The University Senate
of Michigan Technological University

Minutes of Meeting 480
14 October 2009

Synopsis:
The Senate:

- Heard and discussed a report from Vice President Reed and Renee Hiller of the Benefits Office on the new health and retirement benefits

1. Call to order and roll call. President Rudy Luck called the University Senate Meeting 480 to order at 5:31 pm on Wednesday, October 14, 2009. The Senate Secretary Marilyn Cooper called roll. Absent were Senators Solomon and Vogler and representatives of Army/Air Force ROTC, Civil and Environmental Engineering, Visual and Performing Arts, and Admissions.

2. Recognition of visitors. Guests included Max Seel (Provost), Dave Reed (Vice President for Research), Karen Hext (Benefits), Renee Hiller (Benefits), Ellen Horsch (Vice President for Administration), David Chard (BLG), and Joseph Herbig (BLG).

3. Approval of agenda. Snyder **moved** that a new item be inserted in the agenda to consider conducting a survey of Senate constituency on changes in total compensation; L. Davis seconded the motion; and it **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

Storer **moved** approval of the amended agenda; Hamlin seconded the motion; and it **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

4. Presentation: Michigan Tech's Health Benefits, by David Reed and Renee Hiller

Reed said they will be talking about changes in the total compensation package, including health and retirement benefits and salaries. He reviewed the background of the changes, especially noting the first goal of the strategic plan (to "attract and support a world-class and diverse faculty, staff, and student population") which led to the formation of the Compensation Strategy Task Force which was charged to make philosophical and tactical recommendations on the structure of total compensation and to benchmark with organizations the University competes with for talented faculty and staff. Part of the charge was that changes to compensation structure should be cost-neutral to the institution and maintain total employee compensation. He noted that in FY07 Michigan Tech's fringe rate was 42.4 percent, approximately 7 percent above the median of peer and competitor institutions. Michigan Tech's average faculty salary in FY07, across all ranks and disciplines, according to the Oklahoma State Salary Survey, was 6.7 percent lower than the average at our peer institutions.

Luck asked whether the low average faculty salary was primarily due to very low salaries for faculty in arts and sciences. Reed said no, this is a weighted number by discipline. It is true that the disciplines where we are farthest below are in the sciences and arts. He asked Provost Seel about this, and Seel said that what's fair to say is that the full professors are furthest below, and then the associate professors, but the assistant professors are getting close to the average.

Mullins said that a presentation to the Senate by Martha Sloan in January 2008 showed completely different numbers for the comparison of salaries with our peer institutions. It said that salaries for assistant professors were 13.5 percent lower. He said he checked with the peer institutions' websites and believes the numbers are correct. The difference was three times higher than the numbers presented by Reed. Reed said that the numbers Sloan used were from the AAUP survey which doesn't distinguish by disciplines but by rank.

Mullins said that the 6.7 percent difference Reed presented is from the Oklahoma State Salary Survey and thus is not a comparison with peer institutions, as Reed stated, but with all division institutions, so that's not a fair comparison.

Reed reviewed the Compensation Task Force findings: that starting salaries are in line with peer institutions, but the University is failing to keep up with salaries for full and associate professors and for professional staff salaries, particularly for more senior positions. The Task Force also found that the fringe benefit package offered by Michigan Tech is better and more expensive than all peer and competitor universities examined.

Mullins said that he talked with the Vice President for Human Resources at Colorado School of Mines, and the employee premium there for health care for any employee with or without families is $0. The university contribution to retirement is 13.2 percent. He asked in exactly what way Michigan Tech's fringe benefits are better than those at the Colorado School of Mines, which is a clear peer institution.

Reed said that the figures we were using were FY07 fringe rates, and that it's difficult to compare the details of various benefits plans.

Needham said that if our salaries are lower and our fringe benefit rate is higher, then our fringe benefit package could be the same as everyone else's but the percentage could be higher because our salaries are less. We could solve this problem by just paying us all more and then our fringe benefit rate would be less.

Mullins said that our fringe benefit package is not better than those of our peer institutions. Reed disagreed.

L. Davis asked if the task force has looked at cost of benefit per employee. He suggested that "costly" would be a more informative term than "expensive," because cost can be measured. Also "better" can not be measured. Reed said he would not dispute that.

Mullins asked if "expensive" is measured by cost per contract or total cost. Reed said that in this context, "expensive" would mean per dollar of salary.

