

THE UNIVERSITY SENATE OF MICHIGAN TECHNOLOGICAL UNIVERSITY

Minutes of Meeting 382

12 March 2003

Synopsis: The Senate

1. heard that the administration approved Proposal 8-03, 14-Week Calendar, and Proposal 11-03, Applied Geophysics Minor.
 2. heard that Michele Miller was elected to the Academic Tenure Committee.
-

President Bob Keen called University Senate Meeting 382 to order at 5:37 p.m. on Wednesday, 12 March 2003, in Room B45 EERC.

1. ROLL CALL OF SENATORS

Secretary Craig Waddell called roll. Absent were At-large Senators Adolphs, Beck, Oberto, and Pilling and representatives from Army/Air Force ROTC, Chemistry, Electrical and Computer Engineering, Mathematical Sciences, Keweenaw Research Center, Auxiliary Enterprises, and Finance and Advancement. Liaisons in attendance were Alex Helmboldt (USG) and Becky Christianson (Staff Council).

2. RECOGNITION OF VISITORS

Visitors included Christa Walck (Conflict of Interest Coordinator) and Marcia Goodrich (*Tech Topics*).

3. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Keen presented the agenda for meeting 382 and said Senator Cindy Selfe had suggested adding to the agenda discussion of a letter-writing campaign. There were no additional amendments or objections to the agenda as amended. Keen said that the agenda would be followed as amended. **[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 379

Keen presented the minutes from meeting 379 and asked for corrections or amendments. There were none. There were no objections to approving the minutes as presented.

5. PRESIDENT'S REPORT

Keen said that Proposal 11-03, Applied Geophysics Minor has been transmitted to the administration for approval. **[Appendix B]**

Keen said that the administration has approved Proposal 8-03, 14-Week Calendar, and Proposal 11-03, Applied Geophysics Minor. **[Appendices C and D]** Keen said that on Friday, March 14, he would present to the Board of Control the results of the referendum on the proposed 14-week calendar.

Keen said that included on the agenda of the March 14 BOC meeting is a discussion of conflict of interest for the Board. This will be an editorial change due to the change in titles of some administrators.

Keen said that the academic faculty have elected Michele Miller (ME-EM) to the Academic Tenure Committee.

Jim Moore has resigned as an alternate senator. Moore was the Professional Staff Policy Committee representative on the Task Force on Career Opportunities for Professional Staff. Keen said that none of the other members of the Staff Policy Committee wish to volunteer for the vacancy. Hence, Keen asked if there were any objections to the Task Force continuing absent one member. There were none.

Keen said that he had received a request from the administration to ask senators from academic departments to query their departments as to whether or not the model schedules currently published in the undergraduate catalog might be discontinued. This would save about 20 pages in the catalog.

Keen said that a recent article in the *Daily Mining Gazette* indicated that Michigan Tech was facing double-digit percentage healthcare increases. The story by Ryan Olson was based on an interview with Kent Wray. Wray has assured Keen that he did not mention double-digit percentage healthcare increases during this interview. Wray did say that the Michigan Public School Employees Retirement System (MPERS) fixed cost has increased by 12.44% per year. This has nothing to do with Michigan Tech's healthcare costs per se.

Keen asked senators to consider between now and the next senate meeting how they would like to have recorded views of their constituents on issues that face the senate. Keen said that on several occasions, senators have read into the senate record views of their constituents. This could begin to occupy a significant amount of the senate's time.

Keen said that the senate has passed two Financial Emergency Procedures: Proposal 15-02, Procedures for a Financial Crisis (adopted 16 January 2002) and Proposal 16-02, Procedures for Periods of Financial Stress (adopted 8 May 2002). Both have been approved by President Tompkins. In order to lay off tenured faculty, the university has to demonstrate a bona fide financial emergency. Keen said that Michigan Tech does not want to be the first university in the state of Michigan to officially declare a financial emergency. There is a problem, then, with staff, who are most vulnerable to layoffs. Keen said that he would like the senate to correct a gap in the current financial emergency procedures. When these procedures are officially declared, several provisions benefit both staff and faculty who might be laid off. These are technically not available to staff who are laid off without an official declaration of financial emergency. Keen asked the Senate Professional Staff Committee to examine the current financial stress and financial crisis procedures and extract from these procedures the list of benefits to staff who have been laid off [see Proposal 15-02, section 10 and Proposal 16-02, section 12]. He asked that this committee then bring to the senate a proposal asking that these benefits be made available to staff and untenured faculty who might be laid off in the course of a normal budget reduction in force.

