

## Graduate Administration Services (GAS)

Koch Hall Board Room

Thursday, May 7, 2009

9:00-10:50 a.m.

Atte [REDACTED] Langford, Brian, Brenda Neuman Lewis, Mike Overstreet, Ted Kenney, Isao Ishibashi, Robert Wujcik, Jason Camak, L. Penwell Chivers, Maureen Marshall, Mont Danner, [REDACTED] Osgood, Ali Ardalan, Laurel Garzon

Guest: Karen Medina

## Approval of Alairu, 2009 Minutes

Minutes were approved without changes.

#### Updates/Announcements

Dr. Langlois informed GAG that the All Reception for graduating graduate students was a success. He stated that he had spoken to most of the students in attendance and felt that they appeared satisfied with their graduation exercises. He reminded GAG that final examinations are scheduled for Saturday, May 9, 2000. Dr. Neumann-Louis reminded Council that their final reviews of the University Graduate Catalog were due on May 1<sup>st</sup>.

## **Updates from the 2008-09 State Goetz Institutes**

a. **GTAI Initiatives (Continuation of DWD registration and Recognition for Continued Training)**

Dr. Ardalan remained convinced that the purpose of the sub-committee was to propose an IELT speaking course to serve as a substitute for the English Test and Student Presentation Test at the GATE 10 graduation ceremony. He taught English as a foreign language, teaching a course or leading a lab. He presented the sub-committee with his findings and indicated that there was not enough data available to make a well-informed judgment.

Dr. Ardalan informed Council of the [REDACTED] committee recommendation to continue using the TOEFL score of Canadian English speaking score of 22 for admission decisions. Use speaking score of 22 as the minimum score for offering teaching assistantship. This score is [REDACTED] smaller than the current required scoff at, but is higher than the scores for several of our currently successful teaching assistants. Continue screening international students' [REDACTED] commitment to English language skills by requiring them to take the TOEFL test and presentations at the GTAI. Students can be assigned teaching responsibilities only if they earn a satisfactory score on the TOEFL test and pass the GTAI presentation. Each program may establish higher [REDACTED] speaking score for both admission decisions and assigning graduate teaching assistantships to students: 22 conduct.

interviews that include both audio and video for screening applicants who are teaching assistantship candidates; 2) evaluate candidate's English speaking and Speak Test scores; 4) request departments to provide student evaluation results, by semester of teaching, for the teaching assistants to the admissions committee; 5) collect retention and graduation rates for all students; to determine the validity of iBT scores for admission decisions; and, 6) extend "orientation" programs to include additional language/culture components for international students who communicate from them. There was a lengthy discussion on the topic. Dr. Christopher Akah indicated that many members of the ODU community are concerned GTAL students are being judged based too stringently in their presentations, and that this may be due to the fact that reviewers not being familiar with knowledge about the subject area which the student presented. In response to this concern, Dr. Robert Wojtowicz indicated he did not believe this to be the case and not being familiar with the discipline does not hinder evaluating if the student is able to communicate effectively to freshmen students. He also urged Council members to become more involved in GTAL and to perhaps become reviewers.

Dr. Wojtowicz suggested that Council prevent students in the program from attending the same GTAL presentation session.

Dr. Brenda Stevenson-Martin suggested it become mandatory for deans to provide student evaluation results after the first semester of teaching, for teaching assistants; in addition to gathering individual data and to evaluate the assistants' teaching abilities." Dr. Akah indicated making it mandatory was not feasible.

Dr. Neuman Lewis asked what the minimum iBT score was that other universities consider acceptable. Karen Medina informed Council that there is no general agreement of consensus on this issue. But, according to the Cornell study mentioned above, it was determined an iBT score of between 17 and 22 indicated students were speaking fluently but that it may be weak for non-native speakers.

Dr. Langlais suggested that the two issues relating to admissions and assistantships be separated. Council agreed that the ad hoc committee's original task was to comment only on the assistantship issue, and that a report on the admissions process should be removed from the current discussion.

Dr. Ishibashi suggested that if a student received a score of 21 or higher on the iBT Speaking test, then that student should not have to do certain tasks, and so he or she would not be required to take the iBT test. This was very well received and passed.

24, then they should be required to pass the Speak Test and GTAF before they are awarded an assistantship.

Dr. Langlais suggested that if a student got comparable scores as for ~~subject~~ on the iBT, then they do not have to pass the Speak Test, and they would immediately receive the assistantship. However if the student scores less than 20 then they must pass the on-campus Speak Test and be withheld from serving as a TA in their first semester while they possibly strengthen their communication skills. Dr. Langlais stated that there may be two consequences this would become immediately. Students financial support during the first semester may be negatively affected thus requiring alternative sources of funding. During the first phases of final implementation of this policy, departments may have to assign instructors to cover all of their courses offered in the fall semester. Dr. Langlais suggested that the sub-committee meet and discuss with department chairs issues related to this topic. Council was concerned about the fair treatment of undergraduate students who attend courses for graduate teaching assistants; all decisions, must keep students best interests in mind.

Council agreed that more data should be collected before making recommendations. Dr. Wojtowicz affirmed that the sub-committee will take all the concerns into consideration and the discussion will continue with department chairs and department chairs. The sub-committee will have a revised set of recommendations prepared for the next GAC meeting.

*b. Thesis and Dissertation Guidelines*

Dr. Wojtowicz recommended that the guidelines presented in the report be affixed to receive funding to edit the current version of the guidelines. Dr. Wojtowicz informed Council that there were people in the college who have been asked these suggested editorial duties in the past. Dr. Wojtowicz and Dr. Akai volunteered to serve in the capacity of supervisor of those individuals who were asked to perform the required editorial work for pay. Dr. University suggested that there be a faculty supervisor who has reviewed theses and dissertations to work closely with the editor during the creation of the draft. Dr. Wojtowicz volunteered to serve in the capacity of supervisor to the person doing the editorial work. Dr. Akai agreed to assist as well! Dr. Wojtowicz proposed that the length of the document be reduced, standard guidelines be maintained, and that the title be in reverse order to departments for any possible changes after the editorial work has been completed. Dr. Langlais requested that the sub-committee prepare a written detailed description of the pre-journal and a restatement of the time and cost implications of this phase. Once he has received this information, Dr. Langlais will begin to prepare for approval by the university.

Schneudiger hétus mohi were not. Géraldine was the first to be asked to the meeting next Saturday.

Meeting agenda next Saturday.