

December 15, 2015

TO: The Graduate Council
FROM: Mary Farmer-Kaiser, Dean of the Graduate School
RE: Request to Remove "CONI" Graduate Admission Status

The University has in place a number of policies that serve as barriers to recruiting and yielding international graduate applicants. Of particular concern to the Graduate School is the policy that dictates that international graduate students who only hold degrees from institutions outside of the United States be admitted into a status known as "Conditional International." This status is not considered as "regular admission" and/or admission in "good standing" and, as a result imposes an unnecessary challenge for these potential graduate students who are otherwise qualified for "regular admission" and/or admission in "good standing." Perhaps most notably, these potential graduate students find that they do not qualify for many funding opportunities. Indeed, if even our own current Graduate Assistantship policy states: "To qualify for an assistantship, a student must be in regular admission status."

With these considerations in mind, and on behalf of the graduate coordinators and the Graduate School, I offer the following proposed revision to the University Catalog for consideration by the Graduate Council. I respectfully request that the below-noted qualification for admission be removed from policy outlined in the University Catalog's Graduate Rules & Regulations, Admission to Graduate School, Qualifications for Admission:

D. Qualifications for Admission

.... All international students who hold degrees only from institutions outside the United States are admitted in conditional status....

With the removal of this qualification for admission, the admission status of international applicants who only hold degrees from institutions outside the United States would henceforth be dictated by the admission criteria in place for all applicants.



The Graduate School
P.O. Box 44610
Lafayette, LA 70504
Office: (337) 482-6965
Fax: (337) 482-1333
Email: GradSchool@louisiana.edu
Université des Acadiens

November 8, 2016

Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies
Report and Recommendations to the Graduate Council

Committee Members: Arturo Magidin (MATH), Anthony Maida (CACs), Wu Xu (CHEM), Mary Farmer-Kaiser (Graduate School)

In Fall 2015, the Graduate Council began to review the policies and practices that guide international graduate admission with special attention to any that may serve as a barrier to recruiting and enrolling new international graduate students. These efforts resulted in the decision of the Graduate Council in December 2015 (effective for Fall 2016) to end the practice of admitting all international graduate students into a "Conditional International" admission status.

Through the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies, the Graduate Council has continued to evaluate our graduate admissions policies as they govern international admission. In particular, members of the committee have reviewed our policies and practices governing English language proficiency and minimum official score requirements, GRE verbal scores, outsourced (or third-party) transcript/credential evaluation, and the definition of "mother tongue" in the University Catalog. Additionally, members of the committee used Fall 2016 applicants data to review the average official test scores submitted by all graduate applicants (both international and domestic, in total, those admitted, those denied, and those whose applications remained incomplete); the Dean of the Graduate School also reviewed these scores by individual graduate program.

As part of its work, the Ad Hoc Committee also reviewed the graduate admissions policies of other Louisiana graduate institutions as well as those of our Integrated Postsecondary Education Data Systems (IPEDS)-peer and IPED-aspirational-peer institutions. These institutions included the following: University of Alabama (Huntsville), University of Arkansas, Florida Atlantic University, Georgia State University, University of Louisville, University of Massachusetts-Boston, University of Massachusetts-Lowell, University of Memphis, University of Montana, University of Nevada-Reno, Portland State University, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, University of South Dakota, Southern Illinois University Carbondale, University of Southern Mississippi, University of Texas at Arlington, University of Texas at El Paso, University of Toledo, Wichita State University, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, Wright State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, Louisiana State University, Louisiana Tech University, University of Louisiana at Monroe, McNeese State University, University of New Orleans, and Southeastern Louisiana University.

With this review now complete, the Ad Hoc Committee now makes the following recommendations to the Graduate Council for its consideration.

1. The Graduate School should continue the practice of offering in-house foreign credential evaluations to international applicants although it should explicitly state (on the website) that it reserves the right to require an external credential evaluation (including a course-by-course evaluation) by an approved independent third party at the applicant's expense. The Dean of the Graduate School should be responsible for identifying the approved professional credential evaluation services.
2. The Graduate Council should better align its English language proficiency requirements with our peer institutions by lowering the TOEFL score requirement for regular graduate admissions from 81 to 80. (The Committee recommends that the current IELTS score requirement of 6.5 be retained.)

We presently have the highest TOEFL score requirement out of all peer institutions with a score of 81 out of 120. While some schools require a much lower score (61 was the lowest found out of peers), the Committee did not wish to compromise quality by lowering scores too drastically.

3. The Graduate Council should revise its policies that define which applicants are required to demonstrate English language proficiency. Presently, the University Catalog states both:

“Applicants whose mother tongue is not English and who hold degrees only from institutions outside the United States must submit acceptable TOEFL or IELTS scores.”

“International students who hold degrees only from institutions outside the United States must present proof of English language proficiency by submitting either official TOEFL or IELTS scores prior to admission to the Graduate School.”

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends replacing the above statements with the following statements:

Applicants who hold a baccalaureate or graduate degree from an accredited institution in the United States, United Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales), Ireland, Australia, New Zealand, and some Canadian provinces are not required to demonstrate English proficiency. All other applicants must demonstrate English proficiency by submitting satisfactory Test of English as a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or International English Language Testing Services (IELTS) official scores. The Graduate School reserves the right to require proof of English proficiency of other applicants when deemed warranted.

TOEFL scores below 550 on the written examination or 80 on the internet-based examination are not considered satisfactory. IELTS score below 6.5 are not considered satisfactory.

Upon entering the University, students may also be required to take the English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESOL) placement test. Those student who place below the minimum establish ESOL scores will be required to take ESOL 402: Advanced Pronunciation and Listening Comprehension and/or ESOL 403: Advanced Expository Writing.

Graduate Teaching Assistants may have additional English language proficiency requirements. See

<http://catalog.louisiana.edu/content.php?catoid=9&navoid=2066#Graduate%20Assistantships>.

December 15, 2015 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

Members Present: J. Albert, D. Baker, C. Briggs, A. Brown, W. Ferguson, R. Gonzales, D. Harrington, J. Heels, R. Hernandez, H. Hurst, A. Khattab, M. Kightley, J. Lemoine, A. Magidin, A. Maida, S. McNerny, D. Olivier, P. Morton, C. Roche-Wallace, K. Smith, D. Stevens, C. Taylor, W. Xu, M. Wright, M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio member)

Members Absent: P. Auter, D. Bellar, K. Evans-Jackson

The meeting was called to order by W. Ferguson at 2:06 p.m.

Announcements:

The Council voted to approve the November 10, 2015 meeting minutes, with corrections to the spelling of M. Kightley's name throughout and also a grammatical error.

The list of degree candidates was presented to and accepted by the Council.

A motion was made by the Council to move the February 9, 2016 Graduate Council meeting to February 2, 2016 in observance of the Mardi Gras holiday. Motion seconded and carried.

Committee Reports:

Student Appeals Committee – No report.

Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by Natalia Sidorovskaia, not present. Motion made to accept the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

Fellowship Committee – No report.

Graduate Faculty Membership Review Committee – W. Ferguson explained that there was one application for Graduate Faculty status left out from the previous review cycle by error of the Graduate School. Michelle Feist, Graduate Faculty Membership Review Committee Chair, prepared a report on the missed application, recommending denial for Level II membership and appointment at Level I. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that this application was reviewed in the same manner as all other Graduate Faculty applications (i.e., by all three College review entities and, since the College reviews resulted in recommendations for appointment at a level different than that which was applied for, the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee) and thus, was properly vetted. Motion made to accept the recommendations of the Graduate Faculty Membership Review Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

Old Business:

W. Ferguson presented the Council with a document containing the proposed revisions to University policies related to graduate assistantships, incorporating feedback and comments from the previous Council meeting as well as feedback from Human Resources. M. Farmer-Kaiser

explained that revisions were made to the document taking into account research assistant duties, graduate certificate students, and recommendations from the task force on University payroll. D. Stephens noted an error in the “L” section where “one” should read “on.” A. Magidin also spotted an error in the “Course Load” section, where “in section” should be deleted. Discussion turned to the dates graduate assistants are required to report to the University for fulfillment of duties, with the new policies requiring students to be present for the start of classes rather than the begin of the semester. A. Magidin and P. Viguerie expressed concern that difficulties may arise from syncing the beginning of the semester and the start of classes on the same date. M. Farmer-Kaiser echoed those concerns and noted that offer letters to students will need to indicate clearly when GA duties begin/end as well as any expectations for participation in orientation(s). Further discussion centered on the definition of University holidays and breaks and when international student were allowed to work during those periods. Motion made to accept the proposed revisions to University policies related to graduate assistantships document with the following changes implemented:

- In both “Graduate Research Assistant” and “Graduate Assistants” under section C, the line, “The duties do not involve classroom instruction” should be amended to read, “The primary duties do not involve classroom instruction....”
- Under section F, the line, “Assistantship appointments are to be made using the appropriate Office of Human Resources form” should be amended to read, “Assistantship appointments are to be made at the outset of each academic year, or semester if not an academic year appointment, using the appropriate Office of Human Resources form.”
- Under section G, the phrase, “in section V.C.4.” should be removed.
- Following section I, a section J should be added with the information present broken into three bullet points.
- Under section L, the word “on” should be changed to “one.”

Motion seconded and carried.

W. Ferguson reopened the discussion on University outside observers and the continuation of that process. He then broke down the three different directions that the Council could take on outside observers:

1. The Council can support the continuation of the appointment of an “outside observer” (or, as identified by other universities, a “Graduate Faculty/School Representative”) with a statement defining its purpose and the role of an outside observer. In doing so, it would also charge the Graduate School with revising the process for appointing and ensuring participation of/feedback from outside observers so that that process runs efficiently and serves a defined purpose.
2. The Council can recommend the discontinuation of the practice of appointment of an “outside observer” to thesis, dissertation, and synthesis projects, citing a general movement away from outside observers by Graduate Schools and the belief that the practice is outdated and serves no purpose. In doing so, it would recommend revision of the Catalog by removing the below-noted references to outside observers.
3. The Council can recognize that some form of Graduate School/University representation

should exist but that its current iteration is flawed, thus recommending discontinuation of the current practice of appointment of an “outside observer” as noted in #2 above and replacing it with the requirement of open defenses that are advertised at least XXX weeks in advance by the Graduate School. This approach would allow, in theory, any attendee to serve as an outside observer. In recommending this new approach, it would also charge the Graduate School with defining and administering the process of publicizing all defenses.

Discussion then began around these three options and the plausibility or desire to accept any one of them. D. Baker initially suggested that outsider observer be required to attend defenses or risk losing graduate faculty status. C. Taylor argued that this approach would be unfair as there were a number of times that he was not contacted about a scheduled defense. A. Maida advocated for abolishing the practice altogether as it’s just another practice that takes faculty away from other important tasks. S. McInerny agreed, while J. Lemoine disagreed as the entire process only takes a few hours. R. Hernandez objected, stating that some doctoral defenses have taken 3-4 hours, while outside observers generally do not possess the expertise to provide meaningful feedback for the student. C. Taylor advocated for option three as a cultural shift for how defenses are held University wide, but D. Olivier stated that such open defenses would have to be in locations that could accommodate larger crowds, necessitating their faculty to move between both campus locations frequently. C. Briggs asked for any evidence of malpractice at defenses that would require outside observers but M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that the general lack of participation in the practice over the past several years makes data-driven conclusions difficult. M. Kightley stated that his greatest concern was ensuring a mechanism to protect students during a defense, to which many Council members agreed. An initial motion was made to create an open defense that is advertised weekly to all grad faculty along with the ability to invite anyone from the graduate faculty to attend, by the student or the faculty. H. Hurst noted though that this change would leave little time for the Graduate School to make the changes necessary to implement a new system in the Spring semester. Thus, the initial motion was not seconded. A new motion was made to continue assigning outside observers for only doctoral students in the Spring semester, and not to assign outside observers to thesis defenses unless requested by the student, committee chair, or graduate coordinator; during this time the Council will act to develop a committee to recommend lasting revisions to the practice. Motion seconded and a vote was taken. Motion carried with 14 votes to approve, 3 voted to oppose, and 2 abstentions.

New Business:

R. Gonzales presented the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Certificate rules and regulations, explaining that the recommendations functions as two documents where the first seeks to include new information on existing programs in the Graduate Catalog while the second offers guidance to programs creating new certificate programs. M. Farmer-Kaiser asked for clarification on the question of grade requirements for certificate students, with R. Gonzales stating that certificate student would be required to maintain the GPA of all graduate students. D. Harrington asked that the committee’s recommendation in the program-specific guidelines regarding admission be revised to include language that prospective students could hold either a Bachelor’s degree or a Master’s degree. R. Gonzales agreed. Suggestion also accepted to change the program-specific admission requirement recommendation to read: “Require at least a minimum undergraduate grade point average of 2.75 (4.0 scale) on all work

required.” Motion made to accept the Ad Hoc Committee recommendations with the proposed revisions. Motion seconded and carried. The Council then thanked the ad hoc committee members for their hard work.

Through the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies, M. Farmer-Kaiser submitted a proposal to admit international students who meet all University standards for regular admission as REG (Regular Admission) rather than CONI (Conditional International). She explained that the CONI admission status is not considered as “regular admission” and/or admission in “good standing” and, as a result imposes an unnecessary challenge for these potential graduate students who are otherwise qualified for “regular admission” and/or admission in “good standing.” Perhaps most notably, these potential graduate students find that they do not qualify for many funding opportunities. Indeed, even our own current Graduate Assistantship policy states: “To qualify for an assistantship, a student must be in regular admission status.” With these considerations in mind, and on behalf of the graduate coordinators and the Graduate School, she asked that the below-noted qualification for admission be removed from policy outlined in the University Catalog’s Graduate Rules & Regulations, Admission to Graduate School, Qualifications for Admission:

D. Qualifications for Admission

.... All international students who hold degrees only from institutions outside the United States are admitted in conditional status....

With the removal of this qualification for admission, the admission status of international applicants who only hold degrees from institutions outside the United States would henceforth be dictated by the admission criteria in place for all applicants. Motion made to approve M. Farmer-Kaiser’s proposal. Motion seconded and carried.

Finally, motion made to discuss enrollment expectations/limits for graduate courses at the February Graduate Council meeting. Motion seconded and carried.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and carried. Meeting adjourned at 4:25pm.

February 2, 2016 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

Members Present: J. Albert, P. Auter, C. Briggs, A. Brown, W. Ferguson, S. Gawronski, R. Gonzales, D. Harrington, , H. Hurst, M. Kightley, J. Lemoine, A. Maida, S. McNerny, P. Morton, D. Olivier, C. Roche-Wallace, K. Smith, C. Taylor, W. Xu, , M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio member)

Members Absent: D. Baker, D. Bellar, K. Evans-Jackson, R. Hernandez, A. Khattab, A. Magidin, D. Stevens

The meeting was called to order by W. Ferguson at 2:02 p.m.

Announcements:

The Council voted to approve the December 15, 2015 meeting minutes, with corrections made on page 3 to a grammatical error and page 4 where an unnecessary word should be omitted.

The Graduate Council welcomed Sarah Gawronski, the new Graduate Student Organization president, as a member of the Graduate Council, replacing former GSO president Jane Heels. S. Gawronski thanked the Council for their warm reception and pledged to do her best to represent graduate students.

The list of degree candidates was presented to and accepted by the Council.

W. Ferguson provided updates on the two Graduate Council recommendations (1-Graduate Assistant Policies and 2-International CONI Admission Status) that were sent to the Provost for approval. Dr. Henderson approved these recommendations with their implementation occurring in the near future. M. Kightley asked for clarification regarding when these changes would take place. M. Farmer-Kaiser stated that they would both be effective with implementation of the 2016-2017 University Catalog; she also reported that the revised GA policy will be shared soon with all relevant campus entities and that the International CONI Admission Status change was being applied for Fall 2016 international admissions.

Committee Reports:

Student Appeals Committee – Committee report submitted by Bob Viguerie, not present, and prepared by the Graduate School. Motion made to accept the Student Appeals Committee report. Motion seconded and carried. P. Auter asked about late appeals considered by the Committee via email. M. Farmer-Kaiser reported that, yes, there were additional appeals considered after the meeting and that the Graduate School would provide updated information to include those appeals in the Committee report at the March meeting.

Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by Natalia Sidorovskaia, not present. Motion made to accept the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

Fellowship Committee – No report. M. Farmer-Kaiser asked that the Council consider allowing

the Fellowship Committee and the Graduate School to make offers to selected students prior to the March meeting of the Graduate Council, so as to increase chances of securing these top tier students. Motion made to allow the Fellowship Committee and the Graduate School to make offers prior to the March Graduate Council meeting. Motion seconded and carried.

Graduate Faculty Membership Review Committee – W. Ferguson explained the current review cycle was underway as of February 1, and acknowledged the work done over the last semester by the Colleges to revise their individual College criteria for Graduate Faculty membership. Due to timing of the revisions, some faculty might have chosen to be reviewed under either their applicable old or new College criteria for this Spring cycle, but the new College criteria would apply in the Fall 2016.

Old Business:

W. Ferguson asked for updates from the Ad Hoc Committee on Graduate Certificate Rules and Regulations. R. Gonzalez stated that he was awaiting further instructions from the Council. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that the Graduate School will turn the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee and into a catalog entry for the 2016-2017 University Catalog, seeking first the review and approval of Academic Affairs.

W. Ferguson asked for updates from the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies. M. Farmer-Kaiser stated that there was no report as the Committee had not yet met.

Concerning the December meeting decision to create an Ad Hoc Committee to review the practice of assigning outside observers to thesis and dissertation defenses, W. Ferguson asked for volunteers to both serve as members and/or chair this Committee. M. Kightley, J. Lemoine, D. Olivier, R. Gonzalez, S. McInerney, C. Taylor, and A. Brown volunteered to serve on the Committee with M. Kightley and J. Lemoine agreeing to Co-chair. W. Ferguson then indicated that the Co-chairs would meet soon to discuss the charge and makeup of the Committee.

H. Hurst provided updates from the University Committee on Graduate Student Success and Retention, proposed for creation by the Graduate Council in Spring 2015 and approved by the Provost last Fall. H. Hurst stated that the Committee had already met twice and that they were considering such topics and issues as mentoring, student connectedness, funding, family and departmental support, advising, and other areas. The Committee is planning to break into smaller groups that will carry out different types of exploratory research involving graduate student success and retention. M. Farmer-Kaiser then explained some of the mentoring initiatives that the Committee and the Graduate School is working to carry out in conjunction with Academic Affairs and the Office for Campus Diversity. In addition, the Committee wants to recognize the milestone of graduate candidacy by having an event honoring those students who have reached candidacy. H. Hurst stated that the Committee will ultimately provide a report to the Graduate Council in May and also to the larger University community at the annual Graduate Faculty meeting.

New Business:

W. Ferguson opened the floor for a discussion about the Academic Affairs enrollment expectations/limits for graduate courses and, specifically, the new policies governing Summer session enrollment. K. Smith asked about the enrollment average that has been identified for classes to run, with M. Farmer-Kaiser explaining that the 19-student average came from the Task Force on Summer Scheduling of Courses and Faculty Pay Structure and was based off of a University-wide review of enrollment trends by college. M. Farmer-Kaiser emphasized that this 19-student-enrollment average was a *college* average and not a *department* average; she also explained that graduate courses almost always function as a loss to the University due to small class size, but that larger undergraduate courses often help to offset this loss. Discussion ensued. A. Brown asked if non-faculty-pay courses (e.g., thesis/dissertation hours, internship) count toward this College average, with M. Farmer-Kaiser answering that they do not. The important point was made that all colleges met this average in the past with the exception of the College of Education. Given the important role that Summer sessions play for our graduate students in Education, however, M. Farmer-Kaiser expressed concern but also noted that Academic Affairs and Dean Nathan Roberts have been in discussions about how to ensure that graduate Education courses will run. Concern also was raised over the change in the Financial Aid award year from Summer-Spring to Fall-Summer and what impact that might have on enrollments this Summer session. .

W. Ferguson asked that the Council consider reiterating their support for the University's revised Strategic Plan during this time of administrative transition. Motion made to reiterate support of the Strategic Plan. Motion seconded and passed.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and carried. Meeting adjourned at 3:00pm.

1 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

2
3 February 14, 2017

4
5 Members Present: D. Bellar (KNES), Mark DeWitt (MUS), M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio
6 member), A. Fekih (ELEE), S. Gawronski (GSO), E. Habib (CIVE), D. Harrington (NURS),
7 K. Hermann (COUE), H. Hurst (NURS), J. Lemoine (NURS), M. Kightley (ENGL), A.
8 Magidin (MATH), K. McClung (ARCH), C. Parker (HIST), C. Richter (GEOL), C. Roche-
9 Wallace (MUS), K. Smith (ARCH), C. Ratliff (ENGL)

10
11 Members Absent: J. Albert (BIOL), D. Baker (MKHP), H. Damico (CODI), P. Das (ECON),
12 R. Hernandez (CHEE), D. Olivier (EDFL), D. Stevens (MGMT), W. Xu (CHEM), M. Young
13 (PhD ALSS)

14
15 The meeting was called to order by H. Hurst at 2:05 p.m.

16
17 Motion made to approve the December 13, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion seconded and
18 carried.

19
20 **Announcements:**

21
22 M. Farmer-Kaiser provided an update on the call for nominations for Grand Marshal for
23 Spring and Summer 2017. Nominations have been received by the Graduate School and a list
24 of all nominations and their supporting documents will be provided at the next Council
25 meeting.

26
27 The list of degree candidates was presented to the Council. Motion made to accept the list of
28 degree candidates. Motion seconded and carried.

29
30 **Committee Reports:**

31
32 Student Appeals Committee – Committee report submitted by P. Viguerie, not present.
33 Motion made to accept the report of the Student Appeals Committee. Motion seconded and
34 carried.

35
36 Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by J. Lemoine. Motion made to accept
37 the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

38
39 Fellowship Committee – No report. M. Kightley made a request to the Council on behalf of
40 the committee to be able make offers to Master’s fellowship recipients prior to approval from
41 the Grad Council. Making those offers early will help in securing the best students for those
42 fellowships. M. Farmer-Kaiser noted that this requested has been granted in the past to use the
43 fellowships as a recruitment tool. A. Magidin suggested that the Council consider making a
44 permanent change to the structure and timeline of the Fellowships committee so the issue
45 would not be recurring. Motion made to approve the request to make early offers for Master’s
46 fellowships. Motion seconded and carried.

1
2 Graduate Faculty Membership Committee – No report
3

4 **Old Business:**
5

6 M. Farmer-Kaiser provided an overview of the recommendation from the Ad Hoc Committee
7 on International Student Admissions Policies, presented at the December Graduate Council
8 meeting. She also discussed changes to SEVIS policies that prevent the issuance of I-20s to
9 international students admitted conditionally, though clarifying that individual Universities set
10 their own criteria for regular vs conditional admission. As a result of SEVIS policy, the
11 Committee also recommended moving the minimum TOEFL score from 81 to 79, rather than
12 81 to 80 as originally recommended. In regards to the recommendations, M. Kightley
13 suggested clarification of recommendation #3, which address which international students are
14 not required to submit proof of English proficiency. The Council expressed concern over
15 which Canadian students would be exempt from submitting proof of English proficiency,
16 arguing that the current recommendation is unclear. M. Kightley proposed the following
17 wording to clear up any ambiguity, “Applicants who hold a baccalaureate or graduate degree,
18 with primary instruction in English, from an accredited institution in the United States, United
19 Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales), Ireland, Australia, New Zealand,
20 and Canada are not required to demonstrate English proficiency.” Motion made to accept the
21 proposed amendment to wording in recommendation #3. Motion seconded and carried.
22

23 Following acceptance of the Ad Hoc Committee report, M. Farmer-Kaiser requested the
24 creation of an Ad Hoc Committee that would review all Graduate School admissions policies,
25 not just those applicable to international students. The goal of this committee would be to
26 assess admissions expectations while defining more clearly what the Graduate School
27 requires. The Council expressed support for such a committee. Motion made to create an ad
28 hoc committee to review all Graduate School admissions policies for all students. Motion
29 seconded and carried. H. Hurst then asked for volunteers to participate, with D. Bellar,
30 volunteering as chair and K. Smith, J. Lemoine, and K. McClung volunteering as members.
31

32 **New Business:**
33

34 H. Hurst asked the Council to consider a request from the Graduate School to create 899
35 Exams Only courses for all departments not yet possessing such a course. M. Farmer-Kaiser
36 explained that in situations where a student has completed all course requirements but has
37 failed comprehensive exams, an Exams Only course is needed for those students to enroll and
38 complete their degree. She then asked that ENVS 899 be included for consideration as it was
39 recently approved by the UL System and the Board of Regents, while H. Hurst asked that
40 NURS 899 be removed as its membership in the Nursing consortium will not allow for
41 creation of a course at just one University. M. Kightley was in favor of approving the request
42 as long as department heads, school directors, and academic deans provided consent, if only
43 electronically, for the creation of these courses. Motion made to accept the request to create
44 899 courses in bulk, with ENVS 899 added and NURS 899 subtracted from the proposed list,
45 provided department heads, school directors, and academic deans provide consent. Motion
46 seconded and carried.