Benefits include efforts to find suitable placement elsewhere in the university, preferential rehiring, not losing credit for previous years of service, access to cultural and recreational activities, on-campus parking privileges, Internet access, employee education and tuition-reduction programs, and so on.

Senator Bruce Barna asked what the triggers were for a period of financial stress and a period of financial crisis and why the university is not currently in a period of financial stress.

Keen said that a period of financial stress or financial crisis would be declared when the university president decides that the financial situation cannot be resolved without laying off tenured faculty. Keen said that on March 12, he and a member of the Senate Finance Committee talked with Provost Wray and encouraged the provost to use some of the procedures in Proposal 15-02 and Proposal 16-02 to increase communication between the administration and the faculty and staff. For example, one of the provisions is that after a condition of financial stress or financial crisis has been declared, a committee responsible for

reconfiguration will be convened. This committee then provides guidelines to deans and directors on what they are expected to do to address the financial situation. One of the provisions of the policy is that deans and directors are to seek active input from appropriate faculty, staff, and students in developing their response to the request for reduction and documenting how they obtained that input. Keen said that this process would be appropriate even in normal budgetary adjustments when a state of financial stress or financial crisis has not officially been declared.

Keen said that he had also suggested to Provost Wray that something like the reconfiguration committee might be usefully consulted. This committee includes the senate officers and two members of the Senate Finance Committee. He said that Wray's response to these suggestions was encouraging.

Barna said that he thought that the trigger for declaring a condition of financial stress was lower than faculty layoffs.

Keen said that it wasn't. He said that the difference between a condition of financial stress and a condition of financial crisis was in the time needed to respond to the situation. A situation of financial crisis includes no extensive, campus-wide review of any proposed reconfigurations; such proposals are instead reviewed only within the Reconfiguration Committee. In a situation of financial stress, for each proposed reconfiguration, a special committee is appointed, which seeks campus-wide input and will make a report on the proposed reconfiguration.

Barna said that given Michigan Tech's current financial situation, the fact that a condition of financial stress has not been officially declared might suggest that Proposal 16-02 is flawed.

Keen said that the proposal could be reviewed by the Senate Finance Committee or by some other committee.

Senator Cindy Selfe said that the senate does not need to wait for the university to declare a financial crisis but should provide leadership in taking its own action in providing guidance and information.

Keen said that that was why he had asked Provost Wray to consider the procedures that would be followed in an officially declared case of financial stress or financial crisis and applying them during difficult financial situations in which financial stress or financial crisis has not been officially declared.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if the Board of Control would have to approve the proposed 14-week calendar at its March 14 meeting. He said that he had heard that the BOC might not have a quorum at this meeting.

Keen said that for scheduling reasons, the BOC should approve the calendar at either its March or its May meeting. Keen said that there should be a quorum of the BOC at its March meeting between 9:00 a.m. and noon.

Keen said that the senate would soon conduct spring elections. He encouraged senators to solicit candidates for senators at large. Senators at large are needed to fill two three-year openings and to complete the term of office for Kelly Strong. Senate officer elections will be held after senators at large are elected. Keen said that the senate constitution allows the senate president to appoint people to fill vacancies on the senate.

6. COMMITTEE REPORTS

Elections Committee

Keen reported that Kathy Halvorsen (Social Sciences) and Blair Orr (SFRES) are nominees for

the Faculty Distinguished Service Award Committee. Keen opened the floor for additional nominees. There were none. The slate will be sent to the academic faculty for election.

7. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

Proposal 2-03, Conflict of Interest Procedures [See minutes, page 10070, for a copy of this proposal.]

Keen introduced Conflict of Interest Coordinator Christa Walck. Walck said that she would quickly review some of the new features of the Conflict of Interest Procedures. She said that the new version begins with a definitions section. This section is not included in the interim COI Procedures that are currently in place; however, this section is included in the revisions that Walck presented during Senate meeting 373 (28 August 2002). The new definitions include the following:

MTU community: All faculty, staff, students, and administrators of MTU.

MTU resources: Includes all facilities such as office space and equipment, as well as information technology (including Web site servers and telecommunications), personnel, and stationery.

Relative: A member of the MTU community's spouse, child (by blood, adoption, or marriage), parent, or person with whom the member has a close personal relationship.

