THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
Minutes
December 3, 2019

JPL ASSEMBLY ROOM
4.04.22
3:30-5:00PM

Matthew Brogdon recorded minutes in the Secretary’s absence.

I. Call to order and taking of attendance:


Excused: Patricia Jaramillo, Nicolas Large, Elaine Sanders, Jennifer Smith, Corey Sparks, Marie Tilleyer, Laura Upenieks.


II. Reports

1. Council Chair (Alistair Welchman)

A. Motion to move chair’s comments on bylaws to after the dean’s comments. Moved, seconded, and passed without objection.

B. Consent agenda, including minutes from November meeting and special memberships, passed without objection

C. Following up on solicitation of feedback from departments in November meeting, the chair solicited views from members on the need to revisit new policy on incompletes:

   i. Reported feedback via email from Public Administration council representative indicating some concerns about impact on graduate students and from Physics and Astronomy council representative indicating vigorous opposition to the new policy.

   ii. History council representative indicated departmental support for the new policy, reasoning that students not eligible for withdrawal and unable to complete course requirements within a year are not equipped to complete their graduate programs.
iii. Management’s council representative indicated majority opposition to the new policy.

iv. Criminology and Criminal Justice council representative is in favor of new policy provided there is a means of petitioning for exceptions.

v. Anthropology council representative is interested in pursuing alternatives to the automatic F, such as converting the course to a no-credit course on the transcript. Noted that such an approach is utilized at some aspirants.

vi. Music is generally opposed to the policy.

vii. Social Work council representative expressed opposition to the policy, noting the many exceptional circumstances that have arisen in the past. The previous policy

viii. Mechanical Engineering council representative expressed overwhelming support for new policy.

ix. Information Systems and Cybersecurity council representative expressed support for the policy.

x. Bicultural-Bilingual Studies council representative reported strong opposition to the new policy.

Straw poll indicated 11 members in favor of revisiting; 11 in favor of leaving policy in place; 5 abstentions

2. **Graduate School Dean’s Report (Ambika Mathur):**

A. Update on Grad Student Success Task Force: Considered barriers to success. Subgroups reported back findings and suggestions for improvement. Solicited participation in sub-groups. Solicited feedback via website, direct email, or anonymous written feedback. Looking to send out a survey to students and faculty, pending IRB approval, by mid-January. Aiming to submit recommendations to the provost by late March.

3. **Council Chair (Alistair Welchman):**

A. Pursuant to earlier motion, chair returned to question of bylaws change.

B. The Senate made two amendments to the bylaws revision, which the chair felt was:

i. The first ensured that departments lacking Ph.D. programs would remain eligible for full graduate faculty membership and to serve on dissertation committees in other department’s “where appropriate.”

ii. The second was in response to faculty workload guidance document, which referred to graduate faculty membership as a necessary condition of attaining research intensive workload status. The amendment indicated that no workload policy may utilize distinction between graduate faculty scholars and graduate faculty members in establishing workload.

iii. Chad Mahood, speaking for the Faculty Senate at the invitation of Dean Mathur, indicated that he received clarification from provost that guideline document is meant to refer to all those on graduate faculty, whether having scholar status or full membership
status. Also received in writing from provost’s office confirmation that the workload
guidance document is 100 percent flexible and subject to revision and implementation
by college-level workload committees.
iv. Dean Mathur reinforced Mahood’s point that the definition of graduate faculty was
intended to be broadly construed to include all those with graduate faculty status of any
kind.

4. Secretary (Elaine Sanders):
   i. No Report

5. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (Jurgen Engelberth):
   A. Jurgen Engelberth reported that the Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation was engaged
      in exploring alterations or expansions in the role of the committee in graduate program
      assessment.
      i. Past practice had involved the committee reading the reviewers’ report and adding its
         own comments after the fact. Jurgen recommends expanding the role of the GC in the
         assessment process given the long intervals (10 years) between assessments. There is no
         impediment to our doing so and the GC has freedom to craft its own role in the
         evaluation process.
      ii. Suggests possibilities:
          1. Active participation in the evaluation process
          2. Looking at the financial status of programs at intervals closer than 10 years
          3. Periodic follow-up on program evaluation using data from Office of Institutional
             Intelligence to gauge progress in addressing improvements recommended by
             evaluators.

6. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements (No Chair):
   A. No Report

III. Unfinished Business

IV. New Business

V. Adjournment
   A. Moved and seconded. Passed without objection.