

**Committee on Graduate Studies  
Report to the Faculty**

**Feb 2004 – Dec 2004**

Introduction.....	1
Continuing Themes and Issues.....	2
Course Approvals and Revised Degree Requirements.....	4
COGS Highlights.....	6
Graduate Center Annual Report .....	11
Ombudsperson Report to COGS.....	13
Appendices.....	14
Appendix A – Grade Review Policy.....	15
Appendix B – SPEAK Test Committee Report.....	17
Appendix C – Template for the Graduate Catalog.....	31

Graduate Center Participation Statistics  
Graduate Program Statistics

## **Introduction**

The structure of the Annual Report by the Committee on Graduate Studies (COGS) to the Faculty is as follows:

- brief introduction including a brief discussion of the importance of Arts and Sciences graduate programs to the university,
- continuing and new themes and issues facing graduate programs in Arts and Sciences
- presentation of course changes that occurred over the past year
- a list of highlights of issues discussed and resolved by COGS
- a report by the Director of the Graduate Center to COGS on the activities of the Graduate Center
- Ombudsperson report to the COGS
- appendices

The Importance of Arts and Sciences Graduate Programs to the University: Graduate programs in Arts and Sciences are a critical part of the university and contribute in a variety of ways. The existence of graduate programs helps determine our “peer group.” This in turn positively affects faculty salaries, library resources, etc. Graduate programs enhance the undergraduate program by providing research and mentoring opportunities. The graduate programs are responsible for bringing in substantial external research support. The overhead on these funds provides benefits to the university as a whole. In addition, graduate programs are an effective means for the university to play a role in economic development.

## **Continuing and New Themes and Issues**

**Graduate Assistance Funding:** The past year has focused on funding of graduate aid in Arts and Sciences. The academic year began with some relief, the first such relief in several years. The base budget for graduate stipends in Arts and Sciences was increased by \$200,000. This was primarily distributed to doctoral programs to allow them to raise stipend levels and make them slightly more competitive. At the same time, a study was completed based on a survey of William and Mary graduate programs and graduate programs at our peer institutions. An estimated overall budgetary gap in stipends ranges between \$607,000 and \$1.7 million. Thus, the boost this year is a small move in the right direction. The study shows that there are significant gaps in each of our graduate programs that affect the competitiveness and viability of the programs. It is important that the university keeps graduate aid funding high on its list of budget priorities.

**New Advisory Board:** This year, the graduate program in Arts and Sciences created a new external Advisory Board. Currently, there are 21 members with an eye toward expanding to 30. The Board has met twice on campus. It has an interim president and has created a set of by-laws. These early meetings are intended to educate the Board about issues at the university in general and graduate studies in Arts and Sciences in particular. The Board has had presentations from several graduate students reporting on their research, selected faculty, the Provost, the Vice President for Finance, the Dean of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, the Dean of Libraries, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies, and the Director of the Graduate Center. The Board is set up to promote Arts and Sciences graduate programs internally and externally and to help with fundraising efforts. There seems to be much enthusiasm by Board members.

**Learning Climate:** An ad hoc committee was set up to discuss issues regarding learning climate in Arts and Sciences graduate education. This committee includes Susan Grover, Phil Daileader, Grey Gundaker, Gina Hoatson, and Carlane Pittman. The committee is looking at a variety of issues and will continue to report to COGS. The issues include the power differential between students and faculty, student/faculty interactions, and assumptions about a student's background based on ethnicity or other demographics.

**Graduate House Move:** The Graduate House building was condemned and the offices of graduate studies moved next door to the Stetson House (232 Jamestown Road) in December. The Office of Graduate Studies is pleased with the space. It is somewhat smaller but more pleasant and safer. The Office of Graduate Studies hopes that faculty will come by for a visit.

**Implementation of Evaluation and Training of International Students:** Following a pilot program, this year, the Graduate Center implemented the evaluation and training of international students by broad use of the SPEAK test and a variety of courses to help with English language and culture. This is discussed in more detail in a subsequent section of this report containing the Graduate Center Annual Report.

**On-line Applications:** We have contracted with CollegeNet to set up the on-line application. In the process (and to finance the on-line application membership) we raised the application fee from \$30 to \$45.

## **Course Approvals and Revised Degree Requirements**

### **Graduate Center**

The following courses were approved on April 19, 2004

COL 501 – RENUMBERED COURSE  
English Conversation & Pronunciation  
*Fall, Spring (0 credit, P/F)*

COL 505 – RENUMBERED COURSE  
Oral Presentation for International Students  
*Fall, Spring (0 credit, P/F)*

COL 508 – NEW COURSE  
Effective Professional Communication  
*(Spring (0 credit, P/F)*

COL 520 – RENUMBERED COURSE  
Academic Writing  
*Spring (0 credit, P/F)*

COL 525 – NEW COURSE  
Writing for Publication  
*Fall (0 credit, P/F)*

COL 530 – NEW COURSE  
Thesis/Dissertation Writing  
*Spring (0 credit, P/F)*

### **American Studies**

New Course – Approved March 15, 2004 -- AMST 690/790 -- Directed Research

Approved December 1, 2004

Currently, as a key component of its curriculum for all students, the American Studies Program requires students to take “A one-semester introductory seminar, designed to provide a broad framework for the study of American culture and society [AMST 661: Introduction to American Studies]” [*Graduate Catalog 2004-2005*, pp 34-35, 41].

The relevant section in our catalogue copy will be changed to the following: “A **two**-semester introductory seminar, designed to provide a broad framework for the study of American culture and society.”

## **Anthropology**

ANTH 695 – Approved March 1, 2004 -- Independent Study in Anthropology was amended to a variable credit course from a 1 – 3 credit course.

## **Applied Science**

The following courses were approved October 6, 2004.

APSC 732 – Thin Film Deposition and Nanostructure Synthesis

APSC 671 – Solid State Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

APSC 672 – Applied Quantum Mechanics

APSC 772 – Tensor Interaction in Magnetic Resonance

APSC 623 – Materials Science of Surfaces and Interfaces

## **Biology**

New Course – Approved March 15, 2004 – BIOL 650 – Microbial Pathogenesis

## **Chemistry**

Crosslisted courses – Approved October 6, 2004 --

- Computational Chemistry 408 to Chemistry 508
- Neurochemistry 417 to Chemistry 517

Renumbered Course – Approved November 3, 2004 -- The current Chemistry 508, Advanced Analytical Chemistry was renumbered to Chemistry 504 to be uniform with the undergraduate version of Advanced Analytical Chemistry is 404.

## **Computer Science**

Changes to the Graduate Catalog were approved on May 3, 2004 – located in Appendix

## COGS Highlights

February 11, 2004

### SPEAK Test Committee Report

SPEAK Test Committee report was presented by the Director of the Graduate Center, Hans von Baeyer. The committee consisted of three administrators: Barbara Monteith (*SPEAK Test coordinator*), Carlane Pittman (*Asst. Dir. of Graduate Studies*), and Hans von Baeyer (*Dir. of the Graduate Center*); three faculty: Nikos Chrisochoides (*Computer Science*), Brian Holloway (*Applied Science*), and Rich Lowry (*American Studies*) and two students: Malliga (Cherry) Suewattana (*Physics*) and Juan Zheng (*American Studies*). A complete SPEAK test report is included in the Appendix. Three motions were approved:

#### **Motion 1**

*Graduate students in Arts and Sciences who are required to take the TOEFL Test will take the SPEAK Test upon arrival at William and Mary. Individual exceptions to this requirement may be recommended by the departmental Directors of Graduate Studies to the SPEAK Test Coordinator. For each student, the SPEAK Test Coordinator will make recommendations to the Graduate Director regarding appropriate ESL courses offered by the Graduate Center. (Departments may then require or recommend these courses.)*

#### **Motion 2**

*The Graduate Center is charged with giving the SPEAK Test, keeping complete records for each student's performance on the test and on subsequent ESL courses, **notifying the students** and offering enough sections of each course to fulfill the requirements and recommendations set forth in Motion 1.*

#### **Motion 3**

*Motions 1 and 2 will take effect in Fall 2004. In Spring 2004 and **Summer 2004** the SPEAK Test coordinator will test those international graduate students who did not take part in the Pilot Program, and who are not close to graduation. (Fall 2004 ESL courses appropriate to their needs will be recommended.)*

*Bold text indicates amendments to the original motions.*

### Grade Review Policy

The Grade Review policy was approved to be included in the 2004-05 Graduate Catalog. The Grade Review policy is included in the Appendix.

**March 15, 2004**

**Climate Issues for Graduate Students**

Susan Grover, Dir. of Equal Opportunity/Assoc. Professor of Law discussed climate issues for graduate students. A committee to look at this issue further was established. The committee members were: Susan Grover, Phil Daileader, Ombudsperson, Grey Gundaker, American Studies Graduate Director, Gina Hoatson, Physics Graduate Director and Carlane Pittman, Graduate Studies.

**March 22, 2004**

**Implementation of Banner**

Berni Kenney, Director of Enterprise Information Systems, Information Technology discussed the implementation of Banner and how it affected graduate departments/programs in Arts and Sciences.

**April 19, 2004**

**Graduate Catalog Restructuring**

A template (see appendix) to create uniformity among departments/programs in the Graduate Catalog was approved by COGS on March 14, 2003. It was recommended and approved to become the format in the 2004-05 Graduate Catalog.

**May 3, 2004**

**Anthropology Handbook/Restructuring**

Pages 8, 10, and 11 of the Anthropology handbook were changed. These changes were made to address student issues and separate out the terminal MA from the MA/PhD. They have been very careful with course scheduling (not to overlap courses). This restructuring is to make sure students have completed everything needed before taking the qualifier. This proposal was approved as amended.

**September 15, 2004**

**Library Support for Graduate Programs**

Connie McCarthy, Dean of the University Libraries discussed the results of a library survey that was administered through COGS members. During the discussion COGS members talked about the need for more resources for periodical and books.

## **Computer Science Proposal/Restructuring**

The purpose of the restructuring effort is to separate out requirements for the MS in computer science, the MS in Computational Operations Research (COR), and the MS in computational science. COR courses are those courses which end with an "8". Special permission of the student's advisor must be given in order for students to take courses other than those listed specifically for their particular program. The department wants straight computer science students to complete their required courses before taking COR courses or courses other than those required. This proposal was approved.

**October 6, 2004**

## **An Update on Climate Issues for Graduate Students**

At a COGS meeting last year, David Finifter asked to have a smaller group convene to deal with climate issues in Graduate Arts and Sciences. The members of this were Susan Grover, Dir. of Equal Opportunity, Phil Daileader, Ombudsperson, Grey Gundaker, American Studies Graduate Director, Gina Hoatson, Physics Graduate Director, and Carlane Pittman, Graduate Studies.

In the meetings of that group they suggested ways to help faculty who meet in one-to-one situations with graduate students. At the beginning of the academic year both Phil Daileader and Susan Grover talked with the new TAs and new graduate students about climate issues.

The problem that the group identified was the power differential that exists between the faculty member and student. For example, students are not free to voice their objections without fear of negative impact. One of the recommendations from the group was to keep free of personal interactions with students that faculty supervise. Faculty tend to deal with multiple levels of relationships with students. If something goes wrong in that relationship, like taking care of pets or a faculty member's house, the situation could result in a difficult situation for both the faculty member and student. In graduate education here are shades of grey. If something is done for one student in a department/program that must be done for all students.

Also the group discussed the assumption of knowing a student's background based on ethnicity or other demographics. An example of this is assuming a student has English as a second language based on the student's name.

Susan Grover suggested that it might be helpful if the chair and director of graduate studies mentioned these issues with faculty in their departments/programs.

Issues that arose from discussion:

Do we need to do more to offer opportunities for students to address their complaints?



Do students have access to someone who will be confidential? This is the role of the Ombudsperson. The graduate director often does not have the option of being confidential.

If a student comes to a Director of Graduate Studies, what is their responsibility with regards to the student's complaint?

Meghan Revelle, President of the Graduate Student Association suggested that first year graduate students are the only students that hear from the Ombudsperson and there should be a yearly reminder of the Ombudsperson's role.

Susan Grover will work with Chairs/Program Directors and the faculty to discuss climate issues.

### **November 3, 2004**

#### **Turn Around Time on Theses/Dissertations**

Phil Daileader, Ombudsperson discussed the role of the Ombudsperson and issues related to thesis/dissertation review. The role of the Ombudsperson is to identify problems that occurred on a case-by-case basis and to identify patterns with students and to address and help solve the issues.

One issue that Phil Daileader as well as the former Ombudsperson encountered is the turn around time on theses/dissertations. There are two issues: 1) reading of the actual thesis or dissertation and 2) the purpose of the thesis/dissertation defense.

Phil Daileader asked COGS members to take these issues back to their department/program to create an enforcement mechanism and greater structure for the process of thesis/dissertation review.

### **November 17, 2004**

#### **GEO 510: Geology of Virginia for Teachers**

Heather MacDonald, *Professor of Geology*, presented a proposal to request approval for a new graduate-level course, GEO 510: Geology of Virginia for Teachers. The Geology Department proposes to offer a three-credit course for teaching on a detailed investigation of the geology and geologic history of Virginia, emphasizing historical geology, petrology, watersheds, structural geology, and tectonics. The course would include significant field and lab investigative activities as well and will include discussion of the theory and practice of effective pedagogical approaches for teaching earth science at the

high school level. The course is aimed at an audience of middle and high school teachers. This proposal was unanimously approved by COGS.

### **Terminal Degree for the Dissertation Committee**

*The following policy was unanimously approved for placement in the 2005-06 Graduate Catalog.*

*All committee members serving on doctoral dissertations should have a terminal degree. Any exceptions may be requested through the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies.*

## Graduate Center Annual Report 2004-2005

**Staff and Facilities.** The Center is directed by Hans C. von Baeyer, Chancellor Professor of Physics, with the assistance of Carlane J. Pittman, Assistant Dean of Graduate Studies, both of whom report to the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Barbara Monteith is the ESL Program Manager, and an Adjunct Lecturer. The Center has moved next door from its original location in the abandoned Graduate House to the Stetson House at 232 Jamestown Road.

**Participation.** The appended spreadsheet listing Graduate Center participation provides a summary of Center activities since Fall 2002 when the current staff took over. Highlights include:

**Course** enrollments have increased from a headcount of 46 (F02-Su03) to 78 (F03-Su04) since the new ESL curriculum, with a mandatory SPEAK Test, was approved by COGS on 9 February 2004.

**Workshop** participation is beginning to display certain trends. "Presenting Yourself With Confidence and Control," offered by Robin Cantor-Cooke, is a perennial favorite. "Grant proposal writing," presented separately for humanities and science students, enjoys a steady demand. "Preparation for foreign language exams," which used to be offered for Spanish, has been successfully revived for French in the fall of '04. With cooperation among the relevant graduate departments, this offering could become a staple.

**Major Programs:** The Raft Debate suffered a decline in attendance, perhaps because it happened to fall on the same evening as a Presidential Debate. The fall of 2005 should reveal whether this event has re-established itself as a W&M tradition. The reputation of the Graduate Research Symposium is growing slowly. For Spring 2005 the departments of History and Anthropology, together with the American Studies Program, changed the annual "American Cultures

Conference", which meets with the Symposium, to a continuing format under the rubric of "American Cultures Caucus."

**Social Events** in the fall of 2004 included a very lively Thanksgiving celebration for international graduate students in the Reves Center. A party honored the participants in the new voluntary and informal Conversation Partners Program, which matches ESL students with native speakers for weekly one-on-one conversations.

**Newsletter.** The Graduate Center's electronic newsletter **DID YOU KNOW THAT?** appears in email boxes every Monday morning. In 2003-2004 there were thirty-two issues, and in Fall 2004 sixteen issues. Anecdotal feedback to this publication continues to be encouraging.

**Cooperation with the professional schools.** Graduate students in Business, Education, and Law are now invited to take the SPEAK Test and to enroll in Graduate Center courses. Unlike A&S and VIMS students they are required to pay a fee for the SPEAK Test, and tuition for one credit per course. The proceeds will go directly to the Graduate Center. It is hoped that these steps will eventually lead to a university-wide ESL program.

**Summer school.** Encouraged by the healthy enrollment in summer 2004, intensive versions of regular ESL courses are planned for the **first** summer semester 2005. It turns out that the **second** summer semester is not very practical for Arts and Sciences students, but for incoming international students in the professional schools, it represents a good opportunity. Together with representatives of the professional schools, as well as the Reves Center, the Graduate Center is planning a program of intensive summer courses designed primarily for professional students.

## Ombudsperson Report for 2004

Philip Daileader, Associate Professor, Department of History, [phdail@wm.edu](mailto:phdail@wm.edu)

Activities of 2004:

- 1) Individual consultations with graduate students. During 2004, the ombudsperson worked with twelve different graduate students on a variety of issues. These issues can be categorized as follows:
  - Sexual harassment and/or physical assault by faculty and fellow graduate students
  - Other forms of improper conduct by faculty: the establishment of a hostile classroom climate, the improper public disclosing of information about students, and poor thesis advising (especially slow turnaround time on thesis chapters)
  - The application of department policies to individual students, especially as regards course requirements, teaching loads and assignments, payroll and stipends, and intellectual property rights
  - Grade appeals

In one student's case, only one discussion with the ombudsperson was required to resolve the situation. In the eleven other cases, the resolution of the situations (some of which are still ongoing) required multiple consultations with the students as well as discussions between the ombudsperson and faculty members, directors of graduate programs, department chairs, the director of equal opportunity, and the dean of graduate studies, as needed.

- 2) The ombudsperson participated in the orientation program for new graduate students and in the training program for first-time teaching assistants
- 3) The ombudsperson met with the Committee on Graduate Studies to ask the directors of graduate programs to discuss with their faculty their policies concerning acceptable turnaround time for theses and their policies concerning the scheduling of dissertation defenses
- 4) To increase access to graduate students, the ombudsperson held three office hours per week that were reserved for graduate students and the business of the ombudsperson's office

## **APPENDICES**

## **APPENDIX A**

### **GRADE REVIEW POLICY**

A student who believes that a final course grade has been unfairly assigned may request a review of the grade within the first six weeks of the next regular semester following that in which the grade was received. This review shall normally be completed by the end of that semester.

The student shall confer with the instructor of the course to discuss the grade. The student may wish to ask about such matters as the particular strengths and weaknesses of his or her course work, the general grade scale utilized by the instructor, and the relative ranking of the student's work in the class as a whole.

If the issue remains unresolved the student may, within the first six weeks of the next academic semester for which the grade was received, present a written statement requesting a further review and giving a full explanation of the reasons for the request. The written statement shall be sent to the instructor, the graduate director, and the chair of the department or program in which the course was taught, and the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies shall be notified. If the course is cross-listed in two or more departments or programs, the chair of the faculty member's home department will be the one to receive the written statement. If the grade in question was given by the department chair or program director, the student will ask the Dean of the Faculty to appoint another faculty member of the department or program to oversee the further review process. Unless the chair or director (or faculty member appointed by the Dean, in cases where the grade in question was given by the chair or director) decides the student's case is wholly without merit, he or she will discuss the matter with the instructor and seek to resolve the issue. This part of the review process should be completed within three weeks of receipt of the written statement by the student.

