

# The University Senate Of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 363

16 January 2002

## **Synopsis:** The Senate

- 1) heard that President Tompkins approved Proposals 11-02, Minors in Modern Languages, and 12-02, International Minor in Modern Languages.
  - 2) heard that the academic faculty elected Martha Sloan, Janice Glime, Barry Pegg, and Kim Hoagland (Alternate) to the Faculty Review Committee.
  - 3) amended and approved Proposal 15-02, Procedures for a Financial Crisis, and Proposal 16-02, Procedures for Periods of Financial Stress.
- 

## **1. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL**

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 363 to order at 5:35 p.m. on Wednesday, 16 January 2002, in Room B45 EERC.

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were At-large Senator Carol MacLennan and representatives from Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Materials Science and Engineering, Mining and Materials Processing Engineering, Physics, Enrollment Management, and Student Affairs and Educational Opportunity. Liaisons in attendance were Michelle Trim (GSC), Dennis Taylor (USG), and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

## **2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS**

Visitors included Kent Wray (Provost) and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

## **3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Keen presented the agenda and asked for amendments. There were no amendments or objections to the agenda as presented. [**Appendix A**. NOTE: Only official senate and library archival copies of the minutes will contain a full complement of appendices.]

## **4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES FROM MEETING 362**

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 362 and asked for corrections or amendments. One correction was noted, and the minutes were approved as corrected.

## **5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT**

Proposals 11-02, Minors in Modern Languages; 12-02, International Minor in Modern Languages; and 14-02, Board of Control Policy for Financial Emergencies, were transmitted to the administration for approval. [**Appendices B-D**]

Proposals 11-02 and 12-02 were approved by President Tompkins. [**Appendices E-F**]

The Instructional Policy Committee has forwarded three proposals to the senate for approval: Proposal 17-02, Late Course Add Policy; 18-02, Amendments to Proposal 27-95, Academic Integrity Policy; and 19-02, 2002-03 Academic Calendar. The proposals will be sent to senators and alternates later this week.

The faculty elected Martha Sloan, Janice Glime, Barry Pegg, and Kim Hoagland (Alternate) to the Faculty Review Committee for the faculty grievance process.

Keen asked senators to identify nominees for the following university committees: Conflict of Interest Committee; Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee; Inquiry Committee (Scientific Misconduct); and Sabbatical Leave Committee.

At his January 15 meeting with senate officers, Provost Wray said that the report of the School of Technology-College of Engineering Merger Committee should be available during the week of January 14.

Keen said that in his December 14 presentation to the Board of Control, he presented three arguments against the merger of the Department of Biomedical Engineering and the Department of Chemical Engineering. The board did not approve the merger. He also supported Proposal 14-02, Board of Control Policy for Financial Emergencies, which was developed jointly by the administration and the senate. The proposal was introduced by Board Chair Claude Verbal. Board member Rodger Kershner, senior vice president and general counsel of the CMS Energy Corporation, objected to two sentences in the proposal: the sentence indicating that the Board of Control would lose none of its authority, and the sentence indicating that the Board of Control would not have to adhere to the policies in any particular circumstances. These are the two sentences that were forced into the policy by the university counsel. The Board of Control tabled the motion. If the senate passes procedures that are approved by the president, those procedures will go to the Board of Control, and then policies relating to those procedures will be developed or approved by the Board of Control. The board would like to approve a policy for financial emergencies before considering procedures.

## **6. COMMITTEE BUSINESS/REPORTS**

### **Board of Control Relations Committee**

Keen said that according to *Robert's Rules of Order*, if the chair of a meeting is also the chair of a committee, the meeting chair should not deliver the committee report. Hence, since Keen chairs the Board of Control Relations Committee, he asked Waddell to deliver the committee's report.

Waddell said that the Board of Control Relations Committee, which consists of the senate officers, met with three of the eight Board of Control members (Verbal, Henricksen, and Lagina) on Friday, December 14, immediately after their (the board members') breakfast with student leaders and immediately prior to the board's December 14 meeting. Keen reviewed the comments that he would make during the board's meeting. Senator Kelly Strong also attended and reported the seven concerns raised about the MTEPS proposal recorded on pages 9422-9423 of the minutes from Senate Meeting 362. The board members appeared to be receptive to these concerns.

Keen said that the board requested a copy of Strong's report, which was read into the minutes of the board's meeting.

