

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

December 4, 2007

**John Peace Library 4.03.08
3:30 p.m.**

Present: Sos Agaian, John Alexander, Michael Cepek, Andrey Chabanov, Mari Cortez, Ashley Curtiss, James Dykes, Walter Ermler, Juanita Firestone, Dorothy Flannagan, Larry Golden, Judith K. Haschenburger (substitute for Stuart Birnbaum), Sara Hohne, Kim Kline, William McCrary, Gregg Michael, Alokparna (Sonia) Monga, Emeka Nwaeze, Malgozata Oleszkiewicz-Peralba, Ben Olguin, Maricela Oliva, James Ordner, Terri Pantuso, David Romero, Scott Sherer, Thankam Sunil, Ram Tripathi, Lila Truett, John Warren, Wan X. Yao, Weining Zhang

Absent: Cheryl Alderman, Andrew Bates, Karl Eschbach, Julie Gresham-Guerra, David Jaffe, Can (John) Saygin, Drew Stephen, Ryan Weekley

Excused: Rena Bizios, Mary Bollinger, Fengxin Chen, Elizabeth De La Portilla, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam, Heywood Sanders, Eugene Stone-Romero

Visitor:

Beth Durodoye, Provost Fellow for Graduate School
Art Hernandez, Chair of Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) Team 6 and Associate Dean of College of Education and Human Development
Gerry Dizinno, Member of Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP) Team 6 and Associate Vice Provost, Institutional Research Office
Steve Wilkerson, Assistant Vice Provost of Assessment, Institutional Research Office
Taeg Nishimoto, Associate Dean of College of Architecture
William Dupont, Professor of Architecture (for Historic Preservation)
Richard Tangum, Professor of Architecture (for Urban and Regional Planning)

I. Call to order and taking of attendance.

The laptop projection system had to be replaced. Consequently, the December 4, 2007 meeting of the Graduate Council was called to order at 3:57 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes (William McCrary)

The Minutes of the November 6, 2007 meeting were approved.

III. Reports

A. Council Chair (William McCrary)

Dr. McCrary introduced Drs. Art Hernandez (Chair of HOP Team 6), Gerry Dizinno (member of HOP Team 6), and Steve Wilkerson (Associate Provost of Assessment). He proposed that the Graduate Council suspend our Bylaws and welcome them as visitors without vote to explain the implications to the Graduate Council of the recommended changes to the HOP regarding program review. His proposal passed unanimously.

Dr. Hernandez explained that his Team 6 has proposed changes to academic program assessment (old HOP 2.21) and academic program review (old HOP 2.39). Program assessment is on-going and emphasizes student learning, while program review is periodic and full-scale. He noted that the proposals by each of the teams and the full HOP committee were strictly with regard to enduring policy. Procedures can change rapidly, so they were separated from policy and removed from the HOP. The Team 6 proposal for academic program review (old HOP 2.39) was distributed (Attachment A).

Dr. Dizinno noted that the old HOP called for review of both undergraduate and graduate programs. While the Graduate Council has conducted reviews of the graduate programs, no reviews have been done of the undergraduate programs. In this proposal, the focus is on the department (both undergraduate and graduate) and includes a number of measures of academic quality (e.g.; faculty, library, and resources). Noting that the draft version distributed was time-stamped 10:30AM on 8/01/07, Dr. Jim Dykes suggested that the 9/25/2007 draft version distributed on 26 September was the current draft. That draft (Attachment B) separated undergraduate program review from graduate program review. Dr. Dizinno explained that the combined HOP committee had not voted on the subsequent draft pending review by the Graduate Council. Hence the Team 6 draft distributed (Attachment A) is the current draft.

Three parts of the proposal were highlighted. First, the review cycle was recommended to be 7 years. That was about the modal review cycle with many as short as 3 or 5 years and others as long as 10 years. Second, the review would have three major components: a self-assessment report, an academic plan, and a report of an external review team. Third, an expedited review would be performed for programs with external accreditation in order to avoid duplication of work.

Drs. Scott Sherer and Lila Truett asked about flexibility in the cycle, especially since some programs have a 10-year accreditation cycle. Dr. Dizinno explained that the "7 year cycle" proposal was a draft and could be changed to "regular cycle". He further noted that the Provost needs to help with resources and to minimize redundancy. As an example, he cited Virginia as an example in response to a funding question asked by Dr. Kim Kline. In the example, the Provost pays airfare and housing for one outside reviewer every seven years. Drs. Juanita Firestone and Emeka Nwaeze asked about the purpose of and the enforcement mechanisms of the review, especially if the self-assessment is negative. Both Drs. Hernandez and Dizinno emphasized that the reviews will be designed to facilitate program improvement and development. Dean Flannagan noted that, in the past, no review has been terrible. Sometimes an area can be improved and the Graduate Council committee can meet with the Dean to help with resources. No previous review has been punitive. Dr. Hernandez commented that the outside review, similar to Graduate Council review, has a broader perspective and can help leverage additional resources. Dr. Dizinno specifically noted the strong incentive that accreditation provides to accounting. He also noted that the review is directed by the Provost and thus the report can have an impact. Dr. Weining Zhang asked about the process of revising the HOP and about establishing the procedures to implement the HOP policies. The HOP revisions will be reviewed by the Faculty Senate, Legal Affairs, and Campus Management & Operations. Modifications to the policies in the HOP also require approval by the UT Board of Regents. The expected time line is about a year. The University sets the procedures; especially the Provost working with Deans,

Department Chairs, and faculty. Policies relevant to Graduate Programs are specifically reviewed by Dean Flannagan and the Graduate Council.

B. Dean of Graduate School (Dorothy Flannagan)

No report.

C. Secretary (Jim Dykes)

Dr. Jim Dykes reported that Dr. Scott Sherer was elected Chair of the Membership Committee and thanked him for his service.

D. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses (Thankam Sunil)

Dr. McCrary introduced Drs. Taeg Nishimoto, William Dupont, and Richard Tangum as invited guests to help us discuss the Graduate Certificate proposals in Historic Preservation and in Urban & Regional Planning within the College of Architecture. The Graduate Council accepted his request that we suspend our Bylaws with regard to visitors.

Dr. Thankam Sunil reminded the Graduate Council that there are currently programs leading to the BS in Architecture, BS in Interior Design, Master of Architecture, and MS in Architecture. Two new graduate certificate proposals would complement the current offerings. Dr. Sunil said that the proposed Graduate Certificate in Historic Preservation is designed to offer specialized education in historic preservation design, technology, planning and management through graduate level courses in architecture and related disciplines. While there is currently a directed elective in historic preservation, certification would provide an opportunity to complete the curriculum. Given our historic sites and cultural heritage, not having a formal degree in this field is an important gap and filling the gap would provide numerous job opportunities. The required 15 credit hours of graduate courses would include six hours of required courses and nine hours of courses selected from an approved list. No additional funds, faculty, or resources are needed. The two required courses would be offered annually and the additional courses would be offered at least once every four semesters.

Dr. Sunil explained that the proposed Graduate Certificate in Urban and Regional Planning is designed to develop a greater understanding of urban and regional planning problems, planning process, and the development of physical and policy plan scenarios for urban, regional, and international solutions. Students would be prepared to act as effective contributors and members of inter-disciplinary and design teams in the public and private sectors. The Department of Labor predicts a 10 percent increase in employment in urban and regional planning in the next five years and one of the fastest job growth areas is occurring in professional and technical services within the private sector. While there is a growing interest among students, no university in the South Texas region offers a certificate program in urban and regional planning. This certificate proposal would also require 15 credit hours of graduate courses, but nine hours are required courses (Urban & Regional Planning History & Theory, Introduction to Urban Design & Regional Physical Planning, and International Community Planning & Design) and six hours of courses would be selected from an approved list. As with the Historic Preservation proposal; no additional funds, faculty, or resources are needed to implement the Urban and Regional planning proposal. Again, required courses would be offered

annually and additional courses would be offered at least once every four semesters. Dr. Sunil recommended approval of both certificate proposals.

There were two questions about the curricula. Dr. Maricela Oliva asked about the list of proposed courses. Dr. Tangum explained that all proposed courses are already in the current inventory. Dr. Emeka Nwaeze asked about the 3 required courses versus 2 required courses between the two proposals. Drs. Tangum and Dupont explained that the programs are different and that there is no set formula. They both agreed that a total of five courses would be appropriate for each certificate.

Dr. Zhang asked about potential students for the certificate programs. Dr. Tangum explained that they mainly would be from among the 200 graduate students in Architecture and Public Policy attending the Downtown campus. Dr. Juanita Firestone asked if the certificate programs might undermine current and future masters programs drawing on the same Downtown campus students. Dr. Tangum explained that the certificate programs would draw additional students that needed a level of expertise, but were unable to complete a 2-year program. Dr. Sherer asked if certificate students would need to complete prior work in a masters program. Drs. Tangum and Nishimoto explained that that would not be necessary, since the certificates are completely separate from the masters degree plans. For example, a person in a Business degree plan could complete one of these certificates.

Dr. McCrary thanked the visitors. Dr. Sunil explained that the proposals included input from employers and local agencies in addition to the surveys of student interest. Both certificate proposals were passed unanimously. Dr. Flannagan said that additional certificate proposals were anticipated for the Spring, including two in Music and one in Educational Leadership.

E. Membership Committee (Scott Sherer)

Dr. Sherer reported that five people had been recommended by a majority of his Committee to become Special Members of the Graduate Faculty: Drs. Hitoshi Kita, Mary Bakich MacDougall, Gregory P. Mark, Izhak Nir, and Robert S. Thompson. The applications for four additional people (Drs. John B. Gruber, Necip Guven, Charles E. Roberts, and Ronald Sweet) had arrived too late for full committee review, but had been unanimously approved by three committee members. All would serve on student committees. All nine were approved by the Graduate Council. Dr. Sherer noted that an application for Dr. Corey Sparks had been submitted. Since Dr. Sparks is tenure-track faculty, he is automatically a Regular Member of the Graduate Faculty.

F. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (Ben Olguin)

Dr. Ben Olguin distributed the current schedule of graduate program review. He asked that the members of the Graduate Council review the schedule and email him about any questions at ben.olguin@utsa.edu. In particular he asked that the implementation date of new programs be confirmed and reminded the Graduate Council that new programs are reviewed five years after implementation and every 10 years thereafter. One correction was noted and the revised schedule is Attachment C.

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

Dr. David Romero reported there was not general agreement on many of the issues concerning student dismissal and readmission. Consequently, his committee only recommends standardization of the deadlines and changing the word “should” to “must”. He noted the changes from the current paragraph to the proposed paragraph.

Current language: A letter containing all explanations, recommendations, or doctors’ statements in support of the student’s request for reinstatement should be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School on or before June 15 for Fall Semesters, October 15 for Spring Semesters, or March 15 for Summer Semesters.

Proposed change: A petition letter containing all explanations, recommendations, or doctors’ statements in support of the student’s request for reinstatement must be submitted to the Dean of the Graduate School. The deadlines for the reinstatement petition, and all supporting documentation, are: June 15 for Fall Semesters, October 15 for Spring Semesters, or March 15 for Summer Semesters.

In response to a question by Dr. John Alexander about whether there would be a deadline by which a student must file a petition (e.g.; two years), Dr. Romero said that the only restriction would be that the student would wait one long term. In response to a question by Dr. Malgozata Oleszkiewicz-Peralba, Dr. Romero explained there was no proposed limit on the number of petitions for readmission. Dr. Sherer asked whether having non-uniform policies might pose a problem for those programs with stricter policies. Dr. Romero did not anticipate a problem given documentation and clear guidelines about the petition letter. Dr. Romero’s proposal was unanimously approved.

IV. **Unfinished Business**

None

V. **New Business**

Dr. Firestone raised the issue of a program’s Graduate Advisor of Record (GAR) needing to be on campus over the Summer. She is on a 9-month contract. Instead of teaching over the Summer, such faculty often focus on their research (which may be off-site) and/or do consulting. She suggested that a 2-month, \$1000 GAR stipend was low for those faculty focusing on research or consulting. Dean Flannagan noted the July 1st deadline for Fall admissions and differences between Colleges in terms of GAR responsibilities over the Summer. She recommended Departmental review and suggested it might be a topic discussed with Associate Deans or the Deans’ Council. Dr. McCrary suggested it might be a topic for the Faculty Senate. Dr. Olguin suggested making the topic an agenda item for the Graduate Council, which would then make a recommendation to the Faculty Senate. Dr. McCrary assigned it to Dr. Romero’s Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements.

