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1. **Follow up business referred from the 2020 – 2021 academic year**
	1. **Changes to the Graduate Bulletin**

Dean Rutherford confirmed that the bulletin language was changed as recommended for the graduate minor, the graduate leave policy, and the graduate course revalidation. Relevant sections of the bulletin are linked below, with details added in Appendix A

i. <https://bulletins.iu.edu/iu/gradschool/2021-2022/requirements/phd/major-minor.shtml>

ii. <https://bulletins.iu.edu/iu/gradschool/2021-2022/policies/leave.shtml>

iii. <https://bulletins.iu.edu/iu/gradschool/2021-2022/policies/revalidate.shtml>

* 1. ***Academic Leave Policies***

Comments about leave (including medical leave) policies. Generally leave policies are left to the individual schools, departments and programs to make decisions about leave policies and to make decisions about an individual requested leave. At IUPUI, for example, once a school or department makes a decision to grant a leave, a form is sent to the campus Graduate Office. The Graduate Office records the leave but does not record a detailed reason justifying the leave.

One explicit concern about leave and leave policies for graduate students is that students who take limited leave from graduate school are not currently able to maintain their campus health insurance. This is especially problematic if the leave is requested for health reasons. Deans Daleke and Blum are currently working with IU Human Resources to sort out how to enable the development of a graduate student leave that allows the student to maintain their campus health insurance through the leave. Some considerations to be addressed will include how long someone may be allowed to maintain their campus health insurance while on leave, the relative cost of the campus health insurance compared to while the student is actively enrolled and participating in a graduate program, and how those costs might be covered or paid.

The APC considered MIT’s medical leave policy, as an example. The MIT leave policy is coordinated centrally as it is a relatively small, and private, university. IU has multiple campuses and many schools, departments and programs separately empowered to make decisions about graduate student leave, and the APC strongly supports maintaining the decentralized approach to graduate student leave decision making, particularly as each school is in the best position to understand the complexities of each student’s situation.

Deans Daleke, Rutherford and Blum have asked all relevant academic deans to provide feedback on their leave policies. As the leave policies have changed recently (see above), some schools needed to bring their leave policies in compliance, a process which was expected to take much of the 2021-2022 academic year. The feedback from the deans has been requested to be submitted by the end of the 2021-2022 academic year and will be collated for the Academic Policies Committee during the summer. As a point, some schools do not have appear to have independent leave policies and used whatever they could find in the bulletin or elsewhere at IU, generally from the same campus.

***This review is being transferred to the GFC APC for the 2022-2023 academic year.***

* 1. **Course Revalidation Policies – Best Practices**

Course revalidation is the term IU uses when, upon returning from leave, a decision is made to let students count their already taken coursework towards their graduate degree. The current IU Graduate School policy and relevant guidance is in these links:

* IU UGS 2019-2020: <https://bulletins.iu.edu/iu/gradschool/2019-2020/policies/revalidate.shtml>
* IUPUI guidance relevant to the above: <https://graduate.iupui.edu/forms/revalidation.html>

The current IU Graduate School policy for course revalidation for graduate programs is five years for master’s programs, and seven years for PhD programs. It is not clear why the revalidation time is different for PhD programs versus master's programs. This difference may be related to the typically shorter length of a master’s program (1-3 years).

The current IU time limits on course validity may prove challenging to some student groups, (as example K-12 teachers) enrolled part-time in IU Online Collaborative graduate certificates and degrees which are offered by all IU campuses.  Many of these students are working adults and taking courses over multiple years towards a degree or certificate.  Our current revalidation policy can result in challenges for these individuals aiming to complete a master’s programs in more than 5 years, as completed courses must be revalidated.  It would be useful to explore if the course content offered in these K-12 teacher education programs change significantly over a 5 year period.  The revalidation process takes advisor/faculty time as well as student time, and could deter some individuals from completing their degree – thus representing a potential barrier to degree completion.

Few other universities use the term “revalidation,” including our Big Ten peers. Feedback from the national Council of Graduate Schools suggests most universities allow courses to remain valid for 6-7 years for a master’s program. However, there is really little consistency across peers, both within and outside the Big Ten. From a google search, using “revalidation” of courses or “revalidation of courses” (optimal search terms so far), most of the hits are from IU. There are other schools that comment on revalidation of courses if graduate courses are not completed within a set period of years. Here is a sampling (based on google searching):

