



Minutes—December 10, 2015
Special Meeting Time-2:00 pm
Academic Affairs Conference RM 239

Members Present: Andrea Paganelli(for Marge Maxwell), Carl Myers, Kristin Wilson, Amy Cappiccie, Eve Main, Kirk Atkinson, Leyla Zhuhadar, Steve Wells, Carl Dick, Chris Groves, Lance Hahn, Beth Plummer, Angie Jerome, Shannon Vaughan, Molly Kerby, Ron Mitchell, Andrew Rosa, John Hay, Richard Dressler

Members Absent: Marge Maxwell, Laura Brigman

Guests Present: Colette Chelf, Julie Harris, Laura Upchurch, Scott Gordon, Danita Kelley, Janet Applin, Cathleen Webb, Bob Hatfield, Tiffany Robinson, Melissa Davis, Douglas Smith,

Meeting presided by Chair Kurt Neelly.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Consideration of November 12, 2015 minutes *Neely announced he sent an email to all members stating there were some technical difficulties at the last meeting with the recording equipment and the meeting was not recorded; members were to look over minutes and make edits and amendments; Hahn/Vaughan motion to approve; passed
- III. Committee Reports
 - a. Curriculum Committee; Report Included, Discussion
 - *Atkinson stated Marge Maxwell will return from teaching at Harlaxton in January and will resume acting as chairperson for the Curriculum Committee;
 - *Atkinson made motion to approve the Curriculum Committee Report; passed;
 - *Atkinson suggested that in the future, graduate council chair should ask if someone would like to move an item from consent agenda to action agenda before passing and approving Curriculum Committee Report.
 - b. Student Research Grants Committee: No report included, Discussion
 - *Hahn stated the committee is planning to review the Research Grant process, paperwork that is involved and who is involved; as well as how the application process can be made more approachable; should have some information to report by the next meeting in February;
 - *Reed stated that there were two options for more funding for the Research Grant Committee; Plan B is that the Graduate School is providing an additional \$7000 for the grant committee to award; Plan A is that a proposal was submitted to Ann Mead to revise budgets so that the Research Grant and Research Travel money would not come out of the operating budget of the Graduate School, but rather would become permanent budget lines in the central budget of \$50,000 for graduate research and \$25,000 for student

travel; it will function the same way as the budget does now only it will become permanent budget; Reed explained that this amount is more than what they had been available for research and travel before and that moving those funds to a permanent budget line would allow more funds to become available in the Graduate School operating budget for student recruitment; he stated that Ann Mead believes that this is a change that could possibly be made by moving some money around and will have a definitive answer in the Spring.

*Groves questioned if this change would mean a decrease from the central budget but without an equivalent decrease from the graduate budget; Reed stated that it would be a transfer from one part of the permanent budget to another; in addition to the increase of money, the move in the budget would require all funds to be allocated, so the guidelines are going to be looked at and revised;

*Hahn asked if the Student Research Grant Committee could at least count on receiving an additional \$7000 to allocate; Reed yes; Vaughan asked if that would be in addition to the \$9000 that is remaining; Reed yes.

c. **Policy Committee No report included, Discussion**

*Wilson stated that two policy revisions were being brought to the floor for a council vote; Wilson reminded council that during the last council meeting Steve Wells made a motion to move how international recruitment should work to the policy committee for consideration; Policy Committee met with Brian Meredith, Raza Tiwana, Eric Reed, Scott Gordon and Kurt Neely to discuss future international recruiting; Enrollment Management is interested and willingness in having an internal Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and working with departments and having a more effective and less controversial approach to international recruitment; Neely advised further discussion of international recruitment after the two policy revisions on the agenda were addressed;

*Wilson stated the first policy revision is Undergraduates taking Graduate Courses; existing policy is published in the Graduate Catalog; Wilson provided a handout to the council for review of changes as follows:

- Having earned at least 75 undergraduate credit hours
- Having a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0
- Removing the requirement of having declared a major or minor in subject area or closely related area for which the graduate course is offered
- Removing the requirement of having earned a minimum cumulative GPA of 3.0 in his/her major

*Wilson requested a motion be made to approve changes; Jerome/Hahn motion to approve; 1 no (Hay); passed.

