

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

ORDER OF BUSINESS
May 1, 2018

**Graduate Student Professional
Development Center
GSR 1.204
3:30-5:00**

Present: John Bartkowski, Michael Baumann, Janis Bush, Guadalupe Carmona, Michael Cepek, Jonathan Clark, Jackie Cuevas, Lucila Ek, Kandyce Fernandez, Doug Frantz, Ruyan Guo, Judy Haschenburger, Shamsad Khan, Myung Ko, Ritu Mathur, Nancy Membrez, Wing Chung Ng, Chris Packham, Libby Rowe, Heidi Rueda, Page Smith, Corey Sparks, Liang Tang, Ram Tripathi, Victor Villarreal, HungDa Wan, Zijun Wang, Alistair Welchman.

Excused: Ian Caine, Judith Engelberth, Firat Testik, Marie Tillyer.

Absent: Ernesto Alva Sevilla, Lauren Bednarski, Ian Caine, Fengxin Chen, Jurgen Engelberth, Fathali Firoozi, Shane Habersroph, Kasandra Keeling, David Martinez-Prieto, Cyrus Melendez, Ricardo Ramirez, Erica Sosa.

- I. Call to order and taking of attendance
Meeting called to order at 3:35pm
Quorum not achieved as of the call to order

II. Reports

A. Council Chair (**Mike Baumann**)

- Consent Agenda
 - Approval of Minutes
 - Special Membership Applicants (Attachment A)
Quorum achieved at 3:37pm

A council member questioned an application submitted by the ELPS program. The applicant Graduated from UTSA in 2015. Asking for a special committee to justify putting our own graduate students on special membership within three years of graduation. Proposing to remove Jennifer Castro Zavala from consideration until a special committee.

Cepek: Application form was revised to specifically call out UTSA grads and consider conflicts of interest. Department voted to approve, so may be out of our hands.

Primary concern is around the time since graduation and the

Motion to approve special membership applicants
Motion seconded

Yes: 24
No: 1
Abstain: 1

Consent agenda approved

Motion to suspend bi-laws

-Motion seconded

-Motion approved 26-0

Motion to rearrange the agenda

-Motion seconded

-Motion approved 26-0

- Update from Senate Meeting
 - SGA requested that senate participate in a joint statement with them about forming a joint committee focused on the +/- system. Committee to form some time over the summer. Start date of September 1. Would like to consult with grad council. Request for interested

B. Committee on Graduate Programs and Courses (**Victor Villarreal**)

- Proposal to eliminate concentrations in the MBA program
- Presented by Victor Villarreal
 - Procedure HOP 2.35 and 2.38
 - Chair and the dean appoint program review committee (two individuals not affiliated with the program)
 - Goes to Senate and Grad Council: Approve or not approve
- Initial proposal: Memo noted information regarding the elimination of concentration programs
 - All students complