|  |
| --- |
| Q2\_6\_TEXT - Other |
| Other - Text |
| This may change depending upon student |
| Recommendation of DOGE |
| Major prof chooses students - must commit to funding them |
| it is a combination--some come with a MP in mind, they learn about each faculty in an intro course, and are encouraged to meet with faculty separately, as well as consider faculty they have had as instructors |
| Classes, informal interactions, DoGE recommendations, formal presentation to faculty |
| Assigned a temp adviser and then pick after working with faculty |

|  |
| --- |
| Q3\_1\_TEXT - Yes (please describe here) |
| Yes (please describe here) - Text |
| Mutual agreement |
| Discussion with DOGE, potential new MPs |
| 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. |
| New POSC is formed to replace old POSC. |
| They must ask that professional |
| consult with DOGE |
| Students fill out a form to confirm/change their MP |
| The student talks to the new major professor and the DOGE. |
| Consultation with DOGE and Dept. Chair |
| They can switch from temp adviser or stay with that person as their major professor after they work with additional faculty |
| They just need to come and talk to the DOGE |

|  |
| --- |
| Q5 - Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their major professor in your program. |
| Newly hired professor is better match for research interests |
| Retirement of current MP from the Department |
| research interests have changed |
| The new professor better fits their research interests. |
| Faculty member leaving the university or retiring. |
| Conflict with major professors related to how they are treated. |
| interest and personality match |
| Desire to research in a different area |
| conflicting expectations bewteen the major prof and the new grad student |
| Personality conflicts |
| Change in topic or incompatible schedule of the faculty. |
| change in research interests, sense of "fit" with another faculty member |
| Dissatisfaction with working relationship with major professor |
| either a change of research interest, or a faculty member leaves the university |
| Lack of satisfactory progress towards research in the selected area. |
| research differences |
| departure of professor |
| personality clash between professor and student |
| change of status from PhD to Masters requiring different project / funding |
| research not aligned |
| changing research area |
| It happens so rarely that I can't give a reason really. In the past, it's been due to resignations and retirements. |
| faculty leave the university; at the MS level, there is not much change of MP |
| Change of research focus |
| Personal reasons |
| personality issues |
| Students' interests change after exposure to other faculty/classes. |
| professor leaving; change in research focus |
| Faculty member leaving ISU |
| personality conflict |
| Personality conflicts |
| NA (hasn't happened while I've been DOGE). |
| They are shopping around |
| Hasn't happened in the past 5 years |
| professor retires or leaves the university |
| Lack of research progress |
| Changing research interests |
| Connecting with a professor who has research and interests that align with theirs. |
| Departure/resignation of major professor |
| Change of research topic |
| conflict, personal issues, harrasment |
| The project is not what they thought it would be. |

|  |
| --- |
| 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 annual reviews of Distance MS graduate students required? |
| Folks need to be trained to be major professors. Many don't understand what the job entails. |
| sometimes not clearly conveying expectations |
| We need a mentoring/training program for faculty. And not just a one-hour workshop. |
| Some do very little mentoring. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q11\_1\_TEXT - Yes (please explain) |
| Yes (please explain) - Text |
| Must be outside the student's disciplinary area of study |
| The outside member should be outside of the student's home department or major. The idea is that the outside member is someone whose research is outside of the area of focus for the student. |
| Faculty that do not have our department as their home department |
| outside of the student's area of study within the unit or outside of the dept |
| member outside student's primary area of research. |
| approved faculty in program |
| Should be outside the major (but we have several majors in the department, so sometimes they are all in the department) |
| Outside the department |
| Outside the major being sought |
| outside the students research area |
| Must be outside the disciplinary area |
| one who must be from a different field of emphasis so as to ensure diversity of perspectives |
| Anyone outside of the department |
| we follow the grad school handbook |
| Graduate Faculty status in program that complements student's interest |
| at least one faculty member outside program or department to ensure diversity of perspectives |

