The eighth meeting of the Graduate Council for the 2000-2001 academic year was held in room 4.03.08 John Peace Library Building, May 3, 2001.


Absent: John Adams, Sos Agaian, Ron Alexander, Virginia Balderas, Robert J. Bayley, Blandina Cardenas, James Chambers, Aaron Cassill, Brian Davies, Keith Fairchild, Larry Golden, Luis Haro, Rosalind Horowitz, Neil Maurer, Alan Morris, Frank Pino, Mary Helen Pratte, Andra Schreiner, Kasey Songy, Amparo Villanueva

Excused: Mark Alford, Frances Colpitt, Glenn Dietrich, Amir Karimi, Kenneth Wunderlich

I. Call to order and taking of attendance

Dr. Armstrong called the meeting to order at 4:42 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the April 2001 meeting were approved as distributed.

III. Reports

A. Council Chair

Dr. Armstrong summarized the Graduate Colloquium included topics discussed during the break-out-sessions. The attached are notes taken from each session assigned to faculty. Dr. Armstrong briefly commented on each topic. (Attachment A)

B. Interim Dean of Graduate Studies

1. Dr. Reesman reported that Dr. David Johnson expressed interest in sponsoring a retreat to discuss future planning of graduate programs at UTSA. Dr. Reesman commented that a plan should be discussed in order to respond to Dr. Johnson’s invitation.

2. Dr. Reesman reported on the results of the Graduate Student Research Conference and presented an update on the Office of Graduate Studies. Following are the main topics she covered:

- announced that the University Assembly approved the two proposed doctoral programs in Music Psychology and the Cell and Molecular Biology. The collaborative efforts of the UTHSCSA and UTSA have brought this proposal to fruition. She commented that the BioEngineering proposal came in too late to be considered by the committee. Dr. Reesman gave thanks to Dr. Amberg and the Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses for their hard work in reviewing the programs;
- commented on the legislature’s action on the Life Science Institute and the “flagship” funding;
- thanked Dr. Armstrong, the committee chairs and the Council for their work this year and briefly touched on the accomplishment this academic year;
- commented on the question asked by several faculty as to why some disciplines have Ph.Ds and others don’t, and that the fact is that some faculty
are more committed and do not give up on the long and arduous process needed to plan, prepare and present the proposals;
• Dr. Reesman referred to the attached chart (Attachment B) and pointed out the need to increase external funds for new degree programs;
• announced that she asked Dr. Bailey not to consider her for the permanent position and that she would like to return to teaching and research at the end of the summer. Dr. Reesman expressed her gratitude and satisfaction on the goals she accomplished in adding new programs, securing funding for graduate students, and expanding the graduate studies staff and recruiting.

Dr. Reesman said that she would prepare a full report and submit to the Chair, Dr. Armstrong, and Dr. Bailey, Provost and Vice President for Academic Affairs.

C. Secretary

1. Dr. Walz had to leave early and Dr. Armstrong presented her report. The email vote for the evaluation of the Master of Science in Accounting was favorable and approved by the majority of the Council.

2. Dr. Armstrong then asked that Dr. Bunch, Chair, Nomination Committee, to present the slate of nominees for the 2001-2002 Graduate Council Committees. A list was distributed for consideration but Dr. Bunch added that a few revisions were necessary. After discussion, a motion was made and seconded to accept the list with the revisions discussed and approved as listed in Attachment C.

D. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses

1. The Committee Chair reported that the committee recommended acceptance of the MS in Statistics. This was passed unanimously.

2. The Committee Chair reported that the Graduate Council has a critical role to play in academic governance of the university. The Council has to approve new degree programs before they can be forwarded to the Senate and eventually to the UT System.

To be effective, the Council’s review of proposals for new degrees must be timely. There are two timeliness issues. First, the Graduate Programs Committee must have enough time to make a serious review of proposals. Often such a review entails working with the faculty involved to improve the proposal. E.g. the biomedical engineering degree proposal came to the Committee simply too late to allow a serious review.

The second timeliness issue has to do with the stage in the process at which the Graduate Council conducts its review. Sometimes proposals come to the Committee after major decisions about a degree program have been all but made. This situation puts the Committee in an awkward position: they would like to be constructive, but when there are major issues involved it is easier to play a constructive role earlier in the process when those commitments are being made. E.g. the Statistics Degree proposal to change the name of the degree came to the Committee after the decision to move the program had already been made...but moving the program seemed to be the most important change.

Also, the biomedical engineering degree proposal—while not ready for a recommendation to the Council—has come to us in a form that suggests that there is no question that such a program should be created and that its administrative structure is not a debatable issue. Big issues such as the allocation of financial resources and the administrative structure of a program are critical issues of faculty governance.

The suggestion was that the Graduate Council or the Faculty Senate become involved in the development of proposals at an earlier stage. Perhaps the Senate President and the chair of the Graduate Programs Committee could be part of the consultations that are conducted by the office of the Dean of Graduate Studies before a proposal is actually sent.
With respect to the Biomedical Engineering Degree program, the committee had no formal report and no recommendation. This will remain pending until the fall.

E. Membership Committee

Eight individuals were recommended for membership, four as members and four as special members. The council accepted all.

F. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation

No report

G. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements

No report.

IV. Unfinished Business

None.

V. New Business

None.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.
Summary of Graduate Colloquium Discussion, Spring 2001
Office of Graduate Studies
Jeanne Reesman, Interim Dean

Quality
(need work on “image,” reputation; shift in identity to research institution; placing students in doctoral programs; marketing oneself—portfolios? hire more nationally recognized scholars and publicize the ones we’ve got; experiences with research need publicity among students and community—students, industry people, and professors from other disciplines as research partners; successful grant proposals)

Teaching vs. Research Expectations
(course releases, start-ups, sabbaticals, summer support, 2-tiered faculty; does present merit system encourage mediocrity?)

Resources
(need more for existing programs as well as proposed ones, including doctoral fellowship, recruitment, small grant money; increase use of TA’s and RA’s; new Graduate Incremental guidelines approved by the System mean more money for students but less for other kinds of college recruiting; more graders with larger courses; new hires; space; library; equipment)

Educating Faculty on How the Institution Works
(strengthen faculty governance, clarify workload policy [and all policies]; strengthen cross-disciplinary, cross-institutional infrastructures)

Existing Faculty, New Faculty
(salary compression, mentoring, professionalism)

Community
(community-based adult learning in underserved areas; develop research areas that are community-oriented; need a “diversity pipeline” into our graduate programs including early identification, nurturing, housing, financial aid; lack of community among faculty)

Need International Programs Office

Humanities Undervalued, Underfunded
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Research and Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project A</td>
<td>Description of Research and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project B</td>
<td>Description of Research and Experience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project C</td>
<td>Description of Research and Experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please review the attached documents for detailed information on the project progress and research outcomes.

Note: The table above is a placeholder for actual data that will be provided in the attached documents.
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and two at large, minimum of three
members of the Graduate Council
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