Annual Report of the Committee on Graduate Studies

to the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

February, 1998

A. Overview

The last annual report of the Committee on Graduate Studies (COGS) was distributed to the faculty on May 6. 1997. This report covers actions by COGS since that date.

It is essential that we maintain a climate which supports and encourages learning for all of our students. Results from our first learning climate survey were analyzed and distributed to all department chairs and Deans. The faculty approved the Final Report on Teaching Assistants and Teaching Fellows at its May meeting. This report set up a procedure for developing programs to train and supervise Teaching Fellows (TFs are those few students who are instructors of record), and criteria for the design of such programs were presented to the Faculty on Dec. 2, 1997.

The Provost appointed an ad-hoc committee to consider whether William and Mary should participate it the Virginia Tech Electronic Thesis and Dissertation (ETD) project and COGS completed a first preliminary examination of this issue.

Joint reviews of the graduate and undergraduate programs of two of our PhD departments (Computer Science and History) will be undertaken this year.

Subcommittees of the Committee on Graduate Studies have been formed to aid in a more careful consideration of the many issues which come before it, and a review of the policy and procedures governing graduate studies in Arts and Sciences has begun.

The next section of this report, Sec. B, gives more detailed information about the issues referred to briefly in this overview. Section C gives important statistical information about the class which entered in the fall or 1997.

B. Issues

1. Training for Teaching Assistants and Teaching Interns

Report of the Working Group on Teaching Fellows

Units employing teaching fellows next year (WM ABD graduate students who are instructors of record) must submit formal plans for their training and supervision to COGS and EPC for their approval this spring. A working group (chaired by Heather Macdonald, Geology) was established to advise COGS and EPC on the evaluation of these plans. The Working Group prepared a report which was approved by both COGS

and EPC (with some changes) and reported to the Faculty at the Dec. 2, 1997 meeting.

The report states that the training of TFs is a joint responsibility of units and Deans (of Undergraduate Studies and of Research and Graduate Studies). Units should begin the training of TFs during the year before the fellow is to teach. The Deans will organize a one day training session in the fall before classes begin. Approved programs for the training and supervision of TFs will be to be evaluated by the Deans two years after they are approved.

Acceptable programs should include seven components:

1. description of the TF program;

2. description of the criteria used to select TFs;

3. description of the initial unit orientation and training of TFs;

4. description of monitoring and supervision of TFs by a faculty mentor, including

    - regular meetings,
    - procedure for resolving disagreements,
    - two classroom observations by both the mentor and another person, who may be a graduate student;

5. professional development experiences including

    - at least two seminars or workshops,
    - videotaping;

6. formal written evaluation of the TF by the faculty mentor for internal use or (if the student so elects) external use by the student; and

7. evaluation of the unit TF program, which might include an exit interview.

The Committee on Graduate Studies believes that training doctoral students to teach is an important part of their graduate education. When this training is carried out by faculty mentors who really care about the quality of the education offered to their students, the experience is beneficial to both the graduate students, who enjoy a unique opportunity to learn, and the undergraduate students, who may be stimulated by the enthusiasm brought to their disciplines by people close to their age and experience. Allowing some graduate students to teach undergraduate courses is fully consistent with the educational mission of a small public university like William and Mary, where graduate student teachers will never teach more than a very small fraction of the courses offered, and where the dedication of the faculty to excellence in teaching is beyond question.

How many graduate students currently serve as TFs?

During the discussion at the Faculty meeting on Dec. 2, 1997, the Dean of Research and Graduate Studies promised to report the number of graduate students currently serving as TFs. In response to a survey distributed in December, six units reported using a total of approximately ? TFs per semester (on average). Use of TFs helps units carry out their mission more effectively, stretches our limited resources, provides a few of our best graduate students with excellent additional teaching experience. and may, in some cases, enrich our teaching program. Details of this survey are reported in the Table below.

Table I

Average TF usage by A&S units for the spring and fall semesters of 1997.

Unit	average/semester	comment
American Studies	3	TF training is integral to graduate training; TFs also provide invaluable assistance and significantly expand the AmSt offerings
Computer Science	1+	Without TFs, additional faculty would be needed.
English	1?	AmSt grad student hired as an adjunct
History	3	TFs free up senior faculty to offer other courses. One TF offers an additional topic in a seminar setting; very appealing to undergraduate students.
Mathematics	1-	Infusion of ideas about teaching comes from a variety of sources
Women's Studies	1	AmSt grad students filled gaps

2. Learning Climate for Graduate Students

Partly because of the increased awareness which resulted from the Macdonald Committee report, COGS decided to conduct a learning climate survey in all graduate programs during the 96/97 academic year, with a follow-up survey in three years. This survey was prepared by an ad-hoc committee, with Kelly Shaver, chair, Larry Evans, Kate Slevin, and graduate students Cindy Burns (assistant in the Dean's office) and Matt Cohen (GSA president). The survey was distributed to all A&S graduate students in early April.

The respondents to the survey were demographically representative of Arts and Sciences graduate students, but since only 43% responded to the survey, there is no way of knowing if the perceptions of the respondents mirror the perceptions of the group as a whole. Some of the findings, however, are similar to the findings of past research studies reported in the literature on sexual harassment in academia. Past research estimates that

50% of women experience some form of harassment from male faculty members. At the same time, only 4 to 10% label or recognize these faculty behaviors as sexually harassing. This survey indicated that 52% of graduate women respondents in Arts and Sciences experienced some form of harassment from male faculty members (i.e., gender discrimination, unwanted sexual attention, or sexual coercion). Of the women who experienced some form of harassment, however, only 28% believed that they were discriminated against because of their gender and only 30% perceived sexual harassment to be a problem in their programs. While these percentages are more than the literature suggests (an increased awareness of sexual harassment in recent years might account for these differences), this study does support the findings of past research that fewer women recognize these behaviors as sexually harassing.

This study should be repeated in 3 years and the results compared to those obtained from this study. When repeating this analysis, every effort should be made to increase the response rate to 70 or 80% so that the results can be generalized to the entire population of graduate students in Arts and Sciences, increasing the reliability of the data.

3. Electronic Theses and Dissertations (ETDs)

Many theses and dissertations are already prepared electronically, but at the moment electronic versions are not accepted for graduation and there is no standardized form for their submission. At the request of the Provost and the ad-hoc committee appointed to draft a recommendation, COGS discussed the merits of providing an option to submit theses and dissertations in electronic form. COGS believes that the development of policy and procedures governing the submission of ETDs and the acquisition of the needed hardware and software requires significant resources, both in time and money. COGS is unsure that the present advantages of ETDs justify this cost and effort, but believes that the College must begin to involve ourselves in this development if it is to remain competitive and up-to-date. With this background, the Committee on Graduate Studies recommends that the College should begin now to develop a policy covering the submission of ETDs, and to estimate the cost of implementing this policy. This policy should be in place no later than January, 1999, and a decision at what rate to proceed with the program should be made at that time. All units are encouraged to begin developing this capability and to study their needs, and some units may wish to move ahead more quickly with pilot projects.

If the College decides to proceed after the January, 1999, review, consideration should be given to the following:

- students and their advisors should retain the right to restrict access to their work for renewable three year periods, up to a maximum of nine years after submission;
- it is essential that adequate technology be in place and facilities for the production of ETDs be available to all students (even those who live off campus or are not registered);

- because computer software continues to develop at a very rapid rate and there is no assurance that electronic media produced today will be readable by the software of the distant future, ETDs should be accompanied by at least one hard copy;
- the College should reexamine its agreements with UMI and be sure to retain the freedom and independence to control the distribution of the work of its own students.

