|  |
| --- |
| Q2\_4\_TEXT - Other |
| Other - Text |
| all of the above |
| Students are admitted with a temporary advisor (a faculty member who has an interest in serving as the student's MP), but then are able to make their own decison about whom to ask to serve as their MP |
| Through class & other informal interactions but also we assign them to a "sponsor" during the admissions process, and this person becomes their advisor when they arrive on campus. |
| Interviews during first 6 weeks, preference survey, DOGE/Chair make final assignments |
| Major Prof chooses student - must commit to financial support of student for the duration of the degree program |

|  |
| --- |
| Q3\_1\_TEXT - Yes (please describe here) |
| Yes (please describe here) - Text |
| Mutual agreement |
| Our handbook defines reasons for dismissal from the program which includes lack of major professor. The student has a defined time period in which to identify a new major professor. This can be funded or unfunded depending on the circumstances and includes scenarios where the student chooses to leave a lab or is dismissed by the PI. The process for identifying or selecting a new major professor is not defined. Given that there are so many variables that influence the process it is handled on a case by case basis. Typically the students in these situations are meeting with the DOGE/Chair of the program along with the Program Coordinator. If there is a POS Committee formed the committee may be involved in offering advice and guidance. |
| a form |
| Talk to the DOGE |
| Program consults with both the current and future major professor and student files a change form (if switching departments) |
| talk to new major advisor and DOGE |
| Students fill out a form to confirm/change their MP |
| meet with DOGE discuss potential new PI |

|  |
| --- |
| Q5 - Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their major professor in your program. |
| Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their major professor in your program. |
| Newly hired professor is better research match |
| Not aware of any such example since we have not experienced it yet |
| The most common reason for a change in major professor for our program has been due to a faculty member leaving the university or a student choosing to change to a different lab. |
| We have so few that change it's hard to say. |
| They would want to work in a different research area |
| Research interest and personality match |
| incompatibility |
| Significant change in direction of research, lack of "fit" between student and major professor |
| Student dissatisfaction with the working relationship with the major professor |
| I have been DOGE in my programs for 4 years and I have never had someone change. |
| Very rare, usual due to retirements and resignations. |
| Lack of fit with research project |
| Change in focus is about equivalent with interpersonal disagreements between the student and major professor in incidence |
| funding availability |
| change in research topic; professor leaving |
| Lack of research progress |
| Incompatibility, either in research areas or in personalities |
| Changes in funding, perhaps. (Hasn't happened). |
| Inability to fund |
| faculty retirement and leaving the univ. |
| Mutual dissatisfaction of student and major professor |
| Changing research interests |
| change of science interest |
| Students change their research focus after exposure to other faculty. |
| Departure of major professor |
| personality issues |
| problems with the lab or lack of progress |

|  |
| --- |
| Q44 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about major professors that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about major professors that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| I would like there to be a training on the rights and responsibilities of being a major professor |
| dispute resolution must be fair to both professor and student |
| Our department struggles with high levels of variability in how MP support/guide/mentor students. Some MPs get overloaded with students because they have great reputations, while others are rarely asked to serve because they have assumed a "prickly" demeanor. Not sure this is a fixable problem, but any thoughts or guidance for DOGEs would be appreciated. |
| A concern I have on some occasions is that students can get caught in feuds of faculty and perhaps get left out of authorship on manuscripts. I also worry about students not making progress or finishing (especially with a couple of faculty members. An equally tough problem is that sometimes students leave to take a career job, but do not finish or take a long time to finish. In my experience, this has NOT been because of a lack of funding for the student, but that the student and professor underestimated how much work was left. |
| I would like students to be able to select their MP officially through GC before completing POSC so MP have access to them as advisees on their list. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q11\_1\_TEXT - Yes (please explain) |
| Yes (please explain) - Text |
| We advise students to select an outside member who is either outside of their home department or major. The idea being that the outside member has research and expertise which is outside of their area of focus. |
| While we suggest going outside of the department, we require that students go outside of their primary area of specialization if they have an outside member from within the department |
| It should be someone that is outside of the graduate major (we have several majors within the department). |
| a POSC member can be outside of the field of research but can be from our department |
| one who must be from a different field of emphasis so as to ensure diversity of perspectives |
| It should be someone with expertise in statistics or research methods. |
| we follow the grad school handbook |
| Someone outside the discipline |
| at least one faculty member outside program or department to ensure diversity of perspectives |
| may not be a member of dept |