L. Davis asked whether we can get a calculation of cost per employee at Michigan Tech. Horsch said that Dana Johnson, who is on the BLG, has asked for a cost per employee and a cost per contract, and we are getting that data together. L. Davis asked whether we can get that information for other institutions. Horsch said we can try. Herbig said it's difficult to compare that from institution to institution because it depends on the percentage of employees that are covered by their health insurance and other factors. Horsch asked if Davis is asking just for health benefits, and he said yes. Hamlin said health and retirement. Horsch said that retirement benefits vary widely from university to university and are difficult to compare.

Luck asked Mullins whether the statement from the Task Force that the fringe benefits package offered by Michigan Tech was better than that offered by all peer institutions was false with regard to Colorado School of Mines. Mullins said yes. Horsch said that the Task Force report was based on the fringe benefits package of FY07, and in 2008 when the report was written it was a true statement. She asked whether the fringes other than retirement and health care are different at Colorado School of Mines than at Michigan Tech. Mullins said that all the other benefits are very similar to those at Michigan Tech.

Reed acknowledged that "better" is a subjective term, and it depends on what your values are. Mullins said that "expensive" is also a problematic term. Price per contract or price per employee or price per salary dollars are much more informative numbers. Reed said that "expensive" means per dollar of salary.

Reed reviewed the recommendations of the Compensation Task Force to the BLG: increasing employee flexibility and choice so faculty and staff could customize salary and benefit packages; reducing Michigan Tech's fringe benefit rate to 34-36 percent while being cost-neutral to the University and without impacting total compensation to employees, which would require shifting compensation from benefits to salary; education for employees regarding the consequences of their choices.

Cooper asked whether the phrase "without impacting total compensation to employees" meant in the aggregate or for individuals. Reed said it is in the aggregate. Cooper noted that the changes do impact total compensation to poorly paid faculty and staff.

Mullins commented that the Task Force charge to the BLG doesn't show much vision. He said that he asked the Vice President at the Colorado School of Mines how they were able to offer heath insurance to faculty and their spouses at $0 premium and $100 deductible. The Vice President said that a previous administrator had a vision, that by teaming together with other small universities in Colorado they could create a bigger risk pool and get greatly reduced rates and become smart consumers of heath care. Their point was not that individual employees need to be smart consumers of health care, but that primarily the universities need to be smart consumers. The trust had much more leverage; they only had to hire one consultant; and they have one plan. Instead of doing the expedient thing of cut, cut, cut, they've done the smart thing. There is a coalition too in Michigan, the Michigan Universities Coalition on Health (MUCH). Hiller said that we are a part of that and there is a pool, but not all universities participate in it because they have a standard plan, and we don't have a standard plan in terms of the benefits we cover. Reed said that the Task Force believed that employees need flexibility and need to be informed. Mullins said he would like to see the administration look at alternatives such as a consortium or trust. He said that Mike Doherty (the Vice President at Colorado he was talking to), who was also previously benefits manager at Missouri, Rolla, said that if not today, then next year it's not going to be possible for small universities to go it on their own especially if they are self-insured.

Smith asked which peer institutions were being used in the Task Force report. Reed said they are listed in the report. Smith said that when you compare the fringe benefits rate, that is a ratio and when it's a ratio you need to know both the denominator and the numerator so we need the salaries for those schools too. Reed said yes, and the Senate could get them. Hamlin said that if you normalize on salary our fringe rate goes from 42.7 percent to 38.8, so it's right in with our peers. Smith said those figures are from the Oklahoma Study, not a comparison with our peers, and peers change from time to time.

Reed introduced Hiller to present the changes in the total compensation package for 2010. Hiller said she would be giving a general overview of the changes, not the details, which will covered in the forums starting on Monday. She reviewed the formation and composition of the BLG, and its philosophy, to be "a shared responsibility on cost containment/reduction with University employees and communities." Starting in 2001, the BLG's goal was to "shift employees from unaccountable consumers into the role of informed consumers with the tools to plan and manage their own health care." Mullins pointed out that "unaccountable consumers" is a rather condescending term. Hiller continued summarizing the goals: to emphasize prevention and effective health management; to move from paternalism to individual accountability; to assure the flexibility to meet the needs of a diverse workforce; and to provide comprehensive protection to the seriously ill. She also reviewed the charges from the BLG and the Compensation Task Force presented by Reed earlier.