If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the above procedure, he or she may appeal to the Dean. Unless the Dean decides the student's case is wholly

without merit, he or she will ask the chair or director (or faculty member appointed by the Dean, in cases where the grade in question was given by the chair or director) to appoint a committee of at least three faculty members of the department or program who will review all relevant and available materials supplied by the student, the instructor, or other individuals. Both the student and the instructor have the right to meet with the committee.

After reviewing the matter, the committee shall decide if it believes the grade should be changed, and if so, what the proper grade should be. It shall inform the instructor and the student of its conclusions in writing and, if it believes the grade should be changed, recommend that the instructor change the grade accordingly.

If the instructor refuses to accept the committee's recommendation and the committee believes that the faculty member is acting inappropriately in assigning the grade, the committee may appeal to the Dean of the Faculty. The Dean's decision to accept or reject the committee's recommendation shall be final.

Taken from Faculty Manual revised 7/02



## APPENDIX B

### SPEAK TEST COMMITTEE REPORT

January, 2004

*The most important thing I learned in school was how to communicate...You can have brilliant ideas, but if you can't get them across; your brains won't get you anywhere.*

-- Lee Iacocca

Hans C. von Baeyer, Director of the Graduate Center (chair)

Carlane Pittman, Assistant Director of Graduate Studies

Barbara Monteith, SPEAK Test Coordinator

Prof. Richard Lowry, American Studies

Prof. Brian Holloway, Applied Science

Prof. Nikos Chrisochoides, Computer Science

Juan Zheng, Graduate Student in American Studies

Malliga Suewattana, Graduate Student in Physics

## CONTENTS

### I. Report on the SPEAK Test Pilot Project

- I.1 Preamble
- I.2 Pilot Project
- I.3 SPEAK Test Scoring
- I.4 Student Scores
- I.5 Significance
- I.6 Conclusion

### II. The SPEAK Test Committee

### III. Recommendations for W&M

- III.1 Who should take the SPEAK Test?
- III.2 Consequences of the SPEAK Test
- III.3 ESL Courses

### IV. Motions for COGS

## **I. Report on the SPEAK Test Pilot Project.**

This section is condensed from the Final Report on the Pilot Project submitted to the Graduate Center on 20 November 2003 by Barbara Monteith, SPEAK Test Coordinator.

### **I.1 Preamble.**

The SPEAK Test is an oral proficiency test, created by Educational Testing Services (ETS) to assess the *generalized* speaking abilities of students whose first language is not English. It consists of twelve questions, each of which requires the examinee to perform a particular language function, such as giving directions, stating an opinion, making a comparison, or describing a graph. All responses for the SPEAK Test are spoken and recorded on individual audiocassettes. (The terms SPEAK, TSE, and TSE/SPEAK are interchangeable for the purposes of this report.)

### **I.2. Pilot Project**

In April 2003, the Committee on Graduate Studies (COGS) asked the Graduate Center to conduct a pilot SPEAK Test project. In summer and fall of 2003, graduate students whose first language is not English were invited to participate in the Pilot project. Forty-four students agreed to take the SPEAK Test, representing American Studies, Anthropology, Applied Science, Biology, Chemistry, Computer Science and Physics. Immediately following the SPEAK Test, the students were sent a brief survey, asking them to provide feedback about their experience. In general, student reactions were very positive:

*Overall, it was interesting experience. I think this test is much more valuable for the college and for the departments than GRE, which is VERY hard for non-native speakers and is NOT illustrative of the knowledge and experience applicants need (Verbal section).*

*Results of the SPEAK test are especially valuable for choosing teaching assistants from foreign students. If I started, I want to tell that I completely disagree with the college policy for foreign students to take GRE to test language skills. If I had a choice, I would opt for TOEFL and SPEAK -- PhD Candidate, Computer Science*

*It was better than the TOEFL because some questions actually asked for our opinions. --  
Modern Languages*

*It would be better if the test is given before the TA assignments are assigned. The scores can be used to evaluate a student's qualification for functioning as a TA for his or her department.-- MS Candidate, Computer Science*

*It is interesting and helpful to improve English. -- PhD Candidate, Computer Science*

### **I.3. SPEAK Test Scoring**

Each audiocassette is scored independently by two trained raters. Responses are judged on

- grammar
- vocabulary
- smoothness or disjointedness of the speaker's response
- the extent to which the speaker's accent affects the listener's comprehension
- the organization and coherence of the speaker's response
- the amount of listener effort required to understand the speaker

While listening to the audiocassette, a rater will assign each of the 12 responses an individual score based on a scale from 20 to 60. Once a rater has scored all twelve responses, the average number is determined. This number is compared to the other rater's average score. If the difference in the two scores is less than 10, the average of the two scores is rounded to the nearest increment of five in order to determine the examinee's final score. If the difference between the two raters' scores is more than 10, a third rater will evaluate the audiocassette, and the two closest scores are used to determine the final score.

#### **I.4. Student Scores**

44 students participated in the pilot program.

43 audiocassettes were scored

1 audiocassette was not ratable due to mechanical failure.

<u>Final Score</u>	<u># of Students</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
35	6	14%
40	10	23%
45	12	28%
50	9	21%
55	3	7%
60	3	7%
Total # of Students:	<hr/> 43	

The meaning of the scores is as follows:

- 20 No effective communication: no ability to perform task, no effective use of compensatory strategies.
- 30 Communication generally not effective: Task generally performed poorly, ineffective use of compensatory strategies.
- 40 Communication somewhat effective: task performed somewhat competently, some successful use of compensatory strategies.
- 50 Communication generally effective: task performed competently, successful use of compensatory strategies.
- 60 Communication almost always effective: Task performed very competently.

## **I.5 Significance**

Many universities use the SPEAK Test to determine the duties of their international teaching assistants (ITA's). Here are a few guidelines from around the country:

### University of Oregon

GUIDELINES FOR THE ASSIGNMENT OF NON-NATIVE ENGLISH SPEAKING GRADUATE TEACHING FELLOWS. (Adopted by the Graduate Council, January 1991)

These guidelines are designed to insure that Graduate Teaching Fellows are assigned duties that are consistent with their ability to communicate effectively in spoken English. There are no restrictions on the work assignments of GTFs who score 50 or above on the revised TSE/SPEAK test. The work assignments of GTFs scoring below 50 on the TSE/SPEAK, however, are subject to the limitations outlined below. It is the responsibility of the department head, graduate advisor, and/or supervising faculty member to make sure that GTFs who have scored below 50 on the TSE/SPEAK are assigned responsibilities appropriate to their level of English language proficiency and that they take the required language courses.