Walck said that the preamble acknowledges that "these procedures cannot address every possible situation and do not obviate the need of members to understand and follow other MTU policies and procedures." The preamble also states that "in applying these procedures, the President and Board of Control relinquish none of their constitutional or statutory authority." Walck said that the BOC is subject to its own policies and to Michigan statutes.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked if the senate could add that the faculty don't relinquish any of *their* statutory authority.

Walck said that she did not believe that the faculty *have* any statutory authority.

Selfe asked why this was the case. She asked why the senate is always discussing the rights of the president and the BOC and not the senate's rights.

Walck said that the COI procedures reflect the rights of the faculty and staff, but legal advisors to the president and the BOC always insist on including in such documents an explicit statement indicating that the president and the BOC are not bound by these documents because they have their own governing rules.

Selfe asked if the text could be amended to say that the senate relinquishes none of its university rights.

Walck said that such an amendment could be proposed during the discussion period.

Walck said that the current Conflict of Interest Policy was adopted by the Michigan Tech Board of Control in August of 2000 (see BOC Policy Manual, section 3.13, available at

<http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/boc/policy/ch3/ch3p13.htm>). Senate Proposal 9-01, adopted in February 2001, amended the Interim Conflict of Interest Procedures. The procedures were last revised on 17 September 2001 and are available at <http://www.admin.mtu.edu/admin/prov/facbook/appb/bapp.htm>. This change required COI disclosure only if a conflict of interest exists; hence, COI reports are no longer required for research proposals where no conflict exists.

Walck said that the next steps are approval by the senate, approval by the provost and president, and notification to Board of Control. The BOC does not have to approve the procedures unless there is a conflict between these procedures and BOC policy. Once these steps have been taken, the COI procedures would no longer have interim status.

Walck said that Proposal 2-03 discusses both conflict of interest and conflict of commitment. Conflict of commitment refers primarily to a conflict of time that university employees spend at their university jobs versus time spent on other activities. Proposal 2-03 defines when such conflicts should be disclosed, mitigated, discouraged, or disallowed. Walck said that university employees should disclose such conflicts; the COI Coordinator does not seek them out.

Walck said that statutory requirements for conflicts of interest can be found at the State of Michigan Statute on Conflict of Interest site at <http://www.michiganlegislature.org> Michigan Compiled Laws Sections MCL15.301 and MCL15.302 are particularly relevant.

Walck said that there are five categories of conflict of interest:

Category I: Outside Activities Exempt from Conflict of Interest. These include such activities as attending professional meetings and composing or reviewing professional papers.

Category II: Outside Professional Service Activities that Create Conflicts of Interest. These include such activities as brief consulting or uncompensated service, including community service. To avoid conflicts of commitment, Michigan Tech employees are not to exceed one day per five-day workweek, and 15 days per academic semester in such service. Such service should be fully and promptly disclosed in writing to the employee's supervisor. Employees may appeal their supervisor's decision to the COI Coordinator; employees may appeal the COI Coordinator's decision to the COI Committee.

Category III: External Relationships and Activities with Minimal Supervision.

A. Consulting. If consulting overlaps with or takes place in the context of Category IV activity (e.g., \$10,000 financial threshold), it will be reviewed by the COI Coordinator to see if Category IV procedures should be followed. Michigan Tech employees may not consult in excess of one day per week and in excess of 36 days per academic year. Such consulting should be fully and promptly disclosed in writing to the employee's supervisor. Employees may appeal their supervisor's decision to the COI Coordinator; employees may appeal the COI Coordinator's decision to the COI Committee.

B. Textbooks.

C. Royalties.

D. Proposals (Sponsored Research). If a COI exists, the Principal Investigator (PI) must submit a disclosure of COI directly to the COI Coordinator. A signed, satisfactory internal review must be on file before funds are released to the PI.

E. Testing.

F. Small Businesses Not Directly Related to Member's Responsibilities. This is a new category; the procedures described under Consulting (A) apply here as well.

G. Use of University Resources. Make special arrangements to schedule such resources and to reimburse Michigan Tech for their use.

H. Supervision of Relatives. Employees must disclose such supervision to their own supervisor, unless it is a Proposal (D), in which case, such supervision must be disclosed

directly to the COI Coordinator.

