Minutes of the Graduate Faculty Council Meeting

Tuesday, November 1, 2011

Members (15): Thomas Drummer (Math), Ashutosh Tiwari (Chem), Craig Friedrich (MEEM), Simon Carn (Geo), Yu Cai (Sch Tech), Barry Solomon (SocSci), Paul Ward (Cog Sci), Andrew Storer (SFRES), Mike Bowler (Rhet), Steve Seidel (Comp Sci), Kim Fook Lee (Physics), Mi Hye Song (Bio Sci), Julia King (Chem Eng), Dave Watkins (Civil), Judith Perlinger (Atmos)

Guests (8): Heather Suokas (Grad Sch), Debra Charlesworth (Grad Sch), Nancy Byers-Sprague (Grad Sch), Felicia Chong (GSG), Jacque Smith (Grad School), Jackie Huntoon (Grad Sch), Erik Nordberg (Libr), Tara Evans (IPS)

1) Meeting called to order at 4:06 pm.

2) Review and approval of 10/18/11 meeting minutes.

3) Committee Reports:
   a. Thesis/Dissertation Guideline Review Committee (Dean Huntoon): Dean Huntoon has met with Nancy and Deb to review the dean’s recommendations. Nancy and Deb made their recommendations and Deb is in the process of incorporating those changes into the document. She will send the draft to the committee this week.

4) Old Business:
   a. Changes to GACS (Andrew Storer): Andrew had a draft proposal sent to the members of GFC for review and comment. He did receive some feedback and the revised proposal can be found in the handouts section on the GFC website. The GFC proposed the following modifications to the new policy: 1. Voluntary uncommitted costshare for assistant professors be continued. NSF is no longer allowing voluntary uncommitted costshare on proposals, but this is not a reason to eliminate this from all proposals. GACS incentive return to assistant professors should be shown as voluntary costshare when permissible by the funding agency. Dean Huntoon reminds the group that currently we do voluntary uncommitted meaning we do not reveal costshare to the sponsor. If you do want to reveal to the sponsor then it is considered voluntary committed. Dean Huntoon feels the new proposal is suggesting that we begin using voluntary committed costshare. Andrew says when an assistant professor is working on a proposal where costshare is permissible it should be able to be shown as voluntary committed costshare. This would help make our proposals more competitive. 2. GACS incentive return should go to a new GACS incentive account of the investigator and not to the Department Chair or School Dean. This may ensure that the funding is used exclusively for graduate student support. Consideration should be given to a higher rate of return to assistant professors than to tenured faculty (perhaps ½ to assistant professors and ¼ to tenured faculty as opposed to the 1/3 flat return rate proposed). Jackie will discuss these ideas with Julie Seppala in the Research Office and then Jackie will respond to the GFC.
   b. Graduate Student Maximum Credits (C. Friedrich): Craig contacted the registrar’s office and the thirteen credit enrollment maximum is in place. Students may seek permission from the graduate director to enroll in more than thirteen credits. Deb Chrarlesworth will add this text to the website.
   c. Report Submission (N. Byers-Sprague): At the last GFC meeting Nancy asked that the members bring this proposal to eliminate the option for professional binding of reports back to their departments for feedback. Currently only Applied Science Education requires a bound report. Paul Ward say feedback from his department (that includes the applied science education program) was not favorable as they see it as treating a report differently from a thesis or dissertation. Cognitive and Learning Sciences does not view a report as different from a thesis. Is electronic data safe? In order to protect the longevity and reliability of electronic data, thesis and dissertations are sent to ProQuest. ProQuest archives electronically and with microfilm. Paul Ward asks if this can be tabled until the recommendations are brought forward from the thesis and dissertation guidelines committee. It is agreed that this will be tabled until the new thesis and dissertation guidelines are agreed upon.
d. Combining Plan C & D as “coursework only” (N. Byers-Sprague): At the last GFC meeting Nancy asked that the members bring this proposal to combine plan C & D as “coursework only” back to their departments for feedback. The Plan C students would not have to submit a pre-defense form. Are we graduating more or less Plan C students as compared to the past? More departments are going to a Plan D so we are graduating less Plan C students. The options would go from Plan A, B, C, or D to Thesis, Report, or Coursework only. The website will clearly state that under the coursework only option that programs can select to include a culminating exam or not. Nancy will need to know if your department includes an exam or not. This can be indicated during the binder process. Motion to approve passed.