### **TSE/SPEAK Score 50-60**

Assignment Guidelines: No restrictions on GTF assignment duties. Supervising faculty should supervise/meet with the GTF on a regular basis.

Language Training: No further language training is required. GTFs desiring language training assistance should contact the American English Institute.

### **TSE/SPEAK Score 40-45**

Assignment Guidelines: The GTF shall not serve as the primary instructor of a course, except for a language course taught in the GTF's native tongue. GTFs leading laboratory and discussion sections shall be closely supervised by a faculty member. Supervising faculty shall observe on a regular basis the teaching of GTFs in order to ensure that they have the speaking proficiency necessary for the satisfactory completion of duties.

### **TSE/SPEAK Score 35-40**

Assignment Guidelines: The GTF shall not serve as the primary instructor of a course. The department shall minimize any duties that require the GTF to interact in English with undergraduates. Supervising faculty should mentor and assist the GTF on a regular basis. Language department faculty should ascertain whether GTFs teaching in their native language are able to communicate in English (if English is to be used) for classroom instruction or during office hours.

### **TSE/SPEAK Score 20-30**

Assignment Guidelines: The GTF shall not conduct lectures, laboratory or discussion sections, office hour meetings, or be involved in the direct instruction of students unless the professor or a GTF with English language proficiency is present. If the GTF is used as a grader, (s)he may grade multiple-choice assignments/examinations only.

University of Tennessee

What is a passing score on the SPEAK Test?

SPEAK Test grades range from 20 (lowest) to 60 (highest). Intermediate grades are in steps of five points, i.e. 25, 30, 35, etc. There are three passing categories and one non-passing category of SPEAK Test scores:

**50 or higher** Unconditionally Approved for Classroom Teaching. This score means that the department may assign the TA any instructional duties it chooses. Departments are not required to assign teaching duties to persons in this range, but may do so as their needs require.

**45 Conditionally Approved for Classroom Teaching.** This score means that the department may assign the TA any instructional duties it chooses, but that the TA's approval for teaching is probationary.

**40** Approved for Limited Assistance Roles. This score means that the department may assign the TA duties involving one-on-one contact in an instructional role. This may include assisting in a laboratory, tutoring individuals, grading papers and discussing them with individuals, or other roles of a similar nature.

**35 or lower** Not Approved for Instructional Duties. This score means that the TA's English is not adequate for instructional roles.

University of Virginia

The ITA program at the Teaching Resource Center is designed to assist International Graduate Students who speak a language other than English as their first language, and who are prospective Teaching Assistants for their departments. ITAs' spoken English skills are evaluated by means of the SPEAK Test, taken when these students arrive at UVa or when they receive TA assignments. Based on their SPEAK scores, some ITAs receive further training or assistance by enrolling in one of the following courses:

SPEAK TEST SCORES <b>30-39</b>	ORAL COMMUNICATION COURSES
SPEAK TEST SCORES <b>40-45</b>	ACCENT MODIFICATION FOR ITAs - LING 110
SPEAK TEST SCORES <b>45-54</b>	CLASSROOM COMMUNICATION FOR ITAs - LING 111/LING 112
SPEAK TEST SCORES <b>&gt; 54</b>	NO FURTHER TRAINING

## **I. 6. Conclusion**

The SPEAK Test is an established assessment tool for evaluating the oral communication abilities of students whose first language is not English. The results of the SPEAK Test pilot project show a bell-shaped curve, with the majority of students scoring in the 40-45 point range. The pilot project has demonstrated that W&M can administer the SPEAK test effectively and economically. Student responses have been generally favorable. Many years of experience at other universities have demonstrated that the test is meaningful, and useful as a placement tool in ESL courses for graduate students.

## **II. The SPEAK Test Committee**

The committee was appointed by Hans C. von Baeyer, Director of the Graduate Center, and consists of three administrators, three faculty members, and two students, as listed on the cover page. The committee met three times (Nov.25, Dec. 2, and Dec. 9, 2003) in the Graduate House, for about 1 1/2 hours per meeting. This, its final report, was produced via email.

After becoming thoroughly familiar with the mechanics and the meaning of the SPEAK Test, the committee studied the report on the pilot project summarized in section I above and discussed ESL programs at other universities. The recommendations in section III below were made against this background.

## **III. Recommendations**

### **III.1 Who should take the SPEAK Test?**

Since the TOEFL is not a test of speaking ability, all graduate students in Arts and Sciences who are required to take the TOEFL should be required to take the SPEAK Test upon arrival at W&M. According to the 2003-04 Graduate Catalog (p.18) "The TOEFL is required for all students for whom English is not a first language." Exceptions to the SPEAK Test requirement may be recommended by the departmental/program Directors of Graduate Studies to the SPEAK Test Coordinator.



### **III.2 Consequences of the SPEAK Test**

The SPEAK Test Coordinator will keep complete records, and will report scores of individual students to the departmental/program DGSs and chairs. Accompanying each score will be a recommendation for the ESL courses offered by the Graduate Center which the student should take. The decision whether to require or recommend these courses is left up to the departments. For planning purposes, each department will inform the Director of the Graduate Center of its decisions. Progress in speaking ability will be monitored by means of the assessment mechanisms in the ESL courses (described below) and not by repeated attempts at the SPEAK Test, which is not designed for this purpose.

### **III.3 ESL Courses**

The current program of College courses will be streamlined and enhanced. Since this report deals with the SPEAK Test, oral communication courses are emphasized, but written communication courses are included for completeness. In each category, three levels (beginning, intermediate, and advanced) seem sufficient. Since there are about 100 international graduate students in A&S (about 30 per year), of whom 60% require a beginning course, two sections should usually suffice. (If the other graduate schools are included, the number of international graduate students is 200.) Comparisons are presented with the offerings at Yale, NC State, and UVa , who all employ the SPEAK Test as a placement tool.

All courses last ten weeks, starting two weeks after the beginning of the semester, and ending two weeks early. They are not graded in the conventional sense. Progress in oral communication courses is assessed by two independent observers, usually the course instructor and another instructor or trained SPEAK Test evaluator. This method is used in the evaluation of the SPEAK Test, and enhances the objectivity of recommendations.

The following charts in matrix form list current and new ESL courses at W&M in comparison with similar courses at other universities. In the first matrix, course entries list the SPEAK scores of the students they are designed for. The matrices are followed by descriptions of the three oral communications courses. (Similar descriptions for the writing courses have been prepared, but are not included in this report.)