She then reviewed the changes put into effect last year and observed that the result was that the fringe rate was lowered to 42.6 percent. She said that moving from Blue Cross to Aetna is not what is costing employees more out-of-pocket expenses; this is caused by Michigan Tech changing its health care plan.

Hiller reported that the BLG recommendations for 2010 are to continue the two employee health care plans (PPO and HSA); to increase the premium cost share on the PPO from 10 percent to 15 percent; to continue the University HSA contribution of $750 for a single and $1500 for a family; to increase the out-of-pocket maximum on the HSA to $3000 for a single and $6000 for a family (an increase of $500 on a single and $1000 on a family); to retain the dental/vision coverage but to implement a 10 percent premium cost share on HuskyCare Dental/Vision 2 and implement a core buy-up plan on HuskyCare Dental/Vision 1, which is 10 percent plus the difference between the two plans in terms of the value. For example, for a single on the Dental/Vision 2, the rate next year will be $5 (the full premium is $45). On the Dental/Vision 1, it will be $5 plus the difference between the full premium, which is $9, so it will be $14.

Onder asked about the out-of-pocket maximum on HSAs when spouses are both employees; they are considered families, but they should be offered the individual limit. Hiller said that the HSA is a high-deductible health plan and it is regulated by the IRS, so we cannot impose an individual limit. Onder said so families who are both working at Michigan Tech are being penalized for being families. Hiller said they are not penalized because there is a choice between the PPO and the HSA, and most families in that situation did go to the PPO.

Other health care changes include: S-rider coverage will be discontinued for new enrollees (those already covered will be continued) and there will be an increase in the monthly premium to those already covered from $250 to $350; the $65 S-rider charge on the HSA plan will be eliminated; and because of the Mental Health Parity law just signed, mental health benefits changes must mirror changes in health benefits, so there will no longer be limits on mental heath benefits.

Snyder asked if the single-parent penalty has been eliminated. Hiller said yes, it was changed during the open enrollment period last year, and it's the same for next year.

Caneba asked about the complaints about the implementation by Aetna, for example the lag in payments. Hiller said we have tried to resolve them with Aetna directly, and they are getting fewer. People with individual issues should contact the Benefits Office.

Onder questioned the costs encountered with Aetna in contrast to those with Blue Cross, which seem to be outrageously higher for the same procedures.

Hiller said it depends on what you're comparing. If you're talking about the bills you receive, that's due to the change in plan. But if you're talking about the provider discounts, differences do exist, but on aggregate Blue Cross and Aetna are comparable.

Scarlett asked if the Benefits Office is doing any study of or compiling lists of problems people have been experiencing. Hiller said that some providers bill services differently and that the Benefits Office has resolved some of those problems.

L. Davis said that we are still self-insured: we aren't buying insurance from Blue Cross or Aetna; they are just processing the claims. So the Benefits Office or whoever is in charge still has the ability to pay for these things. If someone comes to the Benefits Office and says I think this should be paid, you do have the ability to do that. Hiller said that we do still have the flexibility to do that. We do have an appeals committee (three individuals) that decides what things should be paid for.

The BLG recommendations for changes in the retirement plans are to offer two choices to replace the current Defined Contribution Program: a plan in which the University contributes 5 percent with optional matching program up to an additional 5 percent for both the University and the employee linked to a 2 percent salary adjustment; or an optional matching program up to 7.5 percent matching for both University and employee (no base) linked to a 4.5 percent salary adjustment.

Mullins asked what happened to the 2.55 percent salary adjustment recommended by the BLG. Reed said that the BLG did recommend a 2.55 percent salary adjustment, but that would have resulted in around a $300,000 cost increase to the University, so it's obviously not cost-neutral. When it was lowered to 2 percent it met the charge to the Compensation Strategy Task Force and the BLG. Mullins said that the salary adjustment was meant to offset pre-tax dollars versus post-tax dollars. Reed said that there are lots of different ways to calculate these ratios: it depends on your tax structure, your deductions, and such factors. Mullins asked if the BLG did recommend 2.55 percent, and Reed said yes. In response to a question from Storer, Hiller also clarified that the second retirement plan was not recommended by the BLG; it was brought to them for discussion.