|  |
| --- |
| Q15 - Please indicate the most likely reason for students changing their committee members in your program. |
| POS Committe member leaves ISU |
| Retirement, leave ISU |
| Committee member's availability |
| Faculty member leaving ISU or retiring. |
| Faculty availability during crucial periods related to their graduation. |
| unavailable for meetings, exams |
| Committee Member has left the University |
| Retiredment or sabbatical of a faculty member |
| Schedule or personality conflicts |
| Change in topic or scheduling conflict with faculty. |
| availability for commitee meetings and final oral |
| Unavailable for POSC meetings |
| change in scholarship interest by student |
| Member may not be available during the semester the student plans to defend. |
| faculty unavailable |
| departure of faculty member |
| faculty member can no longer serve |
| absence during final |
| change of research area, committee members resign |
| Retirements and resignations |
| faculty leave or the focus on their thesis changes so that different expertise is needed |
| change of focus |
| Committee member not available as much as needed |
| Faculty member leaves ISU |
| A change in student research area or faculty availability |
| committee member leaves; change of research topic |
| Fit with topic |
| N/A |
| Seldom are changes made |
| Hasn't happened since I've been DOGE. |
| member leaving or not involved in the research any more |
| Professor leaves the university |
| retirements or leaving the university |
| Changing research interests |
| Professor moves or retires and must be replaced. |
| faculty leaving ISU |
| Departure |
| change of thesis topic |
| leaving of committee members |
| The committee member leaves 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? |
| I sometimes worry that they are not "broad" enough |
| I wish we did more academic writing guidance than we do outside the MP |
| Because research in our program often cuts across disciplinary lines, we really like finding soneone with an appointment outside the department whose expertise will benefit the research. |
| making sure faculty engage in the committee and do not just show up at defense with little feedback |

|  |
| --- |
| Q26 - What criteria does the major professor use to determine whether a thesis or creative component is ready for defense? |
| Proposal meeting with POS committee |
| Meets Grad College and Library format requirements, all sections/analyses are complete, writing is graduate level. |
| Whether research is ready for publication and whether the student is independent. |
| Scientific content and quality of writing |
| Review of research as well as discussion with student |
| Chapters/publications for submitting are in a workable form. |
| There are no set criteria - which is part of the problem. It seems to vary from individual to individual. |
| Meets expectations of MP and MP's understanding of dept expectations. |
| Is it completely ready and will it succeed |
| Adequate data to support hypothesis |
| quantity and quality of the work, including the writing |
| Depends on the area of research (Theory, Experimental, Software Development) |
| Completion of work, analysis, and summary. |
| All data have been completed and appropraite interpretations and conclusions have been reached |
| Graduate College handbook, journal publication requirements |
| Careful reading. Is it defensible? Does the committee agree its defensible? |
| Multiple reviews of the document to make sure the logic and method is sound and grammar is correct |
| Proper format, matches the products identified in the proposal, interpretations from data are logical and explained well |
| IS there a completed story to tell, can this be published |
| MP works with the student for thesis to make sure it is a polished document. The creative component does not have MP oversight during the writing process. |
| Unsure |
| successful rsearch completion; relevant; acurate approaches to analyses |
| Is it approaching publishing quality? |
| Readability. End of funding also factors in. |
| reasonable of contribution based on the field |
| Publication and/or a publishable body of work |
| Publishable results, thesis writing in near-publishable condition |
| Good draft of the thesis document that describes a contribution |
| One-on-one review with student |
| Some require a publication to have been at least submitted. Others require only the completion of a substantial research contribution. |
| Has met departemntal expectations |
| personal standards and departmental guidelines |
| Is the work proposed finished with the quality expected. |

|  |
| --- |
| Q49 - Are there any specific questions or concerns you have about the thesis or creative component that you would like to Graduate Council to know about or discuss? |
| Copyright restrictions on CCs deposited in e-Library. |
| Yes, some students may not have any or not many work published if let graduate before a submission of a MS |
| Our department will probably create new thesis guidelines next year to clarify thesis expectations including minimum time it must be presented to the committee before the defense. |
| We expect a thesis to include publishable work - but would never delay graduation based on a journal review timeline. |

|  |
| --- |
| 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-only questions |
| Thesis seminar open to public followed by POSC questions and decision. |
| Not sure what you want here. |
| Students give a presentation on their research topic, then answer questions from committee members and non-committee members, after that the committee has time with the student and no one else to question the student, then the committee deliberates without the student present to determine if they pass |
| Presentation to committee and open to all |
| Exams include presentation of thesis, audience questions, then closed session with student and POSC. |
| Public invited for presentation. Questions from public. Then private discussion between student and committee. Private discussion among committee w/o student. Consensus. Announced to student |
| questions pertain to the thesis/creative component, for the most part |
| Problem statement and Impact/Importance. Challenges. Prior/Related work. Contributions. Future directions. |
| 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. |
| Individual committee members ask questions, beginning with the outside member, then the reader, then the advisor. |
| seminar then defense |
| Brief presentation of thesis/creative component followed by a discussion/question period. Student leaves the room while committee deliberates and comes to consensus about approval. |
| 15-20 min presentation, then questions from committee |
| oral presentation of thesis, questions from POSC |
| presentation of work for about 45 minutes |
| PowerPoint interrupted by questions |
| Summary of results presented by student, followed by questioning by committee members sequentially |
| Presentation by student followed by questions/answers |
| oral presentation, open Q&A, close Q&A, POSC discussion |
| 35-45 presentation by the candidate followed by questions from the audience then non-committee members are asked to leave and the POS committee asks more questions. Typically completed in 90 minutes. |
| Student presentation, questions from committee over thesis, committee deliberation and decision |
| 15 minute student presentation, facutly question period, committee discussion period, student knowledge of outcome |
| Generally and open presentation followed by questions from the audience followed by closed session to discuss the thesis in detail. |
| 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 |
| some give public presentation while others are a closed defense |
| formal presentation, followed by Q&A, more informal discussion with integrated questioning |
| Most follow format of open seminar followed by closed examination by POSC |
| Typically open to any questions from committee with emphasis on dissertation topic. Can sometimes involve defending a research proposal or other written assignment |
| No oral exam required |
| Oral presentation in seminar format open to the department followed by committee exam |
| student gives presentation, questions from the floor (minus committee), then private evaluation and questions by committee |

