**Senate Rules and Elections Committeejjddj**

**Oct. 2, 2014**

**Wood (Chair), Brion, Brown, Grossman, Jones, Mazur, McGillis, Pienkowski, Tagavi**

**1. Introductions**

The SREC Chair welcomed returning and new members to the 2014-2015 SREC.

**2. Administrative Structure of SREC**

Wood identified Jones as SREC Secretary. In that capacity Jones will draft SREC minutes and act for the SREC Chair on occasions in which time is of the essence but Wood cannot be reached at the moment.

Wood established an SREC Elections Subcommittee and appointed Jones as subcommittee Chair. The SREC Chair solicited two additional volunteers for the subcommittee.

**3. P/F grading option in 400G and 500 level courses.**

Wood related to the SREC that she recently had the occasion to clarify that graduate students can register for 400G and 500 classes as P/F, however, they cannot receive degree credit for courses completed with this grade option.

**Certification of Elections for 2014-2015 Academic Year**

Wood reviewed reports that two colleges had not conducted elections of new Faculty Senators by secret ballot. The SREC discussed in much depth the circumstances of each case in relation to the wording of the current University Senate Rules. The SREC determined that the Senate Rules on elections do not provide clear guidance on the situation in which none of the eligible college faculty are willing to represent their college in the University Senate.

a.. The situation for the College of Law has now been resolved by discussion between an Associate Dean and the SREC Chair. The Associate Dean agrees with the SREC Chair that the Senate Rule requires a secret ballot for Senate elections.

b. With respect to the situation for the College of Social Work, the SREC unanimously certified that the Dean made a good-faith effort to exercise the election provisions of the University Senate Rules, given that no eligible faculty member had responded to the solicitation for nominations.

The SREC further discussed potential revision to the University Senate Rules on elections, such as requiring a nomination stage and elaboration by the rules of the features that the nomination exercise would have under particular circumstances. The SREC felt that the election rules ought to make clear that if neither an initial nor a follow-up solicitation for nominations results in any candidates, then the seat will remain empty for that academic year. (In other words, there will be no ‘administrative selection’ or ‘administrative urging’ that the College Faculty accept a particular individual as their new Faculty Senator.) The SREC will continue its discussions toward drafting revised election rules.

**Future Agenda Items**

Jones reviewed a number of items carrying forward from the previous year that need SREC attention. These include urgent attention of the Elections Subcommittee to setting up the web site for voting by elected Faculty Senators for new members to the Senate Council.

Also included is the ‘Academic Terms’ draft, that originated with a work-group put together by former Associate Provost Mike Mullins, and which the SAASC further edited in spring 2013.  The version submitted by the SAASC to the SC in April 2013 was then directed by the SC to the SREC, for review, oversight, and editing.  The SREC has been substantively working to ensure compliance of the draft definitions with SACS, CPE, the UK *Governing Regulations* and the *University Senate Rules*.  There was apparently some confusion at the August 18, 2014 SC meeting as to whether the SAASC had ever forwarded its spring 2013 edits to the SC.  Wood has contacted the Senate Council Office to ensure that all parties are aware the SAASC edits in spring 2013 were forwarded to the SC, and that document is now being attended to by the SREC.

**Other Business**

Grossman informed the SREC that he and Wilson were going to talk to the higher administration regarding the General Counsel’s role in informing and advising faculty regarding legal matters and asked for the advice of SREC. At issue is the Kentucky statute regarding eligibility of faculty with family members employed by UK to serve as Faculty Trustee and the Kentucky Attorney General’s informal opinion on the subject issued in Spring 2013, which revised the previous formal opinion issued by that office. The SREC is very concerned that it, the University Faculty, and the Board of Trustees be provided with accurate and up-to-date information on this topic. The SREC advised that the University General Counsel should seek a formal opinion from the Kentucky Attorney General.