Senator David Chesney asked if this list of concerns included the senate's unease with Board of Control member Bronce Henderson's company purchasing the off-campus business incubator building. [Note: At Senate Meeting 362 (December 12, 2001), Executive Director of MTU Corporate Services Pete Radecki said that the agreement with Henderson's company is not a purchase agreement but a lease agreement with a purchase option at the end of sixteen years.]

Keen said that it did and that the board members understood this concern and recognized that Henderson's company was taking a risk on which it could either make or lose money.

Chesney asked if this issue had been raised at the board meeting.

Keen said that it had been.

Strong said that at the Board of Control meeting, Henderson disclosed his financial position for the public record and then abstained from the vote.

Waddell asked if Strong's report could be posted to the senate.

Strong said that it could be.

Waddell read item 2 from Strong's list of concerns: "That the Board be cognizant of potential conflict of interests regarding the purchase, operation, and/or leasing of the off-campus incubator which could create 'bad publicity' for the university."

## **7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

### **A. Proposal 15-02, Procedures for a Financial Crisis [Appendix G]**

Keen said that since he must take an advocacy role with respect to Proposals 15-02 and 16-02, he would turn over the chair of the senate to Vice President Christianson.

Keen said the senate had passed Proposals 1-99, 2-99, 3-99, and 4-99 and that two of these proposals (1-99 and 2-99) are combined in Proposal 15-02, Procedures for a Financial Crisis. Keen said that Senator David Chesney--who was a member of the ad hoc committee on separation, which produced Proposals 1-99, 2-99, 3-99, and 4-99--had compared the new proposals with the older proposals. He asked if it would be profitable to review the major differences prior to entertaining a motion to approve.

Senator Don Beck said that it would be.

Keen said that one major difference between the old and the new proposals is that section A.2 of Proposal 15-02 says, "In approving these procedures, the President and the Board of Control relinquish none of their constitutional and statutory authority." This was included at the insistence of the university counsel and matches the language in the Senate Constitution. The counsel wanted stronger language.

Chesney asked what the counsel wanted.

Keen said that the counsel wanted section A.2 to indicate that the president and the Board of Control could follow the procedures or not, as they see fit. Keen said although that was in fact the case, it didn't need to be included in this proposal and, in fact, this was one of the sentences that Board of Control Member Kershner objected to at the board's December 14 meeting.

Keen described the second major difference between the two proposals. The first two sentences of section C.1 of Proposal 15-02 read, "The decision to initiate a state of Financial Crisis rests with the President. The procedures below will be followed when the President determines that a financial emergency exists which may justify declaration of a Financial Crisis." Section C.1 of Proposal 1-99 said, "The procedures below shall be followed when, on the basis of information from the Executive Budget Council, the President believes that a financial emergency exists which may justify declaration of a Financial Crisis." Keen said that when Proposal 1-99 was being drafted, there was an Executive Budget Council, but that that council no longer exists.

Keen described the third major difference between the two proposals. Section C.1 of Proposal 1-99 also says "Factors other than the financial emergency, including a need to reorganize the University or to implement long-range educational policy, shall not be used to justify the declaration of a Financial Crisis. However, declaration of a Financial Crisis shall not preclude consideration of these factors in resolving the emergency." Keen had argued for including this language, which calls for the president to act in good faith in declaring a financial emergency. The university counsel, however, argued for removing this language because it is a policy rather than a procedural statement and it is redundant. Keen said that the senate could reintroduce this language if it wished to do so.

Chesney asked if any changes the senate made at this point would have to be reviewed by the university counsel.

Keen said that minor clarifications should not need another review by the university counsel; however, major changes probably would.

Chesney said that the university counsel would not approve the reintroduction of this language.

Keen agreed but said that this or similar language could be incorporated into a senate policy statement based on approved procedures.

Chesney said that the new wording puts all of the responsibility for declaring a financial crisis with the president.

