

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

October 5, 2004

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

Present: Steve Amberg, Stuart Birnbaum, James Bower, Stephen Brown, Thomas Bylander, Paul Cotae, Blanche Desjean-Perrotta, Juanita Firestone, Lila Flory-Truett, JackHimmelblau, Han Hyunsoo, Eugene John, Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam, Kasandra Keeling, Michael Kelly, Laura Levi, Don Lien, Cynthia McCluskey, Bill Mullen, Francine Romero, James Schneider, Alan Shoho, Howard Smith, Judith Sobre, Jon Thompson, Raydel Tullous, Raj Wilson, and Jamal Rhadbane.

Absent: Adria Bodour, Jan Clark, Larry Golden, James Groff, Neal Guentzel, Han Hai-Chao, Daniel Hogenauer, Rosalind Horowitz, Fred Hudson, Michael Karcher, Debbie Lopez, Tina Lowrey, Randall Manteufel, Neil Maurer, Hugh Maynard, John McCarrey, Armando Trujillo, Esther Wheeler, Mary Zey, Tereasa Skeete, Sandra Guerrero, Sam Slocum, Robert Ayoub, Shawn Crawford, and Lorraine Trevino.

Excused: None.

Visitor: Glenn Dietrich

I. Call to order and taking of attendance.

The October 5, 2004 meeting of the Graduate Council was called to order at 3:33 pm.

II. Approval of Minutes (Ted Skekel)

Dr. Francine Romero noted an error in the first paragraph of section III. E. in the minutes of the September 7, 2004 meeting. Since the Membership Committee had not conducted any votes by email, the words "by email" were struck from the paragraph. As amended, the minutes of the September 7, 2004 meeting of the Graduate Council were unanimously approved. They are posted on the Graduate Council website (<http://www.utsa.edu/graduate/grad/GradCouncil.htm>).

III. Reports

A. Council Chair (Ted Skekel)

Dr. Ted Skekel introduced Dr. Joe Stafford, who was unanimously invited to provide an update on the Washington Advisory Group's (WAG) report and long-

term plans of the University. Dr. Stafford explained that the WAG was hired by the Board of Regents to review UT component institutions with regard to advancing to top-tier research university status. He said that it is clear that research has the attention of the Board of Regents. He noted that all but two of the institutions that have moved into the top tier in the last 30 years have medical schools. In research with a doctoral student, he identified three characteristics of those two institutions: 1) a set of processes to facilitate and streamline research, 2) providing space to growing programs, and 3) a commitment to hire and reward productive scholarship. He asked faculty to send him information about procedures that get in the way of research at UTSA, but each communication should include a solution to the problem. Since space is at a premium at UTSA, he noted that we will need to finance and/or lease additional space and focus on the utilization of the space we now have. The Board of Regents has established a \$2.7 million fund to support start-up equipment for newly hired assistant professors. Additional money will be available for newly hired tenured professors. He noted the importance of expeditious hiring, since the requests for funds are competitive across UT institutions. He also noted that the Board of Regents will be reviewing the productivity of the new hires. Overall, he thinks the WAG report gained us some visibility with the Board of Regents.

Continuing, Dr. Stafford proposed four strategies for UTSA. First, he stated that we should grow our formula funding as fast as we can. Last Summer and this academic year are a base year for formula funding. One way to increase graduate enrollments would be to increase the percentage of students admitted who enroll. The current yield rate is about 70%. Second, he recommended that we use our formula funding to recruit productive new faculty and to develop partnerships. He mentioned Southwest Research Institute as an example of such a partnership. Third, he suggested that we leverage our extramural funding from sources such as NIH, NSF, and DOD. Fourth, he proposed that we be responsive to the needs of scholarship and focus on high standards.

Dr. Stafford responded to questions posed by the members of the Graduate Council. In response to Dr. Stuart Birnbaum's question about line item stipends for graduate students, Dr. Stafford indicated that student support would need to be based on extramural funding and weighted state formula funding. Dr. James Bower noted the importance of sending faculty (especially new assistant professors) frequent and timely notices of funding opportunities. Dr. Armando Trujillo mentioned that the Office of Research Development used to send more notices and conduct seminars prior to the development of the electronic system (SPIN). Dr. Blanche Desjean-Perrotta suggested that more faculty needed to be aware of SPIN and help available from the Office of Research Development. Dr. Stafford will work with the Office of Research Development to improve SPIN and increase faculty awareness. He also reported that a new University-level position is being created to provide grant administration assistance. That will help with the burden currently born by Principal Investigators and Administrative

Assistants in the Departments and Colleges. In response to questions by Dr. Bill Mullen and Dr. Blanche Desjean-Perrotta about the support of current junior faculty (travel, Summer support, and leaves) and about the possibility of going to a 2-2 teaching model, Dr. Stafford noted that the Legislature now provides formula funding to the University and allows the decisions about allocation to be decided locally. He suggested that the faculty be provided with full information about funding and that members of the Faculty Senate and Graduate Council should be instrumental in strategic planning. In response to a question by Dr. Palani-Rajan Kadapakkam about new graduate programs, Dr. Stafford reported that base money would be used to launch new programs that would then become self-supporting. To become self-supporting, programs can focus on the formula funding weights assigned masters and doctoral enrollments and increase class size. He also noted that outside people could be hired to review dissertations in order to help UTSA faculty cope with the most time-consuming consequence of increased doctoral enrollments. Dr. James Bower asked about UTSA's strategy for moving to top tier with regard to hiring productive senior faculty from outside relative to growing young faculty at UTSA. Dr. Stafford indicated that UTSA would strive to achieve the right balance between the two approaches. He also described a university that had sent some of their new Ph.D. students to NIH to gain experience before bringing them back as faculty. In response to a question by Dr. Judith Sobre, Dr. Stafford said that the liberal arts would not be forgotten, but that NIH has more money than NEH. He described one institution that used a grant from NIH to fund its theater arts program as an example of a creative application to funding agencies.

Dr. Skekel pointed out the efficacy of comparing the characteristics of the institutions that failed to achieve top-tier status to those that succeeded. That is the comparison that Dr. Stafford is making with his doctoral student. Dr. Skekel thanked Dr. Stafford for his discussion.

Dr. Skekel referred two items to the Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements. The first involves a request to change the residency requirement for doctoral students. The current requirement is two semesters with a minimum of 9 hours of course work per semester. The request is to reduce the requirement to 6 hours of course work per semester. Secondly, Dr. Skekel charged the committee to review "the organizational structure of the Graduate Council for the purpose of evaluating its current and future efficiency and effectiveness in light of the increased number of both masters and doctoral level academic programs offered at UTSA" (Attachment A). He asked the committee to bring a preliminary set of findings to the January 2005 meeting of the Graduate Council for discussion. A final proposal could be presented at the February 2005 meeting in the form of a proposed change to the Bylaws. Any proposal to amend the Bylaws must be distributed to the Graduate Council members at least 30 days prior to a vote. Such a vote could be taken at the March 2005 meeting in time to be take effect for the Spring elections.

B. Dean of Graduate School (Dorothy Flannagan)

Dr. Dorothy Flannagan informed the Council that the site visit by the Coordinating Board led to a very positive report on the PhD in Chemistry proposal. That proposal will be considered by the Coordinating Board at its October 28th meeting. At that meeting, the Coordinating Board will also release a report on how they will assess PhD programs currently in place and their strategic planning for future, state-wide growth. Their specific criteria for new programs will be important for our PhD proposals.

C. Secretary (Jim Dykes)

The revised list of Members of the Graduate Council is posted on the Graduate School website*. Dr. Jim Dykes noted that the list reflects the election of Dr. Juanita Firestone and substitutions for members with teaching conflicts this Fall. The new MS in Applied Mathematics and Industrial Mathematics is in the process of electing its representative. There were no changes in membership on the committees of the Graduate Council (also posted on the website*). No other member of the Graduate Program Evaluation Committee volunteered at their September 16th meeting to replace Dr. Vic Heller as chair. Dr. Skekel proposed to suspend the Bylaws in order to allow Dr. Heller to serve as interim chair for this year. His proposal was unanimously approved. Increasing membership on the committee will help with the workload of reviewing so many programs.

D. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements (Stephen Brown)

Since Dr. Stephen Brown had to go to class, Dr. Armando Trujillo presented the report. The Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements proposed that the MS in Information Technology program should be allowed to apply up to 15 hours of transfer credit from the National Defense University toward their students' degree requirements. The committee further recommended that this exception should not set a precedent for other programs to exceed the 6 transfer hours rule. The Graduate Council unanimously approved the proposal.

E. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses (Fred Hudson)

The committee's recommendation on the non-substantive change to the Master of Architecture program will be presented to the Graduate Council in November.

F. Membership Committee (Jon Thompson)

Dr. Jon Thompson presented his committee's Recommendation for Graduate Faculty Membership (distributed with the Agenda as in III. F., page 2541). The recommendation was unanimously approved. Dr. Thompson discussed two issues with respect to his committee. First, a number of nominations of new assistant professors had been sent to the committee for review. Under the new Bylaws, new assistant professors automatically become members of the Graduate Faculty. He recommended that members of the Graduate Council spread the word. Dr.

Flannagan is also coordinating with the Associate Deans to inform them of the change in the Bylaws and to update the membership list of the Graduate Faculty.

Dr. Jon Thompson also asked for opinions about using email to expedite the review of proposed new special members of the Graduate Faculty. The reliance on paper forms impedes the review process, especially given the two campuses and the need for fast review in the Summer. He does not want to increase the staff workload, but he wondered if the cover page with three signatures could be scanned and attached to an email along with the applicant's curriculum vita as a Word document. If so, the members of his committee could electronically vote on the applicant upon receipt of the email. Dr. Skekel suggested trying to streamline the process. Dr. James Schneider suggested that there might be a way to streamline the reappointment of Special Members who had previously been reviewed. The Bylaws state that "The status of Special Members expires at the end of their appointment period, unless renewed". Recommendations should be forwarded to Dr. Thompson at JTHOMPSON@utsa.edu.

G. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (Victor Heller)

Dr. Heller noted that his committee had been very busy last year reviewing a dozen graduate programs. He has been working with Dr. Flannagan to develop guidelines/timelines to aid in the review process. The Graduate Program Review Timelines is posted on the Graduate School website*. While the outside reviews of the programs were generally positive last year, he noted 10 trends that were common across the reviews:

1. When did you last review the core course list, class schedule, and class size?
2. What is the role of the comprehensive exam and is it consistent?
3. What is the level of advising and student support?
4. How well is the progress of graduate students tracked?
5. What are the structures within the College to support the program (e.g.; release time for the Graduate Advisor of Record)?
6. What are the planning goals of the program as related to size and enrollments?
7. What are the faculty workload policies?
8. What resources and outside funding are available for research and student support?
9. What are the incentives for faculty?
10. Is there community outreach?

Dr. Heller presented evaluations for five programs:

- Education, MA
- Information Technology, MS
- Mechanical Engineering, MS
- Management of Technology, MS
- Culture, Literacy and Language, Ph.D.

Dr. Steve Amberg noted that a bulleted, executive summary of each program review with respect to each of the 10 trends could be helpful. Dr. Bill Mullen added that any recommendation with respect to the 10 trends could help the programs to be reviewed in the future. In response to a question by Dr. Armando Trujillo, Dr. Heller clarified that there were unique items for each program and that the 10 trends were common across programs. Drs. Stuart Birnbaum and Bill Mullen suggested that meeting with the program could be synchronized with the outside review time table and could help with the analysis of the outside report. The Graduate Council unanimously approved all five program reviews.

Dr. Heller explained that reviews of seven more programs are on-going: Art History (MA), English (MA), Chemistry (MS), Business Administration (MBA), Finance (MS), Educational Leadership (EdD), and Biology (PhD). Dr. Skekel pointed out that, instead of being a burden, program reviews can provide a way to leverage resources in order to improve a program.

IV. Unfinished Business

None.

V. New Business

None.

VI. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 4:55 pm.

* www.utsa.edu/graduate (go to Graduate Council link)

Attachment A

Task for Policy and Procedures Committee

Charge:

The committee is charged with reviewing the organizational structure of Graduate Council for the purpose of evaluating its current and future efficiency and effectiveness in light of the increased number of both masters and doctoral level academic programs offered at UTSA.

The committee should identify and evaluate alternative membership and voting structures. Such alternative structures might include but are not limited to:

- a. A fixed number of elected representatives from each college with decentralization of authority regarding which programs are represented by the voting members.
- b. Same as a, but Council dictates the programs represented.
- c. Elected reps. From each college with the number of reps. Determined by the size of the college.
- d. One rep per department. All programs housed in that department would be represented by that rep.
- e. A fixed number of reps per College (voting) plus each GAR becomes a nonvoting member.
- F. etc.

The committee should give a preliminary report to Council by January, 2005 at which time an open discussion will be held at the Council meeting. Following that discussion, the committee should consider all inputs and draft final recommendations to be presented at the February meeting in the form of proposed bylaw changes. The formal vote would then take place at the March meeting.

Additional considerations:

- 1. New committee membership structure
- 2. Transition
- 3. Review by Faculty Senate and Administration