

# The University Senate of Michigan Technological University

To: Senators, Alternates, and Liaisons  
From: Robert Hutchinson, Senate President  
Date: March 6, 2024  
Subject: Agenda for University Senate Meeting #698  
Copies: President, Provost, Board of Trustees Secretary, Vice Presidents, Library, Staff Council Chair, *Tech Today*, Michigan Tech Lode

**Meeting #698** of the University Senate of Michigan Technological University will convene at 5:30 p.m. on **Wednesday, March 6, 2024 in DOW room 642.**

Senators are responsible for making their constituents aware of the agenda for this meeting. Senators who are unable to attend should arrange for their alternates to attend in their place.

Agenda	Time
<b>Call to Order</b>	
<b>Roll Call of Senators and Recognition of Visitors</b>	5
The quorum was met. Absents: Gerard Caneba, Ramy Al-Ganainy, Joel Neves, Carl Blair, Alexandra Morison, Jaroslaw Drelich, and Lindsey Wells.	
<b>Approval of Agenda</b>	2
The agenda was approved.	
<b>Approval of Minutes from Meeting</b>	5
Minutes from meeting #697 were approved.	
<b>Presentations</b>	20
a. AI Working Group Holly Hassel gave a presentation about the AI working group. They are identifying a workplace for AI as it is becoming popular for any workspace. The AI working group is available for any department. She asked the senators if their constituencies have been contacted, they contacted the working group. The working group is doing various activities such as building an online resource. They also asked for faculty feedback. The highest request was how to practice AI. Students also gave feedback, and they had some concerns about when they should use AI. Questions and Discussions: A question about subscription: the university doesn't have any AI subscription. A question was asked about the best practices of AI.	
<b>President's Report</b>	5
It is time to remind everybody, as you are going back to your units and looking at elections for next year for Senate representation. The senators are responsible for finishing the process within the department to find that representation. Reminder: next year we will be meeting during the daytime from 12:30 to 1:30 on Thursdays. Both Zoom and in-person attendance is permissible. The next announcement is that we have received a memorandum from the administration, from the president regarding calendars. One of the duties of the Senate is the approval of academic calendars, which we do through the AIPC. It was a perfunctory process until we approved the fall break, which has caused a lot of problems for institutions such as Rozsa.	

The point is that we have two years calendars out and then we have a provisional calendar, which is three years out. The only calendar that we may and can change is the provisional calendar. But any change should be approved before the deadline, that is March 31<sup>st</sup>.

## Committee Reports

10

- a. Academic and Instructional Policy – Chair Paniz Hazaveh  
They will present a proposal about ITF tonight.
- b. Administrative Policy – Chairs Jon Sticklen and Eric Seagren  
They are finishing the chair evaluation proposal.  
They will be working on a new proposal about chair search afterwards.
- c. Curricular Policy – Chair Paul Bergstrom  
They have passed all the proposals that they had on their agenda.
- d. Committee for Promoting and Facilitating Equity and Understanding –  
Chairs Lanrong Bi and Sangyoon Han  
They had a meeting with Laura Bulleit (Vice President for Student Affairs)  
regarding to the mental health proposal.  
They are reviewing a student survey pertinent to mental health.
- e. Elections – Chair Laura Fiss  
Please make sure that you initiate the process in your unit and think about  
officer elections. We need to have those people in play by April 17th,
- f. Finance and Institutional Planning – Chair Carl Blair  
Nothing to report.
- g. Fringe Benefits – Chair Patrice Cobin  
Nothing to report.
- h. Information Technology – Chair  
Nothing to report.
- i. Professional Staff Policy – Chair Christine Grotzke  
Nothing to report.
- j. Research Policy – Chair Kelsey Kocher  
Nothing to report.
- k. Ad Hoc Committee Reports
  - a. Ad-hoc Academic Calendar Committee  
Nothing to report.

## Unfinished Business

20

- a. [Proposal 4-24](#): “Establishment of a MS in Wildlife Ecology & Conservation  
Developed by College of Forest Resources and Environmental Science Graduate  
Studies Committee” Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units:  
Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.
- b. [Proposal 9-24](#): “Minor in Water Resource Recovery Technology” Presented by:  
Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.

- c. **TABLED [Proposal 11-24](#):** “Defining Digital Badges” Presented by:  
Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: All).  
The motion to untable the proposal was approved.  
A motion to make voting possible for all units was proposed. Rationale: the staff will be involved in this badging process. The motion was approved.  
Paul Bergstrom: It's not a specific degree proposal. This proposal serves as an umbrella from within which these digital badges can be offered by units. The edits that we have made since the last summit meeting are in this document that address some of the concerns raised in the last meeting. Digital badges are more akin to a course approval as opposed to a program or degree approval.  
So we added a statement saying that the badge badges would need to be approved by the unit's faculty led process, whatever that is. So each unit would have control of what evaluation process is approved by the unit's chair and or dean or supervisor. The role of the Provost Office in the evaluation is to make sure that the documentation is complete.  
A senator raised a concern that the proposal says the units approve a proposal for badging but doesn't say where the proposal comes from.  
We do allow for non-faculty badges in this proposal as it's currently.  
There was a concern that content that was developed for badges may not fall under the category that the board of trustees defines in policy 14.3 as scholarly work, which is content that the Board of Trustees cedes back to the instructor or the faculty member. So we added this content to recognize that anything that is related to the delivery of the badges in terms of content delivery would be recognized as the statement scholarly work as defined by the Board of Trustees policy.  
Many senators presented their support and criticism.  
Some amendments were made to the proposal on the senate proposal.  
Roll call vote: 18-Yes, 6-No, and 6-abstain.  
The proposal was approved.
- d. **[Proposal 12-24](#):** “Proposal to shelve a program - MS in Integrated Geospatial Technology (TGT)” Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.
- e. **[Proposal 13-24](#):** “Proposal to shelve a program - graduate certificate in Geospatial Data Science and Technology (CGDS)” Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.
- f. **[Proposal 15-24](#):** “Proposal to Shelve Graduate Certificate in Post-Secondary STEM Education” Presented by: Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.
- g. **[Proposal 16-24](#):** “Establishment of a New Graduate Certificate in Artificial Intelligence (AI) for Business Information Systems” Presented by:  
Curricular Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)  
Paul Bergstrom presented the proposal.  
The proposal was approved.

- a. [Proposal 6-24](#): “Proposal to Modify Sections 2.1 and Appendix L of the Faculty Handbook to Update Instructional Track Faculty Reappointment and Promotion Review” Presented by: Academic and Instructional Policy Committee (Voting Units: Academic)

Paniz Hazaveh introduced this proposal. The main points of the proposal are to update language for promotion and reviews for ITF and really serves to reduce paperwork and departmental workload for ITF faculty that have advanced to the higher ranks. For example, annual reviews won't be required after promotion to associate teaching. Nor will annual reviews be required for Professors of Practice after three years. Instead, formative performance evaluations will take place at least once every four years. This proposal also gives more job security to ITF after promotion.

### **Public Comments**

**10**

No public comments.

### **Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned.