

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

May 4, 2010

**University Room, BB 2.06.04
3:30 p.m.**

Present: John Alexander, Norma Cantu, Bill Cooke, Jim Dykes, Dorothy Flannagan, Richard Hartley, Kim Kline, Myung Ko, Don Kurtz, Gregg Michel, Sharon Navarro, Joel Saegert, Scott Sherer, Ryan Sprott, Drew Stephen, Heather Trepal, Ram Tripathi, Lila Truett, John Wald, Raj Wilson, Xu Xiaohu

Absent: David Akopian, Michael Cepek, Sean Guidry, Adrian Lipscombe, Francisco Marcos-Marin, Rene Nank, Emeka Nwaeze, Anne S. Reamy, Brian Smith, Jose Wiessmann, Mary Zey, Weining Zhang

Excused: Kim Bilica, Rena Bizios, Julie Bland, Andrey Chabanov, Norma Guerra, Anjali Gupta, Mary Kay Houston-Vega, Lance Lambert, Elizabeth Murakami, Rudy Sandoval, Can Saygin, Howard Smith, Garry Sunter

Visitors:

Michael Lichtenstein, Professor of Internal Medicine, UTHSCSA
Susan Stappenbeck, Institute for Integration of Medicine & Science, UTHSCSA
Steve Wilkerson, Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment

I. Call to order and taking of attendance.

Dr. Norma Cantú called the May 4, 2010 meeting of the Graduate Council to order at 3:36 pm. She welcomed our visitors who were invited to the meeting to help with the discussion of the PhD in Translation Science proposal and the discussion of Academic Program Review. Dr. Cantú moved that the Bylaws be suspended to allow their discussion. The motion was unanimously approved.

II. Approval of Minutes (Norma Cantú)

The Minutes of the April 6, 2010 meeting were approved.

III. Reports

A. Council Chair (Norma Cantú)

Dr. Cantú noted two items from the Faculty Senate meeting. The UT System is expected to move to a stricter program approval process and to require more accountability during the first five years. Also, there may be support for new on-line courses (perhaps only at the undergraduate level).

B. Dean of Graduate School (Dorothy Flannagan)

No Report

C. Secretary (Jim Dykes)

Dr. Jim Dykes noted that the list of Graduate Council members for September 2010- May 2011 is now complete. The list distributed as Attachment A with the Agenda had two vacancies. Since then, Dr. Elaine Sanders was elected to represent Accounting and Peter Anderson will replace Julie Bland as the student representative for the College of Sciences.

D. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses (Xiaohe Xu)

Dr. Xiaohe Xu explained that his committee had reviewed and had voted to recommend the Proposal for a Joint Doctoral Degree Program in Translational Science (TS). A summary was included as Attachment B with the Agenda. In his PowerPoint presentation, Dr. Xu noted that the proposal is for a joint degree between UTSA, UTHSCSA, and UT Austin's College of Pharmacy & Pharmacotherapy. The UT School of Public Health (San Antonio Regional Campus) will also participate by offering courses, but not awarding the joint degree. The goal of TS is to use systematic assessments of scientific evidence to close the gaps between knowledge and prevention, disease management, and strategies to improve health outcomes. There are two levels and corresponding tracks in the proposal: Type 1 advances basic laboratory discoveries to clinical trials and Type 2 advances evidenced-based results from clinical trials into clinical practice, the community, and policy. Dr. Xu noted a strong market for the graduates. A 40% increase in employment is expected across the next 10 years (31.7% in Texas), but there are only 17 doctoral programs nationally and only two in Texas (the UT Medical Branch at Galveston and the Baylor College of Medicine). The rigorous program is designed to train the prospective researcher in eight domains: 1) Understanding of Translational Science; 2) Responsible Research Conduct; 3) Research Design and Analysis; 4) Leadership, Motivation, and Management of Collaborative Team Science; 5) Multi-level Cultural Proficiency; 6) Effective Scientific Communication; 7) Business of Translational Science; and 8) Evidence Based Implementation and Policy. He described the three-year, 72-hour curriculum (9 hours each Fall & Spring and 6 hours each Summer). Each student would take 42 didactic hours and 30 hours of dissertation research. The 42 didactic hours will include a 24-hour common core, 12 prescribed hours in the student's track (Type 1 or Type 2), and 6 hours of electives. Applicants must have a Masters or Professional degree (e.g.; MD, DDS, RN, PharmD). It is expected that UTSA would offer courses in the Colleges of Business, Liberal & Fine Arts, Public Policy, and Sciences. The only new costs would be to support doctoral students as Graduate Assistants.

Dr. Raj Wilson asked about administrative oversight and how students would receive their degree. Drs. Flannagan, Xu, and Michael Lichtenstein explained that the program would not be housed in a department. The Committee of Graduate Studies will include faculty from each institution. The degree would be awarded by the institution of the mentor supervising the dissertation: UTSA or UTHSCSA. The UT School of Public Health in San Antonio is eager to teach courses, but cannot award a PhD. Similarly, the UT Austin College of Pharmacy and Pharmacotherapy is interested in teaching courses. Drs. John Wald, Ram Tripathi, Scott Sherer, and Kim Kline asked about expected student enrollment, progress toward degree, faculty, and funding. Susan Stappenbeck and Drs. Flannagan, Xu, and Michael Lichtenstein estimated that three or four students would enter in the first cohort and expected that enrollments would grow to 16 full-time student equivalents. A number of applicants will enter the program with research in progress

from their MS. That should help them meet the three-year timeline. Also, some may transfer relevant MS work. On the other hand, some students will want to take more than the minimum required research hours. That will extend their program. Unlike the programs at Galveston and Baylor, this proposal was designed from the ground up instead of being a modification of an existing program. For the proposal, Associate Deans, Department Chairs, and faculty were contacted for a potential list of courses. A joint meeting in October included about 33- 36 faculty and two UT System representatives. Since no new courses are being proposed, the only new costs are for graduate student stipends. To augment extramural funding, the UTSA Provost is committed to funding one student a year and the UTHSCSA is working on two student scholarships. At UTSA, the administrative work will be shouldered by the Graduate School.

Dr. Cantú thanked the committee and visitors. The proposal was unanimously approved.

E. Membership Committee (Scott Sherer)

Dr. Scott Sherer referred the Graduate Council to the list of six applicants for Special Membership in the Graduate Faculty. All have PhDs. The list was unanimously approved. Dr. Cantú asked that applications be submitted early for next year.

F. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (Howard Smith)

No Report

G. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements (Andrey Chabanov)

No Report

IV. Unfinished Business

Drs. Cantú and Sherer reminded the Graduate Council of the 30-day waiting period prior to taking a vote on any proposed change to our Bylaws. The proposed changes (Attachment D with the current Agenda) were designed to clarify the review, duration, and duties of Special Members of the Graduate Faculty. They were originally distributed with the Agenda on March 1st. It was noted that a syntactic change (“nor” for “and”) was made. The proposed changes passed unanimously.

Dr. Cantú reported that Dr. Sherer would be able to serve with the Graduate Council next year, but had to resign as our Chair for next year due to a time commitment. She nominated Dr. Kline to serve as our Chair. No other nominations were proffered from the floor. Dr. Kline was acclaimed as our Chair and applauded.

Dr. Cantú introduced Dr. Steve Wilkerson (Assistant Vice Provost for Assessment) to discuss the new procedures for Academic Program Review (APR). Dr. Wilkerson referred the Graduate Council to the revised Handbook of Operating Procedures and the Schedule of Academic Review (Attachments A and B, respectively). His Overview of APR (Attachment C) was distributed. He noted two big changes: 1) the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness (VPAIE) has the responsibility for APR and 2) the new process is by department so that undergraduate and graduate programs will be reviewed together. As before, specialized accreditation reviews will satisfy APR as long as they can be linked (some accreditation reviews may only focus on an undergraduate or graduate program). The Graduate Council will continue to be involved in the site visit and final report when a graduate program is part

of the review. The Department of History is up for review soon, so the Office of the VPAIE is coordinating with the department to test the generalizability of the procedures and database. Dr. Wilkerson pointed out that the six programs completing graduate program evaluation (Attachment C, top of page 3255) would finish under the old policy. Dean Flannagan elaborated that the Graduate Council would complete their evaluation as before. For all new program reviews with a graduate program component would involve the new procedures. Specifically, a member of our Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation would be assigned to work on the graduate component of APR and report to the Graduate Council.

V. New Business

None

VI. Adjournment

Before adjourning the meeting, Dr. Cantú thanked all of the Graduate Council members for staying the course and especially thanked the Committee Chairs. It was a great year in terms of working together in service to our students and our institution. The Graduate Council gave her a standing ovation.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:29.

Attachment A

Handbook of Operating Procedures

2.39 Academic Program Review

I. Purpose

The University of Texas at San Antonio provides quality programs to students in each of its academic disciplines. Quality programs result from careful, collaborative self-study and reflection by the faculty in each of the disciplines and appropriate stewardship by university administrators.

II. Policy

- A. All department programs shall undergo periodic academic program review.
- B. Reviews shall be conducted by a panel of external reviewers representing expertise in the academic discipline of the programs under scrutiny.
- C. The frequency of program review shall not be more than ten (10) years between successive reviews.
- D. Units subject to periodic specialized accreditation reviews may use those reviews to satisfy this requirement.
- E. Reviews shall be based on organizational units (for example, departments) and shall integrate reviews of all degree programs offered through those units. Exceptions include
 - 1. interdisciplinary programs involving multiple departments, and
 - 2. instances where specialized accreditation only reviews the undergraduate or graduate programs (e.g. ABET only reviews undergraduate programs). In this event, the Department or College shall separately schedule a complementary review for programs not covered by specialized accreditation.
- F. The Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness shall maintain a general schedule of program reviews and will notify the Dean, Department Chair and other appropriate individuals (e.g. Program Director) no less than eight (8) months in advance of an upcoming review.
- G. The Provost's Office shall maintain a set of guidelines specifying the process by which external reviews take place. Said guidelines will be made publicly available on the Provost's web site.

Provost Guidelines

Process for Academic Program Review

Review Process and Timeline

A Department shall be notified at least eight (8) months in advance that a program review has been scheduled. Upon notification, the program shall implement the following process.

- A. The review team and its chair shall be established six (6) months in advance of the review.
- B. The Office of the Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness (hereafter, the “Vice Provost AIE”) shall oversee the arrangements for the review visit.
- C. The Department shall assemble its self-study materials (see “Self-Study Document” below) for posting online at least one month in advance of the review team visit and shall notify the reviewers how to access the materials.
- D. Review visits shall typically extend over two days and include the following meetings:
 - 1. an initial meeting on the first day attended by the Provost, Vice Provost AIE, Vice Provost for Undergraduate Studies (hereafter, “Vice Provost US”), Dean, and Vice Provost for the Graduate School (hereafter, "Vice Provost GS") with the review team;
 - 2. meetings with Department faculty;
 - 3. meetings with students of the Department, including both undergraduate and graduates students where appropriate;
 - 4. a meeting with the Dean;
 - 5. a meeting with Vice Provost GS, Dean and Graduate Council representatives, when appropriate;
 - 6. other meetings as requested by the review team in advance;
 - 7. unscheduled time for the review team to formulate initial recommendations; and
 - 8. an exit interview with the Provost, Vice Provost AIE, Vice Provost US, Dean, and Vice Provost GS.
- B. The review team shall submit a written report of their review as soon as is feasible following the completion of the review visit

Self-Study Document

Departments undergoing a program review shall prepare a set of materials to aid external reviewers in their task of reviewing the strengths, weaknesses, challenges, and opportunities of the unit.

- A. The preparation of materials for a program review should be an inclusive process, involving all faculty to the extent possible.
- B. The materials should include, but need not be limited to, the following:
 - 1. the unit’s strategic plan
 - 2. documentation of expected learning outcomes for each of the department’s degree programs (described in the department assessment plans and course syllabi)
 - 3. documentation of assessment of student learning outcomes for each degree program
 - 4. a summary of research productivity, as compiled from FAIR
 - 5. curriculum vitae for all continuing faculty
 - 6. program enrollment information
 - 7. a brief summary statement (no more than ten pages)

- C. Specialized accreditation processes may require other materials in addition to those listed here.
- D. The Department's self-study materials shall be posted online for the external reviewers to access at least one month in advance of the reviewers' visit. Printed copies of the strategic plan and the summary statement shall be sent to each reviewer at the time the materials are posted.
- E. A hard copy of or electronic access to all of the materials shall be made available to the chair of the review team during the visit.

External Reviewers

The external reviewers should be senior faculty members at institutions equivalent to the university's aspirant institutions. Whenever possible, the reviewers should be eminent scholars and academic leaders who have achieved national prominence.

- A. Choice of reviewers
 - 1. A Department shall propose a list of suitable reviewers to the college Dean (hereafter, the "Dean") at least six months in advance of a scheduled review.
 - 2. The Dean shall select a subset of no more than three reviewers from the list provided by the department.
 - 3. The Dean may also choose to add up to two members not on the department list, but the total number of reviewers should not exceed five.
 - 4. The Dean should identify alternate reviewers in the event one or more of the reviewers chosen is unable to commit to the review.
 - 5. The Dean shall consult with the Provost and the Vice Provost GS before finalizing the list of reviewers and alternates.
- B. Once the set of reviewers is finalized, the Dean and Department Chair shall consult to appoint a chair for the review team from among the reviewers.

Review Response

The report of the external reviewers, as well as the response of the Department, College, Graduate School, and university will be documented in writing.

- A. Following the submission of the written report, the Department shall prepare a written response to the review team recommendations and submit that response to the Dean.
- B. The Dean shall review the unit response and prepare a written recommendation for the Provost.
- C. If the review includes graduate programs, the Graduate Council shall review the reviewers' report and prepare a written response to any recommendations involving graduate studies in the unit and submit that response to the Vice Provost GS.
- D. The Vice Provost GS and Dean shall meet with the Provost to discuss the review and their respective recommendations.
- E. The Provost shall meet with the Department Chair, Department's Graduate Advisor of Record (GAR), Dean, Vice Provost GS, and Vice Provost AIE to discuss the outcome of the review and formulate the final response. For those programs housed at the downtown campus, the Vice Provost for the Downtown Campus shall also participate in the discussion.