Category IV: Complex External Relationships, Including Outside Business Activities and Entrepreneurial Projects. This category includes financial interest of \$10,000 or more per year in any outside activity related to Michigan Tech responsibilities, such as in Categories II or III. This category also includes a list of other activities that must be reported even if the \$10,000 threshold is not yet reached. Michigan Tech employees engaged in such activities should consult with Michigan Tech's Office of Intellectual Property and Technology Commercialization, disclose such activities to their supervisors and to the COI Coordinator, and submit an annual report on these activities.

Category V: Other. This category includes purchasing, business referrals, and business relationships with subordinates (including students).

Walck said that Proposal 2-03 also includes a section on review and enforcement. This section requires supervisors to submit annual reports to the COI Coordinator in which they outline the COIs they have resolved within their departments. The section also defines the COI Coordinator and the COI Committee, which reviews all Category IV activities. Finally, this section includes a discussion of violations and appeal procedures.

Walck concluded her remarks and called for questions.

Senator Debra Bruch said that she owned a small business that has nothing to do with Michigan Tech and uses no Michigan Tech resources. She said that Michigan Tech has no right to tell her what she can do outside of her work hours. She asked if she had misunderstood the intent of Proposal 2-03.

Walck said that there may be a conflict of commitment in such cases.

Bruch said that there is no conflict of commitment because she only engages in her business after she goes home from Michigan Tech.

Walck said that Bruch would still need to disclose this business to her supervisor.

Bruch said that her supervisor is aware of her business and has used this business.

Walck said that all that Proposal 2-03 asks for in such cases is that Michigan Tech employees disclose such businesses to their supervisors so that supervisors can make sure that there is no conflict of interest or conflict of commitment. If there appears to be a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment, then the employee or his or her supervisor must contact the COI Coordinator to review the situation.

Bruch said that the COI Coordinator does not have the right to regulate work that Michigan Tech employees do if that work has nothing to do with Michigan Tech and uses no Michigan Tech resources.

Walck said that she has the right to make sure that the outside activities of Michigan Tech employees do not create a conflict of interest.

Senator Bruce Barna asked if this policy applied to any outside business interests.

Walck said that the policy is to ensure that outside business activities of Michigan Tech employees do not create a conflict of interest or a conflict of commitment.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked if the \$10,000 trigger was a one-time amount.

Walck said that this was an annual amount.

Selfe said that she would not know whether she would cross that threshold until she received royalty checks and compensation for consulting.

Walck said that Selfe should report exceeding this threshold as soon as she knows that she has exceeded it.

Selfe asked if this was \$10,000 net of \$10,000 gross.

Walck said that it was gross.

Senator Dickie Selfe asked if this applied to grant money.

Walck said that it applied to any extra funding that a Michigan Tech employee might receive as income, not reimbursement.

Senator Peck Cho said that the Conflict of Interest Policy seemed to address only cases where financial interests were at issue. He said that other situations, such as serving on a promotion committee or a grievance committee, might also create a conflict of interest, yet they might not involve financial considerations. He asked who would decide whether there is a conflict of interest in such cases.

Walck said that this would depend on how "conflict of interest" was defined. Proposal 2-03 defines "conflict of interest" as involving some inappropriate benefit to the party in question.

Cho asked if the benefit had to be financial.

Keen said that most of Michigan Tech's grievance policies and scientific misconduct policies have provisions for the exclusion of people who have an inappropriate connection to the case. He said that these would be conflicts of interest, but they would not be the sort of conflicts of interest that are covered by Proposal 2-03.

Cho asked who would arbitrate any disagreement about a proposed conflict of interest in such cases.

Keen said that any dispute would be resolved somewhere in the chain of command of the grievance procedure and that, ultimately, appeals could be made to the president and the provost.

Walck said that grievance procedures are separate from Proposal 2-03.

Cho asked if Proposal 2-03 could be amended to include conflicts of interest that do not involve financial benefits.

Bruch asked if Cho was referring to a gain in status or administrative power.

Walck said that she would have to confer with the Office of Human Resources to see if their policies already cover such situations.

Keen said that the senate's Administrative Procedures Committee might address this issue.

Senator Steve Seidel said that the conflict of commitment section of Proposal 2-03 seems highly intrusive. He said that it is part of a supervisor's responsibility to determine whether employees are performing adequately. Supervisors should make this determination independent

of what they may or may not know about employees' outside activities. He said that he was inclined not to vote for this proposal on the basis of its intrusiveness.

Keen ruled Seidel's comment out of order and asked him to raise this point again when there was a motion on the floor to approve Proposal 2-03.