4. Graduate Program Reviews

This year the Computer Science and History programs will both have joint (graduate and undergraduate) program reviews. In connection with the graduate part of this process, Henry Krakauer (Physics), Rahul Simha (Computer Science), and Mary Voigt (Anthropology) have agreed to serve on the internal review committee for Computer Science, and John Selby (History), Virginia Torczon (Computer Science), and Alan Wallach (Art and Art History and American Studies) will serve on the internal review committee for History. Prof. Krakauer will chair the Computer Science review committee and Prof. Wallach the History Committee.

5. Administrative organization of the Graduate Program

Selection of the student representative to COGS

COGS passed the following motion:

> The student representative to COGS will be the current president of the Graduate Student Association.

This will speed up the current process of selecting the student representative and insure that the full membership of COGS is known at the start of the fall semester.

Subcommittees of COGS

To insure a more careful and considered faculty review of important issues coming before COGS, the Committee was organized into three subcommittees, with charges as follows:

Academic Standards and Administration (Operations)

Monitors and maintains A&S-wide academic standards and sets A&S-wide policy for administration of existing graduate programs.

> Portfolio includes responsibility for:
>
> • maintaining a high quality curriculum and reviewing proposals for new courses;

• reviewing academic rules and regulations, including grading policy;

• reviewing requirements for the award of advanced degrees, including format for the

thesis and dissertation;

• maintaining and updating the Statement of Policy and Procedures to insure good

practice.

Program Review and Development (Review and Development)

Reviews proposals for new programs or changes in existing programs, and defines what is and what is not graduate education.

Portfolio includes responsibility for:

• recommending ways to maintain an atmosphere of trust, fairness and collegiality

among the programs;

• developing the clusters and other linkages between different programs;

• developing ways for graduate education to contribute to and enhance undergraduate education;

• following periodic program reviews;

• supervising the collection of data about graduate programs in A&S at W&M;

• reviewing annual graduate admissions statistics and efforts of individual programs to attract students.

Admissions and Student Development (Students)

Reviews the A&S-wide admissions policies and practices, monitors the learning climate, and follows student progress toward the degree.

Portfolio includes responsibility for:

• reviewing requests for extensions beyond the time limits;

• monitoring the support services for graduate students;

• overseeing the learning climate survey;

• reviewing and monitoring the TA/TF training program;

• recommending ways to maintain contacts with graduate alumni;

• following student placement;

• developing recruiting and admissions policies and procedures;

• tracking admissions and supervising the collection of admissions data;

• following national admissions trends.

Major issues are discussed by the subcommittees before they are brought to the entire Committee. Members of COGS are free to come to any subcommittee meeting.

C. Statistical Summary

1. ADMISSIONS - Fall Semester 1997

Department	[1] Number Applicants	[2] Number Accepted	[3]Number Matriculated
American Studies	97	51	23
Anthropology	43	15	11
Applied Science	58	20	12
Biology	22	14	4
Chemistry	51	8	5
Computer Science	176	67	17
History	114	32	13
Physics	97	34	9
Psychology	76	13	11
Public Policy	75	50	21
Totals	*809*	*304*	*126*
Psy.D. Program [3]	143	14	10

[1] Figures based on completed applications for fall admission as reported by each graduate

[2] Figures include all applicants offered admission as reported by each graduate department.

[3] Total in Consortium.

2. AVERAGE UNDERGRADUATE GRADE POINT

AVERAGE OF ENTERING STUDENTS (4.0 SCALE)

DEPARTMENT	FALL 1995	FALL 1996	FALL 1997
AMERICAN STUDIES	2.99 (23 of 26)	3.51 (13 of 16)	3.3 (22 of 23)
ANTHROPOLOGY	3.41	3.44 (9 of 10)	3.5
APPLIED SCIENCE	3.68	3.53 (13 of 15)	3.44 (11 of 12)
BIOLOGY	2.9	3.13	3.36
CHEMISTRY	3.14 (3 of 5)	3.24	3.26
COMPUTER SCIENCE	3.3 (19 of 22)	3.55 (15 of 16)	3.42 (15 of 17)
HISTORY	3.54 (20 of 22)	3.57 (21 of 25)	3.61 (12 of 13)
PHYSICS	3.52 (9 of 11)	3.55 (7 of 9)	3.16 (8 of 9)
PSYCHOLOGY	3.48	3.46	3.47
PSY.D. PROGRAM	3.36	3.34	3.63
PUBLIC POLICY	3.35	3.35 (20 of 22)	3.46 (20 of 21)

3. AVERAGE GRADUATE RECORD EXAMINATION SCORES OF ENTERING STUDENTS 1

	FALL 1996				FALL 1997			
DEPARTMENT	VERB	MATH	ANALY	ADV	VERB	MATH	ANALY	ADV
American Studies	613 (15 of 16)	583 (15 of 16)	595 (14 of 16)	*****	585	510	579	*****
Anthropology	637	621	678	*****	541	559	598	*****
Applied Science	567 (14 of 15)	747 (14 of 15)	709 (14 of 15)	*****	487 (11 of 12)	723 (11 of 12)	667 (11 of 12)	*****
Biology	573 (7 of 8)	657 (7 of 8)	667 (7 of 8)	740 (5 of 8)	610	610	645	673 (3 of 4)
Chemistry	578 (4 of 5)	720 (4 of 5)	625 (4 of 5)	540 (2 of 5)	528 (4 of 5)	703 (4 of 5)	630 (4 of 5)	540 (1 of 5)
Computer Science	597	713	698	690 (3 of 16)	551	744	687	730 (5 of 17)
History	610 (23 of 25)	595 (23 of 25)	635 (23 of 25)	540 (4 of 25)	634	570	665	500 (1 of 13)
Physics	518	743	642	750	518	757	660	802
Psychology	643	665	715	648	556	565	592	608
Psy.D.	587	606	658	622	542	646	636	629
Public Policy	561 (20 of 22)	650 (20 of 22)	679 (20 of 22)	*****	576 (19 of 21)	637 (19 of 21)	670 (19 of 21)	*****

[1] Table includes all regular and provisional students.

Scores on the advanced portion of the GRE are not reported unless at least 70%

4. REGISTERED REGULAR & PROVISIONAL GRADUATE STUDENTS [1]

Fall 1995 to Fall 1997

DEPARTMENT	FALL 1995	SPRING 1996	FALL 1996	SPRING 1997	FALL 1997
AMERICAN STUDIES	56	54	52	51	63
ANTHROPOLOGY	22	17	23	22	20
APPLIED SCIENCE	41	39	49	49	54
BIOLOGY	34	30	27	30	15
CHEMISTRY	9	7	8	8	6
COMPUTER SCIENCE	69	71	64	59	62
HISTORY	65	61	68	69	63
PHYSICS	53	52	55	46	48
PSYCHOLOGY	16	15	16	15	16
PUBLIC POLICY	43	41	43	46	46
TOTALS	***408***	***387***	***405***	***395***	***393***
PSY.D. PROGRAM [2]	56	53	59	55	56

[1] Totals include both full-time and part-time registration.

[2] Total in Consortium.

5. GRADUATE DEGREES CONFERRED 1996-97

DEPARTMENT	DEGREE	AUGUST 1996	DECEMBER 1996	MAY 1997	TOTAL
American Studies	M.A.	1	2	3	6
	Ph.D.	0	2	2	4
Anthropology	M.A.	0	6	3	9
Applied Science	M.A.	1	1	0	2
	M.S.	0	2	5	7
	Ph.D.	0	1	5	6
Biology	M.A.	3	0	7	10
Chemistry	M.A.	0	6	1	7

Computer Science	M.S.	3	6	6	15
	Ph.D.	1	2	0	3
English	M.A.	5	5	9	19
Government	M.A.	0	1	2	3
History	M.A.	4	1	3	8
	Ph.D.	2	1	1	4
Mathematics	M.A.	0	0	0	0
	M.S.	0	6	0	6
Physics	M.A.	0	0	0	0
	M.S.	0	2	9	11
	Ph.D.	1	4	5	10
Psychology	M.A.	2	0	6	8
	Psy.D.	2	3	3	8
Public Policy	M.P.P.	1	1	19	21
Sociology	M.A.	3	0	0	3
TOTALS	M.A.	19	22	34	75
	M.S.	3	16	20	39
	M.P.P.	1	1	19	21
	Ph.D.	4	10	13	27
	Psy.D.	2	3	3	8

TOTAL NUMBER OF DOCTORATES CONFERRED

Arts and Sciences	27 Ph.D., 8 Psy.D.
Education	18 Ed.D.
Marine Science	11 Ph.D.

M.A IN EDUCATION

Secondary School Teaching **28**

6. GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED DURING THE LAST 10 YEARS [1]

(August-June)

Part A. 1987-1992

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAM INITIATED	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92
American Studies	1982-MA	3	4	11	14	8
	1988-PhD		0	0	0	0
Anthropology	1979-MA	4	8	9	8	7
Applied Science	1970-MA/MS	0	0	0	1	1
	1990-PhD				0	0
Biology	1963-MA	7	5	10	4	5
Chemistry	1964-MA/MS	4	5	7	4	5
Computer Science	1984-MS	10	15	19	15	13
	1986-PhD	1	0	3	0	3
English	1970-MA [2]	9	10	9	18	11
Government	1966-MA	6	8	8	9	10
History	1955-MA	13	7	16	13	10
	1967-PhD	1	1	5	2	9
Mathematics	1961-MA/MS	2	9	5	10	6
Physics	1959-MA/MS	8	6	14	8	10
	1964-PhD	5	3	6	6	7
Psychology	1953-MA	6	3	11	5	7
	1978-PsyD	8	10	14	8	7
Public Policy	1991-MPP					
Sociology	1967-MA	4	6	5	5	5
A&S Totals	MA-MS-MPP	76	86	124	114	98
	PhD	7	4	14	8	19
	PsyD	8	10	14	8	7

Part B. 1992-1997

DEPARTMENT	PROGRAM INITIATED	92-93	93-94	94-95	95-96	96-97	8/97	AUG. 1987
American Studies	1982-MA	12	10	9	11	6	1	89

	1988-PhD	1	2	1	4	4	0	12
Anthropology	1979-MA	5	12	10	10	9	0	82
Applied Science	1970-MA/MS	1	2	6	9	9	1	30
	1990-PhD	1	1	4	5	6	1	18
Biology	1963-MA	7	8	13	15	10	3	87
Chemistry	1964-MA/MS	7	11	2	8	7	0	60
Computer Science	1984-MS	23	16	12	9	15	2	149
	1986-PhD	2	4	3	0	3	1	20
English	1970-MA [2]	15	17	15	11	19	3	137
Government	1966-MA	4	7	12	7	3	0	74
History	1955-MA	10	7	16	12	8	4	116
	1967-PhD	6	4	1	3	4	1	37
Mathematics	1961-MA/MS	8	9	9	7	6	0	71
Physics	1959-MA/MS	8	11	9	7	11	1	93
	1964-PhD	7	7	6	5	10	3	65
Psychology	1953-MA	7	9	5	8	8	2	71
	1978-PsyD	5	6	13	7	8	6	92
Public Policy	1991-MPP	18	17	14	13	21	0	83
Sociology	1967-MA	2	6	2	7	3	1	46
A&S Totals	MA-MS-MPP	127	142	134	134	135	18	1188
	PhD	17	18	15	17	27	6	152
	PsyD	5	6	13	7	8	6	92

[1] **See Table 5 for M.A. in Education degrees.**

[2] **Earlier Program suspended in 1963.**