- F. The Provost shall provide a written final response to the Department indicating any actions the university will take in response to the external review.

One year after issuing the final response, the Provost shall meet with the Department Chair, GAR, Dean, Vice Provost GS, and the Vice Provost for the Downtown Campus (when appropriate) to review progress in responding to the external review.

Attachment B

ACADEMIC PROGRAM REVIEW

KEY:

External Accreditation Agency may substitute for Program Review
 Program Reviews will occur according to UTSA HOP 2.39 guidelines. Academic Program reviews will cover the entire departmental programs, including Minor degrees, Concentrations and Graduate Certificates.

COLLEGE	2008-2009	2009-2010	2010-2011	2011-2012	2012-2013	2013-2014	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
ARCHITECTURE											
Dept. of Architecture		CIDA, NAAB (6 yr. review) & BS Arch.			MS			BS Const. Mgmt.			
BUSINESS											
Dept. of Accounting				AACSB (6 yr. review)							
Dept. of Economics				AACSB							
Dept. of Finance				AACSB, BA & MA							
Dept. of Information Systems & Tech. Mgmt. Management				AACSB							
Mgmt. Science & Statistics		MS under review		AACSB, BS & Ph.D							
Dept. of Marketing				AACSB							
EDUCATION & HUMAN DEVELOPMENT											
Bicultural-Bilingual Studies							BA, MA (BBS), MA, & Ph.D.				
Counseling								CACREP (6 yr. review)			
Educational Leadership & Policy Studies							M.Ed & Ph.D				
Health & Kinesiology							BS (H), BS (K) & MS				
Interdisciplinary Learning & Teaching							BA, BAAS, MA (ALT), MA & Ph.D				
ENGINEERING											
Biomedical Engineering		MS & Ph.D. under review								MS & Ph.D.	
Civil & Environmental Engineering		Ph.D. under review		ABET (6 yr. review)						ABET (6 yr. review) & MS	
Electrical & Computer Engineering				ABET & MS Computer						ABET (6 yr. review) & MS	
Mechanical Engineering				ABET						ABET (6 yr. review) & MS	

Attachment C

Overview of Academic Program Review**Policy**

The *UTSA Handbook of Operating Procedures (HOP)*, Chapter 2, Section 39 - Academic Program Review provides the basis for the APR process.

- The Vice Provost for Accountability and Institutional Effectiveness (VPAIE) will be responsible for coordinating the periodic reviews of academic programs.
- Reviews are based on departments and include reviews of all degree programs offered.
 - Exceptions to this policy are
 - interdisciplinary programs involving multiple departments; and
 - disciplines where specialized accreditation reviews only the undergraduate or graduate programs, i.e. ABET.
- Departments participating in periodic specialized accreditation reviews may use those reviews to satisfy this requirement.

Overview of the APR Process

The program review process is comprised of the following steps:

1. An annual informational meeting is conducted with all deans, department chairs, and directors undergoing review.
2. The Office of Institutional Research (OIR) provides departments under review with a profile of their performance on key metrics.
3. Nomination of external reviewers by the department
4. Selection and appointment of the external reviewers by the dean
5. Departments arrange with the VPAIE office for external reviewers' site visits and schedule them
6. Completion of the preliminary self-study by the program
7. Review and approval of the preliminary self-study by the dean
8. Completion of the finalized self-study by the program
9. Distribution of the final self-study document to the external review team and university participants
10. On-site visit (up to two days)
11. External review team submits report within two weeks of site visit
12. Department, dean, and Graduate Council (where applicable) prepare a response to the external report
13. Provost, VPAIE, the dean of the college, and the department chair of the program meet to review report and draft response
14. Provost provides written response to the department
15. One year follow-up meeting to review progress

Programs completing graduate program evaluation (previous policy)**Completed site visit:**

MS Statistics (April 20-21, 2010)

PhD Electrical Engineering (February 19, 2010) – received external reviewers' report

Completed self-study:

MA Anthropology – identifying external reviewers/site visit fall 2010

MS Psychology – identifying external reviewers/site visit fall 2010

Completing self-study:

MS Mathematics

PhD Cell and Molecular Biology

Programs scheduled for review in 2010-2011 (revised policy)**Engineering:**

All Undergraduate programs (ABET) and MS Computer Engineering

Liberal and Fine Arts:

English (BA only)

History (BAs and MA)

Modern Languages & Literature (BAs and MA)

Philosophy & Classics (BAs)

Honors College (BA and Program)

Undergraduate Studies:

Writing Program (Writing courses and Writing Center)