Senator Dana Johnson asked if Proposal 2-03 was comparable to the conflict of interest procedures at other universities.

Walck said that Proposal 2-03 was longer and more specific than most other COI procedures she had examined.

Senator Cindy Selfe asked where the privacy rights of the employees conflict with Michigan Tech's right to know what employees do outside of their employment with Michigan Tech.

Walck said that the intent of Proposal 2-03 is to protect Michigan Tech and its employees from unmitigated conflicts of interest. The only way that this can be done is by employees disclosing any such conflicts.

Barna said that section 5.1.1 of Proposal 2-03 reads in part as follows: "A member is normally deemed to be engaging in Category IV activities when that member has a significant financial interest of \$10,000 or more per year in any outside activity related to their MTU responsibilities." He said that Walck was expanding the terms of this section by saying that it addressed any activity, whether related to MTU responsibilities or not.

Walck said that this section addressed Category IV activities.

Barna asked if he was correct that an activity is classified as Category IV if it exceeds \$10,000 and is related to the employee's activities at MTU, and an activity is classified as Category III at any level of income and whether or not it's related to the employee's activities at MTU.

Walck said that this was correct.

Barna asked what constituted ownership in a business. He asked if holding stock in a company constituted ownership in a business.

Walck said that the employee would have to be directly involved either in management or as an equity partner. She said that disclosure would allow the supervisor or the COI Coordinator to determine whether or not there was a conflict of interest. She said that it was the employee's responsibility to disclose potential conflicts before they are brought to light by other means with potential adverse effects for both the university and the employee.

Bruch asked if an employee who doesn't perceive a conflict of interest could be fired for not disclosing what is subsequently characterized as a conflict of interest. She said that Section 7.3.2 reads in part "MTU has the authority to take action against individuals who violate these procedures, up to and including discharge."

Walck said that if the Conflict of Interest Coordinator identified such a conflict, she or he would attempt to mitigate this conflict. If the conflict could not be mitigated, the other activity would be disallowed by the university, and the employee would have to choose between continued employment at MTU and continued pursuit of the disallowed activity.

Bruch said that her main concern is the right to privacy. She said that she owns a Web-page-design business, which doesn't have anything to do with Michigan Tech. This is her way of preparing for retirement.

Walck said that if Bruch used this business to do contractual work for Michigan Tech, there could be a conflict of interest.

Bruch said that Fine Arts Department Chair Milt Olsson asked her to design the Web site for the Department of Fine Arts. She did this work without compensation.

Walck said that if Bruch received no financial benefit from this work, then there was no conflict of interest.

Bruch said that she did place her logo on each page of the Web site.

Walck said that she believed that there were already university policies governing such situations.

Senator Chris Williams said that there were such policies and that the only benefit of disclosing such information would be for Bruch's own protection so that a local vendor who provides this service (Web-page design) can't sue Michigan Tech for hiring Bruch to do this work.

Keen called for a motion to approve Proposal 2-03.

Senator Dana Johnson MOVED and Senator Chris Williams seconded the motion to approve Proposal 2-03, Conflict of Interest Procedures.

Keen called for debate on the motion.

Seidel said that disclosure was not an issue in Bruch's case because her supervisor (Olsson) had requested the work. He said that his concern was the intrusion on employee privacy.

Bruch said that she disclosed by choice, but Proposal 2-03 *requires* disclosure.

Walck said that Proposal 2-03 says that employees *should* disclose.

Barna said that Proposal 2-03 says that under Category III, employees *must* disclose. Furthermore, activities described under Category III don't even have to be related to the employee's work at Michigan Tech. This is particularly invasive.

Bruch MOVED to amend the description of Category III activities to restrict them to work related to the employee's work at MTU.

Keen asked Bruch to specify the amendment with the exact wording.

Walck said that the point of disclosure is to allow the employee's supervisor and the COI Coordinator to determine whether there is a conflict of interest that the employee might not be aware of.

Senator Dana Johnson said that in working for both public and private businesses, she has found it common for employers to ask for such information. She said that she has never experienced any problems with disclosing her other activities.

Keen asked Barna to indicate for the record a section of Proposal 2-03 that specifies that employees must disclose potential conflicts of interest.

Barna said that Section 4.6.1.1 reads in part "Category III activities, including owning and operating a small business inside of MTU in an area not directly related to the member's MTU responsibilities or areas of expertise." He said he read that section to mean that any small

business outside of MTU unrelated to Michigan Tech activities or responsibilities falls into this category.