*Kelly asked if the revision was going to include requiring instructor approval; Wilson explained that the form has already been revised to include instructor approval; Chelf stated the current approval signatures include student, advisor, and instructor of record;

*Applin questioned why the 3.0 GPA in the major was removed and left it as a cumulative 3.0 GPA; Wilson indicated that she was not present for that particular discussion in the last policy committee meeting, but she was informed that it was the preference of the committee; Chelf explained the original reason this change was made is

because so many programs are interdisciplinary and it is difficult to determine which courses are relevant and which course aren't in their major, also, some undergraduate students will be enrolling in a graduate program unrelated to their undergraduate major and want to take a graduate course relevant to the graduate program they intend to pursue; Hatfield asked how long the Undergraduate Taking Graduate Courses form was applicable; Chelf stated that approval is course and term specific;

*Hay questioned that if the application had to be approved by the advisor and instructor of record should they not be better at determining the students qualifications rather than setting arbitrary numbers for qualifications; Chelf and Applin both stated that the 3.0 is minimum GPA requirement to matriculate in Graduate School; Chelf further stated that 2.75 is the minimum undergraduate GPA for admission to Graduate School, however the Provost was in favor of keeping the 3.0 GPA standard for undergraduate students wanting to enroll in graduate courses; Multiple council members agreed that the 3.0 GPA minimum was appropriate;

*Webb suggested that the department head may want to be informed of an undergraduate enrolling graduate courses; Wilson stated that adding the Department Head signature could be done on the form but will not be included in the policy revision; Webb asked if the department head could just be informed once an undergraduate student is enrolled in a graduate course and not necessarily require they include their signature on the form; Chelf stated that informing the Department Head could be done;

*Hay asked if an undergraduate student had a GPA below 3.0 but is an exceptional student in the program they will be enrolling in for graduate school, would they not be considered because of their GPA; Jerome stated an appeal process is in place for any policy; Neely questioned if a student would not be admitted into the specific program for which they are requesting to take a course, then why would they be permitted to take the course; Hay expressed concern that students would not know that an appeal could be filed if they didn't have the 3.0 GPA and suggested that the appeal information be included in the catalog; Chelf commented that the appeal process is currently published in the graduate catalog;

*Wilson presented the second policy revision, Graduate Faculty, and indicated that this definition is in the faculty handbook so the approval process would be different; if council approves the revision, the proposal will then be forwarded to the Faculty Handbook Committee of Senate, followed by the Senate Executive Committee and the final vote will be with the full Senate; the Policy Committee has devised changes based on council discussions at previous meetings regarding the Graduate Faculty including:

- Graduate Council vote will no longer be needed for Graduate Faculty Status approval
- Membership in the Graduate Faculty may be granted by two methods:
 - At the time of hire, the search committee chair or department head may recommend graduate faculty status. The College Dean will review the recommendation, (dis)approve, and forward the recommendation to the Graduate School.
 - Current faculty members may be recommended by the faculty member's department head. The College Dean must review he recommendation, (dis)approve and forward to the Graduate School.

*Jerome proposed a friendly amendment to edit line 5 to say "Graduate Dean" instead of "Graduate School" and in the last line it should also say "Graduate Dean"; Wilson stated that changing Graduate School to Graduate Dean will allow the faculty member to go to the Graduate Dean if they are unhappy with what is happening in their Department in regard Graduate Faculty Status decision and plead their case and maybe change the

outcome of the process; Reed stated he looked at some other KY colleges graduate faculty practices for comparison and they either have the Graduate Council do the review and approval or to have the Graduate Dean's office do the review and approval; Wilson stated the Graduate Council Executive Committee met and reviewed the Graduate Faculty revisions and they asked to have the Graduate Dean approval on Graduate Faculty status, if it is the preference of the council; Wilson indicated that the paragraph explaining the requirements to obtain Graduate Faculty status has not been changed and those requirements will remain the same; Atkinson questioned the council to give their thoughts on having a friendly amendment including Program Directors to recommend Graduate Faculty;

*Plummer added a friendly amendment to add "and/or professional attainment, active participation in research and or professional accomplishment and scholarly activities and professional standing"; Plummer explained this change will allow flexibility in defining scholarship within different types of programs;

