Senate Committees, three nominations to fill unexpired Senate terms, one nomination to a University Committee, and the nomination of a new Ad Hoc General Education Committee pursuant to a faculty charge.

By an agreement between the Committee and the Provost's office, the Ad Hoc General Education committee elected its own chair and will make a final report to the faculty no later than October 1, 1992. The existing General Education Committee will continue to monitor the present program until the new one is in place. The composition of and lines of responsibility for the General Education Committee that will ultimately supervise the new program will be determined by an ad hoc committee to be appointed jointly by the Senate Executive Committee and the Provost. The committee charge will include clarification of duties assigned to the Coordinator and to the Committee.

The Committee made nominations for new appointments to all Senate Faculty Committees in accordance with the divisional requirements, faculty preference, and recommendations by the proper divisional members of the Senate.

Senate Elections:

Senate Elections were conducted by the Vice President and have been completed. Forms for nomination of Senate Officers and Budget Committee members have been mailed. Elections will be held by the new Senate on May 11.

Grievance:

Early in the spring semester a grievance was filed with the Rules Committee Chair by a faculty member. The Rules Committee decided that adequate information was filed to support formation of a grievance committee. The
convener was chosen from a pool by the Rules Committee Chair and a suggested list established for the committee. The Grievance Committee has been formed according to the procedures outlined in the Faculty Handbook and is at work reviewing the grievance. Revision of the Grievance Procedure was delayed again this year. The Committee recommends that it be considered early next year. A revised draft was prepared by a committee composed of Dwight Murphy and Fred Benson and is available for consideration.

Definition of the term "compelling reasons" for rejecting a recommendation for a grievance committee remains an issue. Senate President Mandt has been asked to try to arrange a joint request with President Armstrong to the Attorney General to ask if there is a legal definition for this term that would be helpful in clarifying our present grievance policy.

Faculty Senate Curriculum Committee:

A new approved procedure for approval of new degree programs that are developed outside a regular degree granting college requires the re-establishment of a Senate Curriculum Committee. A charge for the committee is presently being developed by the Executive Committee and should be proposed to the Senate this spring.

Non Senate Committees:

An initial discussion was held between the Chair of the Rules Committee and Peter Zoller in the Provost's office to consider the status of non Senate Committees. Some of these have completed their function, others are not functioning and still others are operating independently. The Committee encourages the process of reviewing these committees, their charges, and to whom they report. Roger Berger has discussed the matter with the chair of the Guest Speaker Committee and the chair is sending information to Zoller about that committee.

Corrections to Faculty Handbook and Charge to Tenure and Promotion Committee:

"At a meeting without either the Provost or the Dean of the Graduate School present, each case will be discussed and the committee will conduct a final vote." (Approved by the Faculty Senate, Vice President Breazeale and President Armstrong in July, 1991.)
ANNUAL REPORT
Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee
April 1992

The Faculty Senate Planning and Budget Committee was established in the Spring of 1991. It is composed of eight members including the Senate President and President Elect and six members elected by the Senate from among its membership. Each elected member will serve three year rotating terms of office with two being elected each year. Each elected member must be from different divisions. Present members are:

David Alexander, Natural Sciences and Mathematics
James Clark, Business Administration
Kathryn Griffith, Senate President Elect and Chair
Melvin Kahn, Social Sciences
Sally Kitch, Humanities
A. J. Mandt, Senate President
Sam Yeager, Academic Services
Carla Lee, Health Professions

Organizational Meeting

The committee held its organizational meeting on May 22, 1991 and elected a chair. There was unanimous agreement that this would be a working committee with members volunteering to make specific studies and that the committee was concerned primarily with planning and policy issues related to the budget. As of April 26, 1992 the committee has met 23 times, twice each with Provost Cottle and Mary Herrin and once each with President Armstrong and Mike Wall.

Change in Membership

One member resigned because of illness in the family and was replaced by a vote of the Senate.

Reports to the Senate

The committee, which among other things is charged with informing the faculty, has made the following reports to the Senate:

Use of Margin and Merit Money 1990–91
Growth of Faculty and Administration, FY 1981 to 1991
Faculty vacancies
Faculty Salary Study

(Executive Summaries of these reports were mailed to all members of the faculty)

A brief history of the Mill Levy and Capital Improvements Bond Issues was mailed to the Senate mailing list.
Presentation by Vice President of Finance and Administration and Vernon Keel, Director of the Elliott School of Communications, on the proposed bond issue to be levied against mill levy funds which will include a new building for the Elliott School.

University Budget Committee

Last spring Vice President Breazeale proposed a University Budget Committee composed of the Provost, the Vice President for Finance and Administration, the Associate Vice President and Director of Budgets, and the President and President Elect of the Senate, to deal with budget matters that required expediting. This proposal was discussed in several meetings with the administration.

Last fall, without further reference to the Senate, President Armstrong created a University Budget Committee which contained representatives of all university constituencies. This committee has met twice to hear reports from the Vice President of Finance and Administration. It is not a working committee. There has been no resolution of the relationship between the University Budget committee and the Senate Planning and Budget committee although a recent memo from Vice President Lowe and Provost Cottle indicated the Senate Committee would have to make its input through the University Committee. No further discussions have been held.

Mill Levy Fund

The administration has opened a portion of the income from the mill levy for allocation to members of the faculty and administration who submit requests for funds. The Senate Planning and Budget Committee are reviewing these applications and will make recommendations to the Provost.

Last fall President Mandt reported that the Administration had agreed to consult the committee before making decisions about the use of Mill Levy funds for building and capital expenditures including future bond issues. The committee was disappointed when, contrary to our expectations, the administration failed to consult with the faculty prior to making a decision to issue a new series of bonds, including a new facility for the Elliott School.

Planning

The committee's charge includes providing input from the faculty point of view in the strategic planning process. At the committee's request, the Provost added two members from the Senate Committee to the Mission Statement Task Force which was charged with responsibility for planning the process for the Regents' program review. When the new strategic planning process emerges after the program review, changes in the Senate Committee's charge may be appropriate. It is important to keep full faculty participation in the planning process, however structured.
Procedure for Participating in the Budget Review Process

Perhaps the major failure of the committee is its inability to establish a formal, structural, procedural arrangement for participation in the budget process. We acknowledged the uncertainty of legislative action, and agreed to work on an ad hoc basis this year and to try to build a more formal procedure for participation for next year. Official expression of possibilities for participation varied over the spring semester from close cooperative scrutiny to possible long-term influence. Discussions with Provost Cottle provided no concrete suggestions for participation. This, together with the alteration in the composition of the University Budget Committee is cause for concern. The Senate regarded the creation of this committee as a major step in an important consultative effort. While we have been able to gather and distribute some information of interest to concerned faculty, there have been no significant opportunities to participate in this important aspect of university governance. We believe that this major concern will require the primary attention of the committee in the next year.

For the Future

Several auxiliary budgets that are important to university finance were not considered or reviewed.

There is no total university budget that includes all funds. We have encouraged the development of such a budget so that it would be possible to trace transfers, sources of funds, reallocations, etc.

The committee believes that its most important task is to encourage and assist in developing policies that would guide the budget-making process in the future. We believe that salary policies are of primary importance and much of our work this year has been in this area. We have developed a series of questions that we believe should be considered and if possible answered regarding equity in salary matters. We believe any policy must have the support of the faculty and we have considered holding hearings so that individual members of the faculty could comment on various possibilities. We have debated attempting to provide a salary study comparable to the one prepared by the Kansas State faculty. If possible, a general statement of salary priorities should be developed.

Faculty Travel resources are important to faculty development and sources and allocations of funds for travel needs attention.
Facility Support Committee
Annual Report
1991-1992

Members of the Faculty Support Committee:
Anneke S. Allen, Chemistry (Chair)
Mary Sue Foster, School of Art & Design
Gary Greenberg, Psychology
Anthony Gythiel, English
Phillip Hersch, Economics
Diane Huntley, Dental Hygiene
Richard Laptad, Physical Education
Robert Schrag, Electrical Engineering
Sam Yeager, Center for Urban Studies (Vice-Chair)
* Peter Zoller, Academic Affairs
* Harry Williford, Research Administration
* ex officio

The Faculty Support Committee (FSC) met 12 times between September 9, 1991 and May 1, 1992. Areas of significant committee activity included the Faculty Orientation Program offered jointly with the Provost's Office in August, and the reaffirmation of changes in eligibility requirements for research grants. A patent workshop was conducted by Dr. John Perchorowicz, Research Corporation Technologies on December 11, 1991. The committee made recommendations on sabbatical leave applications; the Young Faculty Scholars award; new faculty research grants, university research grants, and faculty summer research awards. The FSC also received a report on the use of research overhead and faculty release time monies (attached). The patent policy as prepared last year and approved by the Faculty Senate Fall 91 has been returned by the BOR staff to the WSU Provost Office. After their scrutiny it will come -- to the FSC again.

Members of the FSC reviewed 63 proposals for sabbatical leaves, grants, and subventions, and recommended or awarded a total of $122,970 to 49 faculty members as summarized below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>SUBMITTED</th>
<th>RECOMMENDED/AWARDED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sabbatical</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Faculty Research Grant</td>
<td>15 for $60,085</td>
<td>13 for $49,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer Research Award</td>
<td>23 for $78,977</td>
<td>17 for $56,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Research Grant</td>
<td>9 for $33,390</td>
<td>4 for $13,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subvention</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 for $ 9,300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Observations on Selected Data Items

(1) Rebates to deans, Chairs, and faculty
   - Rebate policy first initiated during FY 87, with initial disbursement August, FY 88.
   - Decline in FY 91 rebate payments (earned in FY 90) due to a sharp decline in research activity in FY 90 vs. FY 89: a principal cause from a hiatus between completing Federal Aviation Administration contracts in the National Institute for Aviation Research in FY 89 and a delay till FY 91 in starting up new work [much reduced research accomplished in Summer of 1990.]

(2) College/Department Support: e.g., 1991 $37,116, includes Summer Faculty Research Grants of $30,000.