Keen said that the senate can develop and submit to the Board of Control its own determination as to whether or not the university is in a state of financial crisis. Also, the first thing that the president is required to do after determining the university to be in a state of financial crisis is to call a meeting of senate officers and the members of the Senate Finance Committee and explain to them that he or she wants to declare a state of financial crisis. ["The President will call the Financial Emergency Committee into session. The President will inform the Committee of the nature and severity of the Financial Crisis and will present a timetable for sending the President's recommendation to the Board of Control." (Proposal 15-02, Section C.2) "Financial Emergency Committee (FEC): An advisory committee consisting of the Officers of the University Senate (President, Vice President, and Secretary), and those members of the Senate Finance Committee who have been appointed to that committee by the Senate. Chaired by the President of the Senate." (Proposal 15-02, Section B.1)]

Keen said that under the procedures defined in Proposal 15-02, after being informed of the nature and severity of the financial crisis by the president, the senate officers and the members of the Senate Finance Committee can then immediately respond in writing, agreeing or disagreeing with the president's determination. ["The Financial Emergency Committee may confer, and comment or respond immediately to the President. The Committee should provide a written response to the President and the Board of Control indicating the Committee's view of the financial crisis. The response may include supporting documentation, and may include recommending an independent audit of the financial status of the University." (Proposal 15-02, C.2.b)]

Chesney said that in Proposal 1-99, the president was to gather information and make recommendations to the Board of Control, which has the final authority to initiate a state of financial emergency. Proposal 15-02 says that the decision to declare a state of financial crisis rests with the president. This seems to overstep the president's authority.

Keen said that the university is not officially in a state of financial crisis until the Board of Control declares it to be. He read from Proposal 15-02, Section C.2.e: "A state of Financial Crisis will exist upon declaration of the Board of Control." The president can only make a recommendation.

Chesney said that this section did not concern him as much as the removal of Section C.1 of Proposal 1-99 ["Factors other than the financial emergency, including a need to reorganize the University or to implement long-range educational policy, shall not be used to justify the declaration of a Financial Crisis. However, declaration of a Financial Crisis shall not preclude consideration of these factors in resolving the emergency."]. He said that this should be included even if it is redundant. However, he did not want to derail the proposal by insisting on a passage that would be rejected by the university counsel.

Chesney said that in Proposal 1-99, Section 2.a said, "The President shall call the Financial Emergency Committee into session. The President shall inform the Committee of the nature and severity of the perceived Financial Crisis, and shall present a timetable for sending a recommendation to the Board of Control." But in the same section of Proposal 15-02, the word "perceived" has been removed, which suggests that the university is already officially in a state of financial at that point in the process.

Keen said that the word "perceived" had been removed at the insistence of the university counsel. However, the financial crisis still does not exist until the Board of Control rules that it exists, and the board will have input from two faculty and staff committees.

Keen MOVED and Chesney seconded the motion to approve Proposal 15-02.

Christianson opened the floor for discussion.

In reference to Section A.4 of Proposal 15-02 ["These procedures are intended for situations requiring decisive action within a period of about one to six weeks."], Senator Don Beck said that a well-run organization should have a sufficient cash reserve to cover this period of time. Also, many of the issues discussed in this proposal would take more than a week or two to put in motion.

Keen MOVED for an amendment to Proposal 15-02 based on his discussions with Chesney. Section C.2.d of Proposal 15-02 reads, "The President will inform the Board of Control of any departures from these procedures, including failure of the Senate or Financial Emergency Committee to meet or forward their recommendations." Keen said that he agreed with Chesney that this made it appear that any failure to follow procedures would be the fault of the senate or the Financial Emergency Committee. Hence, he proposed that Section C.2.d be stricken, and that the last sentence of Section A.7 be reworded as follows: "If departures are necessary, they should in good faith conform to these procedures and should be reported by the President to the Board of Control and the University Senate."

Senator Susan Martin asked Keen to give an example of the kind of departures from procedures this section might address and which people's illness or absence might require such departures from procedures. [The first sentence of Section A.7 of Proposal 15-02 reads, "At a time of a financial crisis, circumstances including illness, absence from campus, or vacancy of position, may require departure from these procedures for timely resolution of the crisis."]

Keen said that if, for example, the senate president was unavailable, the university president might call the Financial Emergency Committee into session without the senate president.

Martin said that the current wording could refer to anyone on campus.

Keen agreed.

Senator Bill Gregg asked if this passage might be clarified as follows: "illness, absence from campus, or vacancy of position of either senate or administrative officers."

Keen said that this could be incorporated since the motion had not yet been seconded.

Barna said that this clarification should not be limited to senate officers, since some senate committee chairs would also serve on the Financial Emergency Committee.

Provost Wray said that he believed that the phrase "vacancy of position" referred to specific positions identified in the proposal.

Keen MOVED and Barna seconded the motion to approve the amendment.

Christianson called for further discussion.

Chesney said that Section A.7 of Proposal 15-02 had not been significantly changed and that the passage he and Keen objected to in Section C.2.d had been eliminated.

Christianson called for further discussion. There was none. The motion to amend PASSED on a voice vote with no dissent.

Beck said that in Proposal 16-02, Procedures for Periods of Financial Stress, Section A.4 defines these procedures as applying to "situations requiring planned action within a period of about one year." Since Section A.4 of Proposal 15-02 indicates that that proposal applies to "situations requiring decisive action within a period of about one to six weeks," he asked what would happen if the university experienced a financial emergency between six weeks and one year and if it would be left to the administration to determine whether such a situation was defined as a financial stress or a financial crises.

Keen said that Proposal 15-02 was designed to address financial problems that require an immediate solution, and Proposal 16-02 was designed to address financial problems that could be addressed over a longer period and, hence, include broader participation.

Beck suggested a closer overlap in the periods of time defined in the two proposals.

Chesney said that each of these proposals refers to the other. The second sentence of Section A.4 in Proposal 16-02 reads, "Contingencies that require decisive action in a matter of weeks are covered in the Procedures for Financial Crisis"; and the second sentence of Section A.4 in Proposal 15-02 reads, "Contingencies that permit action over a more extended period of time are covered in the Procedures for Financial Stress." Chesney said that it was unfortunate that Proposal 16-02 used the phrase "about one year," but it was intended to address financial problems that allowed some time for resolution.

Senator Pam Long said that the passage reads, "within a period of about one year," which could be anywhere between six weeks and twelve months.

Chesney agreed.

Beck asked if the phrase "within a period of about one to six weeks" in Section A.4 of Proposal 15-02 might be changed to read "within a period of weeks."

Keen said that the ad hoc committee on separation thought that one to six weeks was an appropriate period.

Strong asked if the proposal had been seconded.

Christianson said that it had been and called for further discussion.

Senator Jim Pickens said that Section D.1 of Proposal 15.02 reads in part, "the Executive Budget Council will provide the vice presidents, vice provosts, deans, and directors with guidelines, including deadlines, for preparing plans for reductions of budgets." He said that the Executive Budget Council consists only of administrators, and that the guidelines might really be marching orders. These guidelines should not be produced only by administrators without senate input. He asked if some senators might serve as non-voting members of the Executive Budget Council.

Keen said that Section D.3 of Proposal 15.02 charges the Reconfiguration Committee with reviewing the proposed plans and preparing preliminary recommendations for the president. According to Section B.3 of Proposal 15-02, the Reconfiguration Committee is "A working advisory group consisting of the Executive Budget Council (above), the Officers of the University Senate, two members of the Senate Finance Committee designated by the Senate, the President of Staff Council, and the Deans of the Colleges and Schools. A representative from Human Resources shall serve without vote. Chaired by the Provost and Senior Vice President for Academic and Student Affairs."

Pickens said that there should be senate input during the process of developing these plans before they are submitted to the Reconfiguration Committee for review. He asked for background on Section D.1 of Proposal 15.02.

Chesney said that this same wording was included in Proposal 1-99, except for the phrase "including deadlines." He said that the key point was that Section D.1 provides guidelines for preparing *plans* for reductions, not guidelines for what to *do* about reducing.

Pickens said that he would still like to see someone from the senate involved in the process of formulating these guidelines.

Senator Larry Davis said that an example of problematic guidelines might be guidelines that would recommend cutting faculty positions but not administrative positions.

Chesney said that he understood Section D.1 to mean that the Reconfiguration Committee would determine how much should be cut and within what time frame. Everything else is defined in subsequent sections.

Pickens said that once guidelines were established, it would be difficult to depart from them; hence, it would be useful to have more diverse input during the process of establishing these guidelines, even if only nonvoting membership on the Reconfiguration Committee. He said that he would like to know if the provost would find this suitable.

Keen said that the second sentence of Section D.1 began to address Pickens' concerns: "These guidelines will also be furnished to the Financial Emergency Committee." The Financial Emergency Committee consists of the senate officers and members of the Senate Finance Committee. Keen said that it might be appropriate to propose an amendment specifying what the Financial Emergency Committee should do with the guidelines developed by the Reconfiguration Committee.