Fick asked if one can change from one to another retirement plan from year to year. Hiller said no, the choice you make is irrevocable. You can change the match you make, but you cannot change between plans.

L. Davis asked what will be offered to new employees. Hiller said that has not been decided. L. Davis asked what the tax implications are of these two plans. Herbig said it depends on the individual situation. Davis said he wasn't asking about the rate, but about what is subject to tax and what is not. Hiller said that any contribution you get from Michigan Tech and any contribution you put in is not taxable. The only way it will affect the supplemental retirement plans is that whatever you put into this plan, you have to consider into the max on your supplemental 403b. Davis said so that will reduce your supplemental contributions if you're already at max.

Mullins asked what the driving force behind each of these recommendations is. Hiller said it is to reduce the fringe benefit rate. Reed said that the projection is that the fringe rate would decrease to 39.8 percent with the 5-5-5, and would decrease to 37.4 percent with the 0-7.5-7.5, but that's if 100 percent of the people picked the second plan.

Hamlin said that we're getting a permanent solution to the wrong problem. He said he is uncomfortable with a lot of these initial conditions and boundary conditions that were applied, and that he hates to see this permanent solution applied when he truly believes that the initial assumptions were incorrect.

Mullins said that there's an implication that our fringe to salary ratio is bad, but the reason is that our salaries are too low. This is not going to significantly impact our research competitiveness in terms of our fringe rate. He said he still doesn't see what's so bad about our fringe to salary ratio when our salaries are clearly so low.

Herbig said that it addresses an overall philosophy of consumer choice. Hamlin asked then why they have not left the third choice available and keep the 10.55 and 2 percent for those who want to contribute more to their retirement.

Reed said that what is driving the recommendations is the University's ability to attract and retain world-class faculty and staff.

L. Davis said that if you want to attract the best people you need to provide them with compensation that will raise the maximum increase in their personal wealth or income without knowing or taking into account all the things we can't know about their individual financial situations. These changes are probably cost-neutral to the University, but we really don't know what they are doing to the value of the compensation of the individual employee; it may be decreasing or increasing. So this may be counterproductive.

Reed said that when the Task Force talked to department chairs, they got anecdotal stories about potential hires turning down our offers because all they looked at was salaries, while we offered higher benefits. Davis said there is selection bias in those reports. But he said he is having a hard time understanding why we're making changes when we don't know what the results are. From a management perspective, it's hard to see that this is a wise policy. It seems like we are making a change because of symptoms without exploring all the potential ramifications. There was at one time a book circulating in the higher administration about unintended consequences, and it would seem that this is a good case of where there might be unintended consequences. He said he also thinks the comment about salaries is valid.

Reed said that Davis would be mistaken if he believes that the BLG and Reed did not spend a lot of time thinking about this. He said that he has run all kinds of salary levels through spread sheets, and that he doesn't think that most faculty would be worse off. L. Davis said that the Senate also represents staff, so we have a responsibility to them. He asked what scenarios Reed ran. Reed said he looked at faculty making over $50,000. Horsch said that we will offer a variety of scenarios at the forums. Hiller said that the BLG as a group has considered all levels of salaries.

Snyder said that the people who are at the lowest salary levels are going to be in the worst position to make the matching contributions. It's just like the changes we had last year in the health care plan; the people who were most negatively impacted were at the low end of the salary schedules. Luck said that he concurred, and that to declare the proposed 4.5 percent raise as an equal compensatory policy could only be found in an Orwellian nightmare.

Mullins said that there's nothing more ephemeral than a salary adjustment. It wasn't that many years ago that we had a 4.5 percent salary take-back. We have not had TIAA-CREF contribution take-backs. And given hard economic times, a 2 percent salary adjustment ten years down the line could evaporate in a heartbeat.

Christianson asked whether the changes last year in the health care plans have succeeded in containing costs for FY09. Hiller said that so far, it has; we are on budget. We won't know until the end of the year. We will know better after a year or two.

Moran asked if the point of this presentation is informational about what is going to happen or a proposal that you're looking for input to modify. Hiller said the presentation is informational. Moran asked if there is a salary adjustment tied to the health care plan. Hiller said no.

