

The Senate of Michigan Technological University  
Minutes of Meeting No. 195

I. Call to Order

At 7:06 pm on Wednesday, 10 February 1993, President Sharik called the meeting to order in Room 105, Memorial Union Building.

II. Roll Call of Regular Members

25 Senators or alternates were present. Representatives from the following units were absent: AF ROTC, Chemical Engineering, Metallurgy and Materials Engineering, Graduate Student Council, Undergraduate Student Council. D. Nelson represented Mechanical Engineering; K. Johnson represented KRC. Absent Senators-at-large: Roblee and Grimm. Also present: Continuing Member Powers.

III. Recognition of Visitors

J. Coleman-Plouff (Senate Secretary Asst.), G. Fox (Comp. Tech. Svcs.), J. Galetto (Enrollment Mgmt.), J. Glime (Biol. Sci.), M. Goodrich (MTU Tech Topics), V. Gougeon (Registrar), K. Lipmann (MTU Lode), T. Malette (Financial Aid), W. J. McGarry (Finance Office), R. Nuottila (Accounting Svcs.), D. Ouillette (Registrar), S. Paris (Enrollment Mgmt.), D. Vincent (Comp. Tech. Svcs.), C. White (Metal. & Matls. Eng.), G. Whiteman (Comp. Tech. Svcs.).

IV. Special Report on Banner System

President Sharik said that two special reports would be presented before passing on to the regular Senate business. Sharik introduced George Fox, who was appearing at the request of the Senate to discuss the Banner computer software system for administrative computing.

Fox's presentation emphasized cost as the major factor in choosing to implement the Banner system from among the possible alternatives (Appendix A of these minutes). Fox stated that alterations to the Banner system were certainly possible, but were likely to be expensive. To discuss the Senate's specific concerns about implementing the academic module of the Banner system, Fox introduced Joe Galetto, Director of Enrollment Management.

Galetto described the Banner Academic Issues Committee and its activities in implementing the new system. He indicated that the scheduling of the Fall 1993 term will take place on the Banner system. Nelson inquired about significant and apparently regressive changes in course scheduling. That is, the current system bases course offerings on student preregistration requests, while the Banner system only presents students with a list of available courses. Nelson commented that this new method neither optimizes faculty resources nor satisfies the students. Galetto agreed that the system is a great change and that Banner does not permit scheduling to meet student demand. He noted however that the current system encourages students to overload their course requests which artificially inflates demand. It also results in tens of thousands of course change requests after students receive their schedules (Appendix B of these minutes). There

has been an effort to help departments anticipate demand based on accumulated enrollment history.

Boutilier stated that "service departments" like math will have real problems with the new system, and noted with dismay that the Issues Committee did not include members from the two largest service departments, math and chemistry. She said that enrollment history by itself was not a sufficient guide to predicting demand, and that faculty resources were unlikely to be utilized as effectively with the new system. She compared the inefficiency of the current course change problem with the prospective problem of faculty members who are more likely to find their upper division courses cancelled due to lack of enrollment. V. Gougeon replied that few upper division courses were likely to be cancelled for low enrollment. Boutilier said she was afraid that it would in fact be a problem. Heuvers asked whether there was a policy requiring a department at its own expense to notify students by mail when a class was cancelled. Galetto said that a definite decision has not been made on this policy. Heuvers stated that the lack of good information about the size of the freshman class made it difficult to schedule math classes in advance, and he asked whether sections could be added during registration. Gougeon said that the problem was finding rooms on short notice, and Galetto said that adding sections or creating waiting lists with Banner was not difficult. Heuvers asked about the availability of departmental grade point averages under the new system, because some dismissal policies are based on this GPA. Galetto said that the system would not find departmental GPA for the transcript, but that it would be sent to the department as part of degree compliance reports.

Galetto said that the real problem is to get through the initial change from the old software system to the new system. Whitt said that the problems of sensitivity to student interests and of faculty efficiency were quite important, and asked about the cost of modifying the system to accommodate preregistration. Fox replied that such an excursion into the basic logic of the system would cost about \$100,000 per year.

Gougeon said that MTU is unique among Michigan state-supported schools in its course request system. All the other schools offer an array of courses in a schedule. Students enroll in the scheduled courses. This system of scheduling and enrollment is in fact independent of the Banner system. The Banner system just follows the usual scheduling practices.

Heyman stated that the Senate's concern is with the rigidity with which the Banner system is being imposed on the academic departments, and suggested that the issue of scheduling should prompt the Senate to begin asking fundamental questions about enrollment, including drop dates and costs of tuition. Heyman asked why, given the power and flexibility

of the new software, departments were being required to freeze in their course and faculty schedules in February, a lead time of six months? Galetto said that the February deadline was needed if student scheduling were to take place in April, but that the deadline should be extended in future years. He also said that the point of drop dates and tuition structure is extremely important to the efficiency of the scheduling process. Vable stated that enrollment history should be an

adequate guide to the scheduling of classes. Boutilier said that it was not adequate in the case of freshman math courses, in which small tweaks of enrollment policy could have drastic effects in demand for different levels of math; however, the math department is now locked into their scheduled offerings with the Banner system. Galetto replied that the concerned departments would have to talk to each other to solve the problems; that engineering would have to let math know about the math ACT requirements. Glime asked about the timing of notification of enrollment levels; sufficient lead time is needed to schedule teaching assistants and alter teaching methods. Gougeon replied that such enrollment information would be available instantaneously during enrollment. Galetto commented that such information would also be available instantaneously to students as they sign up for courses.

Julien asked whether the Banner system could generate reports on faculty work loads. Gougeon replied that it could generate a report on teaching loads of individuals, but not a summary report on the work load of the faculty as a whole. Sharik asked about the timing of information on under-enrolled upper-division courses, specifically when will faculty or students learn of the possible cancellation of such courses? Galetto said that such information would be available immediately upon the closing of enrollment. Heyman asked whether it would be possible for an extra calculation to be run after and outside of Banner's enrollment process to allow matching of faculty and enrollment. Gougeon said that it depended on whether the question concerned current students enrolling in April, or new students enrolling in the fall, and that adjustments could be made in class schedules between the April and fall enrollments, based on enrollment statistics. Galetto noted that the old system depended extensively on fine-tuning by the schedulers. Boutilier asked if summer freshman orientation had been cancelled. Galetto replied that it was. Julien asked when grades would be reportable by e-mail. Galetto said that the new system would allow this. Sharik thanked the presenters and called for a 5-minute break.

#### V. Special Report on the Budget

President Sharik gave the floor to Provost Powers for a report on the budget proposed for the University. Powers introduced William McGarry for a report on the financial status of the University. McGarry said the financial position was strong; the cash position was weak; the turnaround strategy was working; the State should not impose any budget cuts this year.

Provost Powers presented the proposed budget (Appendix C of these minutes). A draft of the budget will be presented to the Board of Control in March; a final budget will be presented to the Board in May. Powers explained the terminology of the budget and assumptions basic to the budget's development. Sharik opened the floor for questions.

Julien asked about the 1 percent reduction in base budgets coupled with a 2% return in salaries, stating that in his department the 1% reduction would almost certainly have to include some salary money. Powers said that the 1 percent refers to the allocations to the deans, so that all departments need not return 1 percent. Some reduction in number of positions was anticipated particularly in administrative areas. Heuvers asked about the library budget. Powers replied that there was \$50,000 of new money in the budget for the library. However, the priority set by all units was for salary restoration. Coupled with the requirement for deficit reduction, funds are limited for new

expenditures like library development. Glime commented that some departments will find it easier to meet the 1% reduction than others, because different proportions of their budgets are committed to salary. Powers agreed with this.