* Pennsylvania State University only allows a maximum of three continuous semesters of leave. (<https://gradschool.psu.edu/graduate-education-policies/gsad/gsad-900/gsad-906-graduate-student-leave-of-absence/> )
* Northwestern University only allows a one year leave of absence. (<https://www.tgs.northwestern.edu/academic-policies-procedures/policies/leaves-of-absence.html>)
* Rutgers University sets leave of absence and program extensions by school and program. The graduate bulletin doesn’t specify limits per se. Within departments, as an example, the clinical psychology doctoral degree must be conferred within eight years of matriculation (seven years if come in with a master's in clinical psychology) ( <https://global.rutgers.edu/Withdraw-LOA>; <https://gsapp.rutgers.edu/current-students/leave-absencematriculation-continued>).
* Purdue is vague about time limits for completion and associated details (“Each department should establish policies to assure that graduate students complete their Ph.D. degree programs in a period of time that is reasonable and commensurate with the practice of scholarship in that field.” ) <https://catalog.purdue.edu/content.php?catoid=13&navoid=15955>)
* University of Iowa requires revalidation of courses taken more than ten years prior to the doctoral comprehensive exam. (<https://grad.uiowa.edu/academics/manual/academic-program/section-xii-doctors-degrees>)
* Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi sets a seven-year time limit for courses to count towards a degree: <https://www.tamucc.edu/liberal-arts/departments/communication-and-media/assets/documents/comm-ma-graduate-handbook-2021-2022.pdf>
* Western Illinois University sets a ten year time limit for courses to count towards a degree: <http://www.wiu.edu/graduate_studies/catalog/liberalarts.php>
* Metropolitan State allows each school to set a time limit for courses to count towards a degree, but that time limit isn’t specified in the Graduate Catalog. However, Metro only allows courses to transfer in from other universities if the courses have been completed within the last five years. (<https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=2ahUKEwj9yInDq9XzAhU2m2oFHZpxDSIQFnoECAgQAQ&url=https%3A%2F%2Fwww.metrostate.edu%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2018-06%2Fcatalog-graduate-2005-2007.pdf&usg=AOvVaw2qeF5mN7jzrFNoCNmVRKSA>)
* Southern Connecticut State requires completion of all requirements within seven years for the PhD and (It seems) six years for a masters, though the master’s time limit is less clearly stated. An extension of a year may be granted under compelling extenuating circumstances. A longer extension is rarely granted. (<https://www.yumpu.com/en/document/read/19328702/graduate-catalog-southern-connecticut-state-university>)
* Prairie View A&M University requires all courses and all degree requirements to be completed within six years. Extensions are allowed upon appeal, but details are not specified in the Bulletin. (<https://sacs.pvamu.edu/assets/library/full-grad.pdf>)
* North Carolina Central University sets six year limits for masters degree completion and eight years for doctoral degree completion. If an extension of the time limit to the degree completion has been granted, courses that are more than five years old must be formally revalidated. There is no discussion of the time limit for revalidation. (<http://www.nccucounseling.com/student2/images/CourseInf/2013-15_Graduate_School_Course_Catalogue_APC_Approved_May%202014_FINAL.pdf>)

(As noted above, the current IU revalidation policy is available at this link and is listed in Appendix A: <https://bulletins.iu.edu/iu/gradschool/2021-2022/policies/revalidate.shtml>

***The APC recommends that the 2022-2023 APC consider whether there needs to be any changes in the current course revalidation policy, including whether doctoral and master’s program time limits should be made consistent. Given the lack of consistency among peer institutions, this must be an IUGS decision.***

**2. Adoptation (or not) of Changes to Grading Policies Passed by the University Faculty Council.**

1. *ACA-66 X and I grades.*

In the April 2021 updated policy on grading (<https://policies.iu.edu/policies/aca-66-grades-and-grading/index.html> ), the University Faculty Council addressed W, X and I grades. Following the updated W and X and I grades for undergraduates passed by University Faculty Council in the late spring, the APC examined the UFC language and discussed whether to either accept or adapt the language for each grade for graduate students.

***The APC evaluated each of these changes and decided that the X grade did not need to be adapted for graduate courses, and decided no changes needed to be made for the I grades.***

1. *W grade*

The APC discussed the withdrawal policies used across the campuses and raised concerns about whether any graduate programs that are linked to professional certification would prohibit a withdrawal policy.

* 1. To assess whether any programs did not allow withdrawals from graduate programs, potentially due to accreditation criteria, the APC (with the help of the GFC executives) put out a survey to ask deans about their withdrawal policies.
		1. Survey Results:
* Still only 15 responses to the withdrawal survey.  8 from IUB, 5 from IUPUI, 1 each from IUE, IUS.
* Essentially everyone said all programs allow a W that they know of, and no accreditation issues were known.
	+ 1. ***Conclusion: No accreditation issues were raised about the W for any respondents. Although no respondent from three of the regional campuses (IUN, IUSB, IUK) filled out the survey, these campuses have few graduate programs. Therefore, course Withdrawal policies should be implementable across the Graduate School.***

Given the acceptability of the W across campuses and programs, based on the minimal feedback the APC received from the survey, and that the W is already being implemented across campuses, the APC generally considers the W grade acceptable for adoption as a graduate policy.

* 1. The APC discussed whether to adopt the W language for the UFC as is. After discussion among the APC and after reaching out to the IUPUI registrar for comment, the APC voted to recommend a modification to the qualifying language at the start of the W policy. Below is first the original ACA-66 C7 policy (1.), followed by ACA-66 C7 with the modified qualifying language (2.).

**1. Original ACA-66 Policy Language**

C.7. “W (withdrawn) For undergraduates only:

A “W” may be given in the following situations in which the student withdraws after the drop/add period:

If a student withdraws after the drop/add period but within the automatic withdrawal period.

If a student withdraws after the automatic withdrawal period but within a time limit set by a unit under a unit policythat allows such withdrawals, with the consent of the instructor and principal administrator of the student’s unit.

If a student received an “I” and the instructor, in consultation with the principal administrator of the unit offering the course, determines that it is not feasible either for the student to complete the required work to remove the “I” or to enter a letter grade based on the work completed.

When the withdrawal is approved under [USSS-02, Military Withdrawal](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/usss-02-military-withdrawal/index.html). “

**2. Recommended modification (bold, blue type) to the ACA-66 Policy Language to be sent to UFC as a request to modify the policy qualifying phrase preceding the policy:**

C.7. “W (withdrawn) ~~For undergraduates only~~: **The provisions in this policy apply to all Indiana University students in all units, including undergraduate, graduate, and professional programs, unless expressly identified as applying to undergraduates only, subject to two principles:**

**1. Units with graduate or professional programs may adopt or modify any provisions, including grade submission deadlines, as appropriate to their programs, in consultation with the chief academic affairs officer and registrar of the campus administering the program.**

**2. Nothing in this policy is intended to override accreditation standards that may require academic units to vary from its terms.**

A “W” may be given in the following situations in which the student withdraws after the drop/add period:

If a student withdraws after the drop/add period but within the automatic withdrawal period.

If a student withdraws after the automatic withdrawal period but within a time limit set by a unit under a unit policy that allows such withdrawals, with the consent of the instructor and principal administrator of the student’s unit.

If a student received an “I” and the instructor, in consultation with the principal administrator of the unit offering the course, determines that it is not feasible either for the student to complete the required work to remove the “I” or to enter a letter grade based on the work completed.

When the withdrawal is approved under [USSS-02, Military Withdrawal](https://policies.iu.edu/policies/usss-02-military-withdrawal/index.html). “

***The APC recommends that the 2022-2023 GFC consider the amended ACA-66 C7 policy on the W grade forwarded from the 2021-2022 APC: Review the modified UFC language (below) for adaptation for the graduate bulletin, and to recommend to the UFC to change the ACA-66 C7 language as indicated above. (If the UFC agrees to change ACA-66 C7, then the graduate bulletin adaptation may not be necessary.)***

***3.* Graduate Student Progress Tracking and Mentoring**

A major issue linked to graduate student leaves or taking a withdrawal from programs is whether graduate students are being appropriately tracked and mentored by both their programs and their mentors through their program. At least on the IUB campus in some programs there is a lack of consistent effective and metrics-based monitoring and reporting on graduate student progress.

The following related questions were also specifically requested of the APC:

* Do you know if there is any policy on how faculty/Chair/Dean can evaluate the progress of a PhD student and then make decisions on whether the student should remain in the doctoral program?
* What is the protocol for evaluating a graduate student’s progress in a program?

Guidance from the APC. Additional feedback from GFC would be welcome additions.

* 1. IUPUI developed a set of “Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning (Appendix B)” and has instituted a requirement for having their students meet annually with their program mentors. At IUPUI there are several forms and practices that have been developed across different programs for tracking of graduate student progress. Reports should be collected by the department. Some reports may go to the UGS. These are listed in Appendix C,D.E
	2. Several other mentoring and graduate progress tracking forms and practices are being implemented by peer institutions. These are listed and detailed in Appendix F.
	3. The American Association for the Advancement of Science adopted a career planning and tracking program initially developed by the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB; 2012 – but no longer listed on the FASEB website) for PhD students and early postdoctoral students. The AAAS program made this available as My Independent Development Plan (aka [MyIDP](https://myidp.sciencecareers.org/?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1)). Information about the MyIDP is available online (<https://www.science.org/content/article/myidp>) and is summarized in Appendix G1.
	4. A similar version to the science-oriented MyIDP has been developed for the art and humanities ([ImaginePhD](https://www.imaginephd.com/) ) and is referenced in Appendix G2.

***The Academic Policies Committee recommends that the IUPUI mentoring and tracking policies and practices be considered for adoption in some form. We recommend that the 2022 – 2023 GFC APC add development of this policy to their agenda.***

***4.* Policy breaks in long classes**

* 1. There was resistance among the APC to turning this into policy. Specifically, the timing and breaks determined by faculty for long classes is linked to the learning goals and the committee did not think the GFC should be setting detailed class timing policy.
	2. This issue was forwarded to the UFC to see if they wanted to do anything. The UFC did not want to act on the policy breaks issue because the UFC perceives this policy to be micromanaging faculty (or instructor) behavior in the classroom.
	3. DSH met with Louis van der Elst and Darcy Furlong to discuss options, other approaches to resolve this issue when it occurs, and ways that they could gain more support for a revised policy, if after additional consideration they still believe this policy is necessary. Issues they will address include:
		1. Whether this is only an issue for the Bloomington campus, or if indeed this is an issue for graduate students from IUB, IUPUI and at least some of the regional campuses. The discussion revolved around both reaching out to graduate students on other campuses and maybe developing a survey to determine whether this is an issue across IU for graduate students who teach.
		2. Whether the issue (where and when it is occurring) could be resolved by making graduate students who are teaching more self-empowered to schedule breaks in classes on their own. An awareness campaign could be developed or this material could be included in orientation materials for graduate students who will be in charge of classes.
		3. Whether the issue (where and when it is occurring) could be resolved by making graduate students who are students in long classes more empowered to take breaks from class as they need to. All IU students are always free to use the facilities without requesting permission.
		4. Whether this issue (if is it still a concern after reconsideration) could be addressed by turning the mandatory policy into a recommendation.

Conclusions: The graduate students will reconsider, have further discussions, gather more data, and return with any revised requests in the future, if they so deem the issue still needing resolution.

5. **New Items to consider for 2022-2023 APC**

 A. Does the dissertation / thesis name listed in official documents need to match the diploma name?

***The Graduate School is requesting recommendations for student guidance from the APC and GFC.***

Discussion (Topic from Dean Blum):

IU requires the student’s legal name on the transcript, and we in the IUPUI Graduate Office have asked that students use their legal name on their dissertation or thesis. But with the change at IU to allow the student to identify a “degree name” for their diploma, the staff in my office asked if we should allow students the option to use a “degree name” on their dissertation or thesis. We may have to consider if that dissertation/thesis name listed should match the diploma name as part of the discussion on whether the GFC wishes to support such a change.

Deans Daleke and Rutherford should be able to comment on what the IUB Graduate Office currently does in terms of student’s names on dissertation/thesis.

We would likely have to ask the Registrar on each campus if such a change in the name on the dissertation/thesis is consistent with IU policies. Dean Blum believes the degree name is the student name read at commencement.

Prior Communication:

**Subject:** RE: Question regarding the student name options.

In looking at the Recorders + minutes I see, “**Diploma** name reminder email will be going to students. The process has changed, as students can update their own diploma name through Student Center. The new method will be explained in an email to students”. Those minutes reference this <https://kb.iu.edu/d/bhdu> which explains the difference between a transcript name and a degree name, as they are not the same.

“**Your primary name is your legal name that is used for transcripts**, billing, financial aid, tax forms, and other pages and documents that require the use of legal names. Requests to update your primary/legal name may be initiated through your campus Office of the Registrar and must be supported by providing documentation such as a marriage license, driver's license, passport, or other appropriate legal documentation.”

“**Your degree name will appear on diplomas**, certificates, Commencement Programs, and on university websites that list graduates.”

I think this is a question that may need to go to the GFC, can students opt to use their Degree name on their thesis / dissertation.

**Monica Henry, M.P.A.**

Director, IUPUI Graduate Office

317-278-2071

mlhenry@iupui.edu

[graduate.iupui.edu](http://graduate.iupui.edu/)

**Subject:** Question regarding the student name options.

Hello Dr. Blum and Dr. Hardy,

This item from the November APPC meeting minutes.

**Reminder that DEGREE NAMES are now available for students to update via the Student Center**.

* Plan is to initially populate this field using primary/legal name as default
* Will be up to student to change at any time

Does this mean the student can use that name in their thesis and dissertation?