VI. **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:51.

Attachment A

2.39 Academic Program Review

This policy pertains to requirements for Academic Program Reviews. Specific details regarding the procedures to be used will be provided by the Provost.

1. Purpose

The purpose of Academic Program Review is to improve the quality of instruction, research, student learning and success, community service and public service provided by the university and in accordance with its Mission.

2. Focus of the Review

Every degree program (including minors), licensure program, and all extended education programs within an academic department will be reviewed during the designated Academic Program Review period for that department. The review schedule (see below) will ensure that degree programs administered by a University unit other than a Department or more than one department or other university entity are conducted on a timely basis and/or coordinated appropriately.

3. Scheduling of Reviews

All programs within a Department or other University unit will be reviewed on a seven year cycle. A detailed schedule of reviews will be determined by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the Deans of each of the colleges and any other University unit which administers a program subject to review.

4. Types of Reviews

- a. Regular Review - for all degree programs that are not accredited by an external agency.
- b. Expedited Review - for all degree programs that are accredited by an external agency.

5. Review Content and Process

a. Regular Review

i. Reports

- o Self-Assessment Report: is evaluative in nature and is written by the faculty members of the Academic Department or other University unit which is home to the particular program(s) under review. Each Department will determine how it's goals have been met in each of the following areas for each program at all levels:
 - Student Success - including student learning outcomes, graduation, retention, student support structures and processes, and responsiveness to student needs. For graduate programs, statements of student research experiences and productivity are also required.
 - Academic Quality - including admissions standards, degree requirements and procedures, the breadth and depth of the curriculum; instruction methods and instructional effectiveness, faculty preparation and development (qualifications), scope of faculty scholarship, faculty productivity, research funding, academic support services and facilities including library, equipment, and technical support.
 - Planning - an analysis of the congruence of the Department's Mission, Goals and Objectives to those of the university, UT System, and state.
 - Resource Efficiency - an analysis of the utilization of human and fiscal resources in support of the University's, College's and Department's academic mission.

- Academic Plan - written by the department, which describes - based upon the analysis and evaluation provided in the Self-Assessment Report - what goals will be met over the next seven years and the specifies strategies that will be used to meet those goals, including timelines. The plan should include any specific modifications to program (i.e. admissions requirements, course requirements, etc.) consequent to the findings of the Self Assessment.
 - Report of External Review Team- an external review team will be appointed by the Provost, in consultation with the Dean of the college containing the Department under review and the University Graduate Council (for all departments containing a graduate program). This review team will evaluate the Self-Assessment Report and the Academic Plan submitted by the faculty.
- b. Expedited Review - for all departments/degree programs that are accredited by an external agency.

i. Reports

- Summary of Findings and Recommendations of External Agency.
- Supplemental Report - to provide information regarding essential elements of the Regular Review Self-Assessment Report that are not included in the external agency report.
- Academic Plan - provided if the external agency report does not include a plan for improvement.

Attachment B

Chapter 2

Faculty and Academics**2.39 Academic Undergraduate Program Review**

This policy pertains to requirements for Academic Undergraduate Program Review. Specific details regard the procedures to be used will be provided by the Provost.

I. Purpose

The purpose of Academic Program Review is to improve the quality of instruction, research, student learning and success, community service and public service provided by the university and in accordance with its mission.

II. Focus of the Review

Every undergraduate degree program (including minors), licensure program, and all extended education programs within and including the academic department will be reviewed during the designated Academic Undergraduate Program Review period for that department. The review schedule (see below) will ensure that undergraduate degree programs administered by a University unit other than a Department or more than one department or other university entity are conducted on a timely basis and/or coordinated appropriately.

III. Scheduling of Reviews

All undergraduate degree programs within a Department or other University unit will be reviewed on a seven year cycle. A detailed schedule of undergraduate reviews will be determined by the Office of the Provost in consultation with the Deans of each of the colleges and any other University unit which administers a program subject to review.

IV. Types of Reviews

A. Regular Review: for all undergraduate degree programs and departments that are not accredited by an external agency.

B. Expedited Review: for all undergraduate degree programs and departments that are accredited by an external agency.

V. Review Content and ProcessA. Regular Review1. Reports

a. Self-Assessment Report: is evaluative in nature and is written by the faculty members of the Academic Department or other University unit which is home to the particular undergraduate program(s) under review. Each Department will determine how it's goals have been met in each of the following areas:

i. Student success: at all levels, including student learning outcomes, graduation, retention, student support structures and processes, and responsiveness to student needs.

ii. Academic quality: including admissions degree requirements and procedures, the breadth and depth of the curriculum; instructional methods and instructional effectiveness, faculty preparation and development (qualifications), scope of faculty scholarship, faculty productivity, research funding, academic support services and facilities including library, equipment, and technical support.

iii. Planning: an analysis of the congruence of the Department's mission, goals and objectives to those of the university, UT System and the state.

iv. Resource efficiency: an analysis of the utilization of human and fiscal resources in support of the University's, College's and Department's academic mission.

b. Academic Plan: written by the department, which describes, based upon the analysis and evaluation provided in the Self-Assessment Report, what goals will

be met over the next seven years and specifies strategies that will be used to meet those goals, including timelines. The plan should include any specific modifications to programs (i.e. admissions requirements, course requirements, etc.) consequent to the findings of the Self Assessment.

- c. Report of External Review Team: an external review team will be appointed by the Dean of the College containing the Department under review, in consultation with the Provost. This review team will evaluate the Self-Assessment Report and the Academic Plan submitted by the faculty.
- B. Expedited Review: for all departments/degree programs that are accredited by an external agency.
- 1. Reports
 - a. Summary of Findings and Recommendations of External Agency.
 - b. Supplemental Report: to provide information regarding essential elements of the Regular Review Self-Assessment Report that are not included in the external agency report.
 - c. Academic Plan: provided if the external agency report does not include a plan for improvement.

- VI. The Office of the Dean of the Graduate College has responsibility for the assessment of all graduate degree programs. (Insert link here.)

Attachment C

UTSA Graduate Council Masters & PhD Program Review Schedule (as of 12/05/07)

Program	College	Implemented	Last Review	Review Due	Last Contacted	Review Status
Accounting (MACY)- Accounting Track	COB	1978	2001/2002	2011/2012	9/14/2007	due date corrected
Accounting (MACY)- Taxation Track	COB	5/4/1993				
Anthropology (M.A.)	COLFA	4/22/1980	1999/2000	2009/2010	9/14/07 email	no update
Anthropology (Ph.D.)	COLFA	7/20/2006		2011/2012 Spring		
Applied Demography (Ph.D)	COPP	9/1/2006		2010/2011 Spring		
Applied Mathematics - Industrial Mathematics (M.S.)	COS	6/28/2004		2009 Fall	9/14/07 email	no update
Applied Statistics (Ph.D.)	COB	9/1/2006		2010/2011 Spring		
Architecture (M. Arch.)	COA	7/21/1995	1999/2000	2009/2010	9/14/07 email	no update
Architecture (M.S.)	COA	9/1/2005		2010/2011 Spring		
Art (M.F.A.)	COLFA	4/21/1972	12/7/2004	2014/2015		
Art History (M.A.)	COLFA	1/20/1994	12/7/2004	2014/2015		
Bicultural-Bilingual Studies (M.A.)	COEHD	4/21/1972				
Biology (M.S.)	COS	4/21/1972	5/4/2004	2013/2014		
Biology/Cellular and Molecular (Ph.D.)	COS	7/17/2003		2008 Fall	9/14/07 email	no update
Biology/Neurobiology (Ph.D.)	COS	10/30/1992			9/14/07 email	due date unclear
Biomedical Engineering (M.S.)	COE	3/20/2003				
Biomedical Engineering (Ph.D.)	COE	3/20/2003		2008 Fall	9/14/07 email	no update
Biotechnology (M.S.)	COS	1986	1997/1998	2007/2008	9/14/07 email	no update
Business Administration (Ph.D.)	COB	1/24/2002				
Chemistry (M.S.)	COS	4/21/1972	1998/1999	2008/2009	9/13/07 email	ext. review in progress
Chemistry (Ph.D.)	COS	10/28/2004		2010 Fall		
Civil Engineering (M.S.)	COE	7/14/1989	2003/2004	2013/2014		
Communication (M.A.)	COLFA	9/1/2005		2010 Fall		
Computer Engineering (M.S.)	COE	9/1/2005		2010 Fall	10/24/07 Memo	ext. review in progress
Computer Science (M.S.)	COS	1977	1996/1997	2006/2007	9/14/07 email	no update
Computer Science (Ph.D.)	COS	4/28/1995	2003/2004	2013/2014		
Counseling (M.A.)	COEHD	9/1/1998	2003/2004	2013/2014	9/14/07 email	due date unclear