Bulleit asked about the Research Excellence Fund, which originally was to be new money coming from the State to support research programs, but which now appears to be a part of the standard appropriation resulting in a decrease for the rest of the University. Powers explained that \$1.2 million was originally an additional amount for research, that the University has to account for the amount to the Legislature, and that \$500,000 taken from the fund during the Fall 1991 budget cut has to be restored. Nelson asked about the planned size of the student body in 5 years, relative to tuition revenue. Powers replied that President Tompkins' model from the fall calls for an enrollment of less than 10,000, with 25-30 percent graduate students. For Fall 1993, the current projection is for 100 fewer undergraduates, with an increase in numbers of faculty. For a Ph.D. granting institution, Michigan Tech currently produces an unusually large number of undergraduate degrees per faculty member. To correct this and to develop the graduate program, numbers of faculty must increase, numbers of undergraduates must decline, and undergraduate tuition must increase. Boutilier asked about the enrollment projection, commenting that the enrollment was supposed to have declined also a year ago, but did not. Powers replied that the new enrollments did in fact decline, but that graduate enrollment and retention had kept overall enrollments up. Boutilier said that increased numbers of graduate students is a problem because they require more space and other resources than undergraduates, and that the university has space problems with its current balance of undergraduates. Powers replied that this problem is being addressed with the plans for a new building, and with new budget categories for equipment.

Sharik asked what features of the budget allow Michigan Tech to be rated as a "best buy" in undergraduate education; specifically, what or who is the University sacrificing? Powers replied that low tuition principally is responsible for the rating, but that the overall rating process is unclear. Sharik commented that such information might be useful in the planning process, relative to student perceptions, and that the best buy rating might be possible because of low faculty salaries. Julien asked whether increasing the number or balance of graduate students produced greater debt. Powers commented that the academic and research reputation of a university was correlated with its ability to attract outside money and to be less dependent on state funding and tuition. Future development depended on the University's research

reputation. Julien agreed, but asked what part of the current budget within departments is given to research, as a way of finding out the cost of graduate education. Powers replied that the number was not available. Boutilier commented that the administration does not look for it. Powers indicated he would not know where to look for it, but would start with the variety in teaching loads in departments. Some individuals evidently are doing more research and less teaching.

Sharik asked about the distribution of positions under "replacement", "advancement", and "program development".

Powers replied that replacement money was for concluding current searches for administrative positions in which the current person has not left the university. The advancement money is for positions to support the development fund. Program development is for new faculty positions. Heyman asked about the ratio between academic and non-academic portions of the budget. Powers replied that Michigan Tech is in line with other state universities, with these approximate percents: instruction, 40; research, 2.5; academic support, 10; student services, 7; institutional support, 15; scholarships, 10; operations & maintenance, 8; transfers, 7. However, the numbers are really useful only for year-to-year comparisons; the proportion for instruction has remained fairly constant, varying between 46 and 44 percent. A drop in 1991-92 to 40.7 percent was caused by a reporting change, with scholarship funds being reported separately. Heyman said that the budgeted shift of money to academic areas would result in only a third on one percent increase in the academic percentage - an insignificant increase. Heyman also asked for the timeline in getting the free-standing research institutes to fund themselves. Powers said that there are two answers. KRC is now almost self-sufficient. IMP was cut to a \$200,000 base budget; there has been no budgeted decrease in this. IWR has shifted personnel to the general fund, but with no increase in funding. BID has also been cut to a base budget.

Leifer asked whether the new budget included buildings. Powers said that monies would come from private funding for the performance facility, from State and Federal agencies for an environmental sciences building, and from State and private funding for new library construction. Leifer said that the university cannot afford to support buildings and equipment at the expense of faculty and staff. He also stated that he could not understand how the salaries, benefits, and building facilities of the Chemistry Department at Northern Michigan University are much higher than those at Michigan Tech, given similar State appropriations. Powers replied that although faculty salaries in Chemistry are higher at NMU than MTU, overall the NMU faculty salaries are lower and their benefits package is less extensive, and does not include health benefits for retirees, for example. Leifer said that the NMU contribution to retirement plans exceeds MTU's, so that retiring faculty are more than compensated for that specific difference. Powers agreed that NMU's contribution to TIAA-CREF exceeds MTU's. Leifer asked whether the departmental budgeting proposals were the "vision statements". Powers replied that deans and directors had been asked in the fall to prepare a set of priorities generated by their personnel; all divisions submitted salaries as the top priority. Leifer asked about the composition of the \$46 million base budget figure. Powers showed the distribution of the monies between about 12 units. Sharik asked about the decision process for dividing funds among the units. Powers replied that the process was based on incremental budgeting, with some units getting an increase, some getting no increase. Decisions among units were made on the basis of priorities and proposals submitted by the deans and directors. Leifer asked about the monies budgeted for "government relations". Powers said this item included the cost of the Board of Control, funding of internal auditors, and the salary of former president Stein and his secretary. Bulleit asked about the discrepancy between lab fees collected and returned; Powers replied that this was due to a mistake in collecting and returning fees previously.

Heyman reiterated his point that the 1 percent re-alignment for academic areas was in fact only 0.6 percent,

that this amount was not much, and that more should be shifted from the auxiliary areas, from research institutes, and from administrative areas. He cited the expense of maintaining the Ski Hill as an example of money which should have been shifted. Powers said that plans for shifting funds were difficult to implement. For example, re-alignment plans called for only internal hiring only in all support positions, but this has not worked in practice. The university should be able to get out of the Ski Hill business, but this is difficult without closing the hill. It is necessary to find a new method for re-alignment.

Sharik asked about timing for Senate contributions to the budgeting process; for example, when should the Senate have begun to work toward the proposed retirement benefits package. Powers replied that the work should be continual. Sharik asked about the discrepancy between "making whole" figures for salary restoration. Powers explained that the larger figure is due to a one-time restoration of lost salary, and the lower figure in the budget aims at a building of the base salary which will result in higher eventual salary and less shock to the budget.

Powers discussed the problems associated with the State failing to make its payments sometime in the future, and the necessity of building a reserve to meet the contingency. Julien suggested calling the amount an "incumbrance" rather than a "reserve". Leifer asked about the total university budgets size; some of last years figures were in the \$100 million range, compared with \$75 million in the proposed budgets. McGarry explained that the larger figure includes the items over which the University has little direct control, including sponsored projects, loans, and auxiliary enterprises.

Sharik thanked the Powers and McGarry for their presentations and called for another 5-minute break.

#### VI. Minutes

The minutes of Meeting No. 194 were accepted and corrected. A motion to approve the minutes as corrected was passed without opposition.

#### VII. Senate President's Report

- A. Senate Office: Sharik announced that the University Senate has a new office, located in Room 321 of the M&M Building. The office was provided by IMP. Sharik acknowledged the helpful cooperation of IMP Director J. Hwang. A phone is to be installed in about a week. The tentative office hours are 2 to 4 p.m. weekdays.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3744 Minutes of Senate Meeting 195 10 Feb 1993

- B. Public Safety Liaison Person: Sharik reported that he attended the first meeting of the Public Safety Advisory Board to be representative for the Senate. Judy Fynewever has since volunteered to accept the position as the Public Safety Liaison Person. Sharik indicated that concerns about the conduct of Public Safety on campus should be directed to Fynewever.
- C. New Provost: Sharik announced that the new Provost was Fredrick Dobney, who will begin his position here in mid-March. William Powers will stay on in an advisory role to the new Provost until the end of this academic year. Bill Predebon has sent a note to the Senate expressing his

appreciation for the role of the Senate in the search for the Provost.