5) New Business:
   a. Meet Tara Evans, Assistant Director, International Programs and Services (T. Evans): Tara Evans is the new Assistant Director for International Programs and Services. She will be handling immigration advising for graduate students. Jackie also recommends that Tara attend a Graduate Student Government meeting as well.
   b. PhD Guidelines (Dean Huntoon): Jackie has been reviewing the PhD guidelines that are posted on the web and then brought them to Deb and Nancy to see if their work falls in line with what is posted. In the process the three of them also came up with a series of questions that are brought up each year. Specifically do we want to allow faculty with adjunct appointments in a unit to be the primary advisor for a student in that unit, and does the current requirement that if you are a student in a non-departmental program, the external committee member cannot be in your administrative home department and they cannot be affiliated with your non-departmental program need to stay in place? The latter in particular is very hard for students. The dean also asked for input on some recommended timelines for completion of milestones as students would like guidance on these. A representative asked that the dean prepare a flowchart to facilitate review and discussion. Another representative asked that flexibility be allowed for the differences between post-bachelor’s and post-master’s students. The dean also asked for input on the potential for standardizing the names and purposes of the different PhD exams. Discussion will continue at a future meeting after the flowcharts have been prepared.
   c. TOEFL Minimum Score (J. Smith): Michigan Tech does not have a recommended minimum TOEFL score for admissions into our graduate programs. The Graduate School is proposing a minimum score of 55 iBT. Applicants with a score of less than 55 iBT would be rejected by the Graduate School and their files would not be forwarded to departments/programs for review. Currently there are not any language support systems on campus for students with TOEFL scores of less than 55. Students who score above 55 can use our campus ESL program to help to bring a student up to your department’s desired language level. What is the maximum score? 120. This proposal is estimated to effect less than 50 out of 3,000 applicants in a year. The Graduate School is not looking to change department requirements. This proposal will help lower the flow of applications streaming to your department by weeding out the applicants with TOEFL scores of less than 55. How would departments identify the popularity of a program in the event that many applying have a low TOEFL score? Will departments still know that people are applying even though the Graduate School is rejecting the applications? Jacque will look into the data and find out how that would be reported. Jacque asks that the members take this back to their departments and bring feedback to the next GFC meeting.

6) Motion to adjourn at 5:10 pm.
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(Last update: 11/02/11)

Handouts of the Graduate Faculty Council
Proposal – eliminate the option for professional binding of reports

Motivation - only 1 program requires professional binding (SASE)
- 14 of the 44 students submitting reports this year wanted binding
  3 of those for themselves only
- creates less confusion for students
- minimizes formatting corrections needed
- we can direct students to providers of professional binding
- library is moving to more electronic/less paper volumes
- currently all students must submit a pdf version of their report

Current text concerning report binding options

Students submitting a report have the option of having it professionally bound. Depending on the option selected, different items must be provided to the Graduate School to complete the degree, as shown below.

- **No professional binding**
  - A single copy of your final report in a sturdy binder for the Library. This copy must include an original signed signature page.
  - Printed Degree completion form

- **Professional binding - providing one bound copy to the Library**
  - Printed Degree completion form signed by the Graduate School and the advisor or graduate program assistant (off campus students will be assisted by the Graduate School). The form must include ordering one bound copy for the Library.
  - A signed signature page
  - A title page

- **Professional binding - no bound copy ordered for the Library**
  - Printed Degree completion form signed by the Graduate School and the advisor or graduate program assistant (off campus students will be assisted by the Graduate School).
  - A single copy of your final report in a sturdy binder for the Library. This copy must include an original signed signature page.
  - A title page.
  - (optional) A signed signature page to include in personal bound copies.

Proposed text

Submit the following items to the Graduate School to complete the degree:

- A single copy of your final report in a sturdy binder for the Library. This copy must include an original signed signature page.
- Printed Degree completion form

Students who wish to have their report professionally bound may utilize one of the following services:

- Link to Google search for “thesis print on demand”
- Book Concern Printers (local) [www.bookconcernprinters.com](http://www.bookconcernprinters.com)
Graduate School

Doctor of Philosophy

The doctor of philosophy degree is a research degree. It is awarded in recognition of demonstrated mastery of subject matter in a chosen field of study and demonstrated competence in the conduct of an individual research investigation that represents a significant contribution to the cumulative knowledge of the field. The program of study and research will be planned and supervised by an advisory committee. Each candidate’s course work and research topic must be approved by the advisory committee as meeting the standards generally associated with the doctoral degree.

The doctoral student must comply with the requirements on this page, the requirements of their program, and complete any necessary forms to document their progress with the Graduate School.

Individual programs may have higher standards, and students are expected to know their program’s requirements.

Residency Requirements

- A minimum of two-thirds of the required non-research course-work credits required for the degree must be taken through Michigan Tech. PhD students must take at least 20 credits beyond the masters or 50 credits beyond the bachelors through Michigan Tech.
- Research credits used to satisfy degree requirements must be taken through Michigan Tech and must be supervised by a member of Michigan Tech graduate faculty.

Courses which meet the "through Michigan Tech" requirement are defined as courses listed in the Michigan Tech course catalog and taught by Michigan Tech faculty.

Credit Requirements

Minimum requirements

Programs may have stricter requirements than listed here and may require more than the minimum numbers of credits listed here.

- Thirty credits beyond the bachelor’s degree are required for a master’s degree.
- Thirty credits beyond the master’s degree are required for a PhD.
- Maximum of 12 credits may be at the 3000 or 4000 level (with program approval).
- One-third of the non-research credits may be transfer credits as long as they were not applied toward another degree.
- Research credits are the only non-graded classes that may be counted toward a degree.
Unallowable credits

- Courses numbered below 3000
- Audited courses
- Continuous enrollment courses (ex: UN5951, UN5953)
- Non-research courses taken for a pass/fail grade
- Credits applied toward another degree (see exceptions below)

Special Exceptions

- Peace Corps Master’s International students may use 2 credits of language courses below the 3000 level.
- Students earning an additional master’s degree may reuse some credits from their primary degree in accordance with Graduate School policy.
- Students in an accelerated master’s program may apply up to 6 of the credits earned while an undergraduate toward both their bachelor’s and master’s degrees.

Academic Progress

Students must be in good standing to earn a graduate degree.

Time Limits

All work for the master’s degree must be completed within five calendar years of the first enrollment in the degree program or earliest course listed on the degree schedule, whichever is earliest. All work for the PhD must be completed within eight calendar years of the first enrollment in the degree program or earliest course listed on the degree schedule, whichever is earliest. Requests for extension must be made by the advisor to the Graduate School.

Advisor

Faculty who advise graduate students must be members of the Michigan Tech graduate faculty. These individuals advise students on course selection and supervise the students’ research. All graduate students must have an advisor.

Each student’s advisor must hold a regular or adjunct appointment in the student's administrative home department or school. Students may be co-advised by two faculty members. At least one of the co-advisors must hold a regular or adjunct appointment in the student’s administrative home department or school.

- While one co-advisor may be from outside the student's administrative home department or school, it is recommended (but not required) that this co-advisor not also serve as the external member of the student's committee.
- Before recommending a sole advisor who holds an adjunct appointment in the student's administrative home department or school, the appropriate graduate program director should ensure that this person is sufficiently familiar with the department/school.
standards for research and with applicable university policies/procedures and that this person can maintain adequate contact with the student.

Students who enter the University may initially be advised by the graduate program director for their degree program.

By the end of the second academic semester in residence, a permanent advisor should be chosen.

Advisory Committee

The advisory committee consists of at least three members of the graduate faculty in addition to the advisor. The membership of the committee is recommended to the dean of the Graduate School by the advisor and the chair/graduate program director of the student’s academic home department or school or program using the Advisor and Committee Recommendation form. At least one member of the committee must be external to the student’s academic home department or school. For students in non-departmental graduate programs, the external member must not be affiliated with the non-departmental program. If co-advisors are chosen and one co-advisor is from outside the student's home department or school, it is recommended, but not required, that an additional external member be chosen.

The advisory committee typically administers the student’s final oral examination and may administer the preliminary comprehensive and candidacy exams.

The advisory committee should be appointed by the end of the student’s third academic semester in residence.

Comprehensive Examination

A comprehensive examination will be given to determine each student’s ability to apply general concepts and methods in their chosen field. This examination must include a written component and may also include an oral component.