Student name appears in four places: title page, copyright page, abstract, curriculum vitae.

Our process has been:

The name on the transcript is the official name. That name will be used on the thesis/dissertation.

Students are allowed to abbreviate their middle name. Or if using their middle name, allowed to abbreviate their first name.

Example, using my name.

My transcript name is Debra Elaine Barker.

I could use Debra Elaine Barker; Debra E. Barker; or if I had been using my middle name, D. Elaine Barker.

I could not use Debra Elaine Thomas because that is no longer my transcript name.

I could not use Thomas-Barker (my maiden and current last name). That is not my transcript name.

Reading the APPC minutes, the student could change their transcript name to any of the scenarios, or more, I identified. As such, will we need to accept the [revised] transcript name for the thesis/dissertation and associated upload to ScholarWorks/ProQuest?

Debra

**Debra Barker**

Graduate Recorder

IUPUI Graduate Office/University Graduate School

University Library #1170

755 West Michigan Street

Indianapolis, IN 46202

APC comments so far:

1. Graduate school time of life often overlaps the life stage of marriage. Not everyone changes their name when getting married, but many do.
2. I know of at least one graduate (now graduated) student who has changed gender and corresponding name in recent years. If such a change does not include a legal change of name before enrolling at IU, the legal and so transcript name might not be a chosen degree name.
3. (from Dean Daleke). I see two reasons for why it might be best for students to use their primary (transcript) name on their dissertation and not a different (degree) name:
	1. The university considers the degree name to be unofficial (for ceremonial documents and website lists only). To avoid confusion between the official record (transcript) and the primary output of a masters/PhD (thesis/dissertation), it seems best that these names be identical. Related to this, international students often use the diploma as an official record of degree completion outside of the U.S. instead of the transcript, which is our practice. They should be advised about this when considering a degree name change, which would result in different names on the diploma and transcript.
	2. The dissertation is a scholarly publication. I recommend that students be as consistent as possible in the name they use for their dissertation and latter publications. This is not essential, of course, but is helpful for better long-term tracking of their scholarly work.

**Appendix A. Graduate Bulletin as modified from GFC 2020-2021 Recommendations**

1. **General Requirements for Advanced Degrees**

### Ph.D. Degree

#### Major Subject and Minor Subjects

**Major Subject**

The student will select a major subject from the departments and programs listed in this bulletin. The major department or program is responsible for monitoring the student’s progress toward the degree and for making recommendations to the University Graduate School regarding the nomination to candi­dacy, the appointment of a research committee, the defense of the dissertation, and the conferring of the degree.

**Minor Subject**

The student will select at least one minor subject. A minor is meant to provide additional breadth and to complement and enhance the value of the major. The minor must be distinct from the major – courses counted toward a minor cannot also be counted toward the major, and the courses must be taken outside the major discipline from among the specifically approved minors listed in this bulletin. (As an exception to this rule, Indiana University doctoral students may take a minor in a Purdue University graduate degree program at Indiana University-Purdue University Indianapolis [IUPUI].)

Courses counted toward a minor cannot also be counted toward the major. The determination of the minimum requirements and examination procedure (if any) for the minor is entirely at the discretion of the minor department or program.

**Individualized Minor**

In certain cases, special individualized minors (12 or more credit hours of work in two or more programs) or minors not specifically listed in this bulletin may be approved by the dean upon recommendation of the student’s advisory com­mittee, provided such approval is requested prior to pursuit of any of the proposed courses of study. Examination procedures (if any) or other requirements (for example, stipulation of the minimum grades acceptable) should also be specified in the proposal to the dean.

1. **Policies & Procedures: Leave of Absence**

Though timely academic progress is essential to all programs of study, students will occasionally encounter extenuating circumstances that affect their ability to make adequate progress and which may necessitate a leave of absence.

All schools must establish and maintain school-level leave policies for students enrolled in graduate degree programs. Graduate student leave policies must be clearly communicated and accessible to all students and, in general, should address all procedural, academic, and financial considerations.

The University Graduate School will likewise provide exceptions and/or increased flexibility with regards to academic progression to all students approved for a leave of absence by their respective schools.