## ORAL COMMUNICATION COURSE COMPARISONS

	YALE	NCSU	UVA	W&M
<b>Beginning Communication</b>	Academic Speaking Skills Workshop	Oral Communication in English  American English Pronunciation	American Pronunciation	<b>COL 513</b> Pronunciation & Communication  <b>SPEAK SCORE &lt; 50</b>
<b>Intermediate Communication</b>	Professional Presentation Skills		Advanced Conversation  Advanced Oral Communication	<b>COL 511</b> Oral Presentation Skills  <b>SPEAK SCORE 50</b>
<b>Advanced Communication</b>	The Professional Communicator			<b>COL 5##</b> Professional Communication Skills  <b>SPEAK SCORE 55</b>
<b>Accent Reduction</b>			Accent Modification	
<b>ITA Training</b>		Oral Communication for International Teaching Assistants	Classroom Communication for International Teaching Assistants ( I and II)	

## WRITTEN COMMUNICATION COURSE COMPARISONS

	YALE	NCSU	UVA	W&M
<b>Beginning Writing</b>	Academic Writing Workshop	Introduction to Academic Writing  Academic Writing and Research	Intermediate Writing  Advanced Writing	<b>COL 503</b> Academic Writing
<b>Intermediate Writing</b>		Research and Technical Writing for International Graduate Students	Academic Writing for Graduate Students	<b>COL 504</b> Scientific Writing
<b>Advanced Writing</b>				<b>COL 5##*</b> Advanced Writing Workshop

\*Open to both native and nonnative English speakers in the Sciences and Humanities

## COL 513: English Conversation & Pronunciation:

Learn more about the rhythm, stress, and intonation patterns of spoken English, and improve your ability to communicate with others. Practice distinguishing sounds that are unique to the English language. Recorded transcripts will be used to evaluate student needs, and assess student progress, and in-class discussions will allow students opportunities to practice their conversational skills.

### GOALS

Increase students' confidence in their ability to communicate in English.

Increase students' perception and production of native-like stress patterns, rhythms and sounds.

Identify problematic sounds specific to individuals, and address ways to improve the production of these sounds.

Provide students with everyday vocabulary needed in daily living.

Present American culture through stories, journal articles, etc.

To increase their vocabulary on topics outside of the academic field.

### IMPLEMENTATION

Students prepare short, in-class presentations on a variety of topics, both academic and social.

In-class activities model and reinforce the target production.

Students are encouraged to visit the language lab to do individual work outside class.

Recordings are made in the audiolab, and oral presentations are video-recorded.

Students are required to meet with the instructor individually on a regular basis to work on improving their areas of difficulty.

Role-playing activities enable students to practice their communication skills in activities designed to mirror their day-to-day lives.

Classroom discussions provide activities, insights into the similarities and differences between cultures. This is an excellent opportunity for students.

**Assessment:** No letter grade will be given for this course. Instead, after 10 weeks, students will be asked to prepare an audiocassette that will then be evaluated by two independent observers. These observers may include the course instructor, one other instructor, or a trained SPEAK Test evaluator. Once students have achieved a score equivalent to a 50 on the SPEAK Test rating scale, representing oral communication that is generally effective, they are ready to proceed to a more advanced course.

## COL 511: Oral Presentation Skills for International Students

This course is for students who have little difficulty communicating in English, but who want to refine their oral communication skills. Students will participate in various kinds of oral communication and presentations which may include leading a discussion, preparing a lecture, fielding questions, and giving a media presentation.

### GOALS

Increase students' confidence in their oral communication skills.

Discuss the theory and application of oral communication

Discuss cultural norms for improving their areas of oral difficulty.

### IMPLEMENTATION

Students prepare various, in-class, oral presentations to be videotaped and evaluated.

Students are required to meet with the instructor individually on a regular basis to communicate in both an academic work and work environment.

**Assessment:** No letter grade will be given for this course. Instead, recommendations will be made, based on a student's ability to adequately and appropriately communicate in a variety of different settings.

## COL 5##: Professional Communication Skills

This course helps prepare students for entry into a corporate or academic environment. It addresses cultural norms for communication in different work settings, and provides practice in the skills needed for job interviews, as well as on-the-job interactions and communication expected in a corporate environment.

### GOALS

Assist students in their transition from student to professional.

Teach cultural norms for written and communication in different work Environments.

### IMPLEMENTATION

Interviewing techniques are discussed, and CVs and resumes are reviewed.

Practice interviews conducted and oral videotaped for evaluation.

Cover letters and thank-you letters are written as needed.

Teaching philosophies discussed and written for those students wishing to teach after graduation.

Nonverbal communication (body language) discussed and practiced.

## **IV Motions for COGS**

### **Motion 1**

*Graduate students in Arts and Sciences who are required to take the TOEFL Test will take the SPEAK Test upon arrival at William and Mary. Individual exceptions to this requirement may be recommended by the departmental Directors of Graduate Studies to the SPEAK Test Coordinator. For each student, the SPEAK Test Coordinator will make recommendations to the Graduate Director regarding appropriate ESL courses offered by the Graduate Center. (Departments may then require or recommend these courses.)*

### **Motion 2**

*The Graduate Center is charged with giving the SPEAK Test, keeping complete records for each student's performance on the test and on subsequent ESL courses, and offering enough sections of each course to fulfill the requirements and recommendations set forth in motion 1.*

### **Motion 3**

*Motions 1 and 2 will take effect in Fall 2004. In Spring 2004 the SPEAK Test coordinator will test those international graduate students who did not take part in the Pilot Program, and who are not close to graduation. (Fall 2004 ESL courses appropriate to their needs will be recommended.)*

### **Motion 4**

*The Graduate Center will prepare, for consideration by COGS using normal procedures, proposals regarding renumbering ESL courses and creating new ones.*

## APPENDIX C

### TEMPLATE for Graduate Catalog

(approved at COGS meeting on 3-14-03)

### DEPARTMENT/PROGRAM NAME

#### THE FACULTY

##### ***Chair***

**Jane Doe**, Associate Professor (Ph.D., John Hopkins)

##### ***Graduate Director***

**John Doe**, Professor (Ph.D., Wisconsin)

*List professors in alpha order*

**Jack Abney**, William and Mary Professor of History (Ph.D., Harvard)

**Harry Brickman**, Adjunct Professor (Ph.D., Wisconsin)

**Anne California**, Professor (Ph.D., Princeton)

**David Doe**, (Ph.D., Yale)

**Wallace Early**, Professor Emeritus, Associate Professor (Ph.D., Brown)

**Sharon Faquin**, Assistant Professor (Ph.D., John Hopkins)

**Mark Harris**, Lecturer (Ph.D., Yale)

**Mary Stanley**, Assistant Professor (Ph.D., Emory)

##### **General Description**

*Put a description of the department here that would highlight research mission, etc. here*

##### **Admission**

*Put general admissions requirement here—GRE and TOEFL*

*Put any additional admission requirements here*

**Degree Requirements for the Master of Arts (or Science) in \_\_\_\_\_ (if you have specializations)**

*(See p. 20-25 for general College requirements.)*

*Put specific info. here*

**Degree requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy**

*Put specific info. here*

## **Description of Courses**

600. Topics in \_\_\_\_\_

Fall and Spring (1 credit – pass/fail) Doe. Prerequisite: \_\_\_\_\_

*Brief description of course.*

## **Selected Faculty and Student Research (not in Year 04-05 -- will include in Year 05-06)**

Please select 2 to 3 stories that would highlight faculty and student research. If you have pictures that would accompany the research highlights, please send them to Carlane via Campus mail.



# GRADUATE CENTER PARTICIPATION MASTER LIST

<u>Course</u>	F 2002	Sp 2003	Su 2003	F 2003	Sp 2004	Su 2004	F 2004	Sp 2005	Su 2005	F 2005
COLL 501 001				7	12	10	12			
COLL 501 002							10			
COLL 502	7	7		10	7					
COLL 505	4				4		3			
COLL 508										
COLL 520		8	10	6		8				
COLL 521					7					
COLL 525	10				7		7			
<b>Course Subtotals</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>23</b>	<b>37</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>32</b>			
<u>Workshop</u>	F 2002	Sp 2003	Su 2003	F 2003	Sp 2004	Su 2004	F 2004	Sp 2005	Su 2005	F 2005
Alternative Careers		40								
Beyond Google							7			
Dream Job				10						
Finding the Right Job				6						
French Refresher							7			
Grant Proposal Writing	32				14					
Grant Proposals (Hum)							15			
Grant Proposals (Sci)										
Outreach to Public Schools		17								
PowerPoint		13								
Presenting Yourself	9	8		5	8		7			
Resume Writing	7									
Spanish Translation I	3									
Spanish Translation II		1								
Stop Talking to Yourself				5						
Stress Management				8						
<b>Workshop Subtotals</b>	<b>51</b>	<b>79</b>		<b>34</b>	<b>22</b>		<b>36</b>			
<u>Program</u>	F 2002	Sp 2003	Su 2003	F 2003	Sp 2004	Su 2004	F 2004	Sp 2005	Su 2005	F 2005
Graduate Symposium		100			110					
Raft Debate	275			325			228			
<b>Program Subtotals</b>	<b>275</b>	<b>100</b>		<b>325</b>	<b>110</b>		<b>228</b>			
<u>Social Event</u>	F 2002	Sp 2003	Su 2003	F 2003	Sp 2004	Su 2004	F 2004	Sp 2005	Su 2005	F 2005
Meet and Greet							17			
Int'l Thanksgiving							51			
CPP Appreciation							15			
<b>Social Event Subtotals</b>							<b>83</b>			
	F 2002	Sp 2003	Su 2003	F 2003	Sp 2004	Su 2004	F 2004	Sp 2005	Su 2005	F 2005
<b>GRAND TOTAL</b>	<b>347</b>	<b>194</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>382</b>	<b>169</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>379</b>	<b>0</b>		
<b>KEY</b>										
<b>Course Number</b>	<b>Course Title</b>									
COLL 502	English Language and Culture					COLL 508	Effective Professional Communication			
COLL 501 001	English Conversation & Pronunciation					COLL 520	Academic Writing			
COLL 501 002	English Conversation & Pronunciation					COLL 521	College Teaching			
COLL 505	Oral Presentation for International Students					COLL 525	Writing for Publication (formerly Scientific Writing)			

## Statistical Summary

### 1. ADMISSIONS - Fall 2004 and Spring 2005\*

<u>Department</u>	<u>Number Applicants</u>	<u>Number Accepted</u>	<u>Number Matriculated</u>
<u>MA/MS/PhD</u>			
American Studies	64	31	9
Anthropology	66	18	10
Applied Science	31	12	8
Computer Science**	106	70	24
History	159	26	13
Physics	72	11	10
<u>PsyD***</u>			
Clinical Psychology	168	17	10
<u>MA/MS/MPP</u>			
Biology	21	17	8
Chemistry	9	4	4
Psychology	84	16	7
Public Policy	<u>93</u>	<u>54</u>	<u>25</u>
<u>Totals</u>	<u>873</u>	<u>276</u>	<u>128</u>

\*The enrollment numbers are subject to change because A&S graduate students are able to withdraw from the academic program until the last day of classes.

\*\*This includes students in the Computational Operations Research program.

\*\*\*The PsyD program admits students through the VA Consortium Program in Clinical Psychology.

**2. AVERAGE UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT  
AVERAGE OF ENTERING STUDENTS (4.0 SCALE)**

Department	Fall 2002/ Spring 2003	Fall 2003/ Spring 2004	Fall 2004/ Spring 2005
<u>MA/MS/PhD</u>			
American Studies	3.39 (19 of 20)	3.47	3.27
Anthropology	3.70 (6 of 8)	3.47	3.50
Applied Science	3.51	3.24	3.13
Computer Science <sup>1</sup>	3.36 (24 of 27)	3.49	3.33
History	3.57 (12 of 13)	3.65	3.68
Physics	3.62	3.57	3.62
<u>PsyD</u>			
Clinical Psychology	3.36	3.49	3.50
<u>MA/MS/MPP</u>			
Biology	3.17	3.25	3.41
Chemistry	3.04	3.55	3.11
Psychology	3.39	3.65	3.47
Public Policy	3.37	3.34 (21 of 24)	3.42

<sup>1</sup> Includes Computational Operations Research.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers in parentheses signify the # of students we used in this calculation. Some international students have GPAs that are calculated on a different scale and these are not included.