1
2 The Council considered a request from the College of Business to waive the graduate faculty
3 membership requirement for graduate coordinators in the college for the Master of
4 Accounting program. The College argued that the current graduate coordinator, while not
5 possessing the terminal degree in Accounting, does possess years of accounting experience, is
6 a licensed CPA, and is a senior instructor in the department, teaching many graduate level
7 courses for the program. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that the College of Business did not
8 wish to change college criteria for graduate faculty membership but decided to ask for a
9 waiver of their requirements in this instance. M. Dewitt asked if there were any other faculty
10 in the Department of Accounting with the terminal degree. The Council determined that there
11 were a number of Accounting faculty members. The Council debated over whether or not a
12 graduate coordinator needed to be a member of the graduate faculty, with M. Kightley
13 arguing that in terms of mentoring possible future scholars, a role that goes beyond simply
14 professional development. K. Smith was hesitant to grant any exception that might set a
15 precedent for other programs to do the same. She expressed concern that the position of
16 graduate coordinator would be less incentivized. H. Hurst suggested granting the exception to
17 the faculty member alone for this one program and for a set time period, so that a precedent
18 would not be set. D. Bellar wondered though if this exception was the easiest solution for the
19 College of Business and not the best option, arguing that the College could consider another
20 faculty member with graduate faculty membership for graduate coordinator. H. Hurst offered
21 to invite Dean Fontenot to the Council meeting to discuss the request further, to which the
22 Council agreed. The request was thus tabled.

23
24 The Council reviewed a non-thesis degree program request from the College of Business to
25 allow the Master of Accounting program to require only 30 credit hours rather than 33 for
26 degree completion. H. Hurst explained that the College request falls in line with UL System
27 Master's degree requirements but does not comply with UL Lafayette policies, which requires
28 completion of 33 hours for non-thesis Master's programs. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that
29 the University, UL System, Board of Regents, and SACS approved the creation of the Master
30 of Accounting program at 30 hours, but the University policies outlined in the Catalog
31 required the program to add an additional 3 hours. M. Kightley asked why the 33 hour rule
32 would have come about, with M. Farmer-Kaiser stating that it was most likely instituted
33 decades ago to ensure rigor across programs. A few Council members asked whether 30 hours
34 was common for Accounting programs nationally, to which M. Farmer-Kaiser referred to the
35 materials submitted by the College of Business that confirmed. K. Smith expressed favor for
36 the request if the Council felt that the quality of the Accounting program would not be in
37 question, though she advocated for a review of the Master's non-thesis credit hour
38 requirements. M. Kightley agreed to a review of existing policies but stressed that the Council
39 should only be approving request based on the desired of the faculty, and not because some
40 other administrative body has previously approved something. D. Bellar also advocated for a
41 review of the Master's non-thesis credit hour requirements but asked that the review come in
42 the form of a denial to the request. Motion made to outright deny the request. No second and
43 the motion ended. Motion made to deny the request with an additional request to create an ad
44 hoc committee to review the Master's non-thesis credit hour requirements as set in the
45 Graduate Catalog. Motion seconded. Ten voted to approve the motion, three voted to deny the
46 motion, and one abstained from voting. H. Hurst then asked for volunteers to participate on

1 the newly created ad hoc committee, with K. Hermann and M. Kightley volunteering to
2 participate.

3
4 H. Hurst provided a brief update on the Provost search, stating that of the original 49
5 applications, 13 candidates were selected for live-streaming interviews, and of those 13, 4
6 individuals were selected for on campus interviews. She reviewed briefly the credentials of
7 each of the final candidates.

8
9 Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and passed. Meeting adjourned at
10 4:14pm.

May 10, 2016 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

Members Present: D. Baker (MKHP), D. Bellar (KNES), A. Brown (PSYC), D. Harrington (NURS), W. Ferguson (ECON), R. Gonzales (ENGL), R. Hernandez (CHEE), H. Hurst (NURS), J. Lemoine (NURS), A. Magidin (MATH), P. Morton (MUS), D. Olivier (EDFL), C. Roche-Wallace (MUS), K. Smith (ARCH), D. Stevens (MGMT), C. Taylor (MCHE), M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio member)

Members Absent: J. Albert (BIOL), P. Auter (CMCN), C. Briggs (EDCI), K. Evans-Jackson (BIOL/SREB), S. Gawronski (ENGL/GSO), M. Kightley (ENGL), A. Maida (CMPS), S. McNerny (MCHE), W. Xu (CHEM)

The meeting was called to order by W. Ferguson at 2:04 p.m.

Announcements:

The Council voted to approve the April 12, 2016 meeting minutes with a change to wording. A motion was made to change the phrase “that are tasked” to “who are tasked” regarding the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Outside Observers. Motion seconded and carried.

The list of degree candidates was presented to and accepted by the Council, with one correction made to a student’s degree program changed from “CODI” to “ALSS.”

W. Ferguson provided updates on the Spring and Summer commencement Grand Marshal appointments, with Mary Jane Ford accepting for Spring and Brian Lock regrettably having to decline for the summer. M. Farmer-Kaiser noted how honored B. Lock was for the invitation and expressed his sincere gratitude for having been considered. As a result of a vacant Summer Grand Marshal position, the Graduate Council nominated Claude Cech of the Psychology program. M. Farmer-Kaiser then asked the Council to consider using the Fall semester as an opportunity to revise the Grand Marshal selection process to include a call for nominations and faculty/administrator bios. Motion was made to invite C. Cech as Summer Grand Marshal and to revise the Grand Marshal selection process in the Fall 2016 semester. Motion seconded and passed.

H. Hurst, Chair of the University Committee on Graduate Student Success and Retention, provided a report of the Committee’s activities from the past semester, highlighting such initiatives as a graduate student survey that will collect data from graduating students as well as those who have stopped out or dropped out of their programs. Particular attention was given to the subdividing of the Committee into quantitative and qualitative groups that will gather data in their own respective ways. H. Hurst also reviewed the first annual Doctoral Candidacy Recognition Ceremony, its success and suggestions, and assured the Council that the Committee is also going to recognize the advancement of master’s students to candidacy in some way. H. Hurst thanked the Committee members present for their work thus far and was optimistic about their efforts moving forward. M. Famer-Kaiser added that the Graduate School, using one of the surveys that the Committee obtained from the Council of Graduate Schools, will begin collecting master’s student exit data from this graduating class.

W. Ferguson took time to recognize the outgoing Graduate Council members for both their service to the Council, and various associated subcommittees, and their contribution to graduate education at the University.

Committee Reports:

Student Appeals Committee – No report.

Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by Natalia Sidorovskaia, not present. Motion made to accept the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

Fellowship Committee – No report. M. Farmer-Kaiser stated that the Fellowship Committee is actively reviewing their own guidelines, the fellowship applications and requirements, and the Catalog fellowship descriptions and indicated hope that the committee would offer recommendations for updates in the Fall 2016 semester.

Graduate Faculty Membership Committee – No report.

Old Business:

W. Ferguson asked for a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that the Committee had met and entered into preliminary discussions of issues and concerns moving forward. M. Farmer-Kaiser then asked the Council to allow the Committee to continue its work into the next academic year. She indicated that the Committee hoped to have formal recommendations for the Council to consider early in the Fall semester. Motion made to continue the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions Policies with the present membership (A. Maida, A. Magidin, C. Taylor, W. Xu, and M. Farmer-Kaiser). Motion seconded and passed.

W. Ferguson asked for feedback, updates, or revisions to the recommendations of the Ad Hoc Committee on Outside Observers for Thesis and Dissertation Defenses. J. Lemoine opened by asking for the inclusion of Synthesis Projects in the description of “defenses” be removed to accurately reflect the nature of the DNP culminating, research document, while also reiterating that the Nursing program is happy to have outside observers present but asking that they be provided instructions explaining that DNP students offer a “presentation” and are not asked to do a “defense” of the DNP Synthesis Project. D. Stevens suggested then that the language in the recommendations be changed to identify Synthesis Projects as having presentations and not defenses. D. Bellar and A. Magidin both agreed that providing outside observers with a short preamble to their outside observer report form with defense/presentation expectations would be helpful. M. Farmer-Kaiser then asked for clarification regarding master’s level project students who have presentations and not thesis defenses and whether they need outside observers. The Council agreed that providing those students with outside observers was not the intention and that only thesis defenses should receive outside observers. M. Farmer-Kaiser then asked for clarification as to the definition of “new” programs, which the recommendations require the assignment of outside observers until a certain number of defenses have taken place. She

expressed concern that using a hard number would result in some programs finishing their required defenses in a very short time, perhaps too short to consider the program “seasoned,” while others would experience a very long time until the requisite number of defenses was met. A. Brown cautioned though about using years instead of a set number of defenses because it could take many years to see a doctoral completer in a newer program. K. Smith then suggested that the whole line in the recommendations about a required number of defenses be amended in favor of the following: “Recently created programs will have observers as determined at the discretion of the Dean of the Graduate School.” A. Magidin agreed that that line would ensure that the Graduate School is not just checking a box for defenses but is ensuring quality of defenses in newer programs. Motion made to accept amended wording. Motion seconded and passed. M. Farmer-Kaiser then asked that the Council consider turning these recommendations into a catalog entry as the current University Catalog contains very little information regarding outside observers. She also asked whether or not outside observers should be assigned in the Summer 2016 semester in the same format as Spring 2016. The Council agreed that enough faculty are present in the Summer to have outside observers assigned. Motion made to continue assigning outside observers in the Summer as was done in the Spring (that is, to dissertation defenses only) and to move forward to seek Provost approval of these recommendations and a catalog entry for the Fall semester. Motion seconded and passed.

W. Ferguson asked the Council to consider a report by R. Gonzales supporting the creation of an institutional repository. R. Gonzales explained that this repository would be a plan to preserve the works being produced by the University and would open lines of communication among scholars at UL Lafayette. The Council agreed that its creation could be beneficial to the University, though K. Smith suggested that the archiving of actual documents be done systematically while C. Taylor suggested that the repository, if created, meet all requirements for grant awarding agencies. Motion made to provide a letter of support for the creation of an institutional repository to the appropriate authority in the Library. Motion seconded and passed.

New Business:

W. Ferguson asked the Council to review an Academic Catalog bulk course change request. M. Farmer-Kaiser explained that the Banner implementation—in particular, the implementation of both the financial aid and the degree audit modules—has necessitated cleaning up course information in the catalog, and with that, the catalog needs explicit language that labels all courses (e.g., thesis and dissertation courses, independent study courses, alternate subtitle courses) that are indeed repeatable as explicitly repeatable. Motion to accept bulk course change request as proposed. Motion seconded and passed.

W. Ferguson explained that with the recent creation of Summer commencement, the Graduate School is left to carry out many administrative functions when the Graduate Council and its chair are not available, due to the Summer break. Therefore, the Graduate School has asked that the Graduate Council consider granting its chair the authority to act on behalf of the Council during the Summer for any issues that arise connected to graduation clearance. Motion made for the Graduate Council Chair to act on behalf of the Graduate Council in the Summer for graduate student graduation clearance. Motion seconded and passed.

W. Ferguson turned the Council's attention to a request from Dean Azmy Ackleh to allow a CACS faculty member who is leaving the University to co-chair and/or to continue to serve on the committees of several CACS doctoral students even after resignation from UL Lafayette. Members of the Council applauded the faculty member for wanting to continue to mentor and guide our graduate students. Motion made to allow the faculty member to serve as co-chair and voting member of the dissertation committees for four advanced doctoral students; to continue to serve as a voting committee member for two additional named doctoral students; to be recognized as one of the three required, voting members on these six committees; and to grant these approvals for a period of three years as requested. Motion seconded and passed.

Lastly, W. Ferguson thanked the Council for allowing him to serve as Graduate Council Chair for the 2015-2016 academic year. With that, he opened the floor for nominations for a new Council Chair. J. Lemoine nominated H. Hurst of the College of Nursing. No other nominations were made and W. Ferguson requested a vote. The Council voted unanimously to elect H. Hurst as the Graduate Council Chair for the 2016-2017 academic year.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and passed. Meeting adjourned at 4:15pm.

1 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

2
3 November 8, 2016

4
5 Members Present: H. Damico (CODI), P. Das (ECON), Mark DeWitt (MUS), M. Farmer-
6 Kaiser (ex-officio member), A. Fekih (ELEE), S. Gawronski (ENGL/GSO), E. Habib (CIVE),
7 D. Harrington (NURS), K. Hermann (COUE), R. Hernandez (CHEE), H. Hurst (NURS), J.
8 Lemoine (NURS), M. Kightley (ENGL), A. Magidin (MATH), K. McClung (ARCH), D.
9 Olivier (EDFL), C. Parker (HIST), C. Richter (GEOL), K. Smith (ARCH), C. Ratliff (ENGL),
10 C. Roche-Wallace (MUS), D. Stevens (MGMT), M. Young (ALSS/GSO)

11
12 Members Absent: J. Albert (BIOL), D. Bellar (KNES), D. Baker (MKHP), W. Xu (CHEM)

13
14 The meeting was called to order by H. Hurst at 2:05 p.m.