The examination will be prepared and administered by members of the Graduate Faculty who are familiar with the examinee’s chosen field of study. The examining committee may be a standing committee appointed by the academic home department or school or it may consist of a student’s advisory committee. Any member of the graduate faculty may attend the oral examination as an observer.

Satisfactory performance on the comprehensive examination is required for students to maintain good progress toward completion of their degree.

The comprehensive examination should be administered during or prior to each student’s fourth academic semester in residence at Michigan Tech. It must be given no later than five years after enrollment. It must be given at least two terms before the final oral defense.

Candidacy Examination

Comment [JH2]: Question for the GFC - is this the right time for this requirement? I believe it is.

Comment [JH3]: Question for the GFC - do we want to keep this? Or, do we just want to ensure that the "external" member is outside the student’s administrative home department. This is asked about frequently. I recommend we do away with this but would like the GFC’s input on it.

Comment [JH4]: Question for the GFC - is this the correct name for the "first" exam which is usually used to measure disciplinary competence. This name is used at other universities, but another name could be used. I would like to standardize the naming and the goals of this exam (that is possible).

Comment [JH5]: Question for the GFC - is this the correct name for the "second" exam which may be a proposal or some other type of exam designed to demonstrate the capability to perform fundamental research in the discipline. After the students pass both exams they are "ABD" and hence full "candidates" for their degree. This name is used at other universities but a different name could be used if that would be better. Again, I would like to standardize the naming and intent of this exam if that is possible.

Comment [JH6]: Question for the GFC – is this the right time frame for this? I believe it is.

Comment [JH7]: Question for the GFC – is this the correct time limit for this exam? I recommend that it is in order to keep students on track.

Comment [nbs8]: Question for GFC: Retain timing for comprehensive exam or delete it? How do we force a student to stay for two terms after if they're done.

Comment [JH9]: Question for the GFC – describing the content of the 2nd exam is new for Michigan Tech. In most cases this will probably be the "proposal defense". Are people comfortable with the description and timeline that follow? Articulation of this is needed because we need to be clear about what students need to do to complete their degree.

If this wording, or a modified version, is adopted, the current "comprehensive exam form" will be modified so that it encompasses both the comp and the candidacy and reports to the graduate school that both exams have been completed.
A candidacy examination will be given to determine each student’s readiness to conduct and complete an independent research project that will contribute to the body of knowledge in their chosen field. This examination must include an oral component and may also include a written component.

The examination will be prepared and administered by members of the Graduate Faculty who are familiar with the examinee’s chosen field of study. The examining committee may be a standing committee appointed by the academic home department or school or it may consist of a student’s advisory committee. Any member of the graduate faculty may attend the oral examination as an observer.

Satisfactory performance on the candidacy examination is required for students to maintain good progress toward completion of their degree. Completion of the candidacy examination is required prior to students entering research-only mode.

The candidacy examination should be administered during or prior to each student’s sixth academic semester in residence at Michigan Tech. It must be given no later than six years after enrollment. It must be given at least one term before the final oral defense.

**Dissertation**

The research undertaken as part of the doctoral degree program will be presented in the form of a dissertation that will be a permanent acquisition of the library. Any classified or proprietary material that cannot be made available to the public is not acceptable as a dissertation. Completing the dissertation requires preparation of the document according to Graduate School guidelines, and submitting the completed (and successfully defended) dissertation to the Graduate School.

A completed draft of the dissertation must be approved by the advisory committee chair two weeks prior to the final examination.

**Final Oral Examination**

At a public final oral examination, primarily concerning the research and doctoral dissertation, the candidate should justify the validity of the methods and conclusions contained in the dissertation and should demonstrate familiarity with the significance of the study in relation to the existing body of knowledge.

The examining committee will be appointed by the Graduate School in consultation with the department chair or school dean of the student’s academic home unit. The student’s advisory committee will typically serve as the examining committee. In all cases the examining committee will consist of at least four members of the graduate faculty. At least one of these will be from outside the student's administrative home department or school. The primary advisor, or a co-advisor who serves as chair of the committee, must be from the student's home department or school. While one co-advisor may be from outside the student's administrative home department, it is recommended, but not required, that this co-advisor not fill the role of sole external member
on the student's committee. For interdisciplinary and non-departmental programs, the outside examiner may not be affiliated with the interdisciplinary or non-departmental program. A person external to Michigan Tech may be appointed as an ad hoc member of the Graduate Faculty to serve as the outside examiner. Persons who are not members of the Graduate Faculty may not serve as voting members of doctoral examination committees.