|  |
| --- |
| Q15 - Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their committee members in your program. |
| Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their committee members in your program. |
| POS committee member |
| not applicable |
| Faculty leaving the university or retirement. |
| The committee member may leave the university or be on leave |
| Faculty Member leaves the university |
| availability for meetings and exams |
| professors unavailable |
| faculty retirements and resignations |
| Faculty member not available in POSC meetings. |
| Usually this is related to a new direction of the research project, or perhaps arrival of a new faculty member that can |
| Retirements and resignations |
| committee member left ISU |
| Sabbatical for faculty or some other issue where the faculty member can no longer serve |
| Someone already on the committee has to leave the committee due to changes in their work location, family situation, or workload |
| scheduling issues |
| change in research topic; committee member leaving |
| Scheduling problems for the final exam |
| Incompatibility |
| Change in research focus (just guessing, hasn't happened since I've been DOGE). |
| Availability |
| faculty retirement or leaving the univ. |
| Committee member leaves ISU |
| Changing research interests |
| unavailability for oral / final exam |
| Committee member is not available to actively participate or student changes interest area |
| Change in research direction |
| faculty leaving ISU |
| committee member leaving ISU |

|  |
| --- |
| Q38 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the program of study committee that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the program of study committee that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Mandate the annual meeting meeting and reporting of progress |
| how to deal with personal relationships among POSC members (i.e. student is spouse of major professor; two members of POSC are spouses). |
| When a conditional pass of prelim is made, there should be a way for the DOGE to confirm that the condition was met. |
| As DOGE, I would like to see one member of the committee be from outside of the department to ensure that Ph.D. level standards are maintained at ISU. I am not sure that having faculty members from one single department is the best way to maintain these standards. |
| I believe the committee should provide more writing guidance but that does not consistently happen. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q18 By the end of a specific semester: |
| By the end of a specific semester: - Text |
| Third semester |
| Generally by the end of the second summer |
| 4-5 semesters after research progress exam |
| end of 4th semester |
|  |
| Q18\_3\_TEXT - By the end of a specific year: |
| By the end of a specific year: - Text |
| By the end of third year |
| 3rd year |
| Third year - typically coursework is also completed. |
| second year |
| third |
| By end of second year |
| end of third year |
| end of third year |
| By end of second year. |
| End of year 3 |
| within 6 months of passing written exam |
| Typically after year 2 for PhD only and year 4 MS/PHD |

|  |
| --- |
| Q20 Yes (please describe) |
| Yes (please describe) - Text |
| in discussion w/ the prof and POSC |
| traditional "sit down" exams, a capstone project (applied research in the context of a client), or a portfolio of artifacts (often including a manuscript based on a pilot study) |
| Traditional exam or portfolio - This is a POSC decision, not a student decision |
| varies according to major profession and committee |
| traditional or grant proposal |

|  |
| --- |
| Q23 Other |
| Other - Text |
| major professor and the student together |
| Ideally it is the major professor working with the student to follow the program guidelines. |
| Major Prof and POSC together |
| The student decides for the first three years, then departmental guidelines after year 3 |
| They have to complete requirements in the PhD Portfolio |
| MP and student |

