Graduate Council Minutes

September 11, 2015


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:07 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the May 1 2015 meeting

The minutes of the May 1, 2015 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve thanked Chris Mattley for her service as chair of Graduate Council these past few years. With a few new people on the council, Steve requested everyone to introduce themselves. It was noted that GSS representatives were not at today’s meeting. Joe said that it is not just this committee, but GSS has not nominated members to other committees across campus as well. Shawn asked if this needs to be looked into and if this body can help in any way. Steve said that he believes that it would be beneficial to graduate students to be on this committee, since this body serves as an advocate for graduate education. He added that he will send an email to Eddie to talk about GSS representatives attending the Graduate Council meetings. Geoff said that Eddie is in one of his classes and he could also try initiating an informal conversation with him.

Steve said that per the list of members and committee members that was circulated earlier this week, the Recruitment and Admissions Requirement and the Planning and Strategy committees need chairs. Krisanna volunteered to chair the Planning and Strategy committee, thus leaving a vacant spot on that committee.

Per the input from all members and Jody (chair of the Graduate Students Affairs and Fellowships) the internal deadline for accepting nominations for the MAGS distinguished thesis award was established as October 20th, 2015.

3. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe informed members that Vicky Hixson, the graduate appointment administrator in the Graduate College, recently resigned from her position. A search is in progress to fill the vacancy. He said that if members experience any issues, they can contact him, David, or Lisa Poston.

He introduced Sara Helfrich as the Faculty Fellow at the Graduate College. Sara said that she is working on two major events, a performance by Theater Delta on November 2nd and 3rd and a Three Minute Thesis competition in February 2016. She said that the Theater Delta presentation is
geared towards graduate students, but if departments want their honors undergraduate students to attend the event, that would be helpful to them. She said that the interactive performance will depict issues familiar to all of us. The group involves the audience members to talk about advisor-advisee relationships and ethics in research and scholarship. This event will be advertised on the Graduate College website. The Three Minute Thesis concept was developed at the University of Queensland and has been very popular all over the world. About 300 universities have adopted it on their campuses. She added that it is open to all masters and doctoral students who are enrolled during the spring semester, and have not defended their thesis or dissertation. She said that she will hold information sessions and will help students if they have questions about preparing their presentations. Sara noted that per the Registrar’s office, the class room reservations for this event in February can be made after November 17th. So, once they are made, she will post this information on the Graduate College website. In response to a question from Shawn, Sara said that they will hand out prizes for this event. She is still working on those, she added. Sara also said that she will send a monthly newsletter via email to all graduate students.

Joe encouraged faculty to attend the Theater Delta event as well. He said that faculty will benefit from attending it. He added that the performance is very well done and that this engaging medium helps us reflect on our own interactions in these situations. He requested assistance in advertising the event. Joe said that the Three Minute Thesis presentations help build communication skills for our students. It also builds visibility for the projects that our students are working on for their degrees.

Joe said that the Graduate College will be sponsoring a showing of The Ph.D. Movie (both the original and a new sequel). He said that these movies are produced by the same people who produce PhD Comics. Joe added that we are the first campus in Ohio to show this movie. These movies will be shown on October 5th at Memorial Auditorium and admission is free. Shawn and Steve endorsed the movies as well.

4. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie pointed to the handout in today’s packet that was given to all graduate coordinators on August 20th, 2015 during the graduate chair information session. She said that the document includes information about registration and some policies that apply to graduate students. Katie said that she and David have been going back and forth on the revisions for the Graduate Catalog and expect it to go live soon. She added that they are still waiting for information from a couple of departments and that she is working on the Student Services piece.

Katie told members that the university will hold a fall commencement on December 12th this year. She said that David ran some reports and we found that most of the graduate students graduate in the fall semester. This will be a combined ceremony but it will run more like a graduate commencement ceremony than an undergraduate commencement ceremony. The ceremony will have a processional and a recessional. She added that Event Services is working on seating arrangements for the event. She added that with many students having already gone from campus, finding Marshalls has also become a major task for them. Katie said that conversations are ongoing regarding printing deadlines for the program. She added that since the TAD deadlines for fall 2015 had been posted a while ago and students have been working towards meeting those deadlines, it would not be fair to change those. Members echoed the same sentiment and
recommended that deadlines not be changed. Katie said that having a Fall commencement should release the pressure off of Spring semester deadlines. This year, students who graduated in Summer, or will graduate this Fall have a choice of attending either the Fall or the Spring ceremonies. But, for the future, the conversation is headed where students who graduate in the Summer or Fall, would be able to participate only in the Fall commencement ceremony. Katie added that she is updating the commencement website, to include more information about the ceremony, and not just the hooding process. She said that typically, master’s students find this information on their college website, but having some of the information available centrally might help students. Ann said that Master’s students should also have all their requirements completed for degree conferral before participating in the ceremony. Katie said that this can be revisited.

5. **Committee Reports**

Curriculum Committee (Tm Anderson): Tim said that things are working well with the bridge committees for the Program committee and the Program Review committee of UCC. Ani said that the three big issues discussed at a recent meeting of the Programs committee were: lack of consistency regarding number of hours required for certificates, requirement of a minimum GPA for certificates, does not seem that programs are following the process for having programs approved. For the latter, he referred to the flow chart that David had circulated amongst members. He added that programs are coming to UCC for approval before being approved by the academic college. Michelle said that another issue that needs to be looked at is the possibility of de-coupling the requirement of licensure as a part of the degree requirement for some programs in the Patton College of Education.

Tim asked if members had comments for the three program reviews that he had sent to all members earlier in the week. He said that we are not required to provide long reports. He said that the review for Social and Public Health was a fairly long report and it seems like a viable set of two programs. He added that the MHA is a large program with 434 students in it, and all of them are fee-paying students. He said that the program seems to be well run and received positive comments from the reviewers.

The program review for English also deemed the program viable and reviewers noted positive comments for it as well. He said that the review noted that the program is facing extraordinary external challenges and that the number of majors has dropped by 46% since the last review. One of the recommendations was to fuse the three areas of creative writing, rhetoric and literature into one. Katie added that there is only one plan code for this degree, irrespective of the areas of specialization.

Tim said that the program review for Psychology was also positive and that he recused himself from it, since he is from that department.

Since, no one expressed any concerns or provided any comments for the three reviews; Steve said that he will follow up with a note that Graduate Council does not have any additional comments.

6. **Conflict of Interest Reviews**

Steve said that this item came up for discussion in his meeting with Joe earlier in the week. He added that the Recruitment and Admission Requirements committee handles these reviews. He
said that during the summer these do not get reviewed by this body and thus during the Fall, there are usually a fair number that need to be reviewed. One suggestion was to have a rotating member of the Recruitment and Admissions Requirement committee work with David to review these. This would allow for those where there was no conflict to get registered; for the ones where there was minimal conflict to register while the review takes place; and for the ones where there was a significant conflict, no registration would be allowed until it was resolved.

Ann said that the conflict of interest deserves an extensive review by a committee. She added that having multiple people review it allows for various perspectives. Steve said that we can have a larger committee for this, which would allow at least some members to be present for this process during the summer. Katie said that many years ago, Graduate Council authorized her to review the conflict of interest cases as they get submitted to the Graduate College. She said that her charge was to clear the ones where there was no conflict. She added that if any of the boxes noting ‘yes’ for conflict were checked, or, if they were not, but she thought that there was a conflict, she would forward them to the committee—as she has continued to do.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:04 pm.
Graduate Council Minutes

October 9, 2015


Excused: Geoff Dabelko, Janet Hulm, Chulho Jung, Jundong Liu, Brian McCarthy, and Chris Moberg.

Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:07 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the September 11, 2015 meeting

The minutes of the September 11, 2015 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve introduced Emilia Alonso Sameno as one of the new members of Graduate Council. He said that the new guidelines, per the Chancellor’s Council on Graduate Studies for new programs and program reviews will be available by the next meeting of the Graduate Council. Steve said that Gursel is the chair of the Recruitment and Admissions Committee. He added that he will forward the current committee membership list to all members.

3. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe informed members that the Regents Advisory Committee on Graduate study (RACGS) is now known as the Chancellor’s Council on Graduate Studies. He said that the guidelines for creating new programs have been revised. He added that an email ballot to approve the guidelines is in process and he expects them to be approved by next week. Joe said that new the guidelines will not be available immediately on the CCGS website since the website remains under construction, and while that remains the case they can be obtained from David or him. He said that the guidelines have not changed much, but anyone who is interested in proposing a new program, should review them.

Joe informed members that Mark Rowe will be joining the Graduate College next week as the Online Graduate Appointment Administrator.

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

David said that the Online Graduate Appointment (OGA) system is dated and now with Mark being appointed as the OGA administrator, the system can be reviewed and updated. In line with updating members about the OGA system and the administrator, David said that as of now, 1528 unique student awards have been processed; 1257 of those are for students who are working for 15 or more hours.
David said that unofficial enrollment numbers for Fall 2015 are slightly higher (5064) than Fall 2014 (5044). The increase can be attributed to the online programs in business and engineering.

He told Graduate Council that members of Academic Quality Improvement Program will be on campus on November 2nd and 3rd, 2015. He said that there will be numerous open sessions and to be on the lookout for banners on campus. Andrea asked about graduate student representation during the sessions. David said that students can attend any of the open sessions, like any other faculty and students.

David informed members that the new graduate catalog was published about a month ago. He added that it follows the ACALOG template created by the Registrar’s office, and looks like the rest of the Ohio University website.

David told members that The Ph.D. Movies (the first one and the recently released sequel) were shown in Memorial Auditorium on Monday (10/05/2015). He said that he hopes that the upcoming Theatre Delta event and the Three Minute Thesis will have better than the modest attendance at the movie. He added that it is possible to stream the first movie for a $5 charge. However, the second one is not available for streaming yet. We were the ninth institution in the country and first in Ohio to have a showing on our campus.

David said that he spoke to Mo Valentine, Assistant Vice President for Research and Sponsored Programs, about the proposed policy for parental leave for students. The conclusion from that conversation is that it is not possible to continue funding students through an external grant if they are not performing their duties. Martin said that it is up to the departments to continue paying or not to pay students during the time they are not working due to childbirth. He added that if a student is being sponsored by an external funding agency that does not allow for this provision, then that would prevent the student from being paid for being off from work. David said that to be fair to all students, it would be best to operate with a fixed fringe rate, so all students who avail this leave can be treated equitably. Shawn agreed and said that Graduate Council should be able to say to the officers at Human Resources that an action on this policy is needed. Martin said that it can take years to have a policy like this, with benefits and a fringe rate. He added that we need to look at ways to help students in the interim. It was noted that the Office of Legal Affairs and the office of Human Resources would review this policy.

5. **Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College**

Katie informed members about the Global Health Case competition, drawing their attention to the handout they all received. She said that the deadline has been extended to October 15th, 2015 and that it a good opportunity for students interested in global issues. The winning team will have the opportunity to work with the winning team from another US institution and will travel to a sub-Saharan African country.

She said that the fall 2015 commencement information has been updated on the Graduate College website, and that the university website is in the process of being updated as well. Katie said that she will send a note to all summer doctoral degree recipients and to everyone who has applied for graduation for this semester about participating in the ceremony. She added that at this point in time, information about line-up has not been finalized.
Katie reminded members that October 30th, 2015 is the last day for students to withdraw from a class through their student center. She said that the hours withdrawn still stay on the record with a ‘W’, and that this does not have an impact on the assistantship a student is receiving.

Katie referred members to the handout about accepting English proficiency scores from external testing agencies. She said that this language will be added to the website and the catalog. Katie said that students cannot be given university funding if they have not provided an acceptable official English proficiency score.

Emilia asked if the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment (CEFR) would be acceptable in lieu of the TOEFL or IELTS. She said that she has been asked this by the University of Seville, which has a student exchange program with Ohio University. Katie and David recommended that either Emilia could propose to Graduate Council to accept the CEFR instead of the TEOFL and IELTS for anyone who wishes to provide that test score; or, to ask for an exception just for students from the University of Seville per the exchange agreement between the two institutions.

**Graduate Council voted to approve the language about setting deadlines for accepting official English proficiency scores for placement recommendations by OPIE and ELIP. (See Appendix)**

6. **UCC Program Reviews**

Tim informed members that UCC and the bridge committee look forward to receiving the updated guidelines from CCGS for proposing new programs. Members discussed the process of a program review; Jen noted that if Graduate Council has an opinion about a program, then it should be expressed. David said that so for all program reviews that have come our way, have been noted as viable; and that if we see something that needs to be addressed, then we should bring it up. Steve said that for example the items of concern in the program review for English are already being addressed. Moreover, they were all about undergraduate enrollment and its impact on faculty.

Tim said that the review for the COMS program was favorable. The program seems to be doing well. The couple of issues that were noted were that the Rhetoric and Public Culture had more resources than the other areas of the program, and the climate in the department. Tim mentioned that the poaching of students mentioned seems to be a matter of concern and should be addressed. He added that students are not comfortable bringing this up to the director of the school for fear of repercussions. Ani echoed the sentiment, and said that it might be helpful to have a process that promises anonymity for students to raise these issues with a neutral person. Austin noted that the school has had a climate of avoiding conflict, but the issues should be addressed. Michelle said that some of these issues have come up to her with requests of anonymity. And, she has worked on them with the director of the school. Austin said that some of the graduate committees for students were not set up to serve the student’s best interest. David said that since each committee gets endorsed by the Dean’s office, that might be a place for students to provide feedback about their committee.

Members discussed the timing of the reviews and whether the review period should be changed. David said that sometimes programs like to have their programmatic accreditation reviews
coincide with this process, while others do not. He added that Patrick Barr-Melej is coordinating these centrally and that we can expect continuity in the long run for this.

Jen said that the DNP proposal is ready to go to UCC and if anyone has any questions. Jen explained that the professional doctorate is different from an academic doctorate. And, that if Graduate Council is supportive, this proposal will be forwarded to UCC. She said that the document circulated to all members earlier this week has Kelly Broughton’s notes of the status of discussion as it took place.

**Members voted in favor of forwarding the DNP proposal to UCC.**

Steve said that he would send an email to Kelly Broughton noting the above.

7. **Committee Reports**

   **Policies and Regulations (Martin Mohlenkamp):**

   Martin asked about the graduate faculty status document which had been discussed during the Spring of 2015. Joe said that he, Chris Mattley, Dave Thomas, and Beth Quitsland met very late during the Spring semester. He said that Faculty Senate would like to be involved in this process and that if there is a desire amongst members of Graduate Council to continue this conversation, then it would need to be reinitiated. It was noted that CCGS would also like all of its member institutions to have a policy, be it at the department or college level. Joe said this would not be something where we would set standards centrally. He said that the levels of standards have to reflect of the heterogeneity of the programs offered. It was noted that the Russ College of Engineering and Technology has criteria in place and so does the college of Health Sciences and Professions. Joe said that since CCGS expects a policy in place, we were in a situation where a program was approved conditionally, pending this policy being set in place. Jen noted that having a policy helps Joe shepherd a proposal on behalf of the university by noting that the courses are being taught by graduate faculty. Joe said that one of the main components is determining who sits on the committee. He added that every unit follows a process to compose committees, but when there is no standard, it is difficult to articulate it. It does not mean that good decisions were not made, but just that the process of making those decisions is not easy to explain.

   Martin referred members to the handout about program appeals. Members discussed the situations in which the process outlined in the handout could be used. Katie said that in the absence of a specified policy, this process would be followed. Jen said that their college has a well-defined process for dismissals. Katie said that since we do not have a student handbook, it is helpful to have these processes outlined for students.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:41 pm.
Appendix

For Graduate Council, 10/09/2015

Clarification about measures of English Proficiency for graduate students

The Ohio Program of Intensive English or the English Language Improvement Program can consider an iBT or IELTS score for placement recommendation if either test is taken after the initial admission decision and the official score is received by Ohio University by the listed deadline: August 14th for the fall semester, December 20th for the spring semester, and May 1st for the summer semester. If an official iBT or IELTS score is not received by the deadline, the on campus TOEFL placement exam will be the sole means for determining placement in academic and English language classes.
Graduate Council Minutes

November 13, 2015


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:10 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the October 9, 2015 meeting

The minutes of the October 9, 2015 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve introduced the Graduate Student Senate members; Sarah Kaplan (Vice President of Communications) and Liudmila Pestun (Vice President of Finance and Administration). Sarah said she is from Athens and is a Master’s student in the Public Administration program. Liudmila said she is from Belarus and is a Master’s student in the International Development Studies program.

Joe asked members if they would be okay with having the next meeting of the Graduate Council on December 11th instead of the 4th (currently scheduled for this day). He added that Joe and David will be out of town on the 4th of December. Members agreed to have the meeting on December 11th, 2015.

3. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe told members about the Theatre Delta presentation held last week. He said that the interactive performance group helps people think about issues encountered in graduate school. He said that this format of interactive theatre for social change allows the discussion of issues like advisor-advisee relationships and research ethics. He said there were about 40 people and the feedback has been positive. He said that he would like to consider a future presentation as well. Joe thanked Sara Helffrich for organizing the event.

Joe said that Academic Quality Improvement Program (AQIP) was on campus 10 days ago. He added that he was in four meetings with the group and that the university received positive feedback. He also said that he believes directives pertaining to more engagement with assessment might be coming through in the near future.

Joe said that last night he attended a meeting of the GSS which was also attended by President McDavis. He said that the students questioned the general fee and the lack of mention of it in their offer letters. Discussion focused on the importance of having all fees noted clearly in admission
letters. It was decided that a template with standard text should be made available to graduate chairs.

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

David said that he enjoyed the excellent performance by Theatre Delta. He added that it would have been nice to see more students attend the event.

He said that Sara Helfrich is hosting information sessions for the three minute thesis competitions that will be held in February 2016. The three minute thesis is gaining popularity at institutions worldwide and that the institutions that have hosted it, have provided positive feedback.

David said that per the preliminary headcount for this fall (4932), it seems that we are just around where we were last fall (5036). He said that according to the Registrar’s dashboard 5075 students are enrolled this semester. He added that enrollment for outreach has increased and he expects, the enrollment at the Dublin campus to hold steady.

5. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie informed members that last spring the Provost had set up a committee to look into certificates. She said that the committee is tackling the low hanging fruit first. She said one of the important topics of discussion has been clarification of language regarding the interdisciplinary nature of the certificates. She said that other issues that will be discussed are degrees earned through stackable certificates; i.e., completing a series of stand-alone certificates with the provision of a capstone project for the last one. She added that this method provides flexibility for delivering content for credentialing purposes; and that micro credentialing for specific skills and curricular transcripts are gaining popularity. Katie said that there are a lot of details that need to be addressed. The committee recommends moving forward with this structure. However, one of the issues that students run into is that certificates are non-degree by nature, and hence students pursuing a certificate are not eligible for federal financial aid. She said that significant amount of alumni tracking and salary infrastructures are required to look into making a case for financial aid eligibility. The advice from financial aid offices is to not pursue this option. The Provost is interested in a pilot program, so more information on this should be coming through. In response to a question from Steve, Katie said that graduate certificates are not required to be interdisciplinary in nature. Emilia asked about the credit hour limit for certificates. Katie said that the minimum number of hours is nine and that certificates over 20 hours have to be approved by the state. She added that most certificates fall in the 12-19 hour range; those can be initiated with department, UCC, and Graduate Council approval.

6. Graduate Course Availability

Sonsoles said that she has been told that graduate students are finding conflicting information about the classes offered and when they are offered. Steve said if there isn’t enough enrollment for a class that was scheduled to be offered, then it is cancelled. This causes problems for students who are taking interdisciplinary classes. Martin said that he had written a script which allowed all the classes in his department over a period of eight years to be offered on a rotation. Steve said that most departments offer classes at least on a two year schedule. Sonsoles said that many times the
classes that are published are not offered. She added that we might need to raise consciousness about this issue and to encourage our students to enrich their perspectives by taking interdisciplinary classes.

### 7. IELTS score for clearing non-native English speaking Teaching Assistants

Katie drew members’ attention to the handout about the IELTS scores. She said that Dawn Bikowski sent the table noted in the handout. Katie said that this provides students with one more avenue to meet the state mandated clearance required for TAs. She said that this would also allow the Graduate College to have a more automated process to mark this on a student’s record. Katie clarified that all TAs, whether native or non-native speakers of English are required to be cleared by academic departments. By using the IELTS score, just like we use the iBT score, students can be cleared before the beginning of the term. Katie said that Dawn has helped us identify the band score for complete clearance and clearance with concurrent enrollment in the appropriate ELIP class. In response to a question from Steve about the number of students taking the speaking part of the IELTS, Katie clarified that it is a part of the test, so everyone who takes the IELTS, also has a score on the speaking part of the test. At this time, data is not available for the question asked by Sarah regarding the percentage of students who score 7 on that band. Liudmila said that as an international student, she can attest to the fact that the IELTS is a difficult test.

Katie explained that this is a state requirement and that many years ago, we used only the SPEAK test scores to clear students who had any instructional responsibility. Once OPIE and ELIP had enough data from the iBT that they could compare with the SPEAK test scores, they were able to recommend using the speak test score of the iBT to clear students for teaching. She added that proficiency in learning in a language and proficiency in teaching in a language are different.

Shawn said that we have to ensure that the undergraduate students who take classes taught by non-native speakers of English are able to understand their instructors. Katie said that we did not see this proposal earlier because there wasn’t enough data to support it. Dawn is comfortable with these scores, so we would defer to her expertise on this matter.

It was decided that members would review the proposal and it will be voted upon at the December 11th, 2015 meeting.

### 8. Graduate Student Fees

Members discussed that the different kinds of fees and their amounts should be made clear to graduate students. It was also noted that at the rally held yesterday graduate students spoke about the reduction in the general fees. Liudmila said that graduate students do not attend the athletics events which the general fee goes towards. A proposal was introduced to separate the undergraduate and graduate general fees and use the graduate general fee buy down to instead reduce the graduate general fee. Joe said that it would be helpful for any proposal that is endorsed by the Graduate Council, to also have the support of the faculty senate. That will help the process at the Budget Planning Council. Steve said that the planning and strategy committee can review this proposal and can bring it back to be voted upon at the December 11th, 2015 meeting. And, then it can be sent to the Faculty Senate, to see if they would be willing to support it.
9. **Committee Reports**

Martin drew members’ attention to the hand out about the programs appeals process that he passed to everyone. In response to a question from Steve, Katie said that this is not addressed in the catalog. She added that it is important for students to be aware of the due process and to have clear information about policies. Members discussed the timeline noted in the proposal and whether the time period of 15 days noted for the first two steps would be sufficient. Shawn said that there are a few times in the year when the two week period is not enough. Steve added that the proposal can be edited to note that the Associate Dean will respond in 30 days. Brian and Shawn said that they do not see this issue too often. Biran added that based on the time allotted in the proposal, it comes to 105 days, and that he does not think, it would take that long. It would probably take half as long to get an issue of this nature resolved.

It was noted that everyone will need to be aware of the implications for international students, since their immigration status is at stake.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:38 pm.
Appendix

Proposal:

Set levels for IELTS scores be able to clear a potential non-native English speaking TA for teaching, in addition to the SPEAK test and the iBT speaking score.

Recommendation from Dawn Bikowski and ELIP, based on:

1. Policies at other institutions

2. An analysis of scores at OU (for those students who have an IELTS score for comparison, though it is not many)

3. Band descriptions for the IELTS (as compared to the iBT and SPEAK test bands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>iBT Speaking</th>
<th>SPEAK Test</th>
<th>IELTS Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleared to teach</td>
<td>24 or higher</td>
<td>230 or higher</td>
<td>7.0 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional teaching (teach with concurrent class)</td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>190-220</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Council Minutes

December 11, 2015


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:17 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting

The minutes of the November 13, 2015 meeting were approved with the edits recommended by Martin.

2. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe reminded members that the fall commencement ceremony will be held tomorrow at 2 pm. Only one ceremony is being held for all students, undergraduate, graduate, and doctoral candidates. He added that the 21 doctoral candidates who will be participating in the ceremony tomorrow are being escorted by 18 faculty members.

He added that David Koonce met with Colleen Bendel at HR about looking into possibilities for options regarding health insurance for graduate students. He added that she is very helpful and brings good experience from her previous position. He said that there are tax implications for the university and thus it has to be looked into greater detail. He also said that since other institutions have been providing this service to their students, we need to look at some models and explore our options. He said that all of this can take time.

3. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie said that the Registrar’s office received notification from 800 students who are planning to attend the graduation ceremony tomorrow. She said that since this decision came later in the year, some students who graduated in the summer had already made plans to attend the spring 2016 ceremony.

4. Committee Reports

Polices and Regulations: Martin Mohlenkamp
Martin drew members’ attention to the hand out about the programs appeals process that he passed to everyone. Members discussed which issues would be handled by Community Standards and
which would be handled at the academic college. It was noted that we do not have a process for extensions on time limits for degrees. Shawn said that the default process would be followed with the request finally going to Joe. Jen recommended clarifying the word ‘days’ to business days. She said that it is important for students to have all of this information. Jen also noted that it should be clarified that the college policy would supersede this policy (Appendix).

Curriculum: Tim Anderson
Tim said that Ani and Jen attended the Programs Committee (of the UCC) meeting. The notes and agenda for that meeting were already sent to all members of the Graduate Council prior to today’s meeting. They noted that most of the time at the meeting was spent on the discussion about the proposed MFA program.

Scripps College is interested in starting an MFA in Communication Media, however, the College of Fine Arts is objecting to it. Jen said that the in-depth discussion was very cordial and the committee talked about the principle based issues. In response to a question from Erik about the timeline for a response, Jen said that we would need to respond by January 7th, 2016. The next UCC meeting is on January 12th, 2016 and we can then share the information with Graduate Council at its January 15th, 2016 meeting. Jen clarified that our role is to make our views known, we can review and decide if we support the proposal put forth by Scripps, or we endorse the view of the College of Fine Arts. Emilia asked the reason for disagreement between the two colleges. Jen said that typically when new programs are proposed, the proposers discuss options with similar programs already being offered. She added that offering a new program is not about being competitive, but about being distinctive in the degrees that are being offered. Shawn asked if the issue was regarding the name of the degree, MFA. He added that most of the degrees offered in the Russ College of Engineering and Technology are either BS or MS; and that we are not a College of Science, but we grant those degrees. Jen said that we should find ways to cooperate- by exploring options of sharing revenue and teaching together. Erik said that the failure to cooperate could be the result of the School of Art and Design feeling that they were not being represented well by their Dean. Vladimir said that this needs to be handled very carefully. He said that different schools have different perspectives. The fear in College of Fine Arts is that the new program will siphon students from their program. It appears that the need to propose this program came from industry demands in that field. Sonsoles said that a solution based on data from the field might be helpful in this process. Joe asked about the possibility of a collaborative degree offered by both colleges. Vladimir said that there is a difference between the institutional and conceptual view of the name of a degree. He said that a media expert is different from an artist whose work is based on free expression. He said that communication is key here, and that Scripps College did not seem to have reached out to the College of Fine Arts.

5. New Business:
IELTS: This was discussed at the previous meeting and the handout is a part of today’s packet. In response to a question from Gursel, Katie said that the TOEFL and IELTS scores are valid for two years. Katie noted that the proposal is requesting the extension of the current policy to one more test, the IELTS.

Members discussed the option of also using the Cambridge language test instead of the TOEFL or IELTS. So, applicants who already have a score on that test would not have to take another test.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:33 pm.
Appendix

- The policy should be vetted by Legal Affairs prior to implementation.

Appeals

Upon occasion, a graduate student may disagree with a decision or action taken regarding them and wish to appeal it. In tuentity cases a university-wide policy or procedure applies, or a particular office is designated to handle the issue. In particular:

- Grade appeals are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Academic Policies and Procedures section on Grade Appeals.
- Extensions to the time limits for completing a degree are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Degree Requirements sections on Time Limits.
- Disputes related to graduate appointments are handled through University Policy 2.102 Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board.
- Matters involving student misconduct are handled through the Office of Community Standards and Student Responsibility.
- Requests for accommodations are handled through Student Accessibility Services or the Office for Equal Opportunity and Accessibility.
- Equity issues are handled through the Office of Equity and Civil Rights Compliance.

A student may wish to discuss the issue with the Office of the Ombudsperson to determine which of these (or other) processes to use.

In some other cases, the student's academic program, department/school, or college may have a written policy that applies to the issue. If a department/school policy applies but terminates at the department/school level, then the student may make a further appeal to their Academic College (Associate) Dean, who makes the final decision.

When none of the above apply, the following backup appeals process will apply for matters of an academic nature. Appeals initiated more than 30 days after the student was notified of the action or decision they wish to appeal may be denied solely because they are not timely. The student may appeal, in order, to:

1. their Department/School Graduate Chair,
2. their Department/School Graduate Committee,  
3. their Department/School, and
4. their Academic College (Associate) Dean.

A level may be skipped only if it is not present for the student's program. In the first three steps, each person/committee has 15 calendar days to respond; if they do not do so, then the student may interpret this as a negative decision and appeal to the next level. The Academic College (Associate) Dean is expected to respond within 30 days and makes the final decision.
Graduate Council Minutes
January 15, 2016


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:07 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the December 11, 2015 meeting
The minutes of the December 11, 2015 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s report: Steve Bergmeier
Steve said that he, David and Joe met with Dave Thomas and Beth Quitsland to discuss graduate faculty status. He said that he believes there is some consensus and that he would like to send the document back to committee. It was noted that last year an ad hoc committee worked on it and that this year again, we might do the same, have an ad hoc committee review the document along with the comments made by Beth and Dave. Steve said that there were some issues like the role of affiliate graduate faculty status and if they could chair a thesis/dissertation committee. He added that the proposal would allow departments to have this flexibility.

3. Remarks by Joseph Shields, Dean of the Graduate College
Joe said that he met with Sonsoles, the program director for the TBS program. The program is doing well, with five students in this first class and a healthy applicant pool for the next year as well. Joe said that 36 faculty members from various departments have expressed interest in being affiliated with this program as graduate faculty.

4. Remarks by David Koonce, Associate Dean of the Graduate College
David said that the application numbers for this year are higher than last year. He said that the low application numbers did not have too much of an impact on the yield.

He reminded members that the deadline for submitting a nomination for the Named Fellowships is February 5th, 2016.

The Graduate Writing and Research Center is having a dissertation writing workshop in June. He said that if anyone has students who could benefit from this writing session that will be offered, they can contact the director of the Graduate Writing and Research Center, Talinn Phillips. The fee
for this workshop is $150. He said that other schools who have used similar models have reported a high no-show rate if there was no fee associated with it.

David said that updates and enhancements to the GRADS system recommended by its users will go into production soon.

He said that there is a pending update to the OGA system. Once completed, the new system will have robust reporting capabilities. It will also allow for more input validation at the front end.

David said the University of Leipzig and Ohio University have signed an agreement to offer a dual degree in Chemistry. This is now the second dual degree program with the University of Leipzig; we also have a dual degree program in Journalism.

5. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie said that fall commencement went well. It was a nice ceremony, it was not too long. Katie said that the weather was good, which worked out well. She said that at this point in time, she has not heard how many students participated in the ceremony. She said that she will send emails to all who graduated past summer and fall and who did not participate in the fall ceremony.

Katie said that she has a couple of conflict of interest cases that she will bring up for discussion during the presentation of the committee reports.

6. Appeals policy: Martin Mohlenkamp

Members voted in favor of approving the document (appendix A).

7. Vote on using IELTS scores instead of SPEAK test scores

Members voted in favor of approving the document (appendix B).

8. Committee Reports

Recruitment and Admissions Requirements:
Members discussed Gary Ginther’s conflict of interest case (appendix C). He has applied for the MFA in Art History. He is a reference librarian for the college of Fine Arts. Katie said that she informed the committee that we have had reference librarians apply for a graduate degree in their field of work. Ann said that it is a given that we will be supportive of graduate education, but in our role here, we are required to play devil’s advocate and thus we tend to be very cautious. Members were supportive of the edits mentioned by Janet noting that the purchase requests made by the faculty on his committee would be channeled through Sara Harrington or other library staff.

Katie explained that the other student, Jesus Pagan (appendix D) is reenrolling to complete his degree. He has now been hired in the same college, but in a different department, Engineering Technology and Management (ETM). Members stipulated that faculty from his department should not serve on his committee. Shawn said that the faculty in ETM do not have graduate faculty status, so they would not be serving on Jesus’ committee.
Members voted in favor of both cases with the recommended edits.

**Programs Committee of UCC:**

Jen said that she attended the first part of the programs committee meeting and Ani attended the second part of the meeting. The MA in speech pathology was the only graduate item on the agenda.

Ani said that the other item of discussion was a question whether the catalog had been updated to reflect the number of hours required for certificate programs. Sonsoles said that there was some new language about stackable certificates. Katie said that the catalog does not have the language about stackable certificates, but it does have information about concurrent degrees and certificates. Katie said the committee that was reviewing the certificate programs has looked into it some of the professional master’s programs can be offered by taking a combination of a few certificates and then a capstone would tie it all together. Katie said that the outdated language of the restriction of number of hours has been stripped from the catalog. Students in certificate programs are admitted as non-degree status, there is however, no way to ensure that they do not take any other classes than required for the certificate.

9. **New Business:**

Martin said that in November a discussion about the graduate general fee had begun, the Planning and Strategy committee will be working on it.

Jody reminded members that the deadline for the Named Fellowships is February 5th, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:55 pm.
Appendix A

- The policy should be vetted by Legal Affairs prior to implementation.

Appeals

Upon occasion, a graduate student may disagree with a decision or action taken regarding them and wish to appeal it.

When a university-wide policy or procedure applies, or a particular office is designated to handle the issue, that policy or procedure takes precedence. In particular:

- Grade appeals are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Academic Policies and Procedures section on Grade Appeals.
- Extensions to the time limits for earning a degree are handled by the process in the graduate catalog Degree Requirements sections on Time Limits.
- Disputes related to graduate appointments are handled through University Policy 28.102 Graduate Student Contract Grievance Board.
- Appeals of sanctions by the Office of Community Standards and Student Responsibility are handled through their appeals process.
- Requests for accommodations are handled through Student Accessibility Services or the Office for Equal Opportunity and Accessibility
- Equity issues are handled through the Office of Equity and Civil Rights Compliance.

A student may wish to discuss the issue with the Office of the Ombudsperson to determine which of these (or other) processes to use.

In some situations, the student's academic program, department/school, or college may have a written policy that applies to the issue. If a department/school policy applies but terminates at the department/school level, then the student may make a further appeal to their Academic College (Associate) Dean. Appeals initiated more than 30 calendar days after the student was notified of the action or decision they wish to appeal may be denied solely because they are not timely. The Academic College (Associate) Dean is expected to respond within 30 calendar days and makes the final decision.

When none of the above apply, the following backup appeals process will apply for matters of an academic nature. Appeals initiated more than 30 calendar days after the student was notified of the action or decision they wish to appeal may be denied solely because they are not timely. The student may appeal, in order, to:

1. their Department/School Graduate Chair,
2. their Department/School Graduate Committee,
3. their Department Chair/School Director, and
4. their Academic College (Associate) Dean.

A level may be skipped only if it is not present for the student’s program. In the first three steps, each person/committee has 15 calendar days to respond; if they do not do so, then the student may interpret this as a negative decision and appeal to the next level. The Academic College (Associate) Dean is expected to respond within 30 calendar days and makes the final decision.
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Appendix B

Proposal:

Set levels for IELTS scores be able to clear a potential non-native English speaking TA for teaching, in addition to the SPEAK test and the iBT speaking score.

Recommendation from Dawn Bikowski and ELIP, based on:

1. Policies at other institutions

2. An analysis of scores at OU (for those students who have an IELTS score for comparison, though it is not many)

3. Band descriptions for the IELTS (as compared to the iBT and SPEAK test bands)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>iBT Speaking</th>
<th>SPEAK Test</th>
<th>IELTS Speaking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleared to teach</td>
<td>24 or higher</td>
<td>230 or higher</td>
<td>7.0 or higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provisional teaching</td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>190-220</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(teach with concurrent class)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
January 15, 2016

Dear Dr. Tadlock,

The Recruitment and Admission Requirements Subcommittee of the Graduate Council reviewed the conflict of interest documents provided for Gary Ginther. The committee recommends approving his request. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, the committee believes that his MS advisor and other committee members should not be involved in ordering books and making other requests related his duty as a librarian until he completes his degree. We recommend that Item 4 in the Conflict of Interest Statement form be changed to “yes” to accurately capture his case.

Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions and or comments at phone (740) 593-1542 or fax (740) 593-0778 or email at suer@ohio.edu.

Sincerely,

Gürsel A. Süer, Professor,
Chair, Admissions and Recruitment Subcommittee
Graduate Council
ISE Graduate Chair, Stocker Center 274
ISE Dept, Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701
January 15, 2016

Dear Dr. Tadlock,

The Recruitment and Admission Requirements Subcommittee of the Graduate Council reviewed the conflict of interest documents provided for Jesus Pagan. The committee recommends approving his request. To avoid any potential conflict of interest, the committee believes that the chair of ETM department should not serve on his PhD committee (and currently he is not) and Jesus Pagan should avoid serving on the same college committees with his PhD Dissertation committee members. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions and or comments at phone (740) 593-1542 or fax (740) 593-0778 or email at suer@ohio.edu.

Sincerely,

Gürsel A. Süer, Professor,
Chair, Admissions and Recruitment Subcommittee
Graduate Council
ISE Graduate Chair, Stocker Center 274
ISE Dept, Ohio University
Athens, OH 45701
Graduate Council Minutes

February 12, 2016


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)

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

TOEFL For Academic Institutions: Compare Scores

14-17*  2
18-20*  5.5
21-23*  6
24-26*  6.5
27-28*  7
29     7.5
30     8
30     8.5
30     9

*indicates score conversion range with the highest degree of confidence. The data is based on the analysis of 1,133 individuals who took both the TOEFL and the IELTS academic module.

Research


ETS conducted score comparison research between the TOEFL test and an alternative test, IELTS academic. For the research, ETS obtained a sample of 1,133 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 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, 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.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CEFR Level</th>
<th>Reading (30)</th>
<th>Listening (30)</th>
<th>Speaking (30)</th>
<th>Writing (20)</th>
<th>TOEFL Total</th>
<th>TOEFL A2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C1 or above</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research


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 2006. For more information on the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR), see:

https://www.ets.org/toeflinstitutions/scores/compare/
Appendix E

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Score</th>
<th>TOEFL Total</th>
<th>IBT Total</th>
<th>IELTS Total</th>
<th>ELIP Requirement</th>
<th>Expected Duration of Study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unconditional Admission</td>
<td>some programs may have higher numbers (graduate admission, funding possible)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>550 &amp; up</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>any</td>
<td>any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditional Admission (graduate admission, no funding)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 - 549</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 17</td>
<td>&gt; 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 semester (15 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500 - 524</td>
<td>&gt; 40</td>
<td>&gt; 17</td>
<td>&gt; 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1 to 2 semesters (15 to 30 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English Provisional (no graduate admission)</td>
<td>&gt; 46</td>
<td>&gt; 20</td>
<td>&gt; 6 composite</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1 to 2 semesters (15 to 30 weeks) until eligible for Unconditional Admission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 499</td>
<td>&lt; 61</td>
<td>&lt; 6</td>
<td>Retest upon arrival. Full-time English probable.</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 to 4 semesters (15 to 50 weeks) until Conditional Admission reached</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Feb. 2013
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

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 the 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, IELTS, or SAT 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 270 or higher; have an official TSE score of 50 or higher; or qualify for probationary teaching with concurrent OPTE/ELIP registration based on a SPEAK test score greater than 180 and less than 200, or an IBT Speaking score greater than 20 and less than 24.

The on-campus English Proficiency test may be administered at the discretion of the department or by the pre-admission or placement test.

Admissions Committee
Graduate Council Minutes
March 11, 2016


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:25 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the February 12, 2016 meeting

The minutes of the February 12, 2016 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve brought members’ attention to the graduate faculty status document in the packet and asked members to review it.

3. Remarks by Joe Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe said that he visited Oak Ridge, TN for a meeting of Oak Ridge Associated Universities (ORAU), which OHIO recently joined. He noted that this organization works closely with Oak Ridge National Lab and other federal agencies, and draws on the expertise of its 120 member universities to carry out a wide range of contract work with an annual budget of $390. Joining the group will not only increase opportunities for research funding but will also increase access to research facilities not just for faculty, but for our students as well. More information on these opportunities will be made available shortly to the university community.

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

David said that Doctor of Nurse Practice (DNP) proposal will be presented at the CCGS meeting next Friday. He added that the new approval process at HLC might add a significant amount of time to new proposals that we might want to advance. He said he will bring more back information about this and the process of completing the HLC notifications to the next meeting.

David said that the English Provisional (EP) admission category was introduced on a trial basis and we have talked about reviewing this policy. Now, we have also heard from the office of International Student and Faculty Services (ISFS) that they would also like this policy reviewed. He added that we would need to look at students who were admitted under this category who progressed to degree programs and if they were successful in those programs. Steve said that the Recruitment and Admissions Requirements committee might be the appropriate committee to
review this policy. It follows well along the lines of the English proficiency requirements that the committee has been working on currently. David said that a lot of data will be required for this purpose which will need to be reviewed for longitudinal tracking at the individual level and also to identify patterns, if any exist.

David said that the Graduate Chair handbook is being revised. He added that he is trying to replace text-heavy pages with flowcharts. He is hopeful that will help interpret the policy and procedures. He said that he is also working on a field guide, which will be a shorter document and easy to access for graduate chairs. He said that per the two questions he sent to all graduate chairs, he now has a list of 33 items that graduate chairs would like to know. The two questions he asked were: what would you like to know? And what do you know now, that you would have liked to know earlier? Brian asked if this information can be made available as FAQs. In response to a question from Steve about the information being accessible, David said that the handbook is accessible to all faculty- it requires the OU log-in information.

David said that graduate applications are still higher than what they were last year at this time. Currently, we are running at an increase of 7.5% from last year.

5. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie said that she attended a meeting of the University Academic Advising Council earlier this week. She added that most of the information there pertained to undergraduate students. She added that the Registrar’s office has opened the PeopleSoft module of classes that students want to take. This creates the rationale for demand for classes, and is helpful to departments to determine the iterations of offering these classes.

She added that we will invite the Registrar to the Graduate Student Orientation to provide not just this information, but all the tools that our available to graduate students through the PeopleSoft system.

Katie said that so far she has received inquiries from three different colleges about doctoral students who are defending their dissertations beyond the acceptable deadline for participation in the spring commencement, but would like to be hooded at the ceremony on April 29th. She noted that the request has to document extenuating circumstances, needs to come from the dissertation advisor and then should be approved by the academic department and college before being sent to Joe and herself. The deadline for submitting these requests is 04/22/2016 at 5 pm. In response to a question from Shawn, Katie explained that reasonable acceptable exceptions in the past have been for doctoral students in Psychology who have defended their dissertations and are in the last few weeks of the mandatory internship (which can end in late May or June). She said that another situation has been where the defense was delayed due to a committee member’s illness. Katie clarified that students who are allowed to participate in the ceremony and be hooded do not receive their degree until all the requirements have been met.

Members discussed whether the 3.0 GPA requirement for degree conferral applies to certificates as well. It was noted that the 3.0 requirement should not be a cumulative requirement, but should be specific to the program, so if the student does not have a 3.0 GPA in the courses that comprise the certificate, then should they not receive the certificate? Joe and David said that CCGS has had a discussion of combining coursework for all programs and the possibility of academic forgiveness.
Ann said that the undergraduate DARS notes GPAs for majors and minors, so the system has the capability to record it. Shawn commented that graduate students in a given program can in some cases meet the program requirements via unique and widely variable combinations of courses, so they would probably need to be entered for each student. It was noted that the courses could be added to a student’s record when the plan of study is approved. David added that as plans of study change, they will need to be updated on a student’s record, and this would need to be done by the academic college. After the Q2S conversion, structured DARS for graduate students no longer existed. In Fall 2015, Jen, Katie, and David attended a meeting with the Registrar and her staff for creating a structured DARS using the CHSP template. Joe said that he will check with the Registrar for updates on this. Gaurav said that clarification regarding the language about the GPA requirements will be helpful. Katie asked if there was consensus about assigning a minimum GPA requirement for any kind of credential earned by a graduate student. Jen said that she would like to see it, since the overall performance should not mask the performance in one area. Katie said that it is not possible to earn a certificate if it is attached to a degree and if that degree is not earned. Chris said that in such cases, the degree is conferred first and the certificate conferral comes after that. Katie added that stand-alone certificates are unique to graduate students, they can earn those as non-degree students. Brian asked about the GPA requirement for an attached certificate. Katie said that for certificates that are being earned as a part of the graduate degree, the requirement is for a cumulative GPA. And, as long as the cumulative GPA is 3.0, it does not matter whether the student earned less than 3.0 GPA in the classes that comprise the certificate. Jody said that UCC and the Certificates task force should be involved in this discussion as well.

6. Curriculum Committee Report (Appendix)

Tim said that the document about professional doctorates has been revised and was circulated to all members earlier in the week. He said that members had raised a question about the academic residency component. He said that this was discussed last month, and for now it was decided to have the text parallel that of the on-campus programs. He said members also asked about some stylistic and language changes. Jen said that the current document has new language, a paragraph in the section on research doctorates. Jen read the text from the document. She said that historically, to be a GA, a student was required to be on campus at least for the CHSP. Brian asked if a student was assisting with an online class. Tim said that is why the wording notes, ‘may be required’ to be on campus. David said that instead of noting the hourly requirements, it might be better to refer to the catalog or the source document. Shawn asked about any state implications about doctoral students and if they had to be on campus working with an advisor to earn their degrees. Joe said, there are programs where students are doing research in a different location. Members noted that the language needs to be reviewed and clarified. Jen said she recommends that members read the document and bring their questions and concerns to the next meeting.

Jen asked members to send any feedback they have about the PDP for the Master’s degree in Accounting. Tim said that there were no concerns noted for the program reviews for Environmental and Plant Biology, Interdisciplinary Molecular and Cellular Biology, OU-HCOM (the entire college), and the College of Business (the entire college). It was also noted that at this point in time, it is not feasible for the program review committee to monitor accessibility. Ani said that it is already difficult to get reviewers and there has not been much in terms of training. Jen
said that this would need expertise and finances to review these needs. Sonsoles added that there are other mechanisms at the university through which a student can ask for accommodations.

7. **Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee Report**

Gursel said that he met Dawn Bikowski yesterday and received some good information about the Cambridge test.

Gursel circulated a handout which included responses to the survey for why students chose Ohio University.

Gursel informed members that the committee had discussed Maureen Rogers’ conflict of interest case and a few suggestions have been made to mitigate any conflict. The committee recommended that Dr. O’Malley not be an instructor of record for Maureen’s course work, and if that it is not possible, then another instructor should evaluate the course work. Katie said that this is a non-degree student and she wants to pursue the TESOL program. She works for the program coordinator.

Members approved the committee’s recommendations.

8. **Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships Committee Report**

Jody informed members that today’s packet contains the committee’s recommendations for the award of the Named Fellowships. He reminded members that these are not endowed awards and that they are funded by the Graduate College. Steve asked if it was possible to get them endowed. Joe said that we do not have a dedicated advancement officer for the Graduate College, so it has not been a priority on anyone else’s agenda. Jody said that this year the information for this fellowship was sent to all graduate chairs, members of graduate council, and in the graduate student newsletters to all graduate students this past November, December, and January.

The nominees for the awards and the titles of their projects are as follows:

John Cady Graduate Fellowship nominee: M. Renee Benham (English) (Beyond Nightingale: The Transformation of Nursing in Nineteenth-Century Literature)

Donald Clippinger Graduate Fellowship nominee: Kiran Prasai (Physics and Astronomy) (Gap engineering and simulation of advanced materials)


Anthony Trisolin Graduate Fellowship nominee: Rachel Bykowski (Division of Theater) (Voodoo Doll)

Graduate College Fellowship nominee: Nicholas Tomeo (Environmental & Plant Biology) (Extent and drivers of genotypic variation in mesophyll conductance)
1st Alternate: Maggie Hantak (Biological Sciences) (Color Polymorphism and ecological divergence in the Red-backed Salamander, Plethodon cinereus)

2nd Alternate: Phally Chroy (Interdisciplinary (Cosmopolitan Cambodia: Arts in the Cambodian Golden Age and Post-UNTAC)

Members voted to approve the committee’s recommendations.

9. **New Business**

Steve said that he will send the graduate faculty status document to Beth Quitsland and Dave Thomas. Jen said that she does not think that the current document reflects all the edits that were made last year

The meeting was adjourned at 4:51 pm.
Graduate Council Meeting

April 8, 2016


Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:21 pm.

1. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve said that the final meeting of Graduate Council will be on April 29th, 2016. He introduced the GSS representatives Ian and Alex, who will most likely serve on Graduate Council next year.

2. Remarks by Joe Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe said the general fee buy-down has been a topic of discussion at the academic leadership committee. Discussion has focused on the nature of the general fee, its impact on graduate students and to what extent can it be tied to graduate appointments. He said that unfortunately, the discussion about health insurance has not yielded results thus far, since per the federal rules, all the recommendations that have been made have been ruled illegal.

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

David said that Sara Armstrong, Director of TAD Services and Digital Processes has accepted another position at the university and her last day at the Graduate College will be Friday, April 15, 2016. He added that Lois Hatfield, who had been assisting Sara will step-in and cover until someone else is hired. David said that the job was posted today and the goal is to get someone in as soon as possible.

David said graduate applications are up by 6% this year.

David informed members that the updated version of the graduate chair handbook will be available online next week.

David informed members that GRADS version 2.2 was released on Monday. He added that with increased functionality and many new features, it should be even more helpful to academic programs. He added that if any of the programs would like to get their students’ life-cycle documents scanned and available through GRADS, the Graduate College can help.
facilitate it. The heavy duty scanner at the Graduate College can be used for scanning those documents.

David said that all graduating Master’s students have been sent the exit survey, and that he will bring the results to the first meeting in the fall.

Discussion focused on the health insurance subsidy ($40) and that IRS rules it illegal since it is considered as the subsidization of an individual plan. Only group plans are eligible for subsidies. In response to a question from Alex if it was possible to have the student’s plan aggregated, it was noted that the University of Dayton included their graduate students on their faculty plan and they were able to provide a subsidy to their students. David said that he is not sure if it would be possible to do the same at Ohio University. David also said that this has been discussed at the CCGS as well, since the IRS rules that apply to small businesses are hurting graduate students financially.

4. Report from the Curriculum Committee

Jen said that the document about professional doctoral degrees has been reviewed three times and the only substantive change in the version in today’s packet is about the residency requirement associated with stipend support and registration hour requirements.

Members discussed the GPA requirement for certificates, and it was noted that it is possible for students to get an A in all of the classes required for the certificate, and maybe a B- in one of the classes. The proposed change in language would prevent the student with the above mentioned grade distribution from earning the certificate. It was also noted that it might deter students, fee-paying and the ones on assistantships from adding certificates to their existing academic plans. More discussion will take place before a vote.

5. GSS: general fee buy-down process for graduate students

It was noted that graduate students do not use the same university resources and facilities as the undergraduate students and that the activities that the general fee funds are not aligned with the interests and needs of graduate students. Members noted that the tuition and general fee are bundled together; and if a decoupling of those fees was possible, it could potentially lead to having the general fee go towards the facilities/resources that would be useful for graduate students. Joe said that the decisions about the allocation of the revenue from the general fees are made by the President and the Board of Trustees. It was also noted that the graduate students should also be able to avail the advantage of the Ohio tuition guarantee rates.

More discussion will follow at future meetings.

6. Report from the Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee
Ann said that conflict of interest case of Cimmeron O’Connor is being handled by the academic college; and that she will have a new advisor for her program.

Gursel said that the committee recommends using the Common European Framework of Reference and the Cambridge English Proficiency tests as additional tests to the iBT and IELTS for non-native speakers of English to demonstrate English proficiency. It was noted that only a few universities in the US accept these tests and us accepting them might give us some competitive advantage.

Gursel said that the survey he designed for newly admitted students and for the ones who were offered admission, but did not come to Athens, would be sent to all members.

Meeting ended at 4:28 pm.
Graduate Council Minutes

April 29, 2016


Guests: Chris Fisher, Mike Sweeney, Jatin Srivastava

Convened: The meeting was convened at 3:07 pm.

1. Approval of Minutes of the March 11, 2016 meeting

The minutes of the March 11, 2016 meeting were approved.

2. Chair’s Report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve thanked all members for their service.

3. Remarks by Joe Shields, Dean of the Graduate College

Joe thanked Katie for her work towards the commencement ceremony. He said that people are getting familiar with the programs that are being offered at the Dublin campus. He added that per the land granted to the university by the city of Dublin, a master plan is required to be submitted. The Dublin location is also looked upon as a venue for graduate and professional activity with the understanding that Ohio University will not compete against other schools, but our programs will be complementary to the existing ones. Steve Golding has transitioned into the role of the CEO and COO of the Dublin campus. Joe said that if an academic department is interested in offering a program on the Dublin campus, David and he would need to be involved in that process. This will allow the CCGS requirements to be taken care of, besides providing any other guidance. He added that academic departments can complete the new form designed to start the process of offering programs on the Dublin campus. Jen asked about the long list of things/questions that are on the form and that it does not seem to be well aligned with the current process. She added that it would be helpful if this dovetails with the process that involves the UCC. David noted that Brad Cohen should be involved in this as well. Jen recommended that redesigning the current form to include the new information would be helpful. Joe said that if there are redundancies, they should definitely be addressed.
4. Remarks by David Koonce, Associate Dean of the Graduate College

David said that Sara Armstrong who used to be the Directory of the Thesis and Dissertation Services is no longer working with the Graduate College. Lois Hatfield, who used to help Sara will be taking care of the responsibilities until a new director is hired. David added that an initial review of the healthy application pool has already begun; and that he expects to have someone hired as soon as it is possible.

He added that the number of applicants from September 2015 to date has increased by 5.8%, and the applications for Fall 2016 are up by 5.3%.

David said that an updated version of the graduate directors’ handbook is now available on the Graduate College website. The manual is now 50 pages long and provides information about actions that graduate directors might need to take. He added that the graduate chair field guide is also available on the website.

5. Remarks by Katie Tadlock, Assistant Dean of the Graduate College

Katie drew members’ attention to the handout that notes participation in today’s commencement ceremony. She said that 117 doctoral students participated in the ceremony today.

6. English proficiency scores for Music Certificate (Chris Fisher)

Chris said that he is proposing to lower the English proficiency requirements for students wanting to earn the Music Performance certificate (Appendix A). He added that this non-degree program has become a feeder program for their degree program and is a pretty good source of revenue for the program. He clarified that the curriculum does not involve much instruction, it is based on modeling and thus the English proficiency requirements can be reduced. In response to a question from Steve, Chris said that they only get a few students every year. He added that BGSU, which has a lower English proficiency requirement, has a large number of these fee paying students. David asked if the limited English proficiency of these students would be disadvantageous to either them or other students in class. Chris said that these students are enrolled in very limited number of credits that require in-class instruction. He also added that at BGSU, these students are also enrolled in appropriately selected English language classes too. Sonsoles asked about the provisions for mentorship and supervision. Shawn noted that in his experience communication with students who were admitted under the English Conditional admission status has been difficult. Ann asked about the services in place for these students. She said that a support system to help them navigate life in Athens needs to be in place. She added that a waiver to accept a reduced level of communicability ought to come with the responsibility of ensuring them the help needed. Sonsoles asked about the systems BGSU has in place for their students. Geoff said that maybe having a Chinese speaker at ISFS might be helpful. Chris clarified that he is not proposing to
eliminate the requirements for English proficiency, he said that the audition and interview with each of the candidates allows faculty to determine the kind of support needed. It was noted that BGSU has a DMA and have invested a lot in their music programs. Steve said that we are now required to certify English proficiency for post-doctoral appointees as well. Sonsoles proposed students taking Music and English classes simultaneously. Steve asked David and Katie about their recommendations for a minimum score. Joe said that we could handle these on a case-by-case basis, but would like some sense of how everyone on this body feels about it. Katie noted that the catalog is very clear about the requirements and we will need to be clear about establishing the floor. In this case, as Chris said, does a modeling based curriculum change the requirements from an instruction based curriculum? Jen said that it would also be best if there was a way to restrict their registration only to the courses required. She added that she very much agrees with Ann in ensuring that students receive the help needed to navigate life in Athens. Katie said that there is no way to restrict registration, and students do end up registering for classes they should not. David said that we could place registration holds on their accounts and register everyone only through permission slips. Martin recommended having a conversation with OPIE and ELIP staff to structure courses for these students. Steve said that it would be helpful to have a description of courses these students will take, details about the mentoring help they will receive for academic and life-skills, and specific information from OPIE and ELIP about the classes they can take. Geoff said that it would be beneficial to bring Krista in this conversation as well. Austin asked about the experience at BGSU, and learning from it.

7. Report from the Curriculum Committee

Doctoral degrees: The last set of changes were either about grammar or about ensuring consistency with jargon in all the sections. The section on professional doctorates now mirrors the one on research degrees, other than the distinguishing characteristics. It was noted that a major difference is that professional doctorates do not require a comprehensive examination. Jen said that all professional doctorates require a certification examination to earn a credential. Shawn asked if our award of the degree is contingent on students passing the examination. Jen said that the Au.D., and the DPT are both accredited programs and do not require passing of a comprehensive examination as we know it; but there is a testing of skills and competencies in a variety of ways and stages.

Members voted to approve the doctoral degree document presented by the committee (appendix B includes the approved version as well).

Standards of work:
Members discussed the document presented (appendix C), with special focus on the GPA required to earn the certificate. It was noted that the catalog does not include a policy for a minimum GPA requirement for a certificate to be conferred. Discussion also centered around the content and if students could count the same courses towards two different certificates. It was noted that no more than 25% of the content could be shared between or among certificates. It was decided that Graduate Council would wait for EPSA approval and also bring the task force into this dialogue.
8. **Report from the Policies and Regulations Committee**

Members were not able to discuss the document presented by this committee (appendix D).

9. **Report from Recruitment and Admissions Requirements Committee**

Mike Sweeney and Jatin Srivastava attended the meeting to answer questions about the HKBU-OU joint program offered by the E. W. Scripps School of Journalism. Mike said that this proposal is similar to the one the school has with the University of Leipzig. He added that they are hoping to begin a cohort in Fall 2017. Mike said that HKBU also has a relationship with Leipzig and that would facilitate a triangular relationship amongst us. The proposal is requesting approval for changing the maximum number of transfer credits from eight to 14. Mike said that our degree is research based and their degree prepares them with skills to write and thus helps them get jobs.

David noted that courses cannot be counted if they have been used to already earn a degree.

Members voted in favor of the proposal (appendix E).

10. **New Business**

Martin said that his term is ending and he will not be on Graduate Council next year. He said that one of the items that had come up for discussion during the year was a different amount of the general fee for graduate students.

Members voted to endorse the separation of general fee for graduate and undergraduate students.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:49 pm.
Appendix A

Ohio University
School of Music
Graduate Music Performance Certificate
Program Description
The graduate certificate program is a full-time, 20 credit hour graduate level curriculum. The one-year Performance Certificate course is designed for advanced students who wish to focus on an intense applied curriculum in order to enhance their performance skills. Because it is a non-degree program, students may not concurrently pursue the Master of Music degree. The program requires fewer credit hours and academic courses compared with the Master of Music degree curriculum and offers more flexibility in course selection, which is determined in consultation with the major advisor.

Applicants must have an acceptable baccalaureate degree or music diploma, although exceptions may be considered in cases where applicants can document that they have the equivalent in professional performing experience and meet School of Music academic and performance standards.

The program is open to all qualified applicants, and has attracted students from many distinguished international music programs. International students enrolled in the program may elect to simultaneously enroll in English courses while simultaneously pursuing the certificate.

Additional information regarding audition and admission requirements is available from program director, Dr. Christopher Fisher, or from respective graduate advisors. Students should apply through the Office of Graduate Studies and the School of Music. An audition and interview are required.

Application Requirements
• Application submitted to the Office of Graduate Studies and the School of Music
• Official undergraduate transcripts
• Two letters of recommendation
• Live or recorded audition
• Live or video conference (e.g. Skype, FaceTime, etc.) interview

Program Director Contact Information
Dr. Christopher Fisher
Associate Professor of Piano
Chair, Keyboard Division
fisherc@ohio.edu

Graduate Music Performance Certificate
Total Credit Hours: 20

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Semester</th>
<th>Credits</th>
<th>Second Semester</th>
<th>Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
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**Graduate Music Performance Certificate**

**Total Credit Hours: 20**

**Recommended English Courses**

Applicants for whom English scores are lower than the minimum for conditional graduate admission (i.e. provisional status) would be encouraged to enroll in OPIE courses as prescribed by the Department of Linguistics.

**Student Mentoring**

International performance certificate students, for whom English is a secondary language, will be provided with academic, language, and life skill mentoring opportunities. These students would be partnered with a mentor from their respective country of origin. The volunteer mentors will be School of Music faculty or students. Furthermore, the program director and each mentor will seek to build and provide a social network beyond the School of Music for each student enrolled in the program.

**Immigration Documentation**

Admitted international students will be issued an initial Form I20 for two semesters.

**Program Status, Trajectory, and Proposal**

The Graduate Music Performance Certificate program has the potential to become a substantive feeder source for our graduate degree program, but regretfully the current TOEFL requirement for admission to the certificate program is an obstacle for many musically gifted international applicants. An investigation of similar programs at peer institutions reveals that the Ohio University TOEFL requirement is as much as twice the requirement at these institutions. Furthermore, a recent visit to a peer institution (i.e. BGSU, our primary competition) revealed large numbers of students enrolled in their certificate program. After further investigation, it was revealed that there is NO TOEFL requirement for admission to BGSU’s program. It is important to note that students enrolled in this program pay full-tuition without financial assistance. Thus, a target enrollment of five new students in this program would generate as much as $150,000 in tuition and fees. Because the curriculum is almost exclusively performance based, English language proficiency is not essential since the curriculum can be largely delivered by modeling (i.e. teacher demonstration) and basic verbal communication. The School of Music is requesting that the Graduate Council grant flexibility with regard to English proficiency requirements for students enrolled in this program. Since all applicants must complete an audition and interview, the program director will be able to assess and provide recommendations to the Graduate College.
Appendix B

Approved by GC on April 29, 2016

(With 2 corrections noted below)

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 for 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, 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 the student’s knowledge of (1) 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 point 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.

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 (e.g., “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.
Research Doctoral Degrees

The doctoral degree is granted on the basis of evidence that the student has achieved a high level of scholarship and proficiency in research rather than solely on the basis of successful completion of a prescribed amount of coursework. The student’s competence and ability to work independently and write creatively are established by qualifying and comprehensive examinations and the quality of a dissertation submitted as an account of the student’s original research.

A minimum of 90 graduate (semester) hours beyond the bachelor’s degree must be completed for conferral of a doctoral degree.

Time Limit

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

If the student does not complete requirements for the degree within the given period, the student may be permitted to continue in graduate study only if exceptional circumstances are associated with the delay in progress.

The dean of the college may grant a one-time, one-semester extension for the semester immediately following the final semester in which the student’s degree requirements were to have been completed.

If circumstances require an extension beyond the one-semester dean’s extension, 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 the student’s knowledge of (1) the required work, (2) research literature, and (3) research methods and techniques. The program may require additional coursework, retaking the oral/written comprehensive examination, changing or updating the dissertation, or fulfilling any degree requirements that have been added since the initiation of the student’s 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 placed on file in the Graduate College. If approved for readmission, the student must fulfill the degree requirements in effect at the point of readmission.

Program of Study and Advisory Committee

The graduate committee of the student’s program will assign an advisor and an advisory committee who must approve the proposed program of study for the degree. Graduate work completed at another university will be considered by the respective graduate committee and the
Typically, when the dissertation proposal is nearing approval, the graduate committee will forward to the office of the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled a recommendation for appointment of a dean’s representative, together with the names of other dissertation committee members and the title of the student’s dissertation. Committee membership guidelines are set by each college. The committee must consist of at least three members representing the range of content in the student’s program of study, in addition to the representative from the dean’s office.

Comprehensive Examination

When coursework is virtually completed, and upon the recommendation of the advisory committee, the student will take a comprehensive examination to establish the student’s mastery of the fields of specialization and readiness for advanced research. The results of the examination must be reported within one week to the office of the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled on a form provided by the dean’s office.

A copy of this form is sent to the Graduate College for inclusion in the student’s academic file.

Scholarly Discipline Requirement

The doctoral degree by definition is research oriented, and each program determines the auxiliary research competencies needed by doctoral candidates. Competence is determined by standards and methods established by the individual program. If the student is expected to demonstrate proficiency in one of the scholarly disciplines in which examinations are arranged by the dean’s office (e.g., statistics, computer science, or foreign language), the student must file an appropriate intent form. This form is available from and should be filed with the office of the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. The student must be registered for a minimum of two hours in the semester in which he/she takes the examination.

The French, German, Russian, and Spanish proficiency examinations of the Educational Testing Service are given at Ohio University several times during the year. Information and application forms are available at the Department of Modern Languages, Gordy Hall 283.

Academic Residency Requirement

Normally, at least two academic semesters of the doctoral program are in continuous residence on the Athens campus in an institutional full-time status (registration for 9 graduate credits).

The continuous residence requirement applies to the period of graduate study following the completion of the master’s degree or the completion of at least 30 graduate credits.

Admission to Candidacy
Admission to candidacy is achieved after the student has completed the following steps:

1. Formation of the dissertation committee (including the dean’s representative), which may be the same as the student’s advisory committee,
2. Approval of the research proposal by this committee,
3. Successful completion of the comprehensive examination, and
4. Satisfaction of all required scholarly disciplines.

Doctoral committee membership is determined by college policy. Check with the dean’s office for specific information.

Forms indicating completion of the above steps are available from and filed in the office of the dean of the college in which the student is enrolled. The student is not permitted to schedule the oral examination of the dissertation until the student has met all requirements for admission to candidacy.

A copy of the student’s admission-to-candidacy letter is sent to the Graduate College for inclusion in the student’s official file.

**Dissertation**

A dissertation, the scholarly account of research in the new area of knowledge, is submitted by each candidate. Each program prescribes the specific style manual to be followed by its doctoral candidates. Regarding the accepted formatting standards for the thesis, the Thesis and Dissertation Services website, [www.ohio.edu/tad](http://www.ohio.edu/tad) is a resource provided by the Graduate College and Thesis and Dissertation Services (TAD) to aid in creating the document. Research doctoral candidates may download a template pre-loaded with acceptable typefaces, heading styles, sizes and front-of-document pages. A PDF document “*Thesis and Dissertation Guidebook*,” is available for those who prefer not to use the templates and wish to format the documents themselves. This pamphlet contains regulations regarding type, margins, quality of paper, and other aspects, as well as detailed directions for submitting the finished dissertation. You must obtain from the TAD Services Website the current format and the printed list of semester deadlines for graduation. In addition, doctoral candidates must complete the online [UMI/ProQuest form](http://www.ohio.edu/tad) for microfilming and entry into Dissertation Abstracts International. Also required is the completion of the *Survey of Earned Doctorates*.

It is recommended that students submit their document for format review to TAD Services via email before the Oral Defense. This may occur at any time, but TAD Services recommends at least 4 chapters or 75 percent of the document for review, including the abstract, references, table of contents and lists of tables and figures. After the dissertation has been approved by the candidate’s dissertation committee, dissertation director, and dean, the document should be emailed to TAD Services for a final format review. The candidate is responsible at this time for providing a photocopy, scan or fax of the [Oral Defense form](http://www.ohio.edu/tad) to TAD Services. After the format has been approved, the final version and an electronically signed PDF of the document will be returned to the student for upload to OhioLINK, a consortium of Ohio university and college member libraries and the State Library of Ohio. Once all steps have been completed, TAD
Services sends an email with the subject of “TAD Process Complete” to the college dean’s office, advisor, graduate director and doctoral candidate with the final document attached noting the document format has been accepted and the doctoral candidate has completed all the steps in the Thesis and Dissertation Process.

**Oral Dissertation Examination**

An oral dissertation examination is required of all doctoral candidates. The examining committee is composed of the candidate’s entire dissertation committee (including the representative of the dean of the college in which the candidate is enrolled) unless otherwise specified by the Associate Dean for the Graduate College. The student must present final copies of the dissertation to members of the examining committee at least two weeks before the date of the oral examination to allow adequate time for review. The final arrangements for the examination must be completed through the office of the dean of the college in which the candidate is enrolled at least 10 days prior to the examination. The arrangement form can be found on the Thesis and Dissertation (TAD) Services Web site at [http://www.ohio.edu/graduate/etd/oraldefense.cfm](http://www.ohio.edu/graduate/etd/oraldefense.cfm). The details of the examination, including time and place, must be completed by the doctoral candidate and sent to the dean’s office of the college for posting.

The doctoral candidate is also responsible for preparing the Oral Defense Form and taking this to the oral defense. This form can be found at [http://www.ohio.edu/graduate/etd/oraldefense.cfm](http://www.ohio.edu/graduate/etd/oraldefense.cfm). Once the candidate successfully defends, the candidate will provide a photocopy, scan or fax copy of the signed Oral Defense Form to the Graduate College and will email a copy of the final, post-oral defense document for a final format check at [tad@ohio.edu](mailto:tad@ohio.edu).
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REVISION – DRAFT/discussion document- FOR GC CURRICULUM COMMITTEE

Three items added (from GC discussion 8apr16)

1. Standards of work for free-standing (ND) certificate.
2. Standards of work for certificate embedded in a degree program (i.e., concurrent with a graduate degree).
3. Application of transfer credits to a certificate (use “25%” rule; same as applied to graduate transfer credits now).

April 24, 2016

A. Current Language

Standards of Work

Graduate cumulative grade point average (GPA) includes all graduate courses taken at Ohio University. Conferral of a graduate degree or certificate requires an cumulative graduate GPA of at least a 3.0. No course with a grade below C (2.0) may be used to satisfy any graduate degree or certificate requirement. Repeating or retaking a graduate-level course will not remove or replace a grade from a previous attempt.
B. Revision regarding certificates below

**Standards of Work**

Graduate degrees.

Graduate cumulative grade point average (GPA) includes all graduate courses taken at Ohio University. Conferral of a graduate degree requires a cumulative graduate GPA of at least a 3.0 (individual programs may set higher standards). No course with a grade below a “C” (2.0) may be used to satisfy any graduate degree. *Any course that is repeated /retaken at the graduate level will not remove or replace a grade from a previous attempt in the calculation of the accumulative GPA for a graduate degree.*

Graduate certificates.

(a) *Graduate certificate embedded in a degree program.* If a graduate certificate is pursued during the course of study for a graduate degree, conferral of a graduate certificate requires a cumulative GPA of at least 3.0 for the sequence of courses attributable to the certificate, as approved by the graduate certificate coordinator (individual certificates may be set at higher standards). No course with a grade below a “B” (3.0) may be used to satisfy any graduate certificate. *Any course that is repeated /retaken at the graduate level will not remove or replace a grade from a previous attempt in the calculation of the cumulative GPA for a graduate certificate.* Individual certificates may apply a more stringent requirement for individual course grades or GPA for courses representing the certificate, as approved by UCC.

(b) *Graduate certificate pursued on a non-degree basis.* If a graduate certificate is pursued on a non-degree basis (as a stand-alone certificate), conferral of a graduate certificate requires a cumulative GPA of at least 3.0 for the sequence of courses attributable to the certificate, as approved by the graduate certificate coordinator (individual certificates may be set at higher standards). No course with a grade below a “B” (3.0) may be used to satisfy any graduate certificate. *Any course that is repeated /retaken at the graduate level will not remove or replace a grade from a previous attempt in the calculation of the cumulative GPA for a graduate certificate.* Individual certificates may apply a more stringent requirement for individual course grades or GPA for courses representing the certificate, as approved by UCC.

(c) *Multiple certificates nested in single or multiple (dual) degree programs.* If a student is pursuing more than one major or a dual-degree program, or is pursuing more than one certificate (either within a degree-seeking program or on a non-degree basis), earned credit hours for one certificate may not be counted more than once; i.e., credits earned for one certificate may not apply to any other certificate.
C. Move the following text to be included under “Application/Admission/Adding Degrees” section of the graduate catalog:

Allowable transfer credits for graduate certificate candidates. Graduate course credit from another university may be transferred to an Ohio University certificate, after approval by the certificate coordinator, the associate dean, and the Graduate College. Transfer credits may not exceed the following thresholds:

i. If the certificate is an interdisciplinary certificate requiring a minimum of 14 credit hours, no more than 3.25 credits (and no more than 1 graduate course) may be used on a transfer basis to the Ohio University certificate.

ii. If the certificate is a specialized certificate requiring a minimum of 9 credits hours, no more than 2.25 credits (and no more than 1 graduate course) may be used on a transfer basis to the Ohio University certificate.

iii. If the certificate is a specialized stackable certificate requiring a minimum of 9 credits hours, no more than 2.25 credits (and no more than 1 graduate course) may be used on a transfer basis to the Ohio University certificate.
ISSUE: Graduate Theses/Dissertation Advising

STORY: I sat in on the dissertation defense of a Ph.D. student here who had been making slow academic progress due to a lack of strong advising by her chair. She came to seek me out as she was terrified she would not complete her degree. Her dissertation chair, according to the student, was verbally abusive and demeaning and her confidence in her own abilities had taken a severe beating. Because of her story, I invited graduate students to an exit interview to see how we might better support their academic work. But her story is not unusual, so I wonder what other schools do in cases where a student is not working well with an advisor or wants to switch advisors. Or what to do if the advisor behaves this way to all the advisees. What recourse do students/administration have to limit senior faculty from being advisors to graduate student theses and dissertations?

SOLUTIONS:

- At my previous institution, students could change advisors with no fault. Meaning, they could tell the head of grad research, I want to change advisors. Sign the forms and be done.
- We also instituted group advisorship so that the student did not have one person lording over them. There were workshops on choosing an advisor which helped students select the most appropriate not just the most senior advisor.
- We have a very toxic faculty member who is often removed from committees for their undermining of students--usually female. One of the things that I have had to defend is the students' rights to remove a committee member with the simple re-doing of paperwork. The faculty member in question tried to have that changed by forcing the students to put into WRITING why faculty are removed. I immediately told the Chair that this was not only unacceptable but potentially actionable, especially if students were forced to write about emotional abuse and that until the Chair consulted the legal department I would not allow this to go forward. Subsequently, the faculty member backed down but in the meantime, I helped rewrite the language of the handbook to firm up our policy on this point. These cases actually reveal the soft spots in policy.
- In my department students can change with no issues, in fact students are assigned a provisional advisor coming into the program--most of the time that appointment stands but it is technically on a test basis for the first year and folks can and do change--sometimes for interpersonal reasons and sometimes because the project may change and the initial advisor doesn't make the most sense anymore. I know students in my program who have changed, even after the first year with mostly no issues. Sometimes the initial person stays on the committee (if appropriate/desirable), sometimes not.
- My alma mater has a process-oriented thesis and dissertation support group that is run through the Student Counseling Center. Interested students are screened by the facilitator, a PhD clinical psychologist, for appropriateness before joining the group. The group is helpful as it has a professional facilitator and peer support. When issues of "fit" with the committee chair or members come up in group, students can receive information on University policies and peer support and encouragement.
- Also, a student manual with sections addressing policies and procedures for changing Chairs/members would also be a true gift to future students.
Appendix E

Introduction: HKBU-OU joint program

Summary: The E.W. Scripps School of Journalism seeks approval for an arrangement with Hong Kong Baptist University that would allow students at HBKU to earn a second master’s degree in journalism at Ohio University. This would require a waiver of two rules, explained at the bottom of this request.

Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU) is a publicly funded university located in Hong Kong. It was ranked among the top 50 universities in Asia in the Times Higher Education Asia university rankings in 2015. The university has around 11,000 students, out of which 25% are international students. School of Communication at HKBU consists of three departments; department of film, department of communication studies, and Department of Journalism. The school offers Master’s degrees in Communication (MA), International Journalism Studies (MA), Media Management (MSocSc), and Producing for Film, Television, and new media. For full-time students, the duration of all four Master’s program is 12 months.

The proposed OU-HKBU Master’s program offers a one-year full-time degree opportunity at Scripps School of Journalism after master’s students at HKBU in International Journalism Studies, Communication, and Media Management complete one year of education at HKBU. Students will be responsible for paying their full tuition fee and cover their expenses.

The faculty of the E.W. Scripps School support this arrangement because there is very little overlap between the MS degrees of the E.W. Scripps School and HBKU. The master’s degree at HBKU provides students with practical journalism skills. The master’s degree at the E.W. Scripps School assumes that the incoming students already have practical journalism skills; thus it is focused on understanding theories and models of mass communication, understanding rigorous research methods, and on doing original research.

HKBU and Ohio University have engaged in collaborative relationships at different levels in the past. According to Dr. Thomas Shostak, who retired as the Ohio University Dean of Lifelong Learning in 2007, there was a collaborative program between OU and HKBU that started in 1984, and lasted for around 20 years. Students could earn an an associate's degree in individualized studies (AIS), as well as a bachelor's degree in specialized studies (BSS). Three key majors for the program were Psychology, Communication, and Economics. At OU, the Division of Lifelong Learning conducted the program and at
HKBU, the School of Continuing Education coordinated the program. The program also involved professor exchange between OU and HKBU. Dr. Anne Cooper Chen and Professor Sandra Haggerty from Scripps School of Journalism taught classes at HKBU as part of the joint program. The program was discontinued primarily due to competition from British and Australian Universities offering educational programs in Hong Kong.

In recent years, Professors from HKBU have taken part in the SUSI (Study of US Institute) program at Scripps School of Journalism. A research delegation from Scripps College of Communication attended a research event in Hong Kong in November 2015, and Dr. Yusuf Kalyango, faculty member at Scripps School of Journalism at Ohio University, is currently spending his sabbatical teaching at HKBU.

The proposed OU-HKBU joint master’s program provide us an opportunity to revive an old relationship and to create synergies that will benefit both HKBU and OU. HKBU will benefit from the research oriented master’s education at Scripps School of Journalism, whereas for Ohio University, the program will provide an opportunity to re-engage with a fast developing educational market.

**Specific issues for Graduate Council Discussion**

1. Request for approval for changing the maximum number of MS-level transfer credits allowed to 14, from 8. This will help make the program more attractive to HKBU students. It will also enhance the possibility of completing the program within one year.
2. Many students applying for the program would have finished their one-year master’s degree at HKBU. We request the approval of graduate council to grant credit transfer after degree completion.