
SREC Meeting Minutes

January 19, 2023, Thursday, 12:30pm to 2:00pm

Zoom Link: <https://uky.zoom.us/j/82053317336>

AGENDA

I. Minutes

- The SREC approved by unanimous consent the circulated draft minutes for the December 8, 2022 meeting ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))

II. Announcements

- Notice of Action Item to SC: As per SREC decision at December meeting, Brown sent the recommendation to SC Office that Senate codify new SREC formal asterisk (“*”) interpretation regarding repeat option for grad students. ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- Posting SR Rules Update re: Grade Points: As per SREC decision at December meeting, Michael and Grossman articulated language for the SR glossary (Sec. 9) for terms: “Grade Points”, “Grade Point Average”, and “Quality Points”. Brown sent those clarifying updates to Sheila to post as ongoing SR updates. ([PDF](#))
- Election Leadership: Brown is (still) looking to train Election Subcommittee members or other SREC members on how to run one or more of these elections or carry out these election duties. Brown proposes to train this spring and hand off oversight for next year. Division of duties: 1) Academic Council elections, 2) apportionment, and 3) trustee election.
- SR Section 4 Updates: SC is looking at updates to SR Section 4. SC has done one review ([here](#)). The proposal will next go to Senate for a first and second review (January and February). Then, SC will send the Senate / SC intent to SREC for suggestions. Final voting should happen at the March Senate meeting.
- Catalog versus Bulletin Update. As per SREC decision at December meeting, Jones contacted the various ‘specialty catalog’ owners (e.g., College of Medicine) and is gathering information on what do they want the Senate Rules to call their corresponding document(s). After that, we would advise the Registrar about our website design ideas (e.g., see draft mock-up [here](#)) and then bring back to SREC a track changes proposal to codify the editorially clarified nomenclature into the SRs. Jones noted that he’d heard back from three colleges, and is awaiting a fourth.
- Putting SRs Online. The SREC agreed at its December meeting that Brown would contact UK CIO Brian Nichols to ask about putting the SRs in Javascript online (e.g., [here](#)). Also: [email info](#), [discussion](#), and [Q&A](#). Roger hasn’t (yet) contacted Brian Nichols.

III. Trustee Election

- Proposed draft timeline for election ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- As per SREC 2022 (Spring) discussions, endorse several changes from past practices:
 - UK Communication Resources. Update policy on Use of UK Communication Resources
 - Current policy posted with proposed track changes ([PDF](#))
 - Proposed version with changes accepted ([PDF](#))
 - Election Statement. In election communications and on election ballots, link to a candidate statement / bio sketch (i.e., single PDF document of any size or design) instead of linking to UK

department faculty webpage. This is to give all candidates the same opportunities to craft their messaging. It seems allowed by the rules ([JPG](#)). Each ballot would still include the college and unit affiliation, but without a live URL link.

- [Election Website](#). Update the Preliminary Voting Round website to include each candidates' "Unit" affiliation and a link to their campaign statements / bio sketch. See mock-up here ([JPG](#)). This is already the format for the final ballot website ([JPG](#)).
 - [Voter Lists to Candidates](#). Provide all candidates in the preliminary and final election rounds with a spreadsheet containing the names, email addresses, college affiliations, and unit affiliations for all eligible voters. We did this last year for the final round after learning about campaigning strategies during the preliminary round. It was clear from the preliminary round that (1) candidates wanted to message voters and (2) candidates were looking for creative ways to do that. Plus, any candidate can get all the voter information via an open records request. And, we did not notice excessive email blasts to everyone. Finally, voter participation was the highest ever ([JPG](#)).
 - [Update Provisional Ballots](#). The preliminary ([PDF](#)) and final ([PDF](#)) provisional ballots can be used if "an error has been made in determining his/her eligibility to vote". We will update these provisional ballots and allow them to be use if a faculty member (Petitioner) "is unable to vote because of a voter system malfunction or because an error has been made in determining the Petitioner's eligibility to vote." Here are the [draft](#) track change documents for the preliminary ([PDF](#)) and final ([PDF](#)) provisional ballots.
 - [Host Debate / Q&A / Meet and Greet with Candidates](#). The staff trustee requires candidates to participate in a public debate (see [here](#)). The SREC (S22) thought this would be a good idea, but we can't do it unless we get more resources.
 - [Coordinate Announcements with UKNow](#). In 2019, UKnow published an announcement related to the UK Staff Senate that (1) announced the start of the voting period and (2) identified the incumbent candidate with a large picture. See [here](#). It turns out that the incumbent candidate was the only candidate, but Roger will check with to confirm with UKnow anyway. UKnow often does announce the start of the final election period.
- The SREC concurred with establishment of the above practices for the upcoming Faculty Trustee election.

Updates to SRs to Review and Approve or Not

- Final Proposed Sheila Brothers (SC Office) List of Mid-year Omnibus Rules Updates
 - Description / list of changes in SC Office draft ([PDF](#))
 - Track changes in SC Office draft ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
 - Jones list of proposed changes to SC draft ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
 - Brown's and Grossman's proposed changes to SC draft ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))

The SREC received from Sheila Brothers (SC Office) a draft of a 'Mid-year Omnibus Rules Update,' that had been circulated in advance to SREC members. Several SREC members submitted before the SREC meeting adjustments to the changes to SRs in the SC Office draft. The SREC sequentially discussed each proposed adjustment that had been offered before the SREC meeting. Upon completion of discussion, the SC Office draft along with the further identified adjustments by the SREC was unanimously approved as the 'final to be posted' version of the SRs.

Physically attached here and thereby incorporated as a part of these minutes is a document (Appendix I) displaying each of the adjustments rendered by the SREC to the SC Office draft. The Appendix I of all the SREC edits combined includes for each item an 'introductory' explanation of what is the edit/set of edits.

In some situations, there is also an additional concluding 'Note' to SC marked in green highlight. Some of these notes are further explanations of the SREC edits. Other notes are drawing some matter to the attention of the SC Office, or matters identified by the SREC for further SREC consideration.

Grad Council Election Proposal

- The SREC received the following in advance of the meeting
 - Email request from Sheila ([PDF](#))
 - Draft Description of Membership and Election Policies ([PDF](#))
 - Additional clarification from Marth Peterson ([PDF](#))
 - Draft Codification of Membership and Election Policies ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- The Grad Council is drafting a proposal to change its election and membership rules. At this of SREC involvement, there will be a preliminary round of iteration in which the SREC will in an informal manner review and make a preliminary draft of what an SR codification of Graduate Council intent might look like. The SREC's offered informal draft codification (discussed by the SREC) will be sent to the SC to forward back to the Graduate Council for one more preliminary round of iteration by the Graduate Council as to whether Graduate Council intent is being reflected in the SREC preliminary drafting. It will then be up to the Graduate Council to finalize a formal proposal to the Senate Council for SC/Senate consideration. In that formal process, the SREC is available to assist in a 'formal SREC' draft codification activity. Hence, at this point, the SREC has not yet assessed ripple effect consequences or unintended consequences of particular revised SR wording. The SREC will exercise those considerations after the Graduate Council considers the SREC's informal suggestions and the Graduate Council then renders to the SC/Senate specific proposed SR wording.
- The SREC discussion noted that the eligible colleges are functionally defined in the draft rule, and hence a footnote listing the eligible colleges is not necessary
- Brown will forward the material to the SC for it's coordinative forwarding to the GC
- The material is physically included here in these minutes as Appendix II

POSSIBLE FUTURE AGENDA ITEMS (information only)

Review of potential substantive edits to SRs

- See list of substantive edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- See A **track changes document** showing all edits ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- NOTE: The potential substantive changes in the track changes document are coded with yellow highlighting.

Clarify in SRs what (when?) is a student?

- Email with Davy 9-9-22 ([PDF](#))
- SREC needs to clarify what is a student and how does a student's status as such change to clarify, in part, when student rights and responsibilities apply.
- Need to distinguish individual's status (i.e., student or not) for the following circumstances:
 1. accepted to university
 2. admitted to university (e.g., person paid deposit)
 3. registered for a course (i.e., person has reserved a seat a course, but the course hasn't started yet)
 4. enrolled in a course (Is this the same as "registered for a course"?)
 5. enrolled in a course that has started

6. not enrolled in any course that is underway but not withdrawn from the university such as in the summer
 7. withdrawn from the university such that admission/readmission is required before being able to register for a course.
- For each of these purposes where in the SRs the Senate exercises authority to ascribe a privilege, right, responsibility, or requirement on a student, the SRs should clarify to which students and at what time the rule applies.

