

**THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT SAN ANTONIO
DOCUMENTS AND PROCEEDINGS OF THE GRADUATE COUNCIL
ACTION MINUTES
ORDER OF BUSINESS**

April 7, 2009

John Peace Library 4.03.08

3:30 p.m.

Present: Gabriel Acevedo, Sonia Alconini (for Michael Cepek), John Alexander, Stuart Birnbaum (for Lance Lambert); Rena Bizios, Norma Cantu, Andrey Chabanov, James Dykes, Roger Enriquez, Walter Ermler; Dorothy Flannagan, Larry Golden, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam, Kim Kline, Gregg Michel, Angelica Nanez, Emeka Nwaeze, Maricela Oliva, Mark Saenz, Can (John) Saygin, Scott Sherer, Howard Smith, Eugene Stone-Romero, Ram Tripathi, Lila Truett, John Warren, Raj Wilson, Weining Zhang

Absent: Shereen Bhalla, Astrid Dewath, Christopher Gonzalez, David Jaffe, Alastair Olive, Jose Weissmann, Yinlong (Allen) Zhang

Excused: Sos Agaian, Michael Cepek, Bill Cooke, Mari Cortez, Karl Eschbach, Lance Lambert, William McCrary, Seyed Moussa Mirehei, Renee Nank, Malgorzata Oleszkiewicz-Peralba, David Romero

Visitors: Bridget Drinka, Chair Department of English
Nancy Martin, Chair, Department of Educational Psychology
Jeremy Sullivan, Assistant Professor of Educational Psychology

I. Call to order and taking of attendance.

Since Dr. William McCrary was unable to attend, Dr. Jim Dykes called the April 7, 2009 meeting of the Graduate Council to order at 3:37 pm. Dr. Dykes happily announced the birth of Everett Allan McCrary and informed the Graduate Council that the McCrary family is doing well despite the 2-hour sleep schedule.

II. Approval of Minutes (Jim Dykes for William McCrary)

The Minutes of the March 3, 2009 meeting were approved.

III. Reports

A. Council Chair (Jim Dykes for William McCrary)

Dr. Dykes noted that Dr. McCrary had explained that there would be a graduate student representative to the University Center Advisory Council.

B. Dean of Graduate School (Dorothy Flannagan)

No Report

C. Secretary (Jim Dykes)

The most up to date list of Graduate Council members for September 2009 (with their terms) was projected and is Attachment A of the Minutes. Despite the busy time in the

semester almost all of the faculty and student representatives for September 2009 are in place. An updated membership list will be distributed for the May 5th meeting.

D. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses (Gabriel Acevedo)

Dr. Dykes moved that the Graduate Council vote to suspend our Bylaws in order to allow our invited guests from Educational Psychology and English to discuss their program proposal and evaluation. His motion was unanimously approved.

Dr. Gabriel Acevedo thanked his committee for their careful review and constructive feedback on the MA in School Psychology proposal (Attachment A in the Agenda). The program's written responses to the committee's questions were so detailed and thorough that the committee unanimously approved the proposal without a face-to-face meeting with the program. In his PowerPoint summary, Dr. Acevedo described the program as preparing the students to work as practitioners (including state licensure and national certification). While the proposal includes a broad set of objectives, the course work is matched to those objectives. He noted that the program will be the only public program in San Antonio. The applied focus needed to prepare the students for licensure is coupled with an evidence-based research component. Dr. Acevedo also noted that specific steps were proposed to actively recruit minority candidates and part-time students in order to allow them to continue working while being enrolled in the program. He described how the 66-hour curriculum was designed to match the broad applied and research goals of the program. It also designed to meet the standards for the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP). After explaining that resources are in place to accomplish the goals, the floor was opened for discussion.

Dr. Howard Smith asked about student funding given the 66-hour curriculum. Dr. Jeremy Sullivan explained that the curriculum is consistent with a state mandated minimum of 60 hours and national requirements. Further, he explained the program is designed to provide flexibility for part-time students. He shared an anecdote of a student accepted to Trinity University's program, but who was unable to enroll in the required 12 hours per semester. This proposal is designed to provide access to full-time teachers who want to take classes part-time. Dr. Smith praised the goal of preparing the students for practicing in South Texas and asked which courses would provide that expertise. Dr. Sullivan cited EDP 6733 (Multicultural Assessment and Intervention), COU 5213 (Counseling Theories), and EDP XXX3 (Assessment of Intelligence and Achievement) as courses that would have a local focus. Dr. Nancy Martin also cited EDP XXX6 (Practicum in School Psychology). Dr. Larry Golden praised the proposal and its accessibility. Both Drs. Sullivan and Martin predicted the program's popularity given the number of phone calls from interested students unable to afford Trinity University's program or unable to commute to San Marcos. Dr. Sullivan also noted the building of community connections, especially with SAISD and NISD. Drs. Raj Wilson and Eugene Stone-Romero asked about faculty. In addition to the two core faculty and the anticipated hiring of two additional faculty, there are support faculty. Many focus their research on regional or minority issues (e.g.; Drs. Norma Guerra, Patricia Quijada, and Kelly Rodgers). The MA in School Psychology proposal passed unanimously.

E. Membership Committee (Scott Sherer)

Dr. Scott Sherer presented the list of four applicants that his committee recommended to be Special Members of the Graduate Faculty (Attachment B in the Agenda). He noted that all held the terminal degree in their field. The list was unanimously approved.

Dr. Sherer reminded the Graduate Council that his committee had proposed a change to our Bylaws at the March 3rd meeting regarding the review process and rights of Special Members of the Graduate Faculty. At the March 3rd meeting, a motion was passed to strike six words (“and/or co-chair thesis and dissertation committees”) from the sentence “Special Members may teach graduate courses and/or serve on graduate committees ~~and/or co-chair thesis and dissertation committees~~ as specifically recommended by the Membership committee and approved by the Graduate Council.” That modified version was emailed as Attachment A of the March 3rd Minutes on March 6th so that we would have the required 30-day review period for our meeting today. The modification was discussed at the Administrative and Agenda meeting on March 17th. The Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) explicitly authorizes Adjoint faculty to supervise theses and dissertations. Since Adjoint faculty are Special Members of the Graduate Faculty, our modification would be inconsistent with the HOP. Since our Bylaws are required to conform to the HOP, we can not vote for the proposed change to our Bylaws with the modification. The original proposal (with the six words intact) was included as Attachment C in the Agenda in order to inform our discussion, but no vote can be taken today due to the 30-day review requirement.

Dr. Sherer discussed the issues of thesis and dissertation committee composition and the inclusion of Adjoint faculty as Special Members with the Graduate Council. Part of the discussion focused on Special Members who are Visiting or Adjunct faculty (not Adjoint faculty). While there was consensus about how important their contributions can be to a student’s thesis or dissertation as committee members, there was no consensus on their role as a potential chair or co-chair. Some members thought they should be able to chair a committee under special circumstances and other members thought they should not be able to co-chair a committee under any circumstance. Other positions discussed included a qualified Special Member being a co-chair as long as a tenured faculty member (or tenure-track faculty member) was the chair (or co-chair) of the student’s committee. A number of people noted the critical importance of having Graduate Faculty members on the committees. An attempt to draft a consensus statement from the floor was unsuccessful.

Dr. Sherer also discussed Adjoint faculty with the Graduate Council. Based on our Bylaws, there are only two categories of Graduate Faculty: Members and Special Members. Thus there is no distinction between Special Members who are Adjoint faculty and Special Members who are Adjunct or Visiting faculty. That poses a problem, because the appointment of Adjoint faculty is specified in a memorandum of agreement between UTSA and their partner organization. Most agreements are currently with SWRI and the UTHSCSA, but there is also a memorandum of agreement with UT Brownsville. Other memoranda of agreement are expected in the future and the list of disciplines is also expected to expand (e.g.; engineering, medicine, physics, biology). Potentially increasing the number of categories within the Graduate Faculty (for instance including a category for Adjoint Special Members) was discussed.

The proposed changes to the Bylaws in terms of the review of Special Members of the Graduate Faculty was tabled and referred back to the committee for a recommendation.

F. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (Norma Cantú)

Dr. Norma Cantú presented the final report for the MA and PhD programs in English (Attachment B). She noted that the reviewers commended the faculty, but recommended hiring more faculty (both assistant professors and endowed senior faculty). They also recommended increasing travel support for both faculty and students. An increase in graduate student stipends was also recommended. Finally, she discussed the issue of the separation between the Writing Program and the English Department. While separate, many of the graduate students in the English Department teach in the Writing Program. The final report was accepted by the Graduate Council.

G. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements (David Romero)

While unable to attend this meeting, Dr. David Romero will report on the Graduate Advisor of Record survey at the May 5th meeting.

IV. Unfinished Business

Dr. Dykes noted that Norma Cavazos had expanded her list of graduate level methods courses (the additional courses were Attachment D in the Agenda).

V. New Business

Dr. John Alexander (a member of the Nominating Committee) presented the committee's proposed slate of officers for the 2009 / 2010 Graduate Council: Drs. Dr. Norma Cantú (for Chair), Jim Dykes (for Secretary), and Lance Lambert (for Parliamentarian). He noted that the Chair of the Graduate Council serves as ex-officio on the executive committee of the Faculty Senate. Consequently the Graduate Council Chair requires ratification by the Faculty Senate. The floor was opened to new candidates and discussion. The slate proposed by the Nominating Committee was unanimously approved.

The Parliamentarian gently reminded the substitute Chair that any proposed change to the Bylaws with regard to categories within the Graduate Faculty would be within the purview of the Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements. Consequently, the Membership Committee and the Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements were charged with considering changes to the review of Special Members and with considering changes to the categories of Graduate Faculty, respectively.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 4:44.

Attachment A

Index	College	Department	Term	Term	2008 Representative	Substitute
1	Architecture	Architecture	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	John Alexander	
2	Business	Accounting	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Erneka Nwaeze	
3		Economics	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Lila Truett	
4		Finance	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	John Wald	Karan Bhanot
5		Information Systems & Technology Management	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Myung Ko	
6		Management	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Rudy Sandoval	
7		Management Science and Statistics	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Ram Tripathi	
8		Marketing	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Joel Saeger	Ashok Lalwani
9	CoEHD	Bicultural-Bilingual Studies	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Howard Smith	Francis Hult
10		Counseling	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Heather Trepal	Larry Golden
11		Educational Leadership and Policy Studies	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Felicia Briscoe	
12		Health and Kinesiology	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Bill Cooke	Sara Oswald
13		Interdisciplinary Learning and Teaching	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011		
14	Engineering	Biomedical Engineering	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Rena Bizios	
15		Civil Engineering	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Jose Weissmann	
16		Electrical and Computer Engineering	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	need runoff / by meeting	
17		Mechanical Engineering	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Can Saygin	
18	CoLFA	Anthropology	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Michael Cepek (class SP)	Sonia Alonini
19		Art and Art History	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011		
20		Communication	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Kim Kline	Paul LeBlanc
21		English	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Norma Cantu	
22		History	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011		
23		Modern Languages and Literatures	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Francisco Marcos-Marin	
24		Music	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	William McCray	John Nix
25		Political Science and Geography	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Sharon Navarro	
26		Psychology	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Jim Dykes	
27		Sociology	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Gabriel Acevedo	
28	CoPP	Criminal Justice	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Roger Enriquez	
29		Demography and Organization Studies	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Mary Zey	Johelle Sparks
30		Public Administration	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Renee Nank	
31		Social Work	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Mary Kay Houston-Vega	Jolyn Mikow
32	Sciences	Biology	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011		
33		Chemistry	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011	Don Kurtz	Walter Ermier
34		Computer Science	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Weining Zhang	Daniel Jimenez
35		Geological Sciences	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Lance Lambert	Stuart Birnbaum
36		Mathematics	1 year	SEP 2009- MAY 2010	Raj Wilson (class)	Rich Richardson
37		Physics and Astronomy	2 years	SEP 2009- MAY 2011		
38	Architecture	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009		
39	Business	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	Anjali Gupta	
40	CoEHD	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	??Ryan Sprott	??Christopher Kibbe
41	Engineering	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	Brian Smith	
42	CoLFA	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	Anne S. Reamey	
43	CoPP	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	?? Angelica Nanez??	
44	Sciences	Student Representatives elected annually	1 year	SEP 2008- MAY 2009	Julie Bland	

Attachment B

PROGRAM EVALUATION
OF THE
UTSA MA and PhD Programs in English

Report Submitted to the Graduate Council
by the
Graduate Program Evaluation Committee

April 2009

GRADUATE PROGRAM EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Graduate Program Evaluation Committee (GPEC) of the Graduate Council upon review affirms that the external reviewers, Professors Alfred Bendixen, Texas A&M University, Louis Mendoza, University of Minnesota and Rajani Sudan, Southern Methodist University offered a useful assessment of the MA and PhD programs overall performance. We concur with the external reviewers recommendations as they impact both programs. A summary of their recommendations appears below and a more detailed report follows:

FACULTY

Hire more assistant professors in and seek more endowed positions at the senior level.
Fill gaps in all areas but especially the critical area of Composition and Rhetoric.
Provide more financial support for faculty research and travel.
The reviewers commended the faculty for their support and mentorship of the students.

STUDENTS

Limited funding was a great concern on various levels: The travel allotment of \$400 a year is insufficient; the fellowship stipends are eaten away by tuition increases; students entering with an MA and those entering with a BA are equally funded for 5 years. They wrote that this latter practice is "peculiar and unfair."
They note that since the PhD program is new, it provides an opportunity to implement a tracking system.

PROGRAMMATIC AND CURRICULAR ISSUES

Expand the curricular offerings in Composition and Rhetoric: "Curriculum needs to be expanded to reflect the stated commitment to this area of strength."
Rethink the decision to separate Writing Program from the English Department to ensure a clear alignment between theory and practice for graduate students.
The MA program was found to be solid and strong, yet, scheduling class size according to room size was found to be problematic.

Norma E. Cantú, GPEC Chair

GPEC REVIEW OF THE PROGRAM EVALUATION FOR THE MA AND PHD IN ENGLISH

The GPEC has reviewed the English MA and Ph.D. Program Evaluation. The following report is based on a number of different sources:

- The Self Study for the MA and PhD Programs in English dated January 2009
- Personal observations during the external review conducted on March 2, 2009
- And the external review submitted by Profs. Alfred Bendixen, Texas A&M University, Louis Mendoza, University of Minnesota and Rajani Sudan, Southern Methodist University

Present at the initial meeting with the external reviewers were Drs. Dorothy Flannagan (Dean of the Graduate School), Augustine Osman (Associate Dean for Graduate Studies for COLFA), Bridget Drinka (Chair of the English Department), Norma E. Cantú (GAR for the doctoral program and representing the GPEC), Linda Woodson (GAR for the MA program. The visitors had previously gone on an informal tour of the facilities on campus and had met the administrative assistants in the Department and in the English Graduate office. At different times during the day, they met with faculty and with doctoral and MA students. The students candidly expressed their views and answered questions. Faculty engaged with particular aspects of the program, such as Catherine Kasper, Director of the Creative Writing Program, also met with the visitors and answered their questions. In their External Evaluation Report, the reviewers offered a number of suggestions, both general and specific. Upon review in April 2009, the GPEC has determined that the external reviewers made a fair and accurate assessment of the programs' strength and weaknesses and offered a useful assessment of the programs overall performance.

The report that follows breaks down their assessment and recommendations into the main areas: faculty, students, and programmatic and curricular issues. Basing their comments on the self-study and their meetings with faculty, students, administrators and staff, they noted that there is a need for an expanded curriculum and several new hires in order to fulfill the goals of the graduate programs at UTSA.

BACKGROUND OF THE MA AND PHD PROGRAMS IN ENGLISH

The older MA program and the seven-year old PhD program in English serve the needs of a growing population. While the doctoral program is relatively new, accepting its first cohort in 2002 and just now graduating the first doctoral students (3 so far), the MA program has an established record and graduates a significant number of students every year. According to the Self Study, the programs "prepare students for the twenty-first century challenges of cultural diversity in English language and literary studies." The document further states: "The programs enable student to advance in the field of English by studying various approaches to diverse literatures, preparing to teach literature and writing, and developing the intellectual, critical and research skills necessary for professional excellence." In addition, the programs offer an option of acquiring a Creative Writing Certificate.

FACULTY

As evidenced in the curriculum vitae and research accomplishments submitted in the self-study and as assessed by the reviewers, the program has strong core and associated faculty but in their overview and again in the section on curriculum, the reviewers strongly urged the addition of new hires both at the assistant and associate levels with the added urging to increase the faculty in the areas that the programs most need: Composition and Rhetoric and Native American literature.

The report states: "We are concerned that the department has apparently experienced a loss of about ten positions since the start of the PhD program." They "strongly urge the development of a hiring plan supported and endorsed by the central administration which will lead to the hiring of new assistant professors to support a growing program as well as a commitment to attracting more endowed professorships."

Another aspect of need that they identified centered on the need to enhance the area of Composition and Rhetoric.

In their conversations with students they found that the students consider their professors as excellent mentors and guides. They reported that the students “spoke eloquently about of a community of faculty and students that fostered support, collaboration, and encouraged interdisciplinary research.” They also commended the faculty orally at the concluding meeting with the GARs.

Reviewers found faculty well qualified and recognized that the demands on the existing faculty are onerous. They recommended that the department “explore the development of break out discussion sections for its large lecture courses and also to insure that class size is consistent with student learning objectives.”

They also recommended that the university “seek means of enhancing the financial resources available” because they felt that more support for faculty is essential; the reviewers felt that “the current annual allotment (for travel) of less than \$600 is incommensurate with the aspirational goals of an institution seeking R-1 status.” As they wrote:

“It is clear to us that faculty require and deserve significantly more financial support for research and travel.”

STUDENTS

The reviewers found that the students’ most dire need is for financial support. Along with concern that the \$400 stipend for travel that students receive is insufficient, they said “More significantly, the stipends students receive do not reflect the cost of tuition and fees which rise each year while the stipend does not. If the university wishes to draw the kind of non-traditional student who seems ideally suited for this focus on transnational literatures, then it needs to recognize the need to increase both the level and the kinds of support that are available.” They also noted that “the current level of support provided is not competitive with funding offered by peer institutions.” Alongside this is the need for a better library since students have to rely on interlibrary loan and the web for core research projects. According to the reviewers, their conversation with the students “revealed their enormous enthusiasm for the program and its faculty.”

PROGRAMMATIC AND CURRICULAR ISSUES

The reviewers commended the department for “targeting the two areas of focus for the PhD program: Cross-Cultural and Transnational Literature with an emphasis on Latina/o Literatures and Rhetoric and Composition.” Citing the need in these areas that are not being met by other graduate programs, they commended and expressed enthusiasm for the graduate program.

Overall they recommended specific changes, including reassessing the wisdom of having the writing program placed outside of the English department.

Facilities and Physical Space

The reviewers found that the programs’ success will also depend on how the department space needs are met. They specifically said that “it will need the office space for new hires and the kinds of classrooms that allow a strong curriculum to flourish, particularly comfortable and well-equipped seminar rooms that enhance the educational environment and demonstrate concretely the university’s respect for the program” adding that “planning for the growth of what promises to be a healthy and dynamic graduate program should be a priority for the institution.”

Website and Recruitment Plan

The reviewers recommend that the department find way to “foreground its strengths and build a larger national reputation.” One way they see this happening is the use of the web. And they concluded that it was not clear to them from the material they reviewed and the conversations with administration that the department is a part of the university plans for development and support.