*Smith questioned if a Faculty members status is denied by the College Dean could the Graduate Dean still approve it; Jerome stated that the Graduate Dean can review the application and approve or disapprove;

*Smith asked if a faculty member is disapproved but the next year they can be approved, will the Graduate Faculty status procedure have to be repeated; Wilson stated it would be different for each college;

*Wilson recapped the friendly amendments, which are 1) adding Department Head and Program Director/Program coordinator to both processes for approving Graduate Faculty Status, 2) remove search committee chair, 3) add Graduate Dean for approval and disapproval in both procedures, 4) "Nominations and recommendations are based upon general criteria of evidence of scholarly attainment and/or professional accomplishment, active participation in research, scholarly activities and professional standing which are recognized or commended by professional organizations in the candidate's field, and willingness to direct the study of graduate students.";

*Passed

*Wilson asked if the council would like her to submit paperwork for the proposal or if the council chairperson (Neely) should submit the paperwork; Jerome stated that it should come from Kurt Neely (Graduate Council Chair);

*Kelley indicated that the Evaluation of Faculty Credentials Policy identifies that Graduate Faculty status as recommended by the Graduate Council and approved by the Graduate Dean is required for teaching graduate courses; Wilson indicated that all relevant policies will need review to align with this proposal if approved to update the Faculty Handbook;

*Neely indicated that the India Pilot Project resolution presented at SEC passed unanimously; the resolution would be presented at the Senate following this Graduate Council meeting; in formulating the resolution Neely included the members from the last Graduate Council meeting that were actively involved in the discussion;

*Hahn questioned his motion from the last meeting regarding the organizational structure issue; Neely stated that he did bring up the motion and the SEC members indicated that the topic could be brought to the floor of the Senate for discussion or that it could be put on hold for further discussion;

*Neely indicated that the Policy Committee has set up a meeting with Brian Meredith and Raza Tiwana in the Spring semester to discuss the India Pilot Project; the resolution has successfully brought all parties together to discuss future recruiting initiatives and address transparency;

*Hahn stated that the organizational/hierarchy chart should still be reviewed by the

Senate; Reed disagreed and proposed that the motion to address the organizational chart should be withdrawn at this time.

*Hahn questioned if students are conditionally admitted and they don't meet the condition will they be dismissed; Chelf stated that the India students will be held to the same Academic Standing policy as all other graduate students;

*Applin stated that whether or not the programs were consulted or pressured to take these students, the university has accepted the students and the faculty have an obligation to try and help them be successful;

*Wilson/Hahn motion for the Graduate School to provide the council with an academic standing report for the India Pilot Program students at the August meeting and an admission/enrollment report in February to include their English scores; Passed.

IV. Report from Dean of Graduate School

*Reed indicated that the admission application for the India Pilot Project is closed; applicants have been notified of their status; incomplete applications will be inactivated; less than 60 students may be arriving on campus; just under 50 of those are enrolled in Computer Science and just under 15 are enrolled in ETM; Reed stated that the estimated numbers of students enrolled are acquired by the number of VISA'S that were issued; there have been discussions with the IEM department and application coding will be done separately from recruiting coding; Reed discussed the need for the application and recruiting process to be separate and the Provost agreed; Reed stated that he supports the council's resolution sent to Senate; IEM will welcome the students and the additional English courses have been set up that these students need to complete; Neely indicated that 59 visas were issued but there is uncertainty if those students will actually arrive; students that have not been issued a Visa will not be permitted to come for the Spring 2016 semester; students not meeting the IELTS score is part of the resolution on the Senate floor.

*Reed stated that he finalized the Graduate Assistantship money for next year and all colleges have been notified and are getting more that they received last year. Part of the process to fund this change was to end the Graduate Student Research Fellowship and the College Deans have been notified of that as well; *Reed indicated he would like to increase the budget in ways to help faculty; standing graduate assistantship agreements would be scrutinized, such as Preston Center and Honors College, and perhaps eliminated so more funds would be available to programs.

V. Public Comments

VI. Announcements & Adjourn

Jerome/Plummer motion to adjourn