Program	College	Implemented	Last Review	Review Due	Last Contacted	Review Status
Counselor Education and Supervision (Ph.D.)	COEHD	7/15/2004		2009/2010 Spring		
Culture, Literacy and Language (Ph.D.)	COEHD	10/27/2000	10/5/2004	2014/2015		
Economics (M.A.)	COB	11/17/1998	12/7/2004	2014/2015	9/14/07 email	due date corrected
Education (M.A.)	COEHD	4/21/1972	10/5/2004	2014/2015		
Educational Leadership (Ed.D.)	COEHD	7/17/1998	9/6/2005	2015/2016		
Educational Leadership (M.Ed.)	COEHD	1/1/2007		2011/2012		
Electrical Engineering (Ph.D.)	COE	1/24/2002			9/14/07 email	no staus report
Electrical Engineering (M.S.)	COE	7/14/1989		2007/2008	9/14/07 email	ext review in progress
English (M.A.)	COLFA	4/21/1972	1998/1999	2008/2009	9/14/07 email	no update
English (Ph.D.)	COLFA	4/18/2002		2008/2009	9/14/07 email	no status report
Environmental Science (M.S.)	COS	1982	2000/2001	2010/2011		
Environmental Science						
Engineering (Ph.D)	COE	7/17/2003		2008 Fall	9/14/07 email	no update
Finance (M.S.)	COB	10/27/1998	11/7/2006	2016/2017	10/2/07 email	due date corrected
Geology (M.S.)	COS	1/11/1991	3/1/2005	2014/2015		
History (M.A.)	COLFA	4/21/1972	5/4/2002	2013/2014		
Information Technology (M.S.)	COS	11/5/1998	10/5/2004	2014/2015		
Justice Policy (M.S.)	COPP	9/11/1999	4/6/2004	2013/2014		
M.B.A.- Business Administration	COB	4/21/1972	2002/2003	2012/2013		
Management of Technology (M.S. MOT)	COB	7/17/1992	10/5/2007	2014/2015		
Mathematics (M.S.)	COS	4/21/1972	2003/2004	2013/2014		
Mechanical Engineering	COE	7/14/1989	10/5/2004	2014/2015		
Music (M.M.)	COLFA	7/14/1978	2001/2002	2011/2012	9/14/07 email	due date corrected
Physics (M.S.)	COS	9/1/2005		2010 Fall		
Physics (Ph.D)	COS	9/1/2005		2010 Fall		
Political Science (M.A.)	COPP	10/21/1996	10/4/2005	2015/2016	9/14/07 email	no status report
Psychology (M.S.)	COLFA	7/15/1994	1999/2000	2009/2010	9/14/07 email	no update

Program	College	Implemented	Last Review	Review Due	Last Contacted	Review Status
Public Administration (M.P.A.)	COPP	5/5/1982	4/6/2004	2013/2014		
Social Work (M.S.W.)	COPP	1/1/2005		2009/2010 Spring		
Sociology (M.S.)	COLFA	10/21/1996	5/4/2004	2013/2014		
Spanish (M.A.)	COLFA	4/21/1972	4/6/2004	2013/2014		
Statistics (M.S.)	COB	9/1/2002		2008/2009	9/14/07 email	no status report
Teaching English as a Second Language (M.A.)	COEHD	7/9/2007				