|  |
| --- |
| Q45 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the preliminary oral exam that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| rigor and uniform expectation of all prelim exams |
| how to make the rigor of the exam equivalent among different programs? |
| No, but I encourage the university to rethink qualifier exams, which seem to have morphed over the years into a pre-preliminary exam of dubious value. |
| Question above concerning "determines the content." I wanted to answer "program guidelines" and not "department guidelines." |
| The qualifying exam is an oral research proposition that builds the confidence of the student. The exercise has enhanced retention and performance. We would like to impose this requirement on all students in the department, but are not allowed to do so by the Graduate College in the case of interdepartmental majors. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q26 - What criteria does the major professor use to determine whether a dissertation is ready for defense? |
| when the research is deemed ready to be submitted as manuscript(s) to appropriate regerred journals |
| This varies across professors. It needs to be of publishable quality |
| It is up to the Major Professor to determine what criteria is used to whether a dissertation is ready for a defense |
| technical content, breath and depth, and quality of the writing |
| how long the student has been working |
| evaluation against personal expectations and in light of MP's understanding of the department's expectations |
| Number of manuscripts prepared for eventual submission for publication (3-4 is typical) |
| Completion of work proposed and agreed to by the POSC. |
| Is it complete? Well written? Original? Do the members of the committee believe the same? |
| When the objectives in the proposal have been completed with expected quality. |
| variable |
| Publishable research results, written in near-publishable condition |
| The student should have an explicit idea of what he/she will be doing in the dissertation and how he/she will do it. |
| Readability. End of funding also figures in. |
| Primarily progress on peer reviewed journal articles |
| I would think that individual professors have their own criteria |
| Publications and/or the completion of a body of work that could be publishable |
| Complete draft demonstrating a significant contribution |
| student mastery of material, and sufficient progress (i.e. publication) demonstrated |
| Criteria specified in the HDFS Graduate Handbook. It should be a polished, finished document. |
| Typically expectation is that one or more papers have been submitted for publication (or patents filed) |
| completion of required experiments |

|  |
| --- |
| Q58\_1\_TEXT - Yes (how many) |
| Yes (how many) - Text |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| Two to six |
| no specific number but 2-4 are likely, in some cases there have been as many as 7 |
| Number is not specified |
| three |
| several (depends on field); expect dissertation to have intro/summary to wrap around papers |
| Two or three |
| no set number - up to POS |
| 2 or 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| Q59\* Yes (how many) |
| Yes (how many) - Text |
| 2 submissions, 1 first author |
| 2 or usually 3 |

|  |
| --- |
| Q49 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the dissertation that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| MS should be submitted before graduation |
| Clarification .. the proposal MIGHT be part of the Prelim, but it is not required. Prelim format is defined by the committee. |
| Sometimes papers that comprise the dissertation are already published before the final oral exam, without having been reviewed by the POS committee. This undermines the value of the POS comittee. |
|  |
| Although the three-paper model is popular, I like the traditional format: more information (that may not be published) can be included; it is awkward for POSC to make corrections on papers included in the dissertation that have already been accepted; traditional dissertation has a better flow and narrative. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q40 Yes, most final exams in our department follow a similar format. (please de... |
| Yes, most final exams in our department follow a similar format. (please describe) - Text |
| Public presentation and questions, then committee questions and discussion |
| Q & A session typically lasting 2 to 3 hours with all the POS committee and the student in a room |
| A student will present their research, to a public group of students and faculty, and then faces questions. After that the committee questions the student on their research and dissertation without anyone else there. then the committee dismisses the student to deliberate |
| Research presentation, and Q/A during |
| thesis defense seminar |
| Final exams must be scheduled with the Graduate College at least three weeks before the scheduled exam. In addition, the Graduate College has a deadline (a â€œno later thanâ€ date) published for each semester (https://www.grad-college.iastate.edu/calendar/). The scheduled exams are posted on the graduate college web page. All Program of Study committee members must be present for the oral examination and must sign the report form indicating the final results of the exam. In some cases, it might be necessary to convene a meeting with one committee member participating at a distance. This is permitted, pending approval by the Program of Study committee. Further, the mode of communication must permit full participation of the committee member at a distance. The Graduate College must be notified in advanced. There is a form entitled â€œPreliminary or Final Oral examination with Committee member at a distanceâ€ on the Graduate college web page. The faculty member that will be participating at a distance is required to complete this online form. It is not recommended, but it is possible for a committee of five members to have two members attend at a distance. The Graduate College must approve this ahead of time and the location of the exam must be approved by the Graduate College. Details are found in the Graduate College Handbook. The faculty member participating at a distance must participate in the entire exam. The creative component/thesis/dissertation should be submitted to all Program of Study committee members at least two weeks before the final exam. The final exam format must include a public sharing of the studentâ€™s original work and an examination conducted by the Program of Study committee. The public event is a seminar that summarizes the literature and the work conducted by the student. Alternate formats of the public event are permissible when a seminar is not possible because of disability. The public event is usually held immediately before the examination portion of final exam, but it can be scheduled at a separate time (for example as part of a departmental seminar). The examination portion is held with the Program of Study committee. There is no time limit unless established by the Program of Study Committee. This event is generally closed to the public, but the Program of Study committee can make exceptions and may invite others to attend. Visitors to this portion of the exam are not included in questioning the student or in the committee deliberations. Exceptions to the described format and procedure can be requested by the Program of Study committee. Each request will be reviewed by the Animal Science Department Graduate Affairs committee. The Graduate Affairs committee will make their recommendation to the Department Chair. |
| Students are questioned, beginning with the outside member, moving "closer" to the most expert person, ending with the advisor |
| Open presentation followed by questions from the audience and then a closed conversation about the details of the disssertation. |
| Presentation by student followed by questions from faculty (not on POSC) and graduate students, followed by questions from the POSC other faculty and students are requested to leave the room) |
| formal seminar |
| Presentation by student followed by questioning from POS committee members sequentially |
| The student makes a powerpoint presentation to the committee, and any visitors who are there, and then the student answers questions from the committee. |
| Presentation of dissertation, questions from POSC. |
| 40-50 minute research seminar |
| PowerPoint presentation interrupted by questions |
| public seminar followed by private oral exam on dissertaiton w/ committee |
| Overview of meeting portfolio requirements and then about a 20-30 presentation followed by questions and discussion. After discussion, students leaves room while committee confers and comes to consensus. |
| 45-60 minute presentation by candidate followed by questions from the audience. Then all spectators are asked to leave and the committee continues to question the candidate. Usually complete in 2 hours. |
| public seminar then non-public defense |
| No, exam format is left up to students, major professor, and committee. (pl... |
| No, exam format is left up to students, major professor, and committee. (please give a couple of examples of different formats) - Text |
| public presentation, followed by private questioning with committee, private presentation followed by questioning, informal discussion among student and committee with interspersed questioning |
| But tradition dictates a 60 minute open seminar followed by 1-2 hours of closed examination by POSC members |
| typically student gives a research seminar; there are questions from the floor (minus committee), then committee holds private meeting with evaluation and questions |