15
16 **Announcements:**

17
18 The Council voted to approve the October 11, 2016 meeting minutes with a few corrections.
19 D. Olivier provided clarification regarding her comments to Dr. David Danahar. D. Stevens
20 and M. Young were both added to the attendance list from the October meeting. Motion
21 seconded and carried.

22
23 The list of degree candidates was presented to and accepted by the Council. Motion made to
24 accept the list of degree candidates. Motion seconded and carried.

25
26 **Committee Reports:**

27
28 Student Appeals Committee – No report.

29
30 Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by J. Lemoine. Motion made to accept
31 the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.

32
33 Fellowship Committee – No report.

34
35 Graduate Faculty Membership Committee – Committee report submitted by William
36 Ferguson, not present, and the Graduate School on behalf of W. Ferguson. The report from
37 the Graduate School offered recommendations for appointment of 58 applicants who received
38 unanimous support from their three college review entities at the level to which they applied
39 (and thus not requiring review by the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee). The report
40 from W. Ferguson offered recommendations for the 27 applications that required additional
41 review by the Graduate Faculty Membership Committee pursuant to University Guidelines;
42 this report also offered additional policy-related points for discussion and follow-up by the
43 Council and/or the Graduate School.

44
45 Prior to review of those reports, D. Bellar noted that some of the individual college criteria for
46 Graduate Faculty membership are nebulous and require more specificity. M. Farmer-Kaiser

1 stated that she would follow up with academic college leadership on any points of concern
2 raised by the Committee or the Council, while noting that most of the individual college
3 criteria had been recently revised. C. Ratliff asked about what communications are sent to
4 those faculty members who the Committee noted appear to qualify for Level 2 membership
5 though only applied for Level 1, with M. Farmer-Kaiser replying that specific appointment
6 letters are provided to those individuals, encouraging them to consult with their department
7 heads and to consider reapplying for Level 2 membership.
8

9 M. Kightley requested that the Council review each of the four applications that the
10 Committee recommended appointment at a lower level of membership than what was applied
11 for by the applicant. The Council agreed. The Council proceeded to individually review and
12 discuss the CVs and the dean, department, and college peer review committee
13 recommendations for each. For three of the four applications, the Council voted to approve
14 the Committee's recommendation of Graduate Faculty membership at Level 1. For the final
15 application, M. Kightley argued that the application should also be approved at Level 2
16 membership as, in his opinion, counting one of the "invited and submitted" refereed
17 publication in question (alongside the other substantive "Category B" scholarly activities)
18 qualified the faculty member for Level 2 rather than Level 1 membership according to the "in-
19 press and forthcoming" parameters set by the College of Liberal Arts criteria. C. Parker
20 agreed, stating that the process for research and publication in the Humanities demands much
21 time, and thus the work already produced by the faculty member in question was substantive
22 enough for Level 2 membership. Much discussion ensued, which included an initial vote to
23 identify whether the majority of the Council favored appointment at Level 1 or Level 2.
24 Motion made to accept the Committee's recommendation for appointment at Level 1 rather
25 than Level 2 for this applicant. Motion seconded and carried with a majority for and one
26 against.
27

28 The Council motioned to accept all other appointments in the Graduate Faculty Membership
29 report at the recommended level. Motion seconded and carried.
30

31 **Old Business:**

32

33 H. Hurst asked for a report from the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student Admissions
34 Policies. M. Farmer-Kaiser walked through the provided report, explaining that the
35 Committee reviewed IPED peer and IPED-aspirational-peer institutions and their policies
36 regarding international graduate student admission. Ultimately, the Committee offered three
37 recommendations before the Graduate Council for its consideration:
38

- 39 1. That the Graduate School continue the practice of offering in-house foreign credential
40 evaluations to international applicants although it should explicitly reserve the right to
41 require an external credential evaluation (including a course-by-course evaluation) by an
42 approved independent third party at the applicant's expense.
43
- 44 2. That the Graduate Council align the English language proficiency requirements with peer
45 institutions by lowering the TOEFL score requirement for regular graduate admissions

1 from 81 to 80. (The Committee recommends that the current IELTS score requirement of
2 6.5 be retained.)

- 3
4 3. That the Graduate Council revise the Catalog policies that define which applicants are
5 required to demonstrate English language proficiency.
6

7 M. Kightley asked why the report proposed that some territories in Canada be required to
8 submit TOEFL scores. M. Farmer-Kaiser noted that the committee's recommendation follows
9 peer institution practices by allowing some discretion when it comes to Canadian institutions
10 due to the provincial and institutional variation. She noted that the committee would be open
11 to revision to its recommendation, which presently states: "Applicants who hold a
12 baccalaureate or graduate degree from an accredited institution in the United States, United
13 Kingdom (England, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales), Ireland, Australia, New Zealand,
14 and some Canadian provinces are not required to demonstrate English proficiency. All other
15 applicants must demonstrate English proficiency by submitting satisfactory Test of English as
16 a Foreign Language (TOEFL) or International English Language Testing Services (IELTS)
17 official scores. The Graduate School reserves the right to require proof of English proficiency
18 of other applicants when deemed warranted...." M. Kightley clarified that there are a number
19 of English-speaking Universities in Quebec and thus it may be better to change the report to
20 read "English-speaking institutions" as an exemption for English proficiency scores rather
21 than some Canadian provinces. M. Farmer-Kaiser noted some concern about stating "English-
22 speaking institutions" due to the vast number of English-speaking institutions outside of these
23 defined areas, but again welcomed further consideration and suggestions from the Council. H.
24 Hurst encouraged members of the Council to take the report back to their respective
25 departments and elicit responses and feedback for the December Graduate Council meeting.
26

27 **New Business:**
28

29 H. Hurst asked M. Farmer-Kaiser to share with the Graduate Council nominations received
30 for the post of Grand Marshal for the Fall 2016 commencement. Additionally, the Council
31 reviewed a list of current retirees that was provided to the Council, as retirees have
32 traditionally been chosen for the post. H. Hurst also called for nominations from the floor.
33 After discussion of the nominations and retirees, motion made to select Dr. Susan Nicassio for
34 the honor. Dr. Nicassio, a professor of History retiring this Fall, was nominated by Dean
35 Jordan Kellman. Motion seconded and carried. The Graduate School will reach out to Dr.
36 Nicassio with the Graduate Council's recognition and invitation.
37

38 D. Olivier, Chair of the Provost Search Committee, provided the Council with a current list of
39 the Provost Search Committee for their reference. H. Hurst thanked D. Olivier for her update
40 and welcomed any future updates.
41

42 Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and passed. Meeting adjourned at
43 4:02pm.