Fernandez said that basically the new plans have transferred the risk onto the individual with the assumption that being individualistic is better than being paternalistic. He asked if they have priced the potential rises in health care costs and how this will affect employees costs. He said that the recent crisis proves that individuals are not the best at managing their retirement and health care decisions. He asked whether the motivation is just a willy-nilly move toward options and choice without looking at the effects of that policy. Horsch said that we started in 2001 with this philosophy; we wanted our employees to look at their options and be more informed. The HSA came about because we want the employees to be able to work with their providers to help us save money. The HSA is not a short-term solution; it is a long-term solution. What other companies are doing is creating wellness incentives to put more money into the HSA account. The BLG is looking into that for next year. Fernandez said it's true that the net effect is that people are being much more careful about what they're spending. He said he hopes to see much more preventive efforts, and that he's curious to see what the enrollment next year will be in the HSA.

Mullins asked about the possibility of doing more cooperative health care with other institutions. Hiller said that she is on the board of MUCH, but that we would have to go to a standard plan in order to take advantage of that type of co-op. For example, we cover massage therapy, but that's not standard and we couldn't continue to cover that. Herbig said that up until this year, there were only 4 of the 14 universities in MUCH that found it cost beneficial to pool into MUCH, though now 4 more have joined the coalition. Hiller said there are only 3 that don't participate. Mullins said that he would encourage the administration to make this a priority to see if this is possible. Herbig said that MUCH reviews every university's plans every year to see if they have crossed a threshold where it would be beneficial for them to come into this plan.

Koszykowski asked whether, for employees like him who are on soft money, if they take the 4.5 percent salary increase, they have to work 4.5 percent less at the end of the year, and could they charge a lower benefit rate. Reed said we will charge a lower benefit rate, but we don't know yet how that will split. He said that we talked with sponsors last year and they said that as long as the salary and fringe benefits total remains the same, it's okay.

Hiller showed the list of open enrollment forums between October 14 November 24. Open enrollment will be online, and it starts November 1 and runs through November 25.

Moran asked whether once you choose a salary increase, that's it, a one shot deal. Hiller said yes.

Storer said he had a question from a blogger who wanted to know, if we are emphasizing prevention, why our plans don't cover flu shots. Hiller said that our plans don't cover flu shots and they haven't in the past; no adult immunizations are covered.

Smith said that employees hired in the last two to four years that he has talked to say they came here for the health care benefits and now they feel betrayed. These are employees who will help us get to a world-class faculty. Particularly those with families were quite angry about the changes last year, angry enough that some are looking for jobs elsewhere. He said he did a quick and dirty analysis that showed that last year's changes were a transfer from the lower end of the salary range to the higher range; it was a major transfer, not just low salaries that were impacted. And while the fringe benefits came down, we should take into account that there are some very angry employees.

Allen asked whether, if we joined a consortium with a standard plan, since we are self-insured, we could choose to augment the standard plan. Hiller said that the best plan, that gives the best rates, would have to be a standard plan. Hamlin asked if we couldn't we go with the cheaper plan through a co-op and add our own benefits such as for massage therapy or flu shots. Horsch said that would entail costs, and the effect of a consortium would be gone. Herbig said the savings from joining a consortium are all in administrative fees. Hiller said that also our provider discounts are lower here than they are downstate.

Moran said that given how fast the health care situation is changing nationally and given that no one likes their health care provider and given that we are a university, not a health care company, he would suggest the BLG monitor an exit strategy for getting Michigan Tech out of the self-insured business.

Scarlett asked if one of the forums could be scheduled on a weekend.
Hiller said maybe. Hamlin asked whether some of the forums could be individually targeted as suggested last year. Hiller said she thought that wouldn't be an effective use of the Benefits Office time. Hamlin said that audience questions would be not so repetitive if that were done. Horsch said she thought focused forums could be done.

Luck showed a chart that allows a calculation of how the changes would affect a range of salaries. A projection shows that if you are making $80,000, the new retirement plans would result in your receiving an additional $9,790 over the next 20 years. He said that the change in the retirement plans is not worth debating as it is basically neutral and the big problem is with health care. Michigan Tech's expenditures on health care have risen from $9 million in 2001 to $15 million in 2009; as a percentage of overall expenditures, health care expenditures have risen from 5.6 percent to 7.7 percent.

L. Davis and Storer questioned the assumptions and figures in the spread sheet, but Luck said his point was just that health care is way more important than the changes in the retirement plans. So it is reasonable to see whether if we link up with some other health care provider we could get better coverage for the money.