Cindy Selfe asked if the "not" could be removed from this passage.

Barna said that this change would resolve the problem.

Walck said that Section 4.6.1.1 was specifically included to address questions she has received from Michigan Tech employees who are operating small businesses that are not directly related to their responsibilities at Michigan Tech.

Barna said that people could certainly volunteer information about such businesses, but they should not be forced to disclose this information.

Keen asked where Proposal 2-03 says that employees have to disclose such information.

Walck said that Section 4.6.3.1 requires disclosure. Senator Bill Gregg said that two sections would need to be changed in order to make the desired amendment.

Gregg MOVED and Bruch seconded the motion to amend Proposal 2-03 as follows:

Section 4.0 Background

These opportunities include professional consulting; adoption of self-authored textbooks or other course materials; royalties from patents; sponsored research, education and training proposals; routine testing; and the ownership and operation of small businesses ~~not directly~~ **which may be** related to the member's MTU responsibilities.

4.6.1.1 Category III activities include owning and operating a small business outside of MTU in an area ~~not directly~~ **which may be** related to the member's MTU responsibilities or areas of expertise.

Senator Becky Christianson said that Section 4.6.3 would also have to be amended. This section reads in part "members must fully disclose proposed activities in writing to their immediate supervisors."

Barna said that this applies only to Category III activities, and the proposed amendments would eliminate this problem.

Cindy Selfe suggested removing the "not" from Section 4.6.1.1.

Bruch said that the "not" responds to the questions Walck is receiving from people who are engaged in such activities.

Dickie Selfe asked why people should be required to make such disclosures if they are already coming forward voluntarily.

Walck said that not everyone realizes that they should come forward; including this language in Proposal 2-03 would make this expectation clear.

Keen called for debate on the proposed amendment.

Williams suggested that the wording be changed to "which may or may not be related." She said that this would help to protect people who do not know that it is to their own benefit to disclose what they are doing, whether it is related to their activities at Michigan Tech or not.

Dickie Selfe said that people should be able to make this choice for themselves.

Bruch said that William's proposal would change the nature of the proposed amendment.

Keen said that the senate was engaged in a discussion as to whether the proposed amendment should be further changed.

Gregg said that Williams's proposal would reinclude those activities that are not related to the employee's responsibilities at Michigan Tech. He said that this was contrary to the general sense of the discussion.

Senator Beth Wagner said that activities not related to an employee's responsibilities at Michigan Tech could create a conflict of commitment even if they don't create a conflict of interest.

Gregg said that as currently worded, Proposal 2-03 could define any part-time job as a conflict of interest.

Walck said that this was already covered by Human Resources policies.

Dickie Selfe said that in that case, such situations did not need to be covered in Proposal 2-03.

Keen asked if there was any further discussion on the proposed amendment.

Cindy Selfe said that the proposed amendment did not address situations such as the one Bruch described because the business Bruch is engaged in is related to Michigan Tech, nor does it address where the university's rights and personal privacy conflict. Selfe said that she was not ready to yield her privacy to the university if her supervisor does not perceive any conflict of commitment or time.

Keen said that Michigan Tech currently has on the books an interim policy that is much worse than the policy described in Proposal 2-03. If the senate does not approve Proposal 2-03, Michigan Tech is stuck with a much worse conflict-of-interest policy.

Walck said that she would have to leave soon to administer an examination. She said that no one had brought these concerns to her attention prior to this meeting. She said that the COI policy does need to address small businesses that are not related to employees' responsibilities at Michigan Tech. She asked if the discussion could be tabled.

Keen said that discussion of the proposed amendment could be tabled.

Walck asked that people who have objections to the current wording of Proposal 2-03 work with her and the COI Committee to revise the proposal.

Cindy Selfe suggested adding a statement about privacy.

Keen called for a motion to table discussion of the proposed amendment to Proposal 2-03.

Senator Dana Johnson MOVED and Senator Steve Seidel seconded the motion to table Proposal 2-03 until the March 26 meeting. The motion to table PASSED on a voice vote.

8. NEW BUSINESS

Discussion of Letter Writing Campaign

Senator Cindy Selfe said that the senate should organize a letter-writing campaign about the university's financial situation.

Keen said that with the departure of one senator, the senate had lost its quorum and hence, could conduct no further business.

9. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:59 p.m. because the quorum was lost.

Respectfully submitted by Craig Waddell
Secretary of the University Senate