The examination will be scheduled by filing a Pre-defense form with the Graduate School.

The date of the examination must be at least two weeks following the approval of the completed draft of the dissertation by the advisor and distribution of the completed draft of the dissertation to the examining committee.

The examination may be given no earlier than two terms following successful completion of the comprehensive examination and one term following successful completion of the candidacy examination. The student’s final oral examination results must be reported to the Graduate School on the Report on Oral Exam form (D8).
TOEFL Minimum Score

11/1/11

Jacque Smith

Proposal

Michigan Technological University does not have a recommended minimum TOEFL score for admission into our graduate programs. The Graduate School would like to purpose that a recommended minimum score of 55 iBT for TOEFL be put in place. Graduate applicants receiving a TOEFL score of less than 55iBT would be rejected by the Graduate School and their files would not be forwarded to departments/programs for review.

Currently there are no language support systems on campus for students with TOEFL scores of less than 55. This proposal is estimated to effect less than 50 applicants in the current recruiting year.

TOEFL Scoring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Score Range</th>
<th>Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>Low (0-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (15-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (22-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening</td>
<td>0-30</td>
<td>Low (0-14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Intermediate (15-21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High (22-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speaking</td>
<td>0-4 points converted to 0-30 score scale</td>
<td>Weak (0-9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited (10-17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair (18-25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (26-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing</td>
<td>0-5 points converted to 0-30 score scale</td>
<td>Limited (1-16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fair (17-23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Good (24-30)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Score</td>
<td>0-120</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graduate Faculty Council

Response to Proposed New Policy for GACS

October, 2011

The Graduate Faculty Council (GFC) has discussed the proposed revisions to the GACS policy. The GFC recognizes the importance of this program in promoting graduate student education at Michigan Tech and hopes to see it continue to meet the goals of:

1. Assisting with support of graduate students, and
2. Helping assistant professors to support students as they develop their research program.

The proposed policy appears to have become intertwined with some other issues:

1. An apparent reduction in the IRAD return to some units resulting from the recent revision in policy regarding overhead return, and
2. The unwillingness of the University to show voluntary cost share on grant proposals.

The GFC proposes the following modifications to the new policy:

1. Voluntary uncommitted costshare for assistant professors be continued.

NSF is no longer allowing voluntary uncommitted costshare on proposals, but this is not a reason to eliminate this from proposals to all agencies. In some cases, this costshare can help make a proposal more competitive and therefore should be available. The elimination of uncommitted costshare is a disincentive to research in cases where agencies will use this as part of the evaluation process. GACS incentive return to assistant professors should be shown as voluntary costshare when permissible by the funding agency.

2. GACS incentive return should go to a new GACS incentive account of the Investigator and not to the Department Chair or School Dean.

Returning GACS to the unit level (department chair or school dean) may ensure that the funding is used exclusively for graduate student support, but this will likely replace graduate student support that may be committed from other accounts. Therefore it may not achieve the goal of increasing graduate student support. The return of GACS to a special account of the PI should enable the PI to utilize the support in the future and be available to them as they develop new research proposals. There may be a time limit within which the support needs to be used. This results in GACS being awarded in an amount that is proportional to the amount expended on graduate student support. Consideration should be given to a higher rate of return to assistant professors than to tenured faculty (perhaps ½ to assistant professors and ¼ to tenured faculty as opposed to the 1/3 flat return rate proposed).
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1. Review minutes of 10/18/11
2. Committee Reports:
   a. Thesis/Dissertation Guideline Review Committee (Dean Huntoon)
3. Old Business
   a. Changes to GACS-Counter Proposal (A. Storer)
   b. Graduate Student Maximum Credits - 12 or more? (C. Friedrich)
   c. Report Submission (N. Byers-Sprague)
   d. Combining Plan C & D as "course work only" - Graduate School no longer tracking final defense (N. Byers-Sprague)
4. New Business
   a. Meet Tara Evans, Assistant Director, International Programs and Services
   b. PhD Guidelines (D. Charlesworth/N. Byers-Sprague)
   c. TOEFL Minimum Score (J. Smith)