1 Meeting Minutes of the Graduate Council

2
3 December 13, 2016

4
5 Members Present: D. Baker (MKHP), D. Bellar (KNES), H. Damico (CODI), P. Das
6 (ECON), Mark DeWitt (MUS), M. Farmer-Kaiser (ex-officio member), A. Fekih (ELEE), E.
7 Habib (CIVE), K. Hermann (COUE), R. Hernandez (CHEE), H. Hurst (NURS), J. Lemoine
8 (NURS), M. Kightley (ENGL), A. Magidin (MATH), K. McClung (ARCH), D. Olivier
9 (EDFL), K. Smith (ARCH), C. Ratliff (ENGL), D. Stevens (MGMT),

10
11 Members Absent: J. Albert (BIOL), D. Harrington (NURS), C. Parker (HIST), C. Richter
12 (GEOL), C. Roche-Wallace (MUS), W. Xu (CHEM), S. Gawronski (GSO), M. Young (PhD
13 ALSS)

14
15 Guests: Ombudsman

16
17 The meeting was called to order by H. Hurst at 2:07 p.m.

18
19 H. Hurst requested a motion to move forward in the agenda to student appeals as students,
20 faculty representative, and the University Ombudsman were present to have grade appeals
21 heard by the Council. Motion made to move student appeals to the outset of the agenda.
22 Motion seconded and carried.

23
24 **New Business:**

25
26 H. Hurst then explained that, although appealing grades in the same course, each of the two
27 student appeals would be heard separately, with the Ombudsman in attendance. After both the
28 student and the faculty representative had the opportunity to present the complaint/respond,
29 Council members would be permitted to ask questions for clarification, and then ultimately
30 deliberate with the student, faculty representative, and Ombudsman absent from the room. In
31 addition, guidelines for appealing unfair and capricious grades were discussed and explained.

32
33 The first student appeal of an unfair or capricious grade was presented to the Council with the
34 student, Ombudsman, student's witness, and faculty-representative present. Following
35 presentation of the appeal, the Graduate Council requested clarification on a number of details
36 from all three parties. Following those clarifications, all three parties left so the Council could
37 deliberate. First, motion made to determine by secret ballot whether the student received an
38 unfair or capricious final grade in the course in question. Motion seconded and carried. The
39 Council voted and a member of the Council and an impartial third party (the Assistant to the
40 Dean of the Graduate School) tallied those votes with 15 votes for "yes" and 4 for "no." The
41 Council then discussed whether to assign a letter grade or a grade of "credit" to a course in
42 question. Discussion centered on concern over both that the grades retained by the student and
43 the faculty representative were incomplete and inconsistent as well as that the members of the
44 Council have no formal training in the course. Motion made to vote by secret ballot to grant
45 the student either a final grade of "credit" or "letter grade." Motion seconded and carried. The
46 Council voted, with a member of the Council and an impartial third party tallying the votes,

1 16 votes for “credit” and 3 for “letter grade.” The Council ultimately determined that the
2 student was given an unfair or capricious grade and that the student’s grade for the course
3 should be changed to “credit.”
4

5 The second student was then invited into the room along with the Ombudsman and faculty
6 representative; the faculty representative was no longer available. The second student appeal
7 of an unfair or capricious grade was then presented to the Council with the student, student’s
8 witnesses, and Ombudsman present. Following presentation of the appeal, the Graduate
9 Council requested clarification on a number of details from all three parties. Following those
10 clarifications, all parties left so the Council could deliberate. First, motion made to determine
11 by secret ballot whether the student received an unfair or capricious final grade in the course
12 in question. Motion seconded and carried. The Council voted, with a member of the Council
13 and an impartial third party tallying the votes, with 13 votes for “yes” and 4 for “no” and 1
14 vote was illegible. The Council then discussed again whether to assign a letter grade or
15 “credit” for the course, with the same concerns being voiced. Motion made to vote by secret
16 ballot to grant the student either a final grade of “credit” or “letter grade.” Motion seconded
17 and carried. The Council voted, again with a member of the Council and an impartial third
18 party tallying the votes, with 16 votes for “credit” and 1 for “letter grade and 1 vote that was
19 illegible. The Council ultimately determined that the student was given an unfair or capricious
20 grade and that the student’s grade should be changed to “credit.”
21
22

23 **Announcements:**

24
25 Motion made to approve the November 8, 2016 meeting minutes. Motion seconded and
26 carried.
27

28 The list of degree candidates was presented to the Council. Motion made to accept the list of
29 degree candidates. Motion seconded and carried.
30

31 **Committee Reports:**

32
33 Student Appeals Committee – No report.
34

35 Curriculum Committee – Committee report submitted by J. Lemoine. Motion made to accept
36 the report of the Curriculum Committee. Motion seconded and carried.
37

38 Fellowship Committee – No report.
39

40 Graduate Faculty Membership Committee – No report
41

42 **Old Business:**

43
44 Motion made to move report from the Ad Hoc Committee on International Student
45 Admissions Policies to the February 14, 2017 Graduate Council meeting. Motion seconded
46 and carried.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

New Business:

H. Hurst asked the Council to consider a request from a former UL Lafayette faculty member to extend an emergency appointment to the Graduate Faculty in order to finish one final PhD student at UL Lafayette. M. Farmer-Kaiser noted that an extension had been granted in the past to this former faculty member to finish a group of PhD students, with all but one student having finished their degree. Motion made to extend the faculty member’s graduate faculty membership until the Summer 2017 semester. Motion seconded and carried.

H. Hurst asked the Council to consider an appeal of a graduate faculty membership decision wherein a faculty member who had applied for level 2 membership, was denied, and granted level 1 membership instead. The Council reviewed the college, department, and academic dean recommendations concerning the faculty member in question. The Council also reviewed additional supporting materials provided by the appealing faculty member, comparing those materials with the faculty member’s college criteria. Upon this review, the Council determined that the faculty member still did not meet the qualifications for level 2 graduate faculty membership. Motion made to deny the appeal based on new supporting materials not meeting the college criteria while encouraging the faculty member to reapply in the Spring 2017 graduate faculty membership application cycle. Motion seconded and carried.

Motion made to adjourn the meeting. Motion seconded and passed. Meeting adjourned at 4:52pm.