

## **The University Senate of Michigan Technological University**

Date: 03/23/2022

Subject: Minutes for University Senate Meeting #672

Video recording of the meeting can be found here:

<https://huskycast.hosted.panopto.com/Panopto/Pages/Viewer.aspx?id=a58b6907-a25e-40ce-8d90-ae6200c03fb4>

Format: Online

Senate Officers: Sam Sweitz (President), Steve Knudstrup (Vice-President), Kette Thomas (Secretary), Ashley Buchanan (Senate Assistant)

---

President Sweitz called meeting 672 to order at 5:30pm.

Roll called by Secretary Thomas. Quorum met.

(Absentee list: Justin Casey, Susanne Kilpela, Courtney Archambeau, Lindsey Wells, Nicole Seigneurie, Quincy Higgins, Jessica Stormoen)

Motion made to approve agenda for meeting 672. Motion made to add the minutes from the previous meeting (671) to the agenda. Both motions approved.

Motion made to approve the minutes for meeting 671. Approved.

### **President's Report:**

Confirm the composition of the two ad hoc committees. Ad hoc committee to evaluate the structure and timing of Senate meetings: Jon Sticklen, Sam Sweitz, Ashley Buchanan; Ad hoc Committee to update the Senate Constitution and Bylaws: Lindsey Wells, Sam Sweitz, Paige Short, Ashley Buchanan. Move to approve by acclamation. Membership of committees are approved.

### **Committee Reports:**

Elections Committee Report, presented by Carl Blair.

Received nominations for all positions. There is an opportunity to nominate self or others. Will proceed as is.

Point of order: There should be an opportunity at the April 6 meeting.

Question: Senate officers?

Response: Yes.

### **Unfinished Business:**

- Presented by: Administrative Policy Committee (Voting Units: Full Senate)
  - a. Proposal 17-22: "Institutional Compliance Standard Changes to Senate Procedure 803.1.1: Senate Search Procedures for the Dean of the Graduate School"
  - b. Proposal 18-22: "Institutional Compliance Standard Changes to Senate Procedure 801.1.1: Senate Search Procedures for University Administrators"
  - c. Proposal 26-22: "Institutional Compliance Standard Changes to Senate Procedure 802.1.1: Senate Search Procedures for Deans of Colleges"

Motion made to postpone all three proposals until April 6. Explanation delivered for the postponement.

Question: Will the proposal that is to be the fourth part of the “set” be ready on April 6?

Response: Yes.

Move to postpone was approved.

- Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)

d. Proposal 30-22: “Elimination of Shelved Programs”

Motion made to accept proposal. Approved.

### **New Business:**

- Presented by: Academic and Instructional Policy (Voting Units: Academic), Tim Scarlett.

a. Proposal 14-22: “Proposal on the Scheduling of Examinations, Projects, Presentations, and Papers on Election Day”

Question: Has there been exploration of getting a polling place on campus?

Response: We are exploring the possibility at the Rozsa. We are trying to get a polling place established here.

Concern raised over large section of weekly labs.

- Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic), Paul Bergstrom

b. Proposal 27-22: “Proposal to Modify Senate Policy 413.1: Accelerated Master’s Programs”

Question: What can’t the accelerated Masters meet the number of credits?

Response: Concerns over the ability to double count undergraduate credits.

- Presented by: Academic and Instructional Policy Committee and The Ad hoc Committee on Textbook Accessibility and Affordability (Voting Units: Academic), Timothy Scarlett

c. Proposal 31-22: “Establishment of an Accessible & Affordable Course Materials University Standing Committee”

Clarification made that this is not a Senate standing committee but a University standing committee.

Further clarification was made.

Questions: If this is a University standing committee, why is the voting unit academic only?

Response: It was presented to the Senate by the Provost’s office in this way.

Follow up was made that since there are people on the committee who are not academic, is it appropriate to limit the voting block?

Clarification made by Nora Allred, Chair of the Committee, that it will be open to all going forward.

Question: Does this strictly fall under academic programs or does it fall into another category, more gray?

Response: Yes, it is gray, as it affects a number of people and areas.