|  |
| --- |
| Q32 - If students have concerns about the integrity of the doctoral education process, to whom are they directed? |
| DOGE |
| There is no written policy in place on this matter to my knowledge |
| DOGE/Chair of the Program. Executive/Supervisory Committee. Graduate College. |
| The DOGE |
| The DOGE and Major Professor |
| DOGE and chair |
| Major professor; DOGE of the program; chair of the department |
| DOGE |
| DOGE or department chair |
| DOGE |
| DOGE, then chair of department |
| DOGE |
| DOGE and chair |
| DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DOGE; Chair |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| Me, the DOGE, at least to start. |
| DOGE or department chair. |
| DOGE or chair |
| DOGE and the Grad College |
| DOGE |
| DOGE |
| chair of department graduate status committee, DOGE, and/or chair |
| Firs to the Director of Graduate Education, Department Chair and then to Graduate College |
| Program DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DOGE, then grad college |

|  |
| --- |
| Q34 - If any faculty member has concerns about the integrity of the doctoral education process, to whom is the faculty member directed? |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| There is no written policy in place on this matter to my knowledge |
| DOGE/Chair of the Program. Executive/Supervisory Committee. Graduate College. |
| I don't know |
| The DOGE |
| DOGE and chair |
| DOGE of the program; chair of the department |
| DOGE or chair |
| DOGE or department chair |
| DOGE or Dept Chair |
| DOGE, then chair of department |
| DOGE |
| Chair and DOGE |
| DOGE, program supervisory committee |
| DOGE |
| DOGE; Chair |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| Again, it would be the DOGE, but I have not had anyone talk to me about the integrity of the process. |
| DOGE or department chair. |
| DOGE or Chair |
| Chair and DOGE of the program, the Grad College |
| DOGE |
| DOGE and department chair |
| same as for students (see above) |
| DOGE, Department Chair and Graduate College |
| Program DOGE |
| DOGE or dept chair |
| grad college |

|  |
| --- |
| Q50 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the final oral exam that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the final oral exam that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Issue related to the two questions asked immediately above |
| high rigor and standard should be used across the program. But it is difficult to monitor |
| Should require all final oral exams to be public. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q47 - Please note any other issues or topics you would like the Graduate Council to discuss here. |
| Continue the discussion on the role of the outside member |
|  |
|  |