



interviews that include both audio and video for selecting applicants who are teaching assistantship candidates. Council also requested that the student evaluation be implemented for the first semester of teaching, for the teaching assistants to be committed, to monitor retention and graduation rates for all students, to determine the validity of IBT scores for admission decisions, and to extend "orientation" programs to include additional language/culture camp components for international students who benefit from them. There was a lengthy discussion on the topic. Dr. [Name] stated that some members of the ODU community are concerned that students are being judged too stringently in their presentations, and that this may be due to the reviewers not being familiar with the knowledge base about the subject matter and 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 subject matter 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 GTAI, and to perhaps become reviewers.

Dr. Wojtowicz suggested that Council present students in the future to the program from attending the same GTAI presentation session.

Dr. Brenda Stevenson-Martin suggested that it become mandatory for deans to provide student evaluation results after the first semester of teaching, for the teaching assistants, in order to gather valid anecdotal data, and to evaluate the assistants' teaching abilities. Dr. Akan indicated making it mandatory was not realistic.

Dr. Neumon Lewis asked what the minimum IBT score was that other universities consider acceptable. Karen Martin informed that she did not know a specific amount of consensus on this issue. But, according to the Cornell study on this topic, it was determined an IBT score of between 17 and 22 indicated student speaks well, but that it may be weak for some programs.

Dr. Langlais suggested that the two issues relating to admissions and assistantships be separated. Council agreed that the subcommittee's original task was centered only on the assistantship issue, and that a mention of the admissions process should be removed from the current discussion.

Dr. Ishibashi suggested that if a student received a score of 24 or higher on the IBT Speaking test, then that student should not be required to take the writing test. However, it is not clear if this would be a score that is required for the life sciences. The vice president also mentioned a score less than 24.

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

Dr. Langlais suggested that if assistants do not receive scores of 2.0 or higher on the IBT, then they do not have to pass the Speak Test and CIAI, and they would immediately receive the assistantship. However, if the student scores less than 2.0, then they must pass the on-campus Speak Test and CIAI before being hired as a TA in the first semester, while they probably strengthen their communication skills. Dr. Dugan also stated that there may be two consequences if this were to become an industry standard: financial support during the first semester may be negatively affected, thus requiring alternative sources of support; and if the university uses of financial aid in lieu of this policy, departments may not be able to cover all of their courses offered in the fall semester. Dr. Langlais suggested that the sub-committee meet and discuss with department chairs the issues related to this topic. Council staff was concerned about the fair treatment of undergraduate students who attend classes taught by 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 it is not the committee's job to make recommendations for chairs. The sub-committee should have a revised set of recommendations prepared for the next GAC meeting.

#### **b. Thesis and Dissertation Guidelines**

Dr. Wojtowicz recommended that the guidelines presented to the department in an effort to receive funding to edit the current version of the guidelines. Dr. Wojtowicz informed Council that there are people in the department who have been doing these suggested editorial duties in the past. Dr. Wojtowicz would not want any of these individuals to do the required editorial work for pay. Dr. Dugan 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. Dugan agreed to assist as well. Dr. Wojtowicz proposed that the chair of the department be reduced, and that the guidelines be revised, and that the chair be responsible to departments for any possible changes after the editorial work has been completed. Dr. Langlais requested that the sub-committee prepare a written and detailed description of the project and a timeline of the time and cost of the project. Once the chair has received that information, Dr. Langlais will be able to discuss it with the department chairs and the GAC.

Schedule items that were not discussed will be added to the agenda for the next CAC meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.