Clarify in the SRs what does “residence” mean?

- Nowadays, it appears that the Senate Rules glossary definition of “residence” is obsolete. What does the Senate nowadays intend for “residence” to mean? Kim has in previous discussions with DeShana and Brian (3/10/21) urged that the Senate’s definition include aspects of non-credit bearing residence, which appears increasingly timely given the current discussion of ‘badges’ and the current SC ad hoc committee to survey the University’s non-credit bearing academic landscape.

Need for SR Definition of ‘what is a course,’ for all purposes of the Senate’s oversight of either credit-hour courses (i.e. Senate numbered courses) or non-credit bearing courses

Fall 2023 Omnibus Revisions

- SR 4.2.2.2.6 – Editorial clarification, add needed section numbers. ([PDF](#)) ([.docx](#))
- SR 1.5.2.1 -- Editorial corrections. ([JPG](#))

Note to SC. This new rule creates an issue with the ability of every Senate standing committee to generate a quorum. Is this effect really intended? SC fix?

Page 53 – **Proposal:** remove ‘dash’

Ex officio members may be voting or nonvoting, but the position is **nonvoting** unless indicated otherwise.


Page 57 – **Proposal:** Correct “IT” to “It”

IT shall also make recommendations regarding significant changes to programs

Page 60 -- **Proposal:** reorganize as shown further, to keep distinct Senate ‘deciding’ role on programs vs ‘recommending’ role on educational units; also make consistent with role of committee stated in SR 3.1.3.3.3.2.2 (page 117); correct misspell of “Senaqte”. Shown below is current ‘Senate changes’. Also typo of “Senaqte”

1.4.2.9.1 Charge

The SAOSC is charged to:

1. Review and recommend to the University Senate priorities on all proposals for new educational units (colleges, schools, departments, graduate centers, multidisciplinary research centers and institutes; interdisciplinary instructional programs)
 2. Review and recommend Senate action on all proposals for abolishment or merger of existing educational units;
 3. Review and recommend Sena~~q~~te action on all proposals for major changes in organization and structure of educational units, ~~including but not limited to suspension of admissions and closure of a degree or certificate~~;
 4. Make appropriate recommendations to the University Senate (and through the Senate to the President and/or Provost) regarding creation, abolition or alterations in organization or structure, or reporting relationships, of educational units throughout the University.
 5. Study and report to the Senate on matters pertaining to faculty size and strength, and student enrollment. [US: 3/12/84]
 6. Review and recommend Senate action on proposals including **but not limited** to suspension of admissions, significant reduction and closure of a degree or certificate program, **and other similar matters.**
- 

Note to SC: SREC draws to SC attention the need to break the “organization and structure” away from suspension of admissions and closing of degrees, certificates, because they are not akin to each other. The Senate endorses (or not) the former and approves (or not) the latter. In addition, SREC suggests that if item 6 is created for clarity, that “but not limited to” could be struck through and replaced at the ending with “and other similar matters.”

Page 61 – **Proposal**: make concordant the rule numbers with the refs to rule numbers, as shown; add space

1.4.2.10.2 Composition

The SRIC shall consist of two voting faculty members and one voting student member.

The composition is as described in [1.4.2.10.2.1](#), 1.4.2.10.2.2 and 1.4.2.10.2.3 unless the Senate Council votes to name a different specific subset of not less than three of its members to constitute the committee. If so, if the Senate Council seeks to designate not more than one student member of the Senate Council as an SRIC member, but no student Senate Council member is available, then a student member shall be nominated to the Senate Council by the Student Government Association.

1.4.2.10.2.1 Chair

The SRIC is chaired by the Senate Council Chair.

1.4.2.10.3.2.2 Voting Members

The voting faculty members are the SC Chair and SC Vice Chair.

1.4.2.10.3.4.3 Voting Student Member

The voting student member is the Student

Page 62 - Page 61 – **Proposal**: make concordant the rule numbers with the refs to rule numbers, as shown

1.4.2.11.2 Composition

The SCC shall be composed of the Senate Council Vice Chair and the members described in 1.4.2.11.3.2.1, 1.4.2.11.3.2.2, and 1.4.2.11.3.2.3, below.

1.4.2.11.2.1 Chair

The Senate Council Vice Chair shall chair the SCC.

1.4.2.11.2.2 Voting Faculty Membership

The voting members of the SCC are the chairs of Senate's standing committees, the chairs of Senate's advisory committees, and the Senate Council Chair

1.4.2.11.2.3 Ex Officio Nonvoting Membership

Page 68 – **Proposal**: adjust wording as follows for clarity and Senate intent re: authorities

Current SR draft

Upon the recommendation of the Undergraduate Council or upon its own initiative, it shall develop and propose changes [in the structure of the program or in the requirements necessary to complete the program](#) to the Undergraduate Council, ~~[in the structure of the program or in the requirements necessary to complete the program](#)~~ for approval and recommendation to the Senate Council and [approval by the University Senate](#).

Incorporate above and further change as:

Upon the recommendation of the Undergraduate Council or upon its own initiative, ~~#~~ [SUKCEC](#) shall

develop and propose [to the Undergraduate Council](#) changes in the structure of the program or in the requirements necessary to complete the program. ~~to the Undergraduate Council. for approval and recommendation to the Senate Council and approval action by the University Senate.~~

Page 68 – **Proposal**: adjust wording as follows for clarity and Senate intent re: authorities

Current SR draft:

1.4.2.15.2.1 Waivers

All waivers of or substitutions for program requirements for particular categories of students, if approved or disapproved by the Committee, shall be submitted to the Senate Council ([SC](#)) for its approval by the Senate. The ~~Senate Council's~~ SC's approval of temporary waivers of, or substitutions for, program requirements for particular categories of students shall be final.

Incorporate above and further change as:

1.4.2.15.2.1 Waivers

[The Committee shall recommend to the Senate Council concerning a](#) All waivers of or substitutions for program requirements for particular categories of students. ~~, if approved or disapproved by the Committee, shall be submitted to the Senate Council (SC) for its approval action by the Senate.~~ The [SC's](#) approval of temporary waivers of, or substitutions for, program requirements for particular categories of students shall be final.

Page 71 – **Proposal**: clarify **second sentence** about tie breaker role

Current Senate version

1.4.2.16.3.1 Chair

The SAAC must be chaired by one of the three appointed University Faculty members. ~~In the case of a tie vote, the vote of the chair shall prevail.~~

1.4.2.16.3.1 Chair

The SAAC must be chaired by one of the three appointed University Faculty members.

[The chair only votes to break a tie.](#)

Page 98 – **Proposal**: remove comma

responsible for the implementation of the curricula of the college, for ensuring through the faculty the quality of instruction given therein [GR VII.F2.c)].

Page 113 – **Proposal**: Move the **first paragraph**, which is about 'the initiating body' (dept), to previous page 112 **to become last paragraph of section 3.1.3.3.1** (that is about the initiating action). The number of the heading shown in yellow (3.1.3.3.1.4) misplaces the first paragraph into section about 'college level' action. The second and third paragraphs below are about 'college level' action; also correct "academic unit" to "educational unit"

3.1.3.3.1.4 Badges

[For every badge there must be a responsible faculty body, to act as ~~the~~ a department faculty, either a traditional ~~academic~~ educational unit within a college, or a faculty body approved by the Senate. The faculty body is responsible for the program/course content, learning objectives, etc. and for taking the educational policy actions in the role of a department faculty. In the cases of a faculty body approved by the Senate, the “dean” is the individual appointed by the Provost, with the concurrence of the Senate, to act in the prescribed manners.] **move this paragraph to page 112**

For every badge, the college faculty body (or responsible faculty Senate-approved faculty body if initiated outside of a college) reviews the badge proposal and either recommends approval or makes the final decision to stop the proposal. For badges homed outside a college, the review by an academic council will serve as the college-level faculty body review.

Proposals for badges are submitted to the Senate Council office (not directly to an academic council), for routing to the most appropriate academic council(s).

Note to SC: SREC suggests also tweaking the first line as indicated.

Page 102 – **Proposal:** insert verbatim from the Senate-approved badges proposal the definition of “course” for the purposes of badges. Also two typos indicated in yellow.

3.1.1.3 Badges [US: 12/12/2022]

A badge program (either credit bearing or non-credit bearing) consists of two or more courses, but no more than four courses, which collectively provide one or more defined skill sets or competencies that can be useful to students/learner and employers. The credit-bearing badge credentials will appear through the Registrar on a student’s University transcript; non-credit bearing badges will not appear on the transcript. The non-credit bearing badge and their non-credit bearing courses, delegated by the Senate Rules to the local jurisdiction of a college faculty body (or its Senate-approved equivalent), will be officially attested by the signature of dean of the college (or dean equivalent) (See SR 3.2.3.3.2-3.2.3.3.3).

[For the purposes of this Senate policy, “course” refers to a unit of educational content with paced delivery to enrolled learners, that includes required interactions with the supervising credentialed instructor during a fixed period of time, which culminates in the instructor’s assessment of the learner’s attainment of specific learning outcomes.](#)

A credit-bearing badge must be a minimum of five credit hours and must not exceed eight credit hours. A student must earn a C or better, or a Pass in a pass/fail course, in each of the required courses to earn a badge. Courses required for a credit-bearing badge can be in any hundred series (see SR 3.2.1.1).

At a minimum, a proposal for a badge will include the following information: badge name; description; audience served; learning objectives; and assessment plan. Badges require the approval of the unit faculty (“program faculty”) and that unit’s respective college-level faculty body. For badges homed outside of a college, the review by an academic council will serve as the college-level faculty body review. For all badges, the approval process will follow the guidance laid out in SR 3.1.3.3.3.1 (“Other Changes”).

Note to SC: The SREC suggests that a future SREC agenda include discussion of a definition of “courses” for purposes other than badges.

Page 139 – **Proposal**: insert the exact GR XIV.B.1 wording into opening of SR 4.1 and into SR 6.1.4.4 and SR 7.2.1.

4.1 Rules Relating to Admission to the University

All applicants meeting the appropriate academic requirements shall be considered equally for admission to the University or to any college or academic program regardless of race, color, national origin, ethnic origin, religion, creed, age, physical or mental disability, veteran status, uniformed service, political belief, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy, marital status, genetic information, social or economic status, or whether the person is a smoker or nonsmoker, as long as the person complies with the University policy concerning smoking ~~or national origin.~~

6.1.4.4 Improper Bases of Evaluation

Evaluations determined by anything other than a good faith judgment based on explicit statements of the above standards are improper. Among irrelevant considerations are, as per GR XIV.B.1 (~~6/20/055/8/15~~) ~~sex, sexual orientation, race, ethnic origin, national origin, color, creed, religion, age, political belief, Vietnam-era veteran status or disabled veteran status, physical or mental disability in regard to any position for which the student is qualified, being a smoker or nonsmoker as long as the person complies with any workplace policy concerning smoking, race, color, national origin, ethnic origin, religion, creed, age, physical or mental disability, veteran status, uniformed service, political belief, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy, marital status, genetic information, social or economic status, or whether the person is a smoker or nonsmoker, as long as the person complies with University policy concerning smoking,~~ being an applicant for or in the service of the United States Uniformed Services or any activities outside the classroom that are unrelated to the course work or program requirements. [US: 2/11/85; 10/12/98]

7.2.1 General Relations

Respect the rights of all campus members to be given fair treatment and to be judged on a basis other than ~~sex, race, ethnic origin, national origin, sexual orientation, color, creed, religion, age, or political belief~~ race, color, national origin, ethnic origin, religion, creed, age, physical or mental disability, veteran status, uniformed service, political belief, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, gender expression, pregnancy, marital status, genetic information, social or economic status, or whether the person is a smoker or nonsmoker, as long as the person complies with University policy concerning smoking.

Page 183 – **Proposal**: change to be the correct interpretation that we adopted at Dec. 2022 SREC meeting

Current SR draft:

* A graduate student can only exercise the repeat option at any time prior to graduation.
[SREC: 12/8/2022]

Change to:

*An enrolled graduate student may exercise the repeat option prior to graduation, but not afterwards.

Page 38 – **Proposal**: correct SR numbers to match intended references

1.3.3.2.4 Extent of Authority

The GC does not have any final decision-making authority, except as related to individual student situations and as described in SR 3.1.1.4.1.1, SR 3.1.1.4.2.1, and SR 3.1.1.4.2.2 ~~SR 3.1.1.3.1.1 and 3.1.1.3.2.1 – 3.1.1.3.21.2.~~ [US: 12/12/2022]

SR 3.1.1.4.1.1 Graduate Doctoral Residence and Time Limits

... Extensions up to twelve months may be approved by the Dean of the Graduate School upon receipt of a request from the Director of Graduate Studies. Requests for extensions longer than twelve months must be considered by Graduate Council and will require the positive recommendation of the Director of Graduate Studies, the chair of the student’s doctoral advisory committee, and a majority vote of Graduate Faculty in the program.

SR 3.1.1.4.2.1 [No title]

... Programs may opt to shorten or extend the required time to complete the master’s/specialist program. Petitions must be submitted to Graduate Council for approval.

SR 3.1.1.4.2.2 Course Work Requirements

... When the establishment of major topics seems to require it, the Graduate Council may, on recommendation of the appropriate Director of Graduate Studies, authorize courses taught outside the major to count toward the major.

Page 40 – **Proposal**: edit the rule for clarity; add highlighted text and remove red strikethrough text.

1.3.2.41.3.3.4 Election

Only regular (“full”) members of the Graduate Faculty shall be eligible to serve on the Graduate Council GC and to vote in the Graduate Council GC election. Graduate Faculty members with administrative titles above that of department chair or who do not possess an employment status of a full-time faculty member are not eligible (see SR 1.3.2.2). In addition, no department shall have more than one Graduate Faculty member on the GC, at any one time ~~members of the Graduate Faculty from departments which have representatives with unexpired terms on the Graduate Council GC shall not be eligible.~~ [US: 11/11/85; 12/12/2022]

Appendix II

1.3.3.3 Composition

The GC will examine its composition annually at its last meeting of the academic year. There shall be eighteen voting members of the Graduate Faculty, plus the chair. [US: 4/12/2004]

1.3.3.3.1 Chair

The dean of the Graduate School serves as the chair.

1.3.3.3.2 Voting Elected Faculty Members

~~The GC shall consist of eighteen voting faculty members elected from the Graduate Faculty.~~

~~The composition of the elected membership of the GC is as follows:~~

The composition of voting elected faculty members of the GC shall be allotted in 4 steps.

Step 1

For each eligible college, make the following calculation:

$$2 \times (\text{doctoral enrollment}) + (\text{master's enrollment}) + (\# \text{ of graduate faculty}) = \text{college total}$$

For the purpose of the above calculation:

- “enrollment” means the number of full-time doctoral or master’s students enrolled in a Senate-number course,
- the enrollment data will be a **three year** rolling average of those data drawn, annually each fall by the University for reporting to the Council on Postsecondary Education,
- students enrolled as ‘en passant’ master’s students within a doctoral program are counted only as doctoral students,
- students on official leave of absence and not enrolled in a course are not counted,
- “full-time” includes enrollment in 0.0 credit hour courses that confer full-time enrollment (e.g., master’s students enrolled in XXX 748),
- “doctoral” program does not include the current six professional practice doctorates at the University (see SR XXX),
- “eligible colleges are those with at least one doctoral or master’s degree,*
- the “Specialist” degree (College of Education) counts as a master’s degree.

Step 2:

Sum all college totals to yield an “overall total”

Step 3:

For each college, determine the college total as **percentage** of the overall total

Step 4: Using each college’s “percentage” as calculated above, apportion membership positions to the colleges as follows:

- up to 7.5%, the college receives 1 GC position, except that a college with 0.0% does not receive a GC position
- 7.6% - 12.5%, the college receives 2 GC positions
- 12.6% - 17.5%, the college receives 3 GC positions
- 17.6% - 22.5%, the college receives 4 GC positions
- 22.6% and up, the college receives 5 GC positions

*Currently, the eligible colleges are: CAFÉ, A&S, B&E, C&I, DEN, DES, EDU, ENG, FA, GS, HS, MED, PHA, PH, SW.