Pickens said that these guidelines would simultaneously be submitted to other administrative units. Hence, he would still like to include senate representation on the Reconfiguration Committee.

Chesney pointed out the concluding paragraph of Section D.1: "Guidelines may include incentives for cutting costs, such as arranging for some portion of the budget given up by a unit to be returned to that area as discretionary funds."

Pickens MOVED to amend the first sentence of Section D.1 as follows: "Immediately after the declaration of a Financial Crisis, the Executive Budget Council and two non-voting liaisons from the Financial Emergency Committee will provide the vice presidents, vice provosts, deans, and directors with guidelines, including deadlines, for preparing plans for reductions of budgets."

Davis seconded the motion.

Christianson called for further discussion on the proposed amendment. There was none. The motion to amend PASSED on a voice vote with one opposing vote.

Senator Steve Seidel said that Section D.2 of Proposal 15-02 reads, "Vice Presidents, vice provosts, deans, and directors will generate plans for budget reductions." He MOVED that department chairs be added to this list as well as to the parallel list in Proposal 16-02.

Senator Deb Bruch seconded the motion.

Christianson called for discussion.

Keen asked what would happen if a chair disagreed with a dean's plans and if a chair would submit a separate plan from the dean's plan.

Seidel said that a chair would submit a separate plan from a dean no more than a dean would submit a separate plan from a vice provost.

Keen said that deans don't report to vice provosts, and that no group on the current list reports to another.

Seidel said that deans report to vice presidents.

Keen agreed that this was a discrepancy.

Christianson called for further discussion on the motion to amend Section D.2. There was none. The motion PASSED on a split voice vote. After a show of hands was requested, fifteen senators voted yes and eleven voted no.

Christianson called for further discussion on motion to approve Proposal 15-02.

Strong asked for a ruling on whether the amendments to Proposal 15-02 were material or editorial. He said that the proposal had gone from defining an efficient process of decision-making at a time of financial crisis to a more cumbersome process, involving many more participants. He said that the senate's constituents should have an opportunity to review the amendments prior to a vote.

Gregg referred to the second sentence of Section A.7, which says, "If departures are necessary, they should in good faith conform to these procedures and should be reported by the President to the Board of Control and the University Senate." He asked how it was possible for departures from procedures to conform to procedures.

Seidel suggested the following alternative phrasing: "departures should be made in a good faith effort to conform to procedures."

Gregg asked if the problem with Section C.2.d ("The President will inform the Board of Control of any departures from these procedures, including failure of the Senate or Financial Emergency Committee to meet or forward their recommendations.") might be resolved by replacing the word "failure" with the word "inability."

Keen said that this would still suggest that the senate bears the burden of responsibility for failure to resolve a financial crisis.

Senator Tony Rogers said that Section A.7 should indicate that there should be good-faith efforts to conform to the procedures, and when, despite such efforts, departures from these procedures are necessary, they should be reported by the President to the Board of Control and the University Senate.

Davis asked if the problem might be resolved by replacing the word "procedures" with the word "policy"; that is, if for any reason the administration is unable to adhere to the letter of the proposal, it should be obliged to adhere to the spirit of the proposal.

Rogers agreed.

Vilman MOVED to amend Section A.7 as follows: "At a time of financial crisis, any departures from these procedures should be made in good faith and must be reported by the President to the Board of Control and the University Senate." Bruch seconded the motion.

Christianson called for further discussion. There was none. The motion PASSED on a voice vote with no dissent.

In light of Strong's concern that the senate had amended the decision-making process defined in Proposal 15-02 such that it had become unwieldy, Barna MOVED that the senate reconsider its amendment to Section D.2. and strike chairs from the list of participants. He said that the department chairs are represented in the senate and, hence, do not need to be included on this list.

Strong seconded the motion.

Seidel asked how *Robert's Rules of Order* addressed reconsideration of motions passed at the same meeting.

Keen said that *Robert's Rules of Order* allows motions to reconsider.

Christianson called for further discussion of the motion to reconsider.

Barna said that paragraph 4 of Section D.2 reads, "The proposed plans are expected to consider the possible unequal treatment of units. Vice provosts, deans, and directors may expect that areas will not be treated equally." He said that it would be difficult to include at this point in the planning process chairs of departments that might be unequally treated.