1. **Policies & Procedures: Revalidation of Courses**

Normally, a course may not be counted toward degree require­ments if it has been completed more than:

* Five years prior to the awarding of the degree for master’s students
* Seven years prior to the passing of the qualifying examination for Ph.D. students

The graduate advisor, after consultation with the advisory committee, may, however, recommend to the dean that course work taken prior to the above deadlines be revalidated if it can be demonstrated that the knowledge con­tained in the course(s) remains current. Currency of knowledge may be demonstrated by such things as:

* Passing an exami­nation specifically on the material covered by the course
* Passing a more advanced course in the same subject area
* Passing a comprehensive examination in which the student demonstrates substantial knowledge of the content of the course; if the qualifying examination is used for the purpose of revalidation, the number of courses to be revalidated by this method should be limited to two in order to avoid compromising the integrity of the qualifying examination process.
* Teaching a comparable course
* Publishing scholarly research demonstrating substantial knowledge of the content and fundamental principles of the course
* Documented professional experience

Each course for which consideration for revalidation is being requested should be justified separately.

**Appendix B. Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning**

*The following language describes the general expectations for graduate education at IUPUI and can be broadly applied to any program:*

“**Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning**

The principles below form a conceptual framework that describes expectations of all graduate/professional students at IUPUI. More specific expectations are determined by the faculty in a student's field of study. Together, these expectations identify knowledge, skills, and abilities graduates will have demonstrated upon completing their specific degrees.

**\*Demonstrating mastery of the knowledge and skills expected for the degree and for professionalism and success in the field**

**\*Thinking critically, applying good judgment in professional and personal situations**

**\*Communicating effectively to others in the field and to the general public**

**\*Behaving in an ethical way both professionally and personally”**

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

*The Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning can be made more specific for individual degrees, based upon the mission and goals of the faculty in the program, e.g.:*

“**Graduate students earning an Indiana University or Purdue University Ph.D. on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities related to the research focus of the degree:**

\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to identify and conduct original research, scholarship or other creative endeavors appropriate to the field

\*Communicate effectively high level information from their field of study

\*Think critically and creatively to solve problems in their field of study

\*Conduct research in an ethical and responsible manner”

*Or,* **“Graduate students in academically-based master’s level programs on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities:**

\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to conduct original research within the discipline or to enter a program to earn a more advanced degree

\*Communicate effectively information from their field of study

\*Think critically and creatively to evaluate literature in their field of study

\*Apply ethics within their field”

*Or,* “**Graduate students in professional graduate level programs on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities:**

\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills needed to meet disciplinary standards of performance, as stated for each individual degree

\*Communicate effectively with their peers, their clientele, and the general public

\*Think critically and creatively to improve practice in their field

\*Meet all ethical standards established for the discipline”

To illustrate how these Principles might be used in assessing individual programs, consider the following example for an IU PhD degree in one of the STEM disciplines:

“Graduate students earning the PhD from Indiana University in X on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities related to the research focus of the degree:

**\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to identify and conduct original research in X**

Method of acquisition: Didactic course work, journal clubs, attendance at research seminars, direct mentoring by faculty, studying grant proposals

Assessment of learning: Grades in course work, ability to pass cumulative preliminary examinations in the field, ability to pass the oral and written qualifying examination, direct laboratory assessment by the research mentor, direct assessment of progress by the research committee for the dissertation

**\*Communicate effectively high level information in X**

Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, mentored writing of grant proposals and manuscripts

Assessment of learning: Successful completion of the oral and written portions of the qualifying examinations, grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, publication of manuscripts, awarding of grants

**\*Think critically and creatively to solve problems in X**

Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, writing pre-proposal for dissertation, writing dissertation proposal

Assessment of learning: Grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, direct assessment by faculty on pre-proposal and dissertation proposal, publication of research manuscripts, success in getting grant proposals funded.

**\*Conduct research in an ethical and responsible manner**

Method of acquisition: Required classes in research ethics, modeling of appropriate behavior in seminars by faculty and peers, direct mentoring by research director, mentoring by the dissertation research committee

Assessment of learning: Grades in ethics classes based on outcomes rubrics, direct observation of data handling by research mentor, direct oversight by dissertation research committee on issues of research compliance and ethics

The graduate faculty of the Department of X will conduct a yearly review of the progress of students through the program to determine if the program is meeting its goals to prepare students in each of these areas. Changes that might be made include replacing faculty in certain courses, adopting new methods to present material, offering additional options for training (e.g., making a writing consultant available), or engaging students in external training in other laboratories or institution (e.g.,ethics seminar at IUB, laboratory placement for short term training in research technique).”