Note to Graduate Council: Strikethrough the above list, because membership is operationally defined elsewhere in the rule.

~~GC shall consist of eighteen voting faculty members elected from the Graduate Faculty. The composition of the elected membership of the GC is as follows:-~~

- ~~• Two members from the College of Agriculture, Food and Environment;~~
- ~~• Three members from the College of Arts and Sciences;~~
- ~~• One member from the Gatton College of Business and Economics;~~
- ~~• One member from: the College of Communication and Information, the College of Social Work, the Patterson School of Diplomacy and International Commerce and the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration;~~
- ~~• One member from the College of Education;~~
- ~~• One member from the College of Engineering;~~
- ~~• One member from the College of Design and the College of Fine Arts;~~
- ~~• Two members from the College of Medicine;~~
- ~~• One member from the College of Pharmacy and the College of Dentistry; and~~
 - One member from the College of Health Sciences, the College of Nursing, and the College of Public Health

Members representing a college or a combination of colleges are elected by the Graduate Faculty whose primary appointment to the Graduate Faculty is in the respective college(s). [US: 3/21/83]

1.3.3.3 Voting Appointed Members

~~There shall be two voting members appointed from the Graduate Faculty by the Dean,~~

1.3.3.4 Voting Student Members

There shall be two voting graduate student members ~~recommended by the Student Government Association.~~ appointed by Dean of the Graduate School after consultation with

1.3.3.3.5 Ex Officio Voting Members

The GC shall also have liaisons from the other two academic councils and the Senate Council, who will serve as ex officio voting members.

- The GC chair shall contact the Undergraduate Council (UC) and request the UC identify a member of that council to serve as an ex officio voting member of the GC
- The GC chair shall contact the Health Care Colleges Council (HCCC) and request the HCCC identify a member of that council to serve as an ex officio voting member of the GC.
- The GC chair shall contact the Senate Council and request the SC identify an individual to serve as the liaison from the Senate Council, an ex officio voting member. The liaison from the Senate Council is not necessarily from within the Senate Council's membership.

1.3.3.3.6 Ex Officio Nonvoting Members

Graduate School associate deans are ex officio nonvoting members of the GC.

1.3.3.4 Election

Only regular ("full") members of the Graduate Faculty shall be eligible to serve on the GC and to vote in the GC election. Graduate Faculty members with administrative titles above that of department chair or who do not possess an employment status of a full-time faculty member are not eligible. (see SR 1.3.2.2) In addition, members of the Graduate Faculty from departments which have representatives with unexpired terms on the GC shall not be eligible. [US: 11/11/85] 697

~~The office of the Graduate School Dean~~ [Each college](#) will be responsible for administering the election procedure but the Senate Rules and Elections Committee (SREC) will certify all aspects of the election, including voting procedures, number of open seats, and eligible membership. . ~~The~~

~~Graduate School Dean's Office~~ [The Dean's Office of each college](#) will prepare the lists of faculty members eligible to vote and those eligible to serve. For each college ~~or collection of colleges~~ where there is an election to be held, the ~~Graduate School college~~ Dean's office will send a list of those eligible to be elected to each person eligible to vote, who will be invited to nominate an eligible person for the GC by a letter. In addition, in each department (or college) that has a graduate program, the chair (or dean) and the director of graduate studies will each be urged to submit a nomination by letter. The ~~Graduate School college~~ Dean's office shall check on the willingness of persons to serve and will get a very brief biographical statement from each person nominated. If fewer than three persons are nominated and are willing to serve from any college ~~or collection of colleges~~, the ~~Graduate School college~~ Dean's office shall call a brief meeting of the directors of graduate study from the ~~unit(s)~~ [programs](#) for the purpose of nominating additional persons to make a total of three. (In the event that more than one person was to be elected from the unit, this group would meet if necessary to pick nominees equal to three times the number to be elected.) [US: 1/18/88]

Once the nomination process has been completed, ballots will be sent out containing the names of all those nominated. Each person must vote for as many candidates as there are vacancies to be filled or their ballot will be disqualified. The person or persons receiving the largest number of votes will be elected. [US: 1/18/88]

[If the election process above does not secure the election of a member to a position, that seat will be declared vacant by the college dean and handled as per SR XXX on filling vacant seats.](#)