Beck said that he disagreed and that this same conflict might also occur at higher levels.

Senator Lee Oberto said that in a case of financial crisis, decisions need to be made as rapidly as possible. They may not be the best decisions, but they have to be made. Why complicate this process by including the chairs?

Beck said that by that reasoning, the president could make such decisions unilaterally. He said that it would be best to maintain a cash reserve adequate to handle a one-week financial crisis.

Chesney asked if a compromise might be to exclude department chairs from the list in Section D.2 of Proposal 15-02 but include them in the list in Section D.2 of Proposal 16-02, since 16-02 addresses financial problems that allow more time to resolve.

Christianson called for further discussion of the motion. There was none. The motion PASSED on a voice vote with one dissenting vote.

Christianson called for further discussion on the amended motion to approve Proposal 15-02. There was none. The motion PASSED on a unanimous voice vote.

Keen asked Christianson for a ruling on whether the amendments are substantive or merely clarifying. He said that this should have been done before the vote.

Strong said that one amendment added two nonvoting members to the Executive Budget Council and that the other amendments were editorial.

## **B. Proposal 16-02, Procedures for Periods of Financial Stress [Appendix H]**

Keen MOVED and Long seconded the motion to approve Proposal 16-02.

Keen said that other than the difference in the time period addressed by Proposal 15-02 and Proposal 16-02, the principal difference between the proposals is that in Proposal 16-02, any proposed reconfiguration must be reviewed by a committee appointed by the Reconfiguration Committee and consisting of faculty and staff not associated with the reconfigured units. This committee will hold public hearings on any proposed reconfiguration and make a report to the Reconfiguration Committee.

Keen MOVED and Davis seconded the motion to apply all amendments from Proposal 15-02 to Proposal 16-02.

Christianson called for discussion of the motion. Chesney said that the previous draft of Section D.5.c of Proposal 16-02 read as follows: "The recommendations will protect the University's commitment to equal opportunity and Affirmative Action." He asked why the phrase "Affirmative Action" had been removed from the current draft.

Keen said that this was done on the advice of the university counsel. The rationale is that there are pending Affirmative Action cases--such as one at the University of Michigan--that might affect this policy.

Christianson called for further discussion on the motion to apply all amendments from Proposal 15-02 to Proposal 16-02. There was none. The motion PASSED on a unanimous voice vote.

Seidel MOVED and Martin seconded the motion to amend Section D.2. as follows: "Vice presidents, vice provosts, deans, directors, *and chairs* will generate plans for budget reductions."

Christianson called for discussion of the motion. There was none. The motion PASSED on a voice vote with dissent.

Christianson called for further discussion of the motion to approve Proposal 16-02. There was none. Christianson ruled that the proposed amendments to Proposal 16-02 were editorial. The motion to approve Proposal 16-02 as amended PASSED on a unanimous voice vote.

Keen resumed his position as chair of the meeting.

In the earlier discussion of Proposal 15-02, Keen had said that the following sentence from Section C.1 of Proposal 1-99 is missing from Proposal 15-02: "Factors other than the financial emergency, including a need to reorganize the University or to implement long-range educational policy, shall not be used to justify the declaration of a Financial Crisis. However, declaration of a Financial Crisis shall not preclude consideration of these factors in resolving the emergency." Keen had said that the university counsel argued for removing this language because it is a policy rather than a procedural statement and it is redundant. Keen went on to say that the senate could reintroduce this language if it wished to do so.

Chesney asked if the senate would officially incorporate this sentence into Proposal 14-02 and resubmit the revised proposal to the Board of Control.

Keen said that the Board of Control would like to first see the procedures for responding to financial emergencies and subsequently consider policies for responding to such emergencies.

Strong asked if the senate could withdraw Proposal 14-02.

Keen said that the proposal was already on the Board of Control's table but that the senate could propose an amendment.

### **C. Proposal 13-02, Enterprise Minor**

Keen said that Proposal 13-02, Enterprise Minor, had been tabled at the previous senate meeting because the Senate Finance Committee had some unresolved questions about the proposal.

Barna said that the proposers have not requested to meet with the Senate Finance Committee.

Keen said that absent any efforts to answer the Finance Committee's questions, there is no reason to further consider this proposal.

## **8. ADJOURNMENT**

Davis MOVED and Pollins seconded the motion to adjourn. The meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell  
Secretary of the University Senate