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>

*The Graduate Affairs Committee recommends the principles above need not be translated down to the level of individual courses. Acquisition of information is demonstrated in grading for course work and long-term retention is demonstrated by cumulative preliminary examinations or in capstone activities; however, the bulk of critical learning in graduate degree programs takes place in settings where discrete information is integrated by the engaged student and put to use in solving problems in the field. It is the integration of the knowledge that must be assessed in graduate programs; these more complex assessments take place in regular committee meetings with the student, in oral and written examinations, and in the collaborative writing of research publications, and grant proposals.*

**Appendix C. Dissertation Defense Evaluation Rubric**

**Graduate Student Learning Outcome (GSLO) Comprehensive Assessment**

**Indiana University PhD Programs at IUPUI**

Candidate Name:

Title of Dissertation:

Degree:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GSLO | Expectation | Does not meet expectations (unacceptable) | Meets expectations (acceptable) | Exceeds expectations (outstanding) |
| Knowledge and skills |  |  |  |  |
|  Literature review | Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of current research in field |  |  |  |
|  Hypothesis/objectives | Generates viable research question and a testable hypothesis |  |  |  |
|  Research methods | Applies appropriate research methods to address hypothesis |  |  |  |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |
|  Writing | Dissertation is clearly written and communicates high level material well with the reader |  |  |  |
|  Oral explanations | Oral explanations are clear and to the point |  |  |  |
|  Format of dissertation | Dissertation requires no or minimal changes to be acceptable to the institution |  |  |  |
|  Publication of Research | Submitted at least one first-authored manuscript of original research based on the dissertation |  |  |  |
| Critical thinking |  |  |  |  |
|  Analysis of data | Analyses relate to conceptual framework |  |  |  |
|  Interpretation of results | Interpretation justified, not over or under-drawn |  |  |  |
|  Conclusions  | Justified, based on appropriate statistics |  |  |  |
| Ethical research |  |  |  |  |
|  Required classes complete | B or better earned in each |  |  |  |
|  Appropriate certifications | Biosafety, IRB, etc documented |  |  |  |
|  Evidence of original work | Literature search supports that research is original |  |  |  |
|  Appropriate citations | No evidence of plagiarism |  |  |  |

**Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning**

“Graduate students earning the PhD from Indiana University in X on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities related to the research focus of the degree:

**\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to identify and conduct original research in X**

 Method of acquisition: Didactic course work, journal clubs, attendance at research seminars, direct mentoring by faculty, studying grant proposals

 Assessment of learning: Grades in course work, ability to pass cumulative preliminary examinations in the field, ability to pass the oral and written qualifying examination, direct laboratory assessment by the research mentor, direct assessment of progress by the research committee for the dissertation

**\*Communicate effectively high level information in X**

 Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, mentored writing of grant proposals and manuscripts

 Assessment of learning: Successful completion of the oral and written portions of the qualifying examinations, grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, publication of manuscripts, awarding of grants

**\*Think critically and creatively to solve problems in X**

 Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, writing pre-proposal for dissertation, writing dissertation proposal

 Assessment of learning: Grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, direct assessment by faculty on pre-proposal and dissertation proposal, publication of research manuscripts, success in getting grant proposals funded.

**\*Conduct research in an ethical and responsible manner**

 Method of acquisition: Required classes in research ethics, modeling of appropriate behavior in seminars by faculty and peers, direct mentoring by research director, mentoring by the dissertation research committee

 Assessment of learning: Grades in ethics classes based on outcomes rubrics, direct observation of data handling by research mentor, direct oversight by dissertation research committee on issues of research compliance and ethics

**Appendix D: J810/G901 Grade Form (IUPUI)**

**Student:**

**DATE OF THE COMMITTEE MEETING:**

**Course:**

**Number of Credits Submitted with this report:**

**Year :**

**Semester:**

**Credits:**

**Year :**

**Semester:**

**Credits:**

**Year :**

**Semester:**

**Credits:**

**Committee Members Present: (Members please initial in the appropriate box)**

**MENTOR SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**COMMITTEE ASSIGNED GRADE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Committee Meeting Evaluation Rubric**

**Graduate Student Learning Outcome (GSLO) Comprehensive Assessment**

**Microbiology & Immunology Program at IUPUI**

Student:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| GSLO | Expectation | Does not meet expectations (unacceptable) | Meets expectations (acceptable) | Exceeds expectations (outstanding) |
| Knowledge and skills |  |  |  |  |
|  Literature review | Demonstrates comprehensive knowledge of current research in field |  |  |  |
|  Hypothesis/objectives | Generates viable research question and a testable hypothesis |  |  |  |
|  Evidence of original work | Literature search supports that research is original |  |  |  |
|  Research methods | Applies appropriate research methods to address hypothesis |  |  |  |
| Communication |  |  |  |  |
|  Data/Progress & Presentation | Graphic presentation of research is clear and allows conclusions to be drawn |  |  |  |
|  Oral explanations | Oral explanations are clear and to the point |  |  |  |
| Critical thinking |  |  |  |  |
|  Analysis of data | Analyses relate to conceptual framework |  |  |  |
|  Interpretation of results | Interpretation justified, not over or under-drawn |  |  |  |
|  Conclusions  | Justified, based on appropriate statistics |  |  |  |
| Professionalism |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance at Journal Club | As appropriate for program |  |  |  |
| Attendance at RIP | Attendance is expected at all sessions |  |  |  |
| Attendance at Department Seminar | Attendance is expected at all sessions |  |  |  |