- D. Sharik reported on the Senate's voted request for a Senator to be appointed by the Provost to the University's Executive Council. Sharik had communicated the request to the provost, but after some delay without a reply, had written again asking for a decision; the Provost replied with a denial of the request. Sharik read the Provost's note for the record:

"You have asked that the Senate be represented at meetings of deans and directors. I have attached an organizational chart illustrating the reporting structure to this office. You will see that there are 18 persons reporting directly. The organization of this group, so as to provide an effective voice for each area reporting to the executive vice-president, has been a steady topic since the position of executive vice-president was conceived and since its implementation was begun last August. Several structures have been tried. At present those areas that directly report to this office now meet weekly with me. This is a staff meeting. No persons other than those deans and directors who head areas reporting directly to the vice-president participate. It will be inappropriate to extend participation in this body further for two reasons. (1) 18 persons is already a larger staff meeting than is desirable. (2) To extend participation to a Senate representative should also be accompanied by a wider extension, including student and staff representation, thus changing the nature of the body. To repeat, the deans and directors now meet weekly in staff meetings. There are 18 of these persons. This is not an advisory council. It is the vice-president's staff."

Carstens asked if the Senate could resubmit this request in four weeks? Sharik responded that the request could be resubmitted at any time. Julien commented that the Senate once placed a representative on the old Academic Council, which was a decision-making body. After the Senate representative was placed on the Council, it became merely a body for disseminating information.

#### VIII. Vice-President's Report

Sharik reported that Vice President Vilmann was ill. There was no report.

#### IX. Committee Reports

- A. Curricular Policy Committee: Chair Bornhorst reported on two items. (1) The Committee has been meeting regularly to consider and review the School of Technology's proposal for creating a four-year program. The committee continues to analyze the proposal carefully and to advise the School of Technology on revisions. The School of Technology is currently revising the proposal based on the Committee's input. The Committee will continue that process into the foreseeable future. (2) Bornhorst moved that the agenda attachment, New Options in Chemistry, be approved (Appendix D of these minutes). Julien seconded the motion, which passed by voice vote without opposition.
- B. Constitution & Constituency Committee: Chair Heuvers distributed and read a short committee report (Appendix E of these minutes). Sharik asked Heuvers when the committee was planning to submit a proposal to the Senate. Heuvers stated that a draft proposal would be prepared for the next Senate

meeting on March 17, and would perhaps be distributed before that meeting. Two weeks are being allowed for comments, and a faculty forum is planned for March 31st. A Senate vote on the constituency issue is planned for the April meeting of the Senate.

- C. Elections Committee: Chair Heyman said there was no report.
- D. Fringe Benefits Committee: Chair Leifer reported that a correction is needed for the first page of the sick leave proposal, and that the new page would be distributed at the next Senate meeting. Leifer stated that the change involved a one time donation of 3 days; for example, at the initial donation, the 132-day maximum possible sick leave would be reduced to 129 days. Should the pool become exhausted after the initial donation, another donation might be made which could be restored, for example to the 129-day maximum. Leifer commented that there would be another committee meeting to finalize the proposal before submitting it to the administration. The committee has been meeting with the Provost; the committee is confident the proposal will not bankrupt the university.
- E. Institutional Evaluation Committee: Chair Hubbard reported that at the next meeting a revised flow sheet and proposals on governance will be brought to the Senate. Sharik asked when the revised package of governance proposals would be brought to the Senate. Hubbard stated that it should be at the next meeting. Vable asked what had happen to the three governance proposals that had been passed. Sharik said that he had sent the three proposals in writing to the President, indicating the Senate's intent that these become part of university policy and procedure. President Tompkins has not responded.
- F. Instructional Policy Committee: Chair Heuvers distributed and read the committee's report dated 2-10-93, regarding a plus-minus grading system for graduate courses (Appendix F of these minutes). Sharik stated that his reasons for introducing the proposal was that there was not enough range of response for evaluating graduate course work, and that most graduate programs nationally have + grading systems. Because the graduate program is increasing on this campus such a system would improve graduate education, because it would prevent having to award a strong A when a graduate student deserved an A-. Whitt asked whether the Senate knew how graduate students might feel about a + grading system? Nelson asked if there had been a survey of practices in peer institutions. Julien commented that graduate