### 3. AVERAGE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION SCORES OF ENTERING STUDENTS <sup>1</sup>

Department	Fall 2003/Spring 2004				Fall 2004/Spring 2005			
	Verb	Quant	Analy	Analy Writ. <sup>4</sup>	Verb	Quant	Analy	Analy Writ.
<u>MA/MS/PhD</u>								
American Studies	583	567	579 (9)	5 (12)	630	628	726 (5)	5.8 (3)
Anthropology	567	569	574 (5)	5.3 (4)	590	592	670 (6)	5 (3)
Applied Science	546	708	680 (5)	5.8 (3)	575	743	630 (4)	4.3 (4)
Computer Science <sup>3</sup>	581	757	727 (11)	5 (9)	557	734	778 (4)	5.1 (7)
History	666	631	689 (12)	5.4 (9)	658	628	660 (2)	5.8 (10)
Physics	561	710	700 (5 of 8)	4.8 (3 of 8)	487	734	730 (1)	3.8 (9)
<u>PsyD</u>								
Clinical Psychology	574 Advanced - 612	598	604 (6 of 10)	5.1 (4 of 10)	512	642		5 Advanced - 665
<u>MA/MS/MPP</u>								
Biology	563	670	770 (2 of 7)	5 (5 of 7)	529	643	–	4.4 (8)
Chemistry	628	793	758		557	734	–	4.3 (3)
Psychology	579	685	708	5.5 (4 of 5)	590	653	640 (1)	5.3 (6)
Public Policy	554	662	665 (8 of 24)	5 (13 of 24)	589	692	605 (2)	5.41 (22)

<sup>1</sup> Includes all regular & provisional students. Scores on the advanced portion are not reported unless at least 70% of the enrolling students took the test.

<sup>2</sup> Numbers in parentheses signify the # of students we used in this calculation.

<sup>3</sup> Includes Computational Operations Research.

<sup>4</sup> Beginning in the Fall 2002, the analytical section was replaced by the analytical writing section.

**4. REGISTERED REGULAR & PROVISIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS <sup>1</sup>**  
**Fall 2002 to Fall 2004**

<u>Department</u>	<u>Fall 2002</u>	<u>Spring 2003</u>	<u>Fall 2003</u>	<u>Spring 2004</u>	<u>Fall 2004</u>
<u>MA/MS/PhD</u>					
American Studies	57	51	60	57	55
Anthropology	27	23	23	21	30
Applied Science	32	36	37	36	36
Computer Science <sup>2</sup>	75	69	84	76	76
History	54	50	59	54	52
Physics	50	49	52	50	57
<u>PsyD</u>					
Clinical Psychology <sup>3</sup>	47	41	43	40	47
<u>MA/MS/MPP</u>					
Biology	29	30	22	23	24
Chemistry	9	10	5	5	7
Psychology	18	18	15	15	15
Public Policy	37	38	38	37	46
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>435</b>	<b>415</b>	<b>438</b>	<b>414</b>	<b>445</b>

<sup>1</sup> Totals include both full-time and part-time registration.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Computational Operations Research.

<sup>3</sup> Total in Consortium.

## 5. GRADUATE DEGREES CONFERRED 2003-2004

DEPARTMENT	DEGREE	August 2003	December 2003	May 2004	TOTAL
<u>PhD</u>					
	M.A.	1	1	7	9
American Studies	Ph.D.	0	0	2	2
	M.A.	0	2	3	5
Anthropology <sup>1</sup>	Ph.D.	0	0	0	0
	M.S.	4	0	2	6
Applied Science	Ph.D.	0	1	4	5
	M.S.	2	6	8	16
Computer Science <sup>2</sup>	Ph.D.	1	1	2	4
	M.A.	4	3	1	8
History	Ph.D.	0	1	2	3
	M.S.	0	6	3	9
Physics	Ph.D.	4	1	2	7
<u>PsyD</u>					
Clinical Psychology	Psy.D.	6	2	0	8
<u>MA/MS/MPP</u>					
Biology	M.A.	6	3	6	15
	M.A.	1	0	0	1
Chemistry	M.S.	1	2	0	3
English	M.A.	0	0	0	0
Psychology	M.A.	5	3	1	9
Public Policy	M.P.P.	0	0	19	19
TOTALS	M.A.	17	12	18	47
	M.S.	7	14	13	34
	M.P.P.	0	0	19	19
	Ph.D.	5	4	12	21
	Psy.D.	6	2	0	8

<sup>1</sup> 2000-01 was the 1st year of students entering Ph.D. program

<sup>2</sup> Includes Computational Operations Research.

**5a. GRADUATE DEGREES CONFERRED 2003-04 (cont'd.)**

AUGUST 2003 THROUGH MAY 2004

Arts and Sciences	*	21 Ph.D., 10 Psy.D.
Education	*	3 Ed.D., 18 Ph.D.
Marine Science	*	11 Ph.D.

M.A. IN EDUCATION<sup>1</sup>

Secondary School Teaching	*	15
---------------------------	---	----

## 6. GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS<sup>1</sup> (August - May)

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAM INITIATED	SINCE										
		94-95	95-96	96-97	97-98	98-99	99-00	00-01	01-02	02-03	03-04	AUG. 94
<b>PhD</b>												
American Studies	1982-MA	9	11	6	4	13	6	5	8	8	9	79
	1988-PhD	1	4	4	2	3	4	5	6	3	2	34
Anthropology	1979-MA	10	10	9	5	4	5	13	7	10	5	78
	2001-PhD	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Applied Science	1970-MA/MS	6	9	9	11	11	4	4	5	6	6	71
	1990-PhD	4	5	6	6	6	6	4	3	4	5	49
Computer Science <sup>2</sup>	1984-MS	12	9	15	13	8	23	19	16	17	16	148
	1986-PhD	3	0	3	1	5	7	3	3	5	4	34
History	1955-MA	16	12	8	16	11	6	20	7	15	8	119
	1967-PhD	1	3	4	3	9	5	4	5	4	3	41
Physics	1959-MA/MS	9	7	11	12	6	7	12	4	11	9	88
	1964-PhD	6	5	10	8	9	7	7	3	4	7	66
<b>PsyD</b>												
Clinical Psychology	1978-PsyD	13	7	8	12	6	14	12	9	10	8	99
<b>MA/MS/MPP</b>												
Biology	1963-MA	13	15	10	8	11	8	11	3	5	15	99
Chemistry	1964-MA/MS	2	8	7	9	4	6	5	1	2	4	48
English	1970-MA <sup>3</sup>	15	11	19	9	5	3	6	0	2	0	70
Government	1966-MA	12	7	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	26
Mathematics	1961-MA/MS	9	7	6	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	23
Psychology	1953-MA	5	8	8	9	7	6	10	5	7	9	74
Public Policy	1991-MPP	14	13	21	23	14	15	13	19	17	19	168
Sociology	1967-MA	2	7	3	2	0	0	0	0	0		14
A&S Totals	MA-MS-MPP	134	134	135	123	95	89	119	76	100	100	905
	PhD	15	17	27	20	32	29	23	20	20	21	183
	PsyD	13	7	8	12	6	14	12	9	10	8	81

<sup>1</sup> See Table 5 for M.A. in Education degrees.

<sup>2</sup> Includes Computational Operations Research <sup>3</sup> Earlier Program suspended in 1963.