

Graduate Council Minutes

October 7, 2016

Attendance: Emilia Alonso-Sameno, Tim Anderson, Ian Armstrong, Steve Bergmeier, Terry Cluse-Tolar, Pete Harrington, Jennifer Horner, David Koonce, Krisanna Machtmes, Brian McCarthy, Jody Lamb, Maria Modayil, Greg Newton, Shawn Ostermann, Ann Paulins, Joseph Shields, Gaurav Sinha, Scott Smith Spencer Smith, Gursel Suer, and Katherine Tadlock.

Excused: Geoff Dabelko, Sonsoles De Lacalle, Andrea Frohne, Alex Hibbitt, Janet Hulm, Chulho Jung, Bose Maposa, Chris Moberg, Erik Ramsey, Anirudh Ruhil and Gaurav Sinha.

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

1. Approval of Minutes of the September 9, 2016 meeting

The minutes of the September 9, 2016 meeting were approved.

2. Chair's report (Steve Bergmeier)

Steve welcomed the two new members of Graduate Council who could not attend the September meeting, Pete Harrington and Scott Smith.

He said that conversations about the graduate faculty status are underway and he has met with Joe McLaughlin (chair of faculty senate), Charles Buchanan (chair of EPSA) and Sherrie Gradin (chair of Professional Relations committee) about it. He added that the revised document will need to be updated by Faculty Senate. Steve said that he will initiate the formation of a small group comprising of members from Graduate Council, EPSA, and faculty senate. Joe added that one of the big issues that needs to be clarified is determining eligibility to serve on thesis and dissertation committees.

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

Joe congratulated Jen on the successful approval of the DNP program by the HLC and the first cohort will begin in the spring of 2017.

He added that the MFA presentation to the CCGS went very well and the program was approved unanimously. He said that David deserves the credit for working with the team to help prepare them for the presentation.

Joe said that the Master's in Global Health was approved by UCC and will be presented to the Board of Trustees in two weeks.

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

David said that the application numbers are up by 21% from last year, it is still very early in the process, but he hopes that the number of applications will be higher than last year. He said that a fair number of these new applications are for the Physician's Assistant program.

He said that he has heard that students who are on research fellowships do not have much to live on from their first check. He has met with the Bursar and Financial Aid to explore the ideal of all fee payments not being taken out of the first check.

David said that the upcoming CCGS retreat will discuss the idea of offering the PhD degree online.

David informed members that he will be meeting with Payroll office staff to discuss the issue of graduate students being paid while they are overseas. Members asked if the time period students spend outside the country comes into play in this issue. David said that if someone has students who will be in this situation during spring 2017 to contact him. He said until a decision and policy are in place, they will work on a case-by-case basis.

5. Report from the Curriculum Committee

Tim said that the six program reviews that are up for discussion are pretty straight forward. He said that the review of the PhD program in Chemistry noted a complaint about the facilities. The Physics program received high commendation, but noted that the facilities were a problem. He said that the reviews for the two master's degrees within the Recreation and Sports Pedagogy were fairly positive. Tim added that the Journalism program also received a positive review, however there was concern about the reduction of stipends for graduate students. The review for Theatre was fairly positive, but it noted that the facilities are being pushed to their limit.

For Biological Sciences Tim said that the external reviewers noted that the lab space is appalling and they expressed concern about decisions being made by small committees and that the junior faculty are not receiving good communication about promotion. Brian said most of the issues noted in the review have been addressed and a fair amount of investment was made in the upgrading the anatomy and the animal science lab. He also added that to reduce the onerous advising load on the faculty, an advisor has been hired. Jen said that the Graduate Council can write a letter noting that the concerns are taken seriously and that the council supports the college in making positive changes.

Tim said that per the discussion at the last Graduate Council meeting regarding the Interdisciplinary Arts program, Steve sent those comments to David Ingram. David Ingram is going to suggest a review in two to three years.

Jen referred to the notes from the most recent meeting of the Program Committee of UCC that were shared with all members. She said that Kelly Broughton will meet with EPSA regarding certificate programs. Jen also said that some clarification regarding the composition and

charge of Friday group is required. She added that updates regarding the status of the Athletic Training program will be coming in the future. Jen also said that discussions with Sonsoles and Kelly about the Graduate Health Policy Certificate and the Global Health Certificate have been underway. Jen said that the proposed name change of the Master of Science in Nursing, Acute Nurse Practitioner track to the Master of Science in Nursing, Adult-Gerontology Acute Care Nurse Practitioner will help meet accreditation requirements.

The Data Analytics course offered under the Translational Biomedical Sciences program has received positive reviews and Tim said that the Curriculum Committee recommends its approval. Brian said that he can see this course being useful as the College of Arts and Sciences works towards the program proposal for a new program. **Members of Graduate Council voted in favor to approve this course.**

6. Report from the Recruitment and Admissions Requirement Committee

Gursel said that due to scheduling conflicts the committee was unable to meet. He said he met with Dawn Bikowski regarding standards for English proficiency and referred members to the handouts he passed to all members (appendix A). Gursel drew members' attention to the chart, 'Admission status levels for graduate study at Ohio University' (page 4 of 4 of appendix A). He said that establishing minimums for each section might be one way to approach this issue. He added that currently we consider the total score on the iBT (80) and we do not take section scores into account. He added that for students who are given teaching assistantships, maybe there should be a minimum listening score as well, besides the minimum speaking score. David said that the note on the chart about certain courses being 'strongly recommended' is difficult to enforce. He added that academic programs can always set higher requirements.

Members discussed English proficiency requirements for TAs. Katie reminded members that all students who are offered university funding are required to show English proficiency scores that meet the current minimum requirement for unconditional admission. She also said that the new policy about issuing I-20s only for unconditional admission has been put forth by the federal government. David said that applicants who do not meet the English proficiency requirements, can be admitted to the Ohio Program of Intensive English for English language study. However, students who would be recommended for academic conditional admission, do not have a fallback admission category for which an I-20 can be issued for that status. Gursel asked if there should be different requirements for TAs who are responsible for in-class instruction, versus those who grade for a class taught by faculty members. David said that it is probably difficult to capture these differences, since so much of this depends on the culture of the unit. Krisanna said that the TAs in their department do not teach, but work in the statistics lab and she added that they require them to take the SPEAK test. It was noted that students who are cleared for probationary teaching have to take the test again and achieve the required minimum score. Students who are cleared for probationary teaching are required to take an ELIP class concurrent with their teaching assignment. There, is however, nothing in the graduate catalog that notes that a student has to retake the ELIP class if he/she takes and fails that class.

Going back to the discussion about the minimum section scores for the iBT, it was clarified that at this point, we look for minimum scores on all bands of the IELTS, but on the iBT, we only look at the total score. Gursel said that by setting a minimum score, we are not lowering the current requirements, we are just setting some limits. Katie clarified that the policy update to accept the IELTS for admission purposes is recent and that accepting the TOEFL (now the iBT) had been in place for a long time. He expressed concern that if academic departments can ask for exceptions to the policy, then there might be a lot of exceptions being requested.

David said that it will be helpful to have a policy on this sooner than later since there are a fair number of applicants who will need to be advised about a future course of action. He added that it would be nice to be able to vote on some recommendations at the next meeting.

7. Report from the Planning and Strategy Committee

Krisanna said that she has been trying to reach an appropriate person to talk about the student contributions to STRS. She will be meeting someone next week to discuss this.

The committee will also discuss the issue of students who graduate in summer and fall, but want to participate in the Spring commencement.

8. New Business

Spencer brought members' attention to the handout about advising (Appendix B). Steve said that these internal policies vary across departments. Ian said that some departments have specific procedures laid out for changes in advisors and thesis/dissertation committees. Joe said that this body does not have the authority to mandate a process to be followed for changing advisors and committee members, but we can showcase best practices to enable departments that are looking for guidance to have some models to review. Brian said that at the college level, recommendations for or against a committee member might be made for technical reasons and not because someone might or might not be perceived as a good advisor. Jen said that the burden of proof falls on the student to show that he/she has been treated unfairly. Brian said that in his college in the last five years all issues about advisor changes have been handled at the department level by all 19 departments; and in a rare instance he has been called upon for help. Ann said that students at the Patton College of Education use a form for changing the composition of a committee. She said that she can see the element of fear on the part of the student due to the power held by the faculty. Gursel added that in their program, students come to the graduate chair with any problems or issues that they encounter. Brian added that if the advisor also happens to be the graduate chair, then the student would go to the department chair. He added that currently they have a student who no one wants to work with; the student is now working with the third advisor. Krisanna said that abuse does not always have to be verbal, an advisor can put off meetings and thus the student would not make any progress. Jen and Scott noted the need for a mechanism and rationale for a request to change advisors or committee members. Brian said that the appeals process that was put in place last year should be able to accommodate this issue. Greg said that some of the internal processes are being reviewed within the college.

Steve said that he will send an email to Sonsoles (chair of Policies and Regulations Committee) to look into this.

Jen asked if a resolution was reached to the discussion about a minimum GPA requirement for conferral of certificates. It was noted that a decision has still not been made.

Jen also asked about the need for students to complete the dual degree form if they are not sharing coursework. It was noted that this can be reviewed and discussed.

Jody said that the internal deadline to submit nominations for the MAGS Distinguished Masters Thesis Award is October 17th, 2016. Nominations are being sought in the two broad categories of Social Science and Mathematics, Physical Sciences and Engineering. The Graduate Student Affairs and Fellowships committee will review and pick the Ohio University nominees to be submitted by October 28th, 2016.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

Appendix A

TOEFL® Score Scales

Skill	Score Range	Level
Reading	0-30	High (22-30) Intermediate (15-21) Low (0-14)
Listening	0-30	High (22-30) Intermediate (15-21) Low (0-14)
Speaking	0-30 score scale	Good (26-30) Fair (18-25) Limited (10-17) Weak (0-9)
Writing	0-30 score scale	Good (24-30) Fair (17-23) Limited (1-16)
Total Score	0-120	

Although the score range for each of the four test sections (Listening, Reading, Speaking, and Writing) is from 0 to 30, each section is a separate measure and each measure has its own scale. Therefore, scores obtained on a section can be compared to other scores from the same section, but it is not appropriate to



Ready to
take the
TOEFL
IBT®
test?

Register
Now >

Official
TOEFL
IBT®
Tests
with
Audio,
Volume 1

Includes 5
actual past
TOEFL IBT®
tests, with
all audio
passages
on disc.

Also
includes the
TOEFL®
Test Prep
Planner.

[Purchase now >](#)

n	T	List	Read	Write	Speak
1	57	11	12	16	18
1	59	9	18	18	14
1	60	9	18	18	15
1	61	10	12	21	18
2	62	12, 13	12,18	15,20	17
1	63	24	17	11	11
1	64	12	19	18	15
1	65	18	14	18	15
2	66	18,19	10,19	13,16	15,22
1	68	17	14	19	18
2	69	12,14	15,17	20,21	19,21
2	70	13,15	14,19	18,23	15,23
1	71	15	16	20	20
1	72	16	20	14	22
4	73	17,23	11,16	14,20	20,22
2	74	13,20	12,23	15,19	19,27
4	75	16,18	18,19	18,21	17,19
3	76	15,18	18,24	18,20	18,23
2	77	16,17	21	20,21	19
4	78	17,21	18,22	20,22	17,20
7	79	14,19	18,22	20,23	20,22
13	80	10,24	17,27	17,24	18,23
20	81	14,24	16,30	13,24	15,24
16	82	17,24	15,24	17,22	15,23

Gursel A. Suer
Admissions and Recruitment Subcommittee
Graduate Council

October 7, 2016

Items to discuss:

1. Admission Status Levels for Graduate Study at Ohio University as proposed by Dawn Bikowski
2. Lower Limits on section scores?
3. Lower limit on Speaking only vs. Speaking + Listening for teaching?
4. TA for labs vs TA for courses?

Admission Status Levels for Graduate Study at Ohio University

Ohio University graduate students studying on a visa have two admission status levels options: Unconditional or English Provisional. Students with Unconditional admission status have no conditions for their admission, are issued a graduate I-20, are eligible for funding, and can take full-time graduate student course loads. Students studying at the English Provisional level do not have graduate admission, are not eligible for funding, cannot take graduate-level coursework, and study on a language training I-20. Students must submit official test scores (see below) that meet university and departmental requirements for unconditional admission before a graduate I-20 can be issued. Students are advised to submit test scores with their admission packet. Those who test on arrival will only be issued a language training I-20, no funding offers can be made, and a graduate I-20 can only be issued if test scores consistent with unconditional admission are obtained and per department discretion. Students who do not speak English as their native language are cleared to teach if they are unconditionally admitted and score: iBT Speaking 24, SPEAK 230, or IELTS Speaking 7.0; provisional teaching with iBT Speaking 21, SPEAK 190, or IELTS 6.5

iBT		OR	Institutional TOEFL (ITP) & Composition		OR	IELTS		Coursework	Teaching
Total	Section Scores		Total	Section Scores		Composite	Band Scores		
Unconditional Admission - some programs may have higher requirements									
≥ 80	≥ 17		≥ 550	Comp: ≥ 5 Others: ≥ 52		≥ 6.5	≥ 6.5	Academic & Professional Communication courses available to all students (http://ohio.edu/cas/ELIP)	Cleared to teach if iBT Speaking 24, SPEAK 230, or IELTS Speaking 7.0; provisional teaching with iBT Speaking 21, SPEAK 190, or IELTS 6.5
Unconditional Admission with Recommended Academic & Professional Communication coursework in ELIP									
≥ 65	Wrtg: ≥ 17 ≥ 14		≥ 520	Comp: ≥ 5 Comp: 3B-4 Others: ≥ 46		≥ 6	≥ 6.0 ≥ 5.5	1 course in Academic & Professional Communication strongly recommended 2 courses in Academic & Professional Communication strongly recommended	
English Provisional with the Ohio Program of Intensive English, OPIE (http://linguistics.ohio.edu/opie/)									
61-79	< 14		500-549	< 3B		≥ 6	< 5.5	OPIE 12 hours + 6 Hours of undergraduate academic classes	No teaching until Unconditionally Admitted
< 60	any		< 500	any		< 6	any	Full-time English courses in OPIE only	

For questions, please contact: Dawn Bikowski in ELIP (740-593-4530, bikowski@ohio.edu), the Graduate College (740-593-2800, graduate@ohio.edu), or the Ohio Program of Intensive English (740-593-4575, opie@ohio.edu).

Oct. 2016

Appendix B

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.