students seem uninterested in grade points. Vable said that grad students in his department had objected to a proposed change of the grading system. Heyman asked whether or not the Banner system could handle a + for graduate students in 400-level courses. Nelson asked what would be the value of an A- if the B+ is 3.5. Bulleit stated that he would like a more refined grading scale; that if there are +'s there should be -'s also. Sharik commented that the Senate could ask the committee to revisit this issue and force it to come to a vote. Carstens said that he also would like to see the system more uniform, and that the current policy was a result of Tim Whitten's attempt to inflate grades. Whitt commented that strong student opposition does not mean the Senate cannot act



on a policy.

Heyman moved that the Instructional Policy Committee return to the issue of a + grading system for graduate courses and report a proposition back to the Senate. Heyman accepted a friendly amendment to alter the motion to a consideration of an across-the-board + system. Bulleit seconded the motion which passed by a majority voice vote.

- G. Research Policy Committee: Keeble reported that the committee had met with the Scientific Misconduct Committee. The Research Policy Committee is currently made up of three people and is trying to increase that number to five, and interested persons should contact M. McKimpson at IMP. Whitt asked what was the charge to the committee. Keeble said the committee was addressing the current University Scientific Misconduct Policy, but that any problem with research policy lay in its purview. Sharik said that several issues had been brought to his attention: (1) the SPIN system for finding funding has being discontinued without consultation; (2) should there be a contingency fund for back-up when funds from awarded grants are late or ill-timed in arrival; (3) the recent change in fringe benefit rates were increased to 30% for graduate students; (4) decommissioning of the main-frame computer may affect research programs negatively, and will be especially awkward for programs currently under contract; (5) increasing the diversity and numbers of this committee. Heyman commented that shutting down the main frame computer harms not only research programs, but also small departments who depend on main-frame processing of e-mail.

#### X. Reports of Affiliated and Ad Hoc Committees

- A. President's Cabinet: Sharik had no report because the Cabinet has not met since the last Senate meeting.
- B. Board of Control Liaison Task Force: With Vilmann absent, there was no report.
- C. Ad Hoc Committee for Discussion of Unionization: Chair Julien reported that union representatives have held regular forums to discuss the questions that concern the Senate. Sharik said that the central question concerning the Senate was the relationship between the Senate and a union. Whitt commented that all the Senators had received a letter inviting them to hear a speaker who was brought in to address this issue, but that the organizers are willing to send a representative to address the Senate's next meeting.
- D. Ad Hoc Committee on Enrollment Policy: Carstens reported that the committee is still gathering information. Lukowski stated that the committee has identified the policy change that caused the dramatic enrollment reductions in the School of Technology. However, reasons for the policy change are not clear from interviews with attenders at the blue-ribbon committee meeting where the change was discussed.

#### XI. Old Business

##### Agenda Item - Hiring Procedures Regarding Minorities & Women:

Whitt stated that in its previous meeting the Senate had asked her to look into alternative legal counsel on this issue and the costs involved. She reported four actions. First, that President Tompkin's Commission on the Status of Women had invited two lawyers who are women to an open forum on women's issues on 11 February; Whitt said she had sent these attorneys a list of questions and documentation concerning the issue of hiring procedures. Second, Whitt had obtained the names of two lawyers from Detroit to address the problems of the MTU affirmative action plan and social justice program. These lawyers had agreed to examine the problem free of charge. Whitt had suggested to President Sharik that he would be the

appropriate contact for these people. Third, the American Federation of Teachers volunteered the use of its lawyer, Mark Cousens, should the Senate choose to use him. Fourth, Whitt had obtained a countering legal opinion regarding Vernon Dorweiler's letters to the Lode editor and to Sharik. The letter should appear in the MTU Lode; it is found as Appendix G of these minutes.