|  |
| --- |
| Q32 - If students have concerns about the integrity of the masters education process, to whom are they directed? |
| DOGE |
| DOGE, Chair of Department. |
| Program DOGE/Chair, Executive/Supervisory Committee, Graduate College |
| The DOGE and/or the department chair. |
| DOGE and dept chair |
| They are directed to DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DoGE then Chair |
| admin staff then DOGE |
| DOGE and then Dept. Chair |
| DOGE |
| Doge, dept chair, grad college in that order |
| DOGE or department chair |
| DOGE, Graduate College |
| DOGE and Chair. |
| DOGE or Dept Chair |
| DOGE, then chair. |
| the first contact, if the MP is part of the concern, is the DOGE |
| DOGE |
| doge |
| DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DOGE |
| The DOGE, then the Department Chair, then GC |
| DOGE; Chair |
| DOGE, Grad College |
| DOGE for the Department |
| DOGE and department chair |
| DOGE or department chair |
| not that I know of |
| DOGE |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| DOGE |
| NA - only addressing Masters concerns in this survey |
| n/a |
| The program DOGE - but I thought this survey was concerned with Masters programs? |
| NA. We are a MA only program |
| DOGE |

|  |
| --- |
| Q34 - If any faculty member has concerns about the integrity of the masters education process, to whom is the faculty member directed? |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| DOGE, Chair of Department. |
| Program DOGE/Chair, Executive/Supervisory Committee |
| The department chair |
| DOGE and chair |
| They are directed to DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DoGE then Chair |
| admin staff then DOGE |
| Most faculty would probably approach the chair directly, but some would likely go straight to the Grad College. Depends on the individual faculty. |
| DOGE or unit head |
| Same as above but included is the dept faculty instead of grad college |
| DOGE or department chair |
| DOGE, associate dean of college, Graduate College |
| DOGE and Chair. |
| DOGE or Chair |
| DOGE, then chair. |
| the DOGE |
| DOGE |
| DOGE or Graduate College |
| DOGE or dept chair |
| DOGE |
| Typically the DOGE and Department Chair and then GC |
| DOGE; Chair |
| DOGE, Grad College |
| DOGE |
| Generally the Soils faculty meet to discuss and revise the process |
| DOGE or department chair |
| not that I know of |
| DOGE |
| DOGE, Grad College |
| DOGE or Department Chair |
| DOGE and department chair |
| NA - only addressing Masters concerns - although process would be from major professor to DOGE, to Department Chair and the on to College dean |
| n/a |
| The program DOGE - but I thought this survey was concerned with Masters programs? |
| NA. We are a MA only program |
| DOGE |
| DOGE |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 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? | | |
| Non-uniform expectations on rigor |  |  |
| number of members at a distance. difficult to schedule. faculty jobs are increasingly more mobile. allow two members at a distance. | | |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Q47 - Please note any other issues or topics you would like the Graduate Council to discuss here. | | |
| Abstracts only submission to e-Library for CCs with difficult copyright issues. | | |
| wide range of faculty expectation of work hours and productivity of students | | |
| The Grad College too frequently conflates an MA and MFA, there seems to be the impression they aren't too different, but certainly inferior to a PhD (credits aren't too different in an MFA). The number of MA credits counting toward an MFA are the same as an MA (22 non-overlapping), though a PhD doesnt have this issue. | | |
| ISU could benefit from major professor training. Too many abuses happen at the hands of folks who don't understand their role. | | |
| How far outside is outside, and whether a Graduate College representative should be assigned to at least some committees, to ensure integrity and fairness. | | |
| Glad to see that Graduate Council is active and engaged! |  |  |
| Please remove the restriction that only 50% of tuition for MS student can be paid by federal grant. (I'm serious, this is a rule at ISU that evidently not everyone is aware/follows.) | | |
| We like the flexibility the current system provides for outside committee members so that we can levegage expertise from people with a different disciplinary perspective (including people with joint appointments). | | |