

## Senate Rules and Elections Committee

January 3, 2012

Davy Jones (Chair), Lee Blonder, Gail Brion, Robert Grossman, David Pienkowski

### 1. Faculty Trustee Election

The SREC discussed several aspects impinging upon the upcoming Faculty Trustee election. The excel sheet of all regular, full-time faculty employees received by Jones from Diane Gagel contained a column in which should have been indicated the administrative assignment of 'Department Chair' for each faculty member who is a Department Chair (or School, Graduate Center or MDRC Director). However, for a number of departments, no individual was tagged on the spread sheet as being the Chair. The SREC discussed that it was essential that the list persons certified as eligible to vote and eligible to serve be accurate. Jones will recontact Diane Gagel and ask if she will be able to ascertain why the spread sheet did not accurately show the identity of all persons who are Chairs/Directors.

After much discussion, it was decided that none of the submitted petitions will be opened until after the announced deadline, the petition form should make the nominator responsible for obtaining at least ten signatures onto the form of persons who are eligible to sign the form (i.e., eligible to vote), and that petitioners should have a two week window within which to obtain ten valid signatures. The petition form will state the eligibility criteria. If a petition (which can have more than ten signatures on it) is determined to have less than ten valid signatures, then that petition will not be deemed as successfully putting the given individual's name in nomination.

### 2. Authority to Transfer Degree Programs, Certificate and Courses to a Different Home Department

The SREC had the occasion to review the question of who has the authority to move a degree program, certificate or course from one home educational unit to a different home educational unit. The SREC agreed the matter of which educational unit homes a degree program, certificate or course is an 'organizational' matter of reporting, i.e., is an infrastructural issue and not an issue of academic content. The SREC noted previous occasions in which it was the Board of Trustees that rendered the final approval to move a degree program from one educational unit to another (e.g., moving the MPA program from the Martin School to the College of Public Health). However, neither courses nor certificate programs reach the Board of Trustees on academic issues or infrastructural/reporting issues. On the matters of academic content of certificates and courses, the BoT's GR IV.C states that the Senate is the final academic decision-maker. On the matter of decision on the organizational

reporting of certificates and courses, it is less clear who is the administrative decision-maker, below the Board of Trustees, that makes the final decision (i.e., President, Provost, Dean?). The answer as to who makes the final administrative decision on certificate and course reporting/organization needs to be more clear.

### 3. What Constitutes “Significant Reduction” of a Degree Program?

Jones related that the Dean of Health Sciences asked for information on procedures to close the Reproductive Sciences program. The SREC had the occasion to discuss the difference between “closure” of a degree program vs. “suspension of admission” to a degree program. A formal decision to close a program is required by SACS to be voted by the Board of Trustees. A decision to suspend admission to a degree program cannot go longer than five years, under CPE policies; after five years CPE policy states that the program is no longer considered by CPE as being legally sanctioned. Hence, a faculty of a program can decide to suspend admissions for not longer than five years, after which the program is de facto closed by the external CPE policy. While the Senate Council has previously considered for the Reproductive Sciences program that a single year of suspension of admissions does not rise to “significant reduction” that requires action above the level of the college, on the other end, the SREC felt that a decision to suspend admissions for five years for the purpose of de facto closing the program does constitute a significant reduction in the program. The SREC agreed that a more effective Senate Rule wording is needed that the bare phrase “significant reduction,” so as to provide effective guidance on which ‘reductive’ program actions need Senate action (or at least Undergraduate Council action for undergraduate programs, or Graduate Council action for graduate programs), rather than just being decided at the level of a program faculty