Sharik reported that he had contacted lawyer William Goodman of Detroit by telephone. Goodman was asked for a legal opinion on MTU's hiring procedures for minorities and women. Goodman volunteered to render the opinion for no fee, but said that if he were to lead a workshop at MTU on the topic, he would need help with his travel expenses. Sharik said that a full set of information concerning this issue had been sent to Goodman.

## XII. New Business

- A. Agenda Item - Report from the Committee on Academic Tenure: The Chair of the committee, Calvin White, distributed a report from the committee (Appendix H of these minutes). He indicated this was the report requested in the spring by former Senate President Julien, who had asked the Academic Tenure Committee to make sure University practice was consistent with University policy. White summarized the report, noting that the explicit University requirement for a written annual review is missing from the written requirements for some departments. Vable asked whether the committee functioned not only to establish criteria, but also as an oversight body if something goes wrong? White stated that the committee is an appellate body, that the policy allows for explicit appeals based on procedure error. Appeals for other reasons are not allowed, but are also not prohibited. White indicated that the faculty member concerned usually initiated the appeal, but that the Provost could also bring the appeal.

Sharik asked if there were any reason why the creation of tenure policy should not be done within the Senate. White indicated that the Senate now elects the majority of members of the committee. As a practical matter White believes that policies have a much greater likelihood of passage by the Board if the President has some input into the committee. White stated that there are some serious problems with the tenure policy that the committee is in the process of revising.

\*\*\*\*\*  
Page 3746 Minutes of Senate Meeting 195 10 Feb 1993

One of the problems being addressed is the appeals process for other than procedural problems. White stated that the Senate or any other faculty body could come to the committee to suggest changes in policy. Glime commented there is one other appeal and that is dismissal for cause and that can be initiated by the faculty member.

Whitt asked whether it were possible to notify tenure candidates at every step of the process above the departmental level. White said that the suggestion was a good one, and that such proposals should be put in writing to the committee. Changes in tenure policy need to be voted on by the faculty. Vable asked if this was a voice vote? White said that it is by secret ballot. Vable asked why the ballot cannot be sent out as in a Senate referendum. White replied that it could use a similar voting mechanism.

B. Agenda Item - Formation of Financial Committee: Jambekar distributed a copy of a proposal to form a Senate Committee on Financial Planning and Policy (Appendix I of these minutes). He noted that attached to the proposal was a copy of a page from the Board of Control policy manual, which states that the Senate is not to consider administrative matters such as finance and personnel. Jambekar said the Senate should be aware that establishing the committee was a policy violation. Sharik said that the recommendations of the Fringe Benefits Committee also violate the policy. Hubbard moved that a Financial Planning and Policy Committee be created. Heuvers seconded the motion. Bulleit asked whether the Budget Liaison Officer should chair the proposed committee. Jambekar said that once the committee is established, the job of the Budget Liaison Officer will disappear. Bulleit replied that this was not evident from the proposal. Hubbard accepted a friendly amendment to the motion to dissolve the job of the Liaison Officer.

Jambekar asked whether the Board of Control policy should be brought to the attention of the Provost or Chief Financial Officer. Heyman said the committee should go ahead, and let the administration take the responsibility for forcing the committee's dissolution. Sharik pointed out that the administration had dissolved the University Finance Committee, which left no avenue for inputs to the budgeting process. The motion was passed with no opposition by voice vote.

### XIII. Adjournment

Sharik noted for the record that the Senate actually conducted its business in about one hour. Heuvers moved that the meeting be adjourned. The motion was seconded massively. President Sharik declared the meeting adjourned at 11:15 p.m.

Submitted by Robert Keen  
Senate Secretary