

interviews that include both audio and video for selecting applicants who are teaching assistantship candidates; 2) conduct a language proficiency test; 3) request the transcripts of students' previous courses; 4) request the transcript of the semester of teaching; 5) request the transcript of the committee; 6) request the 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 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 an obstacle to reviewers not being familiar with the knowledge 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 presentation 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 prevent students in the exchange 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 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 the exact 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 enough 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 revision of the charge was necessary to 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 IBT. However, it is not clear if this would be a score less than

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

Dr. Langlais suggested that if assistants can't make scores of 2.0 or higher on the IBT, then they do not have to pass the Speak Test and CIA, 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 CIA while continuing to serve as a TA in the first semester while they hopefully strengthen their communication skills. Dr. Dugan also stated that there may be two consequences if students who become ineligible for student financial support during the first semester may be negatively affected, thus requiring alternative sources of support. 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 Provost in an effort to receive funding to edit the current version of the guidelines. Dr. Wojtowicz informed Council that there are many people in the college who have fulfilled these suggested editorial duties in the past. Dr. Wojtowicz would not want any of those 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 and 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 succinct and detailed description of the project and a timeline of the time and cost of the project in its first phase. Once it has received that information, Dr. Langlais will submit it to the Provost for approval and funding.

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

Meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.