(3) Hazardous and Radioactive Materials Management and Disposal. FY 1991: New office established to manage this function and campus did a "housecleaning" of stored chemicals for disposal that year.

(4) Miscellaneous. 1990 and 1991 included major sums to help with work on McKinley Hall chemistry research labs.

(5) Office of Research Administration: Staff reduced in 2nd half of 1991 by retirement of long-term employee, resulting in substantial payoff of accumulated leave time.

(6) Total Sponsored Program Expenditures is the actual costs incurred annually for both training (including student assistance programs, such as TRIO) and Research, with the sum of the two continuously growing: training programs generate 1/5 or less indirect cost recovery compared with research.
## INDIRECT COST ON SPONSORED PROGRAMS
### 5 YEAR COMPARISON

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Indirect Cost Income</td>
<td>$628,815</td>
<td>$899,741</td>
<td>$904,167</td>
<td>$492,929</td>
<td>$614,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebates to Deans, Chairs and Faculty</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$26,551</td>
<td>$169,907</td>
<td>$162,369</td>
<td>$120,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College/Dept. Support</td>
<td>$359,041</td>
<td>$253,411</td>
<td>$17,080</td>
<td>$13,400</td>
<td>$37,116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total University Support</td>
<td>$359,041</td>
<td>$279,962</td>
<td>$186,987</td>
<td>$175,769</td>
<td>$157,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Research Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll &amp; Purchasing</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$23,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous &amp; Radioactive Mat'ls Mgmt/Disposal</td>
<td>$21,535</td>
<td>$22,938</td>
<td>$22,097</td>
<td>$32,744</td>
<td>$61,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Care</td>
<td>$3,222</td>
<td>$3,205</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$300</td>
<td>$1,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instit. Review Board</td>
<td>$57,611</td>
<td>$65,541</td>
<td>$5,506</td>
<td>$27,997</td>
<td>$43,256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Research Support</td>
<td>$105,368</td>
<td>$114,684</td>
<td>$53,007</td>
<td>$87,888</td>
<td>$134,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Office of Research Administration (ORA)</td>
<td>$210,112</td>
<td>$326,608</td>
<td>$330,974</td>
<td>$249,492</td>
<td>$259,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$674,521</td>
<td>$721,254</td>
<td>$570,968</td>
<td>$513,149</td>
<td>$552,061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F. Total Sponsored Program Expenditures</td>
<td>$4,678,573</td>
<td>$5,351,672</td>
<td>$5,730,445</td>
<td>$6,185,192</td>
<td>$6,356,587</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. ORA EFT Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-Award Activity</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>3.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Award Activity</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. ORA &amp; Research Support as % of Total Sponsored Program Expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$C + D$</td>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Salaries and Fringes</td>
<td>159,095</td>
<td>238,719</td>
<td>281,630</td>
<td>204,333</td>
<td>210,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communications/Postage</td>
<td>4,725</td>
<td>9,786</td>
<td>11,817</td>
<td>9,043</td>
<td>8,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printing/Duplicating</td>
<td>7,835</td>
<td>3,995</td>
<td>3,703</td>
<td>2,056</td>
<td>1,617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repairs &amp; Maintenance</td>
<td>6,367</td>
<td>2,683</td>
<td>3,152</td>
<td>2,713</td>
<td>1,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel</td>
<td>6,252</td>
<td>8,388</td>
<td>9,003</td>
<td>9,333</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dues and Subscriptions</td>
<td>11,539</td>
<td>2,944</td>
<td>4,962</td>
<td>7,850</td>
<td>8,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Supplies</td>
<td>4,949</td>
<td>4,840</td>
<td>3,202</td>
<td>2,851</td>
<td>3,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computing Expenses</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>5,661</td>
<td>4,145</td>
<td>3,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>4,976</td>
<td>24,195*</td>
<td>2,455</td>
<td>3,389</td>
<td>4,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Equipment</td>
<td>3,340</td>
<td>29,693</td>
<td>5,489</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>14,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Overhead Expenses</strong></td>
<td>210,112</td>
<td>326,608</td>
<td>330,974</td>
<td>249,492</td>
<td>259,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Excludes Total GU Salaries &amp; Fringes]</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>-0-</td>
<td>38,859</td>
<td>45,977</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes $19,647 of remodeling expenses for ORA.
FY 1991 ACTIVITY REPORT SUMMARY

Sponsored programs (externally funded) are a significant source of financial support for the University.

New awards for research and training totaled $8,928,320 during FY 1991. (Most of the effort will be expended in FY 1992 with some carryover into FY 1993.) This pie chart illustrates the funding sources.

As in past years, federal agencies continue to be the primary source of support for research and training programs at WSU. In FY '91, federal funding provided 70% of the dollars awarded. Other award sources include state and local governments for 9% foundations for 11% and business/industry for 10%

SOURCES OF SPONSORED PROGRAMS FUNDS AWARDED DURING FY 1991

A portion of the research and training grants and contracts performed in FY '91 generated indirect cost recovery funds to the University. The expenditure of such recovery funds for FY '91 is illustrated by major category in this pie chart, totalling $592,474.
Allocation of Faculty Research Salary Release Monies

Faculty salary release monies are credited to unallocated salaries accounts. Other sources for these accounts include such items as vacant positions, unpaid leaves and reclassifications. Debits to the account include instruction, sick leaves, retirements, etc. The accounts are also used to meet shrinkage.