**SIGNATURE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ DATE: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Principles of Graduate and Professional Learning**

“Graduate students earning the PhD from Indiana University in X on the IUPUI campus will demonstrate the following abilities related to the research focus of the degree:

**\*Demonstrate the knowledge and skills necessary to identify and conduct original research in X**

 Method of acquisition: Didactic course work, journal clubs, attendance at research seminars, direct mentoring by faculty, studying grant proposals

 Assessment of learning: Grades in course work, ability to pass cumulative preliminary examinations in the field, ability to pass the oral and written qualifying examination, direct laboratory assessment by the research mentor, direct assessment of progress by the research committee for the dissertation

**\*Communicate effectively high level information in X**

 Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, mentored writing of grant proposals and manuscripts

 Assessment of learning: Successful completion of the oral and written portions of the qualifying examinations, grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, publication of manuscripts, awarding of grants

**\*Think critically and creatively to solve problems in X**

 Method of acquisition: Attendance required at seminars by faculty and peers, presentation at informal laboratory meetings and at formal seminars, writing pre-proposal for dissertation, writing dissertation proposal

 Assessment of learning: Grades on formal seminar presentations based on outcomes rubrics, direct assessment by faculty on pre-proposal and dissertation proposal, publication of research manuscripts, success in getting grant proposals funded.

**Appendix E. (IUPUI)**

**Graduate Student Examination Rubric**

Student Name: (prepopulated) Faculty Examiner: (prepopulated)
Degree Objective: (prepopulated) Faculty Evaluation Score from form: (prepopulated)
Program Code: (prepopulated) College Grouping: (prepopulated)
Major Code: (prepopulated) Department: (prepopulated)
Concentration: (prepopulated)

This evaluation is for:

* MS-Thesis Defense
* PhD-Preliminary Examination
* PhD-Final Examination

**Instructions**

*Please select the answer that best represents your evaluation of the graduate student in the general outcome areas. The data captured in this form is intended for use for accreditation purposes.*

**Outcome 1: Knowledge and Scholarship**

The student has demonstrated the ability to identify and conduct original research, scholarship or creative endeavor in their field of study.

* Exceeds Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Does Not Meet Expectations

**Outcome 2: Communication**

The student has demonstrated the ability to effectively communicate (orally and/or in written form) in their field of study.

* Exceeds Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Does Not Meet Expectations

**Outcome 3: Critical Thinking**

The student has demonstrated the ability think critically, creatively and to effectively solve problems in their field of study.

* Exceeds Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Does Not Meet Expectations

**Outcome 4: Ethical and Responsible Research**

The student has demonstrated the ability to conduct research, scholarly and creative endeavors in an ethical and responsible manner that aligns with best practices in their field of study.

* Exceeds Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Does Not Meet Expectations

**Outcome 5: Professionalism**

The student has demonstrated the attributes of professionalism consistent with the expectations and norms within their field of study.

* Exceeds Expectations
* Meets Expectations
* Does Not Meet Expectations

Additional information concerning this student’s examination performance.

 (text box)

**Appendix F. Links to Graduate Student Tracking Programs at Peer Universities**

D1. University of Wisconsin: (<https://gsts.grad.wisc.edu>)

D2. Northwestern University: <https://www.tgs.northwestern.edu/academic-policies-procedures/gsts.html>

D3. Michigan State University: <https://grad.msu.edu/gradplan>

**Appendix G. Other Graduate Planning and Mentoring Resources**

G1. My Individual Development Plan (MyIDP: for natural / physical sciences programs)

Web Based IDP Tool: <https://myidp.sciencecareers.org/?AspxAutoDetectCookieSupport=1>

My IDP is a web-based career planning tool for early career scientists at the PhD and postdoctoral level.

The tool is based on the “Individual Development Plan for Postdoctoral Fellows” developed by the Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology (FASEB), first released in 2012 but no longer available on the FASEB website.

Initial reference about the individual Development Plan for science career planning: <https://www.science.org/content/article/you-need-game-plan>

G2. Imagine PhD (Individual Development Plans for social sciences and arts & humanities programs)

[https://www.imaginephd.com](https://www.imaginephd.com/)