Question: Will this committee monitor and assess. What are the limitations for individual units?

Response: It will not affect individual units. It does not set policy; it is advisory.

Clarification made about the charge of the committee. Intellectual freedoms are unaffected.

- Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic), Paul Bergstrom

d. Proposal 33-22: “Establishment of a New Graduate Certificate in Automation and Controls in Mechatronic Systems”

e. Proposal 35-22: “Establishment of a New Graduate Certificate in Industrial Robotics”

Question: What has occurred with 34-22?

Response: Structural issues that will, hopefully, be resolved for the next Senate meeting.

Question: Are we to vote on these together?

Response: At this time, there is not a reason they need to be together. These are ready.

Concerns raised that people understand the three proposals fit together as a stackable Masters.

Response: That is correct.

Discussion about how to vote on the proposals.

President Sweitz offers to check on the situation to make sure it is not an issue to vote on the two ready proposals, followed by the third, 34-22.

- Presented by: Academic and Instructional Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic), Tim Scarlett.

f. Proposal 39-22: “Amending the Scheduling of Spring Break in Senate Procedure 101.1”

Question: Concern that our semester starts earlier than other universities. Recommends postponing the start of the semester until a more appropriate date so that Spring Break falls at the same time as other schools.

Clarification made about policy regarding dates. Clarification made about the difference between changing semester dates and recommending different timing for Spring break.

Concern that the break is not in alignment with the public schools.

Considerable discussion around faculty and staff with children and alignment with schools.

Question: why is this an academic issue if it affects both faculty and staff?

Response: This is how it was presented but there is a good point in these concerns.

Recommendation made to bring these issues up when discussing amendments in unfinished business.

Argument made to open it up to All Units.

Question: How do staff Senators discuss this with their constituents, given they are currently not permitted to vote?

Response: Reassure constituents that the voting will likely change because of positive feedback.

Recommendation made to do a sense of the Senate vote.

Point of Order made that it is not legal to do so.

Question: What do USG and GSG think of this proposal?

Response: From Davi Sprague, the USG has not seen this yet, but in support from a mental health perspective.

Comments from Nathan Ford, GSG Representative. Largest concern is that our Spring Break align with other Universities

- Presented by: Fringe Benefits Committee (Voting Units: Full Senate), Greg Waite

g. Proposal 40-22: “Improved Access to Health and Wellness Programs/Activities”

Questions: From Sue Kerry. SDC at max capacity serving students. Students are requesting student-only time. To make SDC free for faculty, we would have to expand. We also charge students, so how would we justify making SDC free for employees. What would happen to the revenue we receive to maintain greater usage. Also, point of clarification, we cannot make a fee mandatory for all employees. Also, How can we incentivize greater engagement with healthcare?

Response: There wasn't an intention that this would be mandatory for all employees. There are ways to create incentives without the cumbersome paperwork.

Comment: The number of faculty and staff that go to the SDC are too low for student-only time. It also sends the wrong message. In addition, the equipment needs significant improvements.

Questions: Who is going to decide between these three proposals?

Response: The Senate is advisory on this. Fringe Benefits Committee would have to submit their work to the CFO or some other decision-making body.

Question: Will options like access to trails continue to be available?

Response: None.

Concerns raised about mental health assistance, rather than physical health.

Concerns raised about costs and limits for people who cannot pay certain amount upfront.

- Presented by: Ad-hoc Committee to Update the Senate Constitution and Bylaws (Voting Units: Full Senate), Lindsey Wells.

h. Proposal 41-22: "Amendments to the University Senate Constitution"

i. Proposal 42-22: "Amendments to the University Senate Bylaws"

Further clarification and definitions made about the presentation.

Clarification made that the constituency has to approve Constitutional changes by a simple majority but two-thirds majority vote by the Senate.

**Public Comments:**

Announcement about Graduate Research Colloquium.

**Adjourned.**



**For staff matters:**  
**Other:**

**8 of 15**  
**1/2 of eligible**

**Visitors:**

Dan Fuhrmann

Jackie Huntoon

Katie Torrey

Andrew Storer

Sue Kerry

Will Cantrell

Theresa Coleman-Kaiser