



Minutes—November 12, 2015  
3:00 pm - Academic Affairs Conference RM 239

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

**Members Absent:** Marge Maxwell, Leyla Zhuhadar, Angie Jerome, Laura Brigman

**Guests Present:** Marie Blakenship, Colette Chelf, Julie Harris, Laura Upchurch, Scott Gordon, Danita Kelley, Janet Applin, Cathleen Webb, Bob Hatfield, Andrew McMichael, Tiffany Robinson, Melissa Davis, Zac Bettersworth, Sylvia Gaiko, John Baker, Robyn Swanson

Meeting presided by Chair Kurt Neelly.

- I. Call to Order
- II. Consideration of October 8<sup>th</sup> minutes  
*\*Neelly stated October minutes were posted on the Graduate Council website; shortly after initial minutes were posted, a revised copy of the minutes were posted; second edition of minutes were correct. \*Wells/Cappiccie motion to approve; passed*
- III. Report from Dean of Graduate School
  - a. International Graduate Student Recruitment/Admission  
*\*Reed indicated the majority of the India Pilot Project students were admitted to Ogden College of Science and Engineering with approximately 160 students; approximately 100 students are currently in a pending status; some of those pending students have been considered for admission, been denied by the program, and IEM has requested the Graduate School wait to send the denial notices to the students; only 30%-60% of the admitted students are expected to enroll in classes; English classes are being created to accommodate the students so it may better their chances for success; review of this project's rate of success is needed as the students matriculate; Wilson questioned if the Graduate School had minimum admission requirements; Reed replied that the Graduate School does have current minimum admission requirements; council discussed why the students were given an admission letter before they had actually applied to the Graduate School; Reed stated the content of the letter distributed was decided on by Dr. Fox (previous Dean of the Graduate School) and International Enrollment Management team; the Graduate School also sent the admission letters to students after programs reviewed and approved individual applicants; Atkinson questioned how the students became pending in the business college; Wells asked if the Graduate School admission policy should be changed; Wilson asked if the Graduate School admission requirements were only going to be waived for the India students; Reed stated that the India Pilot Project would not happen again and that the Graduate School was given materials for hundreds of students at one time; Reed suggested that the departments should be asked how many*

students they could actually admit and handle at one time; Hahn expressed concern that WKU as a whole would lose credibility with other students if the University started admitting anyone and everyone with no consideration to the admission requirements and policies set forth by the University; Reed stated that the students who currently have a pending status will not be admitted to attend in the Spring 2016 semester; he further stated the departments will be at liberty to decide what to do with these pending students; Wells asked how other students would react to the India Project students not being held to the same admission requirements as other international students and domestic students; he further questioned what should be done to keep this type of recruitment issue from occurring again in the future; Neelly asked if a resolution should be passed; Wilson stated that Graduate Council should request a person from International Enrollment Management come speak to the Graduate Council; Reed stated he has spoken with Mr. Raza Tiwana (Chief International Officer) of International Enrollment Management, about speaking on behalf of IEM to the council; Mr. Tiwana did not agree on a definitive date at this time; Reed thought it was more appropriate to start with the Graduate School to answer questions about the India Pilot Project;

\*Atkinson/Plummer motion to move forward with the remaining agenda items and revisit India Pilot Project and continue Dean's comments at the end of the meeting;

\*Wells/Main motion to refer exploration of International Recruiting topics policy committee, specifically the India Pilot Project;

\*Plummer friendly amendment to include review of why graduate school admission were waived for this cohort of students; Passed.

Hahn stated he believes the Departments are being pressured by IEM to accept the India students that don't meet minimum Graduate School standards or minimum program standards; he further stated the entire Graduate Council should review and not just the Policy Committee; Neelly stated he could present information to the Senate regarding the India Pilot Project;

(Discussion suspended to consider remaining agenda items)

*Deans Report cont.*

Reed stated he would like to get the Graduate Council more involved in establishing new policies; suggested having a Graduate Student medical/parental leave policy that would suspend the 6 year time limit for completion; stated he would develop a list of items he would like the Graduate Council to review; Reed stated he would like to know why more domestic or out of state students aren't being recruited; Members discussed having fewer spots for students that meet the Graduate School and program standards because the India Pilot Project students are taking those spots; Webb stated that President Ransdall reported at the Board of Regents that the India Pilot Project students will not be supported by Graduate Assistantships; Reed stated that the India student tuition was \$11,000 and \$7000 was being waived; Plummer stated that traditional international students pay a higher tuition rate; Hay questioned why these students were admitted to certain programs; Reed replied that the students chose program; Reed stated that ETM could reject those students that are pending at this time and that September 1, 2015 was the deadline for accepting Spring 2016 applications; Reed stated that there should be a specific number in each department/program and standards should be set that the whole Graduate School must follow with regard to how many students they can accept; Wilson asked Reed considered admitting the students as unethical knowing they most likely would not be successful and would it be unethical to call a student before they came to give an explanation as to what is expected of them once they are here; Vaughn agreed that students should be told what they need to do to succeed when they are here; Hay asked

what can these students do to prepare their language skills before they get here and to relay suggestions for academic success before they get here; Wilson questioned if all India students were going to be in the same English class together; Reed stated that it was not known at this time; Dick asked what criteria was used to determine whether they were regular admission, conditional admission, or rejected; Webb asked if other international students would retaliate if they were denied for low test scores, if they find out India students were admitted with lower test scores; Atkinson stated that this was a SACS issue as it specifically states in the SACS guidelines that you are not to misrepresent abilities required to complete a program; Wilson stated that there needs to be something in place to prevent this sort of thing happens again; McMichael suggested a resolution be passed so that IEM wouldn't be allowed to enter students into BANNER; Reed stated he was meeting with IEM in the following week to inform them that the Graduate School will not accept more students from the India Pilot Project; Webb asked that the Graduate School make certain the students official test scores are submitted; \*Atkinson/Wilson motion to forward the following resolution to University Senate: The India Pilot Project group should be treated as a cohort and no additional students will be added to the group; Academic programs may continue to review the students pending admission without coercion to accept. \*Plummer/Wilson motion to amend the resolution to add: The Graduate School will develop an assessment plan to report student progress. All graduate students must complete the normal application process with coding completed by the Graduate School only; Graduate School would put together the assessment plan to inform the Graduate Council of the India Pilot Project students' progress; Passed. \*Hahn/Plummer motion for Graduate Council Chair, Kurt Neelly, to relay the following issues to the Senate Executive Committee: University organizational structure should be reviewed with concerns that Chief Enrollment Officer reports directly to the President and not to the Provost of Academic Affairs; International recruiting practices are negatively impacting the university; Passed.

#### IV. Introduction to Graduate Council Curriculum Committee Website

\*Atkinson introduced and gave tutorial on Curriculum Committee Website; meeting calendar was added to the website so people could make certain their proposals would be submitted on time.

#### V. Committee Reports

##### a. Curriculum Committee; Report Included, Discussion

\*Hahn nominated Beth Plummer to serve as a member of the Curriculum Committee;

\*Wilson/Atkinson motioned to approve; passed.

\*Atkinson stated that if your department submits a proposal you must have a representative from the department present at the curriculum committee meetings to answer questions if they should arise;

\*Atkinson motion to accept the curriculum report as a consent agenda; passed.

\*McMichael led discussion as to the proper procedure when pulling proposals from the consent agenda;

\*Neelly stated consent items will be sent to Senate and the proposals that are being sent back to departments for review and corrections will not be included in the items for the Senate; Council discussed admission test scores and need to make the requirements clearer.

##### b. Student Research Grants Committee: No report included, Discussion

\*Hahn requested if more money was to be allotted for research grants that the committee be notified before Thanksgiving to allow students enough time to apply for the extra

funds made available; he stated the committee created a notification letter that the Graduate School sends students informing them of the amount of the research grant they have been awarded; Rosa asked if the students must wait a year to apply again if they had already applied; Hahn stated the students could reapply for the rest of the amount that wasn't awarded to them when first applying for the grant;

\*Atkinson motion to approve student research grant committee report; Passed.

c. Policy Committee

\*No report; will provide report during the next meeting on topics from October meeting.

\*Neelly requested motion to approve the Graduate Faculty Report; \*Hahn/Wilson motion to approve; Passed.

VI. Public Comments

None

VII. Announcements & Adjourn

\*Hahn/Vaughan motion to adjourn.