Snyder **moved** that the University Senate conduct a survey of its constituency regarding the recently proposed changes in total compensation; the motion was seconded by Boschetto-Sandoval. Snyder offered four possible questions for the survey but stipulated that the final wording of the questions be left to the Senate executive committee. Questions concerned the opinion of employees about whether the old schedule of contributions to retirement be retained, whether the proposed changes in total compensation will be beneficial in attracting and retaining faculty and staff, what effect the proposed changes will have on employees' financial position, and whether faculty have confidence that the proposed changes are in the best long-term interest of the University.

Luck said that the floor was open for discussion of whether this should be considered an emergency proposal.

Rouleau asked whether the Benefits Office will take our opinion into consideration, or whether the changes are set in stone. Snyder said that as faculty and staff, we can decide to express our opinion or not. If we don't express our opinion, that's saying something. He stated that this is not a survey to evaluate the performance of the President; it is a survey to assess the opinion of the faculty and staff on the changes in the total compensation package.

The consideration of this proposal as an emergency proposal **passed** on a voice vote with no dissent.

Moran proposed an additional question: I would prefer the University pay me $12,000 more and I get my own health insurance, yes or no.

Storer proposed an additional question for faculty only: the proposed change in total benefits would make it either more likely that faculty would unionize or less likely that the faculty would unionize or have no effect. L. Davis said professional staff should be included in that question too. Mullins and Snyder supported adding the question about unionization.

Allen said that he didn't understand how the survey would express any opinion. It will be a self-selected subset who answers it, and most people won't understand the changes enough to be able to answer any of these questions. He said he didn't understand what we hope to achieve by the survey. L. Davis said that if we don't get a better response rate than we do on the Presidential evaluation, you could say that, but if we get a 60-70 percent response rate, we will have meaningful results. Allen asked if we have ever gotten a 60-70 percent response rate on a survey. Davis said that on at least two occasions in the past we have gotten almost an 100 percent response rate.

Caneba asked about the timeline for the survey. Snyder suggested that the survey be sent out next week with the response due the following week.

Moran **moved** that we delay the survey until after the open enrollment period, so that people will realize that the survey won't affect the plan, and so that they will be better informed; Wood seconded the motion. Storer suggested that we use the time frame Snyder suggested because it will get people thinking about the changes more, focusing more on the fact that this is a big issue. The motion to delay the survey was **defeated** on a voice vote.

Storer asked whether the additional questions could be considered as friendly amendments to the motion. Snyder said that the motion clearly states that the questions proposed are just suggested questions, and if the Senate executive committee decides that it would be appropriate to add a question about whether the changes would make unionization more likely that would be entirely consistent with the purpose of the survey. Allen commented that the motion is that a survey will be sent out, but we don't know what the wording is. Snyder said this is where you trust the Senate officers. Luck said the Senate executive committee will discuss the survey on email and something in keeping with the essence of this survey will be distributed if the motion passes.

Smith said that surveys should be treated with a little more respect. We need to have someone who knows about surveys help compile it. The purpose is to get an opinion very quickly, so it needs to be as short and clean as possible.

Luck said that after the executive committee has made their suggestions, we will ask the elections committee to vet the survey.

Moran asked if the purpose or the survey is to gather opinions or raise awareness or both. And if the purpose is to gather opinions, who are we offering these opinions to? And do they want to hear them? Luck said that he would find it hard to believe there would be someone who would welcome an increase in health benefits costs, so in that sense the survey is set up to prove a point that should be obvious. Snyder objected, saying that who's going to pay the increases is a non trivial issue. The purpose of the survey is both informational and to raise awareness. The administration needs to know if their faculty and staff are largely dissatisfied with their proposed actions, and the BOC presumably would be interested in the results as well. Moran said that perhaps we should ask the administrators here whether they would be interested in these questions or if they have other questions they would prefer. Snyder said that we don't answer as a Senate to the administration; we are here to represent our constituents. If the administration wanted to gather information they could have gathered it before this all started. The administration had no indication of gathering any information except from the BLG which is a very carefully selected group of individuals. Moran asked if then this is for our own purposes. Snyder agreed.

The motion **passed** on a voice vote with some dissent.

10. Adjournment. Hamlin **moved** that the meeting be adjourned; Storer seconded the motion; and President Luck adjourned the meeting at 7:25 pm.

Respectfully submitted
by Marilyn Cooper
Secretary of the University Senate