Because the monies are fungible, it is generally not possible to explicitly match faculty release money to specific instructional funding.

For the current fiscal year only eight academic departments generated faculty release money, four of which are in the College of Engineering. In the attached table are tabulated the release monies by department and the funds earmarked for instruction from the unallocated salaries accounts. The term "instructional money" is loosely defined to encompass items such as graduate assistantships and fellowships.

Given the nature of the accounts, there is no reason to expect instructional money to equal release money at either the department or college level.
Table 1

Allocation of Research Salary Monies (FY '92)¹

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAS</th>
<th>Mathematics</th>
<th></th>
<th>Computer Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Release Money:</strong></td>
<td>Through March 1, 1992:</td>
<td>$19,896</td>
<td>Through March 1, 1992:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extrapolated, April-June:</td>
<td>$9,948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29,844</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instruction:</strong></td>
<td>Spring Lecturers</td>
<td>$27,821</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Graders</td>
<td>2,738</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GTA's</td>
<td>$35,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Source: [Copy and paste the LaTeX code for the table here.]

This table shows the allocation of research salary monies for FY '92, including release money and instruction. The data includes the allocation for Mathematics and Computer Science, with subcategories such as Spring Lecturers, Graders, and GTA's. The table also shows the total amounts for each category, both through March 1, 1992, and extrapolated for April-June.
College of Health Professions
FY '92
Salary Release Funds

Department of Clinical Sciences
Release Money: 7/18/91 - 6/17/92: $8,573
Instruction:
Graduate Assistant $3,036

Department of Health, Administration, and Gerontology
Release Money: 9/12/91 - 6/17/92: $9,257
Instruction:
Graduate Assistants $18,057
Lecturer 1,500
$19,557

Department of Nursing
Release Money: 8/18/91 - 6/17/92: $11,349
Instruction:
Graduate Assistants $6,009
Lecturer 400
$6,409

Department of Physical Therapy
Release Money: 6/18/91 - 6/17/92: $0
Instruction:
Lecturers $2,280

TOTALS:
Release Monies: $29,179
Instruction: $31,282
## College of Engineering

### 1528 Account - Unallocated Salaries 1991-1992

### Income (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Position Funds + Benefits (College)</td>
<td>105,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Release (College)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(AE)</td>
<td>32,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(EE)</td>
<td>64,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(IE)</td>
<td>34,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ME)</td>
<td>35,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Release Benefits (College)</td>
<td>60,215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$499,733</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Expenditures (Estimated)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AE - Grad. Assistants</td>
<td>24,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Assistants</td>
<td>1,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE - Research Grant Cost Share</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adj. Fac. 1st &amp; 2nd Sem.</td>
<td>3,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Assistants</td>
<td>4,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer School Not Included</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE - Lecturer 1st &amp; 2nd Sem.</td>
<td>4,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Assistants</td>
<td>23,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade Funds for Fac. Travel</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ME - Lecturer 2nd Sem.</td>
<td>2,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Assistants</td>
<td>24,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO - Shrinkage</td>
<td>128,988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dist. Prof Stipends</td>
<td>12,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1/2 Technician - IE</td>
<td>14,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visiting Prof IE - 1st Sem</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grad Assists IE - 2nd Sem</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D. Fellowships (16) College Share</td>
<td>84,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MEMORANDUM

TO: Classified Senate, Mardith Hammond, President
    Faculty Senate, A. J. Mandt, President
    Student Senate, Jennifer Volz, President
    Unclassified Professional Staff Senate, Dale Valentine, President

FROM: Warren B. Armstrong

DATE: April 30, 1992

SUBJECT: University Smoking Regulation

The increasing concern about the University's current smoking regulations that permits smoking in buildings prompts the University's need to revisit the current policy. A copy of the current and the newly proposed policies are attached along with copies of signed petitions relating to Ahlberg Hall and a letter dated February 14 from Debra L. Williams concerning the same matter in Clinton Hall. These are merely examples of numerous complaints made verbally and in writing and need our early attention.

I ask that each of you in your respective Senate assignments place this matter on the agenda for action and have a recommendation back to me no later than June 1, 1992.

mrs

cc: Rex L. Cottle
    Elizabeth H. King
    Roger D. Lowe
    James J. Rhatigan
    John D. Gist, Director of Facilities Planning
    Armin L. Brandhorst, Director of Physical Plant
Subject: Smoking Regulations

Initiating Authority: President

Accountability: Director for Facilities Planning, Director of the Physical Plant, and Building Users

Purpose: To provide regulations concerning smoking in buildings

I. Policy Statement

It is the policy of The Wichita State University to prohibit smoking in all areas of campus buildings.

II. Smoking Guidelines

A. Smoking is prohibited in:

- classrooms, offices, lounges, hallways between classrooms; elevators; stairways; restrooms; all work areas that serve the public; museums; libraries; gymnasiums; arenas; auditoriums; dining halls, cafeterias, residence halls; laboratories, storage areas, garages; and all other portions of buildings.

III. Implementation

A. The Director for Facilities is responsible for assuring all areas are in compliance with this policy.

B. The Director of Physical Plant shall assure that there are no University-owned ashtrays in University buildings.

The Director of Physical Plant shall provide University-owned receptacles at or near the exterior of each building entrance for smokers' use.

C. Complaints about policy violation should be submitted to the complainants budget or budget review officer for resolution.

IV. Effective Date

This policy is effective as the date of approval by the President.

Approved:

______________________________  __________________________
Warren B. Armstrong              Date
Subject: Smoking Regulations

Initiating Authority: Executive Vice President for Academic Affairs

Accountability: Associate Director for Facilities Planning; Director of the Physical Plant; building users

Purpose: To provide regulations specifying where smoking is allowed and prohibited in buildings

I. Policy Statement

It is the policy of The Wichita State University to prohibit smoking in all areas of campus buildings except where "designated smoking area" signs are posted. Smoking will be allowed only in accordance with State law, i.e., K.S.A. 21-4009 et.al. and the guidelines below.

II. Smoking Guidelines

A. Smoking is prohibited in:

- classrooms, hallways between classrooms; elevators; stairways;
- restrooms (unless designated smoking area sign is posted);
- all work areas that serve the public; museums; libraries; gymnasiums;
- auditoriums; areas where combustible fumes can collect such as laboratories, storage areas, garages; and all other areas where the University determines smoking may pose a health, safety or fire hazard.

B. Designated smoking areas may include:

- lounges (as long as a nonsmoking area is also provided); enclosed private offices (as long as sufficient ventilation exists to assure nonsmokers are not affected by side-stream smoke); and portions of dining halls, cafeterias and residence hall lounges. Each building should have one designated smoking area; a hallway may be a designated area if there is adequate ventilation and it does not connect classrooms. Residence halls should establish policies for smoking in rooms and lounges.

III. Implementation

A. The Associate Director for Facilities Planning is responsible for maintaining a list of all "designated smoking areas" (except private offices) and assuring these areas are in compliance with University and State requirements.
B. The Director for the Physical Plant shall assure that "designated smoking area" signs are appropriately posted in each building. The Director is also responsible for assuring there are no University owned ashtrays in areas where smoking is prohibited.

C. Requests for designated smoking areas should be forwarded to the Associate Director for Facilities Planning for a determination of policy compliance. If approved, the Associate Director will authorize the posting of a "designated smoking area" sign.

D. Complaints about policy violation should be submitted to the complainants budget or budget review officer for resolution.

IV. Effective Date

This policy is effective as of the date of approval by the President.

Approved:

[Signature]

[Date: May 5, 1989]
Notes on WSU Faculty Senate Caucus Discussion of Desirable Attributes in a University President

May 27, 1992

The caucus discussion centered around several themes. There seemed to be broad consensus on the importance of the themes themselves, with some differences of opinion on the ideal qualities to be looked for in each case. Participants in the caucus frequently endorsed views expressed by others that seemed to say better what they had sought to express earlier, and on a number of themes, participants seemed to change their mind after listening to the discussion. With a couple of exceptions, there was no effort to define a common position or even a majority view. The following notes, therefore, encompass the variety of views expressed on each major theme. There tended to be broad agreement on the last position expressed on each theme. The notes are organized around the themes rather than presenting comments sequentially. Approximately 20 senators attended the caucus.

Academic and Administrative Qualifications

Discussion on this theme began by noting that in the Provost search last year, WSU sought candidates who had earned academic credentials up to the full professor rank through traditional faculty service. The first suggestion, not challenged by anybody, was that we would expect the same record from Presidential candidates. As clarified later, this would indicate possession of a terminal degree in an academic field, and a career in the ranks prior to administrative service.

With respect to administrative experience, the initial suggestion was to look for candidates who had served at least at the Provost level. But several were uncertain this level of experience should be required. Perhaps experienced college deans would offer the sensitivities and appreciations expected as often, or more often, than more senior administrators. It was even suggested that we might look at non-academics, although it was immediately suggested that this is not the time to be too risky. Could a faculty member without administrative experience succeed as a President? There was skepticism that there could be many faculty clearly qualified for the complex tasks of the presidency without a record of administrative service.

As discussion developed, someone offered the formula: a provost or dean at a university like we would like to be, with this ideal defined realistically. This seemed to satisfy most participants, with the caveat that we should probably leave it open enough not to completely exclude the "non-standard" candidate. One of them just might be the right individual.

Leadership Qualities

The theme of university leadership came up repeatedly. The initial formulation was to contrast "leadership" with "an industrial model of top-down management." As various participants tried to put more content into the idea of leadership, the most common theme was that a true academic leader seeks to unite rather than divide the university community, doing so, in part, by
recognizing and responding to diversity of peoples and views, and by seeking out ideas. A leader is one who stimulates and excites, and, in the university context, one who will speak with faculty regularly.

Several participants attempted to develop these ideas in terms of contrasting mind-sets. A leader is not one who "crystallizes a single model for acting" in his/her mind, and then expects conformity with this from everyone. Later, the following formula was offered as a summary and generally accepted: "demonstrated success in leading a diverse institution to consensus on divisive issues." The final thought offered, again with apparent agreement on all sides, was that "leadership is achieving consensus."

A sub-theme on this topic concerned the issue of whether a President is an "inside" or "outside" figure. Traditionally, we have supposed our President to have a primarily "outside" agenda, with the Provost leading on "inside" issues much of the time. But the expectations of campus leaders are in flux these days. The Regents will probably set an agenda for the individual they select, and that agenda will no doubt include both inside and outside issues. Presumably, the Regents renew and revise their charge to Presidents during their annual reviews. Recent circumstances have tended to break down some of the traditional divisions of responsibility, so that the inside/outside distinction may be less valid than it once was. As roles change in this respect, a new kind of leadership may be called for, able both to gain respect internally while effectively representing the institution to outside constituencies.

A President for a Diverse, Urban University

Another theme that ran through all the discussion was the need to have a proper appreciation for what we are (and are not) as the foundation for realistic expectations about future leadership. This part of the discussion centered around the related ideas of "diversity" and "an urban institution." The first articulation of these ideas came with the urging that we should seek a President who would be inclusionary rather than exclusionary, specifically in terms of the varieties of research, scholarship, and creativity activity. It should not be the case that only one kind of research is valued by the institution.

Diversity is also important in the search process itself. It was pointed out that WSU is unique in many ways within the Regents system, and that our differences from the ordinary need to be effectively represented--most of these qualities having to do with our "urban mission." But on the other hand, it was emphatically noted that we are not a large urban institution. We lack both the sheer quantitative size, and the vast diversity of programs characteristic of truly large urban schools.

Search Process

The various themes above each had implications in various senators' minds for the organizing of the search itself. For example, as senators discussed the kind of experience (faculty, administrative, other) that would be desirable, others noted that experiences don't guarantee anything. Several pointed out that we have probably been guilty in recent searches for senior personnel of not checking them out adequately. Perhaps we should insist on visits to the
current campuses of candidates to gain a better appreciation of what their credentials really mean.

It was noted several different ways that the search committee will represent a variety of constituencies, and that we cannot expect the faculty agenda to dominate the process, or even to be appealing to others. While it is important, for example, to address "the needs of hurt faculty who were not listened to for ages," as one senator put it, we can't expect that concern to be shared in the same way by the search committee as a whole. Our representatives, then, need to be effective advocates of our concerns within the search committee.

It was urged that the search committee examine as closely as possible the team surrounding a candidate in his/her present position—perhaps a much better guide to real priorities and sensitivities than applicant rhetoric. The issue of secrecy is also important. Presidential searches tend to be more confidential than others, even secretive. We probably cannot afford that at this time.

It was urged, apparently with general agreement, that we will need some kind of open interview process at the final stage, and probably a process that includes the Wichita community in some way, and not just the campus. What about inside candidates? There appeared to be agreement that we would not wish to exclude such candidates, but that it would be necessary, if any such turned up, to avoid biases (for and against) due to familiarity. It was noted that the Provost search dealt with this fairly successfully last year. To encompass our various aims, it was urged that we write the advertisements to indicate qualities, backgrounds, or experiences that are "desirable," but that we avoid, for the most part, requiring various things. This approach signals our intentions and expectations, while not closing the pool of candidates to the talented unconventional candidate.
TO: Faculty Senate
FROM: Jay Mandt, President
DATE: May 15, 1992
SUBJECT: Report on May Board of Regents Meeting

The May Board meeting was the longest of the year. A number of important issues were discussed by the Board and at the meeting of the Council of Faculty Senate Presidents.

Council of Faculty Senate Presidents

All of the Presidents-elect attended to share in discussions of the transition from 91-92 to 92-93 Senate representatives. The Council spent two hours with Regents Slawson and Montgomery, discussing program review and changing campus missions.

The Council agreed that our forceful advocacy of faculty concerns, particularly at Pittsburg in October had resulted in much greater responsiveness from the Board. We are now assured that policy proposals affecting faculty will come to the Council for review as a matter of course. Board members are much more interested in talking with us and establishing good communications. The Board has been receptive to our initiative on faculty development. It appears to be an established fact, although not formalized, that the Council will communicate directly to the Board at its discretion, rather than channelling all of its contributions through COCAO or the Council of Presidents.

