

Graduate Council Minutes

February 12, 2016

Attendance: Emilia Alonso-Sameno, Tim Anderson, Austin Babrow, Steve Bergmeier, Sonsoles De Lacalle, Geoff Dabelko, Michelle Ferrier, Jennifer Horner, Janet Hulm, Chulho Jung, David Koonce, Jody Lamb, Krisanna Machtmes, Bose Maposa, Vladimir Marchenkov, Brian McCarthy, Martin Mohlenkamp, Shawn Ostermann, Liudmila Pestun, Ann Paulins, Anirudh Ruhil, Carl Smith Gursel Suer, and Katherine Tadlock.

Excused: Andrea Frohne, Jundong Liu, Chris Moberg, Erik Ramsey, Joseph Shields and Gaurav Sinha.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:05 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the January 15, 2016 meeting

The minutes of the January 15, 2016 meeting were approved.

2. Remarks by David Koonce, Associate Dean of the Graduate College

David said that Ohio University hosted its first Three Minute Thesis presentations last week. The event was coordinated by Sara Helfrich and was well attended and interesting. He added that eight students presented their work. Sean McGraw took first place, his advisor is Joe Shields, Nikhil Dhinagar took second and his advisor is Mehmet Celenk, and Reetobrata Basu took third place and his advisor is Shiyong Wu. The judges were Geoffrey Dabelko, Theda Gibbs, David Koonce, Kelee Riesbeck and Usha Matta.

David informed members that the ETD steering committee yesterday (02/11/2016). He said that new tools and styles are becoming available to create persistent, media rich, non-linear works. And, that institutions across the country are adopting them for accepting thesis and dissertations with various models for the archived document. He added that the ETD committee was reconstituted with the aim to help guide our possible adoption of new models. He said that the committee will discuss and review options that are accessible and non-proprietary, and will allow the document to stay in permanent/static/final status. The document or the piece of work has to be archiveable and we can create a style guide for our students.

David said that application numbers are higher than last year. He added that the September to September count shows a 5.3% increase (4214). We are however, lagging by 4.5% from two years ago. And, applications for fall 2016 are up by 5.3% (64 domestic and 71 international).

3. Curriculum Committee Report (Appendix A)

Ani said the MFA proposal seems quite promising and this final document summarizes the background well. Jen said that members can review and send their comments as soon as possible to Kelly Broughton.

Jen drew members' attention to the handout about professional doctorates (Appendix B). She said that the document uses the existing language with modifications in key areas that would be specific, yet broad enough to include the professional degrees currently being offered. Tim said that the most substantive change is that the comprehensive examination is not required. Sonsoles said that a note stating that a comprehensive examination is not required because this degree has licensure requirements. Tim clarified that state licensing procedures have been put in place to ensure protection of the public; and practitioners with professional doctorates go through the state licensing procedures. Martin said that the section on scholarly discipline requirement mentions that the professional bodies set standards, but it does not indicate that those standards have to be followed. Ann said that a program can choose to not be accredited by a national body.

Members discussed residency requirements in the light of the increasing number of online class offerings. Jen said that they are trying to be true to the original language, but it is worth noting for example that if someone who is not on campus would not qualify for a graduate assistantship. Katie said that the current academic residency requirements noted in the catalog can be reviewed as well. Steve said that the Policies and Regulations committee (chaired by Martin) can review this policy and bring recommendations to a future meeting.

Tim encouraged members to read the program reviews; he said that we have two meetings to do so. Michelle said that the Board of Trustees used to get shorter documents for review. They had questions and now they are receiving the entire document. She added that about 10-12 program reviews are coming up for them to review at each meeting. She said the Board would like to see a plan of action for any areas of concern noted in the review. Michelle said that this would apply to all programs, even the ones that are deemed viable. The plan of action can then be reviewed along with the next round of review of that program. She also said that there was a feeling among the members of the Board that a large number of programs are being noted as viable and that there could probably be more that fall under the category of being in jeopardy. And, that if a program is in jeopardy it should come up for review on a shorter cycle to ensure that the checks and balances are working and that the program is on the right track. Tim said that some concern has been expressed that no action had been taken about the issues noted in the program review for English. Ani said that there was some feedback and the corrections noted were factual. However, the original reviewers have not responded and new reviewers are being asked for their input.

4. Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee Report

Gursel said that the committee met on Wednesday to discuss multiple issues (Appendix C)

Graduate Student Survey (Appendix: D)

Gursel said that it would be nice to not only know the reasons for applicants who choose us, but also will be helpful to hear from those applicants who were offered admission and decided not to come to Ohio University. He added that he has the contact information for the ones who did not come, he can always ask, whether they respond or not. Ani said that the most common response is that this was the only program that offered full funding. Geoff said that it would be helpful to have Craig Cornell's perspective on the success they have had with their recruitment efforts. He added that we should look at how LJ Edmonds, the Vice Provost for Global Affairs and International Studies can help us in this endeavor. Geoff said that we all are trying to recruit more students and we are all doing it in our own silos. And, if the university has information that can be helpful to all of us, then it is that much better for the university as a whole. David said that the head count on

campus has been pretty steady over the years. Members noted that funding and faculty ranking are probably big factors that help students make decisions about choosing graduate schools. Gursel said to attract good students, we need funding; and faculty need students to help in their labs so that they can apply for more funding. Everyone agreed that it would be beneficial to have Craig come to one of the Graduate Council meetings to talk about the experience thus far.

Accepting CEFR along with the iBT and IELTS (Appendix: E)

Emilia said that most of the students in Europe take the Cambridge examination for English proficiency, and that the coordinators of the exchange program that we have with the University of Seville ask about us accepting this score in lieu of the iBT or the IELTS. In response to a question from Steve about why the iBT and the IELTS were used as acceptable scores, Katie said that these decisions were made by Graduate Council. She added that before the IELTS was adopted the staff of OPIE conducted an in-depth review to ensure that our standards were along the same lines as other institutions. David said that the main difference between the CEFR and the iBT or IELTS is that most countries in Europe offer their own tests, which are then mapped to the CEFR scoring pattern. The scoring is in very broad terms, so it does not allow the granularity that we are used to seeing with the iBT. He said that he would like the OPIE and ELIP staff to review the proposal. Sonsoles said that all of tests have differences because all of them are measuring different things and that is why the grading is different. She said that the Cambridge test measures the use of English, and accepting this test will be advantageous to us.

ELIP placement guidelines (Appendix: F)

Gursel asked if this table could be included in the Graduate Catalog. David said that this is more of a guidance tool for our academic programs to help them review the status of their applicants and students. David added that placing it in the catalog, could imply its formalization into policy, and could have students view it like a contract. It was decided that a link for this could be added to the graduate catalog once caveats noting that this is an estimate based on other students' performance, that all students are different, and that this is not meant to be a predictor of the path that all students would take.

English proficiency scores and placement (Appendix: G)

David said that students can be placed in academic/English classes per the test score received from the testing agency, instead of the test score received at the on-campus placement test. In response to a question from Ani, David said that students who are taking ELIP classes can progress to unconditional admission status (full time academic), per the grade in the ELIP class/classes even if they do not achieve 550 on the end of the term test. He added that we trust the recommendations that the ELIP faculty make for us and it is eventually the choice of the academic program whether they want to accept the status. He added that academic departments can always ask for higher standards. David said that many departments ask for waivers to the current policy, so until there is a change, the way to handle any of the exceptions would be to submit requests of exception to him. Katie said that the English Provisional admission status was approved as a provisional category and it might be time to review that status.

5. New Business:

Jen asked Steve if he had met with Faculty Senate recently. Steve said that Faculty Senate discussed graduate faculty status, and that he would share the document that they reviewed with all members.

Jen said that the Ohio University's College of Health Sciences and Professions and Heritage College of Osteopathic Medicine are hosting the second annual interdisciplinary health sciences research symposium on Friday, March 25, "Interdisciplinary Health Sciences Research Symposium: Collaborating for Clinical Innovation." She encouraged everyone to attend.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:35 pm.

Appendix A

Agenda Items from the GC Curriculum Committee

(1) Program Committee – Please see attached documents, including:

- (a) Selected notes from the recent Program Committee that are pertinent to graduate education.
- (b) Expedited Review Process – Goes to UCC for approval on 2/16 [NOTE: This document is an updated version to what was distributed by Usha on 2/5/2014]
- (c) Master of Fine Arts Program. Attached are the proposal and an addendum. The addendum document is NOT to be shared without permission because it is intended for an internal OHIO audience and is not for distribution outside of the university.

(2) Program Review.

- (a) Board of Trustee comments and suggestions on the program review process.
 - (b) Program Review Reports. There are four Program Review reports that are attached for review of graduate council. All of these programs were deemed as viable by the committees conducting the reviews. The programs include:
 - (i) Interdisciplinary Molecular and Cellular Biology
 - (ii) OU-HCOM (the entire college)
 - (iii) Department of Environmental and Plant Biology
 - (iv) College of Business (the entire college)

(3) Professional Doctoral Degree Requirements. The curriculum committee submits a proposed statement of requirements for professional doctoral degrees. The attached document is intended to provide needed wording for requirement for current and future professional doctoral degrees. These programs do not meet Ph.D. requirements, but the wording of this statement is intended to be parallel to the current requirements statement for Ph.D.s.

Appendix B

Professional Doctoral Degrees

The professional doctoral degree is granted on the basis of evidence that an advanced level of competency in a defined domain has been achieved. The professional doctoral degree incorporates basic and clinical sciences as the foundation the acquisition of professional skills and competencies. Professional doctoral training is often the core component of one step in a multi-step credentials process, often required by state licensing boards and professional associations, which provides public assurances of those skills and competencies. For some fields, a professional doctorate is the entry level degree for clinical practice in that discipline.

A minimum of 70 graduate (semester) hours beyond the bachelor's degree or 36 beyond a clinical/professional master's degree must be completed for conferral of a professional doctoral degree.

Time Limit

Students must complete the doctoral program of study within seven calendar years of the date of its initiation as determined by the school/department and recorded in the Graduate College.

If a doctoral student does not complete all requirements for the degree within the given period, he or she may be permitted to continue in graduate study only if exceptional circumstances are associated with the delay in progress. In these circumstances the student must file a formal request for extension by X date, and this request must be supported by the student's advisor.

Upon receipt of this request, the dean of the college may grant a one-time, one-semester extension for the semester immediately following the final semester in which the degree requirements were to have been completed.

If circumstances require an extension beyond one semester, the student must apply for readmission to the program. The application for readmission must be reviewed by the graduate committee of the program and the dean of the college. Criteria for readmission should be the currency of your (1) knowledge of required academic content areas, (2) clinical/professional literature, (3) professional skills and competencies, and (4) research methods and techniques. The program may require additional coursework, a retaking of the comprehensive examination, modifications (in part or in whole) to the scholarship project, and fulfilling any degree requirements that have been added since the student's initial enrollment into the program. If readmission is approved, the specifications for readmission, including the length of time for the readmission, must be presented to the student in writing, with a copy filed with the Graduate College. If approved for readmission, the student must fulfill all degree requirements in effect at the time of readmission.

Professional Program Requirements

Scholarly Discipline Requirement

The professional doctoral degree is, by definition, oriented to a specialization within a professional domain, for which a national standard-setting or national accreditation body and/or state licensure board sets the standards. Each school/ department determines the auxiliary research/scholarship competencies needed by professional doctoral candidates. Competence is determined by standards and methods established by faculty in the individual degree program.

Academic Residency Requirement

A professional doctorate must articulate requirements, if any, for students' on-campus presence, either periodic (as in hybrid on-line/on-campus learning model), or continuous, noting that residence on an Ohio University campus is required for any student receiving Ohio University stipend support. Specifically, students are considered to have instructional full-time status by registering for a minimum of 12 graduate credits for an assistantship, or a minimum of 15 graduate credits for recruitment scholarship/stipend, fellowship, or tuition scholarship only.

Curricular Requirements

Professional doctoral degrees at Ohio University must provide clearly stated guidelines or standards that are commensurate with doctoral training in the discipline in general and for specializations, if applicable. Minimal guidelines for doctoral training should include standards and methods for evaluating student learning outcomes (knowledge and skills); establishment of an advisory committee with at least one designated mentor for each student; articulation of culminating competencies (e.g., assessed using a comprehensive examination, clinical portfolio, or capstone project), and, if required, rigorous standards for completion of an independent work of scholarship compatible with the norms of the specific academic discipline or profession. Further, doctoral programs should strive to track their graduates' career placements.

Advisor / Advisory Committee

A member of the graduate faculty will serve as the student's primary advisor or on an advisory committee. The advisor / committee must be approved by the doctoral program and also must be consistent with college policy (i.e., "graduate faculty status"). The primary advisor and advisory committee must approve the proposed program of study for the degree, track students' progress at regular intervals, and recommend degree conferral.

Appendix C

Graduate Council
Admissions and Recruitment Subcommittee:
Gursel A. Suer

February 10, 2016

Items to discuss:

1. Survey of Graduate Students
Those who are accepted and arrived at the Ohio University (new coming, current?)
Those who were given admission but did not come (next phase?)
2. CEFR as a replacement for English Test
(C1 level or above, corresponds to 95+ in TOEFL ibt score)
3. Including OPIE/ELIP in the graduate Catalog
(currently only on the web site)
4. Changing the graduate catalog language for conditional admission
(students with conditional admission due to deficiency in English language must take on-campus English Proficiency)
Must → may be asked to take on-campus English Proficiency test at the discretion of accepting department or they can be placed in the appropriate category based on the guidelines of the OPIE and ELIP. (the highest test score if it is within 6 months of the date of the start of coursework; otherwise their most recent test score will be used for placement).

Appendix D

3/2016

TOEFL® For Academic Institutions: Compare Scores

14–17*	5
18–20*	5.5
21–23*	6
24–26*	6.5
27–28*	7
29	7.5
30	8
30	8.5
30	9

2

*Indicates score comparison ranges with the highest degree of confidence. The data is based on the analysis of 1,153 individuals who took both the TOEFL test and the IELTS academic module.

Research

[Linking TOEFL iBT Scores to IELTS® Scores — A Research Report \(PDF\)](#)

ETS conducted score comparison research between the TOEFL test and an alternative test, IELTS academic. For the research, ETS obtained a sample of 1,153 students who had both IELTS and TOEFL scores. Under this approach, TOEFL iBT score ranges are identified for test takers meeting a particular score level on the equivalent IELTS score band. The score comparison results for each section (Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing) and for the total test showed that most of the students in the sample scored in the middle to mid-high score ranges on both tests.

TOEFL iBT Scores and the CEFR

In 2006, as the TOEFL iBT test was being introduced, ETS conducted a standard-setting exercise with educators to map the new scores to the CEFR levels.

Since the time of that study, ETS has been closely monitoring the needs of TOEFL iBT score users and how they make use of CEFR levels and TOEFL iBT cut scores to inform their policies and decisions. ETS has also received extensive feedback from universities and teachers of English about the levels of performance in an academic setting represented by different CEFR levels and TOEFL score levels.

Based on this feedback from the field, ETS has adjusted the TOEFL scores corresponding to different CEFR levels, so that the scores more closely reflect performance described in the CEFR levels.

ETS adjusted TOEFL iBT scores using the test's Standard Error of Measurement (SEM). An SEM is found in every test, and quantifies the reliability of test scores — that is, the extent to which test takers would earn the same test score if they took different versions of the test on different occasions. Using commonly accepted educational measurement practice, ETS adjusted the TOEFL score requirements by two SEMs.

Comparison Table

Below are the adjusted TOEFL iBT scores mapped to their corresponding CEFR levels.

CEFR level	Reading (0–30)	Listening (0–30)	Speaking (0–30)	Writing (0–30)	Total (0–120)
C1 or above	24	22	25	24	95
B2	18	17	20	17	72
B1	4	9	16	13	42
A2	n/a	n/a	10	7	n/a

Research

[The Association between TOEFL iBT® Test Scores and the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages \(CEFR\) Levels \(PDF\)](#)

This 2015 study presents the rationale for the revision of the TOEFL iBT scores mapped to the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR) levels that were originally mapped in [Linking English Language Test Scores to the Common European Framework of Reference \(CEFR\) \(PDF\)](#).

Appendix E

*0-13
1/11/13
sk*

3

English Study for Graduate Students at Ohio University—in the Ohio Program of Intensive English (OPIE) & the English Language Improvement Program (ELIP)

This document reflects admission status options for Ohio University international graduate students regarding their English proficiency. The chart below specifies test scores and expected duration of study for the levels of Unconditional admission, Conditional Admission, and English Provisional. Students who have not taken one of the following tests within two years of the date for beginning their graduate program will need to take the institutional TOEFL test upon arrival to campus. Newly-admitted students with multiple test scores all within the Conditional Admission band will be placed based on their highest test score if it is within 6 months of the date of the start of coursework; otherwise, their most recent test score will be used for placement.

English Study General Guidelines: Levels and Duration of Study

Institutional TOEFL		OR	iBT		OR	IELTS		OPIE/ELIP Requirement	Expected Duration of Study
Total	Comp.		Total	Writing		Total	Writing		
Unconditional Admission - some programs may have higher numbers (graduate admission, funding possible)									
> 550	any		≥ 80	any		≥ 6.5 on all bands	any	ELIP available to interested students	N/A
Conditional Admission (graduate admission, no funding)									
525 - 549	> 40		71-79	≥ 17		> 6 on all bands	≥ 6	ELIP 3 hours, up to 15 hours of Academic Classes	1 semester (15 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission
	< 40			< 17			N/A	OPIE 8 hours + 9 Hours of Academic classes	1 to 2 semesters (15 to 30 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission
500-524	> 46		61-70	≥ 20		≥ 6 composite	≥ 5.5	ELIP 6 hours + 12 hours of Academic classes	1 to 2 semesters (15 to 30 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission
	< 46			< 20			< 5.5	OPIE 12 hours + 6 Hours of Academic classes	2 to 3 semesters (30 to 45 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission
English Provisional (no graduate admission)									
< 499			< 61			< 6		Retest upon arrival. Full-time English probable.	1 to 4 semesters (15 to 60 weeks) until Conditional Admission reached

For questions, please contact: Dawn Bikowski in ELIP (593-4564, bikowski@ohio.edu), the Graduate College (593-2800, graduate@ohio.edu), or the Ohio Program of Intensive English (593-4575, opie@ohio.edu).

Feb. 2013

Appendix F

Suer, Gursel

From: Suer, Gursel
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2016 7:07 PM
To: Babrow, Austin; Paulins, Ann; Frohne, Andrea; Geoff Dabelko
Cc: Tadlock, Katie; Koonce, David; Matta, Usha; Suer, Gursel
Subject: RE: Update on Conflict of Interest Documents

4

Dear Professors,

I am hoping that we can meet this week before graduate council meeting on Friday. I was wondering if you guys can meet Wednesday (anytime 9am-12:30) or Thursday around (9am-2pm) to talk about the following issues.

Item 1. Some minor changes needed in the graduate catalog
Item 2. Survey of graduate students/applicants

I will discuss briefly about item 2 here. What I am hoping is to understand why current graduate students decided to come to Ohio University. This can help us to identify our strengths (university-wide, college-wide, department-wide, etc.). This may be instrumental in marketing our graduate programs to potential applicants. This is the 1st phase. (At a later time, we can extend this study/survey to graduate applicants whom we admitted but they chose not to come to OU. This may tell us more but will be more difficult to do).

We can ask questions such as,

Name (optional),
College,
Department,
Domestic/International,
MS/PhD,
Tuition Scholarship offered or not
Stipend offered or not
Bachelor degree from OU or not (MS students or PhD students)
MS degree from OU or not (PhD students)
Ohio resident or not
They are attending Ohio University because (identify top three choices, etc.)

- Well known university
- Well known college
- Well known department
- Well known faculty
- Tuition scholarship offered
- Stipend offered
- Beautiful campus
- City of Athens
- Facilities available in your program
- Job opportunities in the area

Etc. ...

I volunteer to help graduate college collect this information when the new semester starts. I am hoping you can join me as well if this is approved by the graduate council and agreed to by the graduate college.

Feel free to send me your thoughts on this (if we cannot meet).

Appendix G

5

Post-Admission Testing

Academic Writing

All admitted students may be tested for academic writing proficiency upon arrival.

English Language Proficiency

Individual academic programs may require on-campus English proficiency testing for any student for whom English is not a native language. Failure to achieve a passing score may result in dismissal from the program.

Students with Conditional admission due to deficiency in English language competency must take on-campus English Proficiency test as described in the Admission Conditions section of this catalog. In lieu of campus testing, students can request English language placement based on the results of the official English Proficiency submitted in support of their application.

Students admitted under the English Proficiency Test Upon Arrival exception must take the on-campus English Proficiency test as described in the English Proficiency section of this catalog. Students who submit official TOEFL or IELTS scores in advance of the deadlines posted on the Graduate College website may request English language placement based on the results of those test scores.

Oral English Proficiency for Teaching Assistants - Ohio law requires all Teaching Assistants to demonstrate English proficiency prior to assuming instructional duties. Oral proficiency is certified by the academic program.

- Native speakers of English: Have received an undergraduate degree from an English medium university or college and have been interviewed by the academic program.
- Students for whom English is not the native language: Have an official iBT Speaking score of 24 or higher; have campus-delivered SPEAK test score of 230 or higher, have an official TSE score of 50 or higher, or qualify for probationary teaching with concurrent OPIE/ELIP registration based on a SPEAK test score greater than 189 and less than 203, or an iBT Speaking score greater than 20 and less than 24.

OPTE/ELIP
Submit to GC

? to take on-campus English Proficiency test
may be asked at the discretion of
the appropriate department or they can
be placed in the appropriate category
based on the judgement of the
OPTE & ELIP based on highest score
within 6 months.

At the discretion of the appropriate dept.

SPEAK → 230
→ report
→ check-test

click.