

September 1st deadline. The only change here is to change that date to November 15th of this year in order to provide more ample time. I also want to point out that the amendment does not prohibit the program from being offered at Kearney, merely directs that it be a cooperative agreement between the two systems. Also, the committee amendment had the Institute of Agriculture as having the sole responsibility in the area of instruction, research and public service in agriculture. The amendment as it would be written would change that to the primary state wide responsibility in these areas. The reason for the change is that there has been a number of...for a number of years, some of these types of activities offered at the state colleges and at the technical community colleges and to insure that no one would attempt to interpret the language as prohibiting that activity some of which has been conducted for 60 or 70 years. This language was suggested as the primary responsibility rather than as originally suggested in the committee amendment. Then, there is another amendment which was, I believe offered by Senator Cullan at the hearing relative to two year programs at the state colleges. As I understand Senator Cullans intent was to limit those two year courses to academic programs and that the vocational type program would be offered through the community colleges or they could be cooperatively offered at a state college campus. But again, in cooperation with the appropriate community college for that area. The change that I have made is that the original language had these types of courses identified as to what the institution intended them to be. Took out the part intended for obvious reasons that you could get into some real difficulties of interpretation as to what that would mean. So that is taken out and what is required is that the Board of Trustees will submit for the following year those programs that are involved so the Legislature could make an understanding if the intent of the Cullan amendment as originally drafted was in fact being followed. Then there is a section being taken out, Section 50 which in visiting with the Attorney General's office it related to some cooperative buying practices which included the K-12 systems and there was a concern of mixing K-12 in with post secondary education could have some technical problems was not significant to the bill one way or the other. It didn't effect the rest of the bill and that is being stricken. Then the.....there is also some language in the bill which was again merely corrective in that the old state Board of Vocational Education as it was existed prior to the passage of 344. There was some language that had never been changed and that language is included but we made some minor technical amendments to those, but again it was merely to make sure that those existing statutes were consistent with LB 344 and they probably would have been changed originally. There is no impact whatsoever from that provision. The other... there are two sections 57 and 58 that was dropped and some additional language which is the last page of the hand out and those two sections dealt with how the Legislature would proceed with the act after it is passed and the purpose of the new language which is similar to what was intended for the old, but it is to set out a prescribed procedure that each of the institutions will be aware of in order to make adjustments in the future of roll and mission statements for