Regents Slawson and Montgomery discussed their views of mission and program review extensively. They believe that the Regents system has raised expectations in the legislature that we will take visible steps to achieve greater efficiencies or effectiveness. They will be "disappointed" if program review does not result in recommendations to close "a couple" of schools or colleges system-wide. Both Regents are worried about loss of quality in programs due to cost-cutting. They suspect that we have too much duplication of programs, but "we aren't talking here about the core areas in liberal arts and so forth." Universities need to find more creative ways to accomplish their missions. Montgomery is interested in the feasibility of year-round operations to achieve higher utilization of the physical plant. Both were responsive to suggestions of other ways of achieving savings or efficiencies than closing or curtailing programs (e.g., more efficient course scheduling to assure optimal enrollment in each class section, freeing faculty for other activities). They were very responsive to the suggestion that it is vital to assure faculty involvement in program review all the way up so that decisions taken have the broadest possible support on campus. They were interested in the suggestion that we might want to appoint a faculty committee to work with Board staff in processing and evaluating campus program review reports. The Board clearly has no idea how to deal with the mass of material that is being generated, and will be discussing options with faculty and administration in coming months. Kansas State reported they expect to produce a 1200 page summary.

Kathryn and I think that we should arrange some leisurely visits with Regent
Slawson in the next few months to capitalize on this very useful discussion. We will be in touch with senators on this.

The Council agreed to the state AAUP's request for "observer" status at Council meetings next year. The aim is to coordinate the activities of statewide organizations that represent faculty interests.

There was a great deal of interest in our internal difficulties with the administration. Kathryn and I provided a chronology, and summarized our recent debates. Our colleagues were surprised that we had not responded more strongly to the administration than we did. Our administration's view on the proper limits of faculty governance activity was characterized as not suitable for a research university. Kansas State reported that their faculty Salary and Benefits Committee must approve all salaries annually, including those of central administration. The KU representatives said that their administration "wouldn't dare" make policy decisions about anything without thoroughly informing the faculty. The KU Senate President said: "They can't expect us to support anything we haven't been consulted about." She said that despite what it says in the Regents manual, "everyone" knows that "the faculty is really in charge at a real university." We were offered advice as to what we should have done and were urged not to be so moderate.

Board of Regents

Two major academic affairs issues dominated the Board agenda. The first was the issue of admission criteria for teacher education. The Board staff was proposing a uniform state-wide set of criteria, including both GPA and scores on the Pre-professional Skills Test (PPST). These proposals were opposed by Education deans. COCAO had not taken a position, and was seeking more time to review the issues. The staff's proposed test score standard appeared to imply that well over half the students now enrolled in teacher education would not be eligible any longer. The validity of the PPST was challenged by several authorities, in addition to the deans. It was noted that ETS is not prepared to defend its validity in litigation, and that no studies of its validity as a test of eligibility for teacher education existed.

After lengthy debate and discussion, the Board rejected the staff position and agreed to set up a task force to develop appropriate admission guidelines for teacher education. All the Education colleges reported having raised standards in recent years. One thing that was clear from the debate and its outcome is that the Board staff has at best a limited grasp of issues like this, and tends to rely obsessively on standardized tests as a basis for making quality judgments without questioning whether various testing instruments are valid measures of whatever they are interested in. The Board seemed rather stunned by the assault on PPST by testing and measurement experts, and seemed to be moving to the view that GPA and curriculum were better indicators of program quality and student preparation than standardized test scores. This issue was a major defeat for the Board staff, and a victory for the principle that campus expertise has to be relied on in making Board policy.

The other big issue was whether or not Emporia State would be allowed to continue development of a Ph.D. proposal in library and information science. The staff recommended that authorization be denied until after new mission statements are finished, and strongly challenged allowing a regional institution to have a doctoral program. Emporia argued that library science has been their "jewel in the crown" program for decades, that their doctoral program would be the only one in an 18 state
region, that they already have a doctoral-level faculty (including three former deans from doctoral library programs), that they already have cooperative programs with leading library science programs, such as that at California-Berkeley, and that their masters program has laid the proper foundation (enrollment of over 300, not counting large scale outreach programs in Iowa, Nebraska, Colorado, and New Mexico).

The Board debate centered on whether they should relax their existing policy prohibiting doctoral activity at regional schools. Ft. Hays and Pittsburg assured them that they had no doctoral plans in the works (although Pittsburg talked about the technology field in the period beyond the next decade). The staff tried hard to raise difficulties with the Emporia proposal. The other campuses raised no objections. The final vote was to authorize continued program development by 6-2-1. Once again, the campus view prevailed over the staff position.

The campuses argued for reinserting additional retirement funding into the next legislative budget request, which staff proposed to delete on the grounds that it isn't going anywhere in the legislature. The current planning is looking toward 5% salary and 6% OOE increases in budget request for next year.

Everyone agreed that the legislative session had been much more successful than anyone anticipated. Credit was given to Ted Ayers, Regents General Counsel, who assumed responsibility for legislative liaison in place of Stan Koplik this year. the Regents were also more active personally. It was very helpful that the campuses worked together on a common agenda rather than trying to cut special deals for themselves. A common agenda for higher education is more credible to the legislature. Better liaison with the home communities of the Regents institutions also helped. (Sedgwick County support for the Regents was especially improved over the past.)

The WSU Presidential Search will be run by a committee of ten: a former Regent as chair (individual to be determined); 3 faculty (a Distinguished Professor, to be named by the Board, the Senate President, and one additional faculty nominated by the Senate); one dean or vice president; two alumni or community representatives (nominated by the Alumni Association); one representative from the Board of Trustees; Executive Director Koplik.

We will call a meeting shortly to select the third faculty representative. Our suggestions that additional students, including a graduate student, and an Unclassified Professional representative be included were not accepted in the final plan.

There appears to be a real debate going on behind the scenes as to who will be the next chair of the Board.
Minutes of the Meeting of May 11, 1992

MEMBERS PRESENT: Alexander, Allen, R. Armstrong, Bair, Bajaj, Benson, Bereman, Bernhart, Billings, Brady, Burk, Campbell, Carroll, Christensen, Clark, Daugherty, Duell, Erickson, Farnsworth, Gosman, Griffith, Gythiel, Hawley, Hay, Horn, Hoyer, Hubbard, Jeffers, Kahn, Kitch, Lee, Mandt, Masud, Merriman, Murdock, Muth, Paske, Perel, Rogers, Romig, Sweney, Wherritt, Widener, Yeager, Zytkow

MEMBERS ABSENT: Baxter, Behrman, Carper, Koppenhaver, Martin, Olivero, Parker, Parkhurst, Sethi

GUESTS: Vincent, Schad

Summary of Action Taken.
1. Received Reports of Committees.
2. Moved to request President Armstrong to meet with the Faculty Affairs Committee about the proposed smoking policy.
3. Moved to ask President Armstrong to discuss the University Traffic Committee with the Senate and the Senate Traffic Committee.

I. CALLING OF THE MEETING TO ORDER. The meeting was called to order at 3:00 p.m. by President Mandt.

At Senator Carroll's suggestion, the Executive Committee asked the Senators-at-Large and President Elect Griffith and Senator Clark to meet with President Armstrong. Senator Clark said the meeting was co-operative. The Executive Committee will meet more often with the President and the Provost, and an all day retreat with the Executive Committee, President Armstrong, Provost Cottle and the Vice Presidents was suggested. Senator Clark said he was guardedly optimistic.

II. RESOLUTION FROM THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

Senator Gosman introduced the resolution calling for the past four presidents of the Faculty Senate to serve as an ad hoc committee to review the development of faculty governance since the founding of the Faculty Senate. Senator Daugherty asked if the past presidents had been contacted and had agreed to serve. Senator Gosman said all but Dr. Zoller. Senator Daugherty said the resolution should be postponed until the new Executive Committee is elected. The resolution failed 18-19.

III. COMMITTEE REPORTS.
(a) Traffic Policy. President Armstrong's memorandum proposing a University Traffic Committee was discussed. President Armstrong does not wish a recommendation from the Senate Traffic Committee or the Senate on reserved parking. Senator Billings said a University Traffic Committee was a good idea, but the Senate needed to continue with its own to advise the Senate. Senator Alexander agreed. He said the Senate has an obligation to consider matters of concern to the faculty. He said the June 1 deadline is unrealistic. Senator Horn asked if there was an excessive number of students on this committee.

Senator Alexander moved that the Senate send the President a memo about its concerns and say we would like to discuss matters with him, and we would like to
consult with the present Senate Traffic Committee. Senator Billings seconded. The motion passed with no "nays."

(b) **Rules Committee.**
1. Roger Berger was nominated to replace Senator Kitch. The nomination was approved.
2. Professor Sheffield and Professor Stubbs were recommended to the Athletic Committee. The recommendations were approved.

(c) **Planning and Budget Committee.** Senator Sweney moved to receive the report. Senator Bair seconded. Motion passed.

(d) **Faculty Support Committee.** Senator Allen said the second half of the report from the College of Engineering was inadvertently left off the report. Senator Lee moved to receive the report. Senator Rogers seconded. Motion passed.

(e) **Library/MRC Committee.**
1. **Ad Hoc Library/MRC**
   Senator Rogers moved to receive reports of both committees and that any recommendations be brought before the new Senate, with the will of the new Executive Committee, as soon as possible. Dr. McDougall said a long range development plan for the Library and MRC has been developed and he looks forward to discussing it with the Senate. Motion passed.

(f) **Proposed Smoking Policy.** The President's memorandum and two attachments concerning a new smoking policy were discussed. Senator Daugherty moved to recommend to the President to continue the present policy. Senator Rogers seconded. Senator Alexander made a substitute motion requesting the President confer with the Faculty Affairs Committee to make a proposal that would accommodate and be agreeable to both sides of the issue. Senator Wherritt seconded. Motion passed.

(g) **Ad Hoc Task Force on Faculty Perception of Administrative Performance.** Senator Perel moved to accept the report. Senator Campbell seconded. Motion passed.

President Mandt thanked the Senators who were leaving the Senate for their service to the Senate. He then said he had been proud to be President of this Senate because this Senate stands for something: public service, professional rights of the faculty, and truthfulness. He said he was most proud to have had the honor to speak to the Board of Regents on behalf of the faculty of the Regents institutions. And he had kept his word to everyone he gave his word to. Senator Lee moved to applaud President Mandt for his work and his leadership. Senator Widener seconded.

Senator Perel moved to adjourn. The gavel was passed to the 1992-1993 President, Kathryn Griffith.

Respectfully submitted, 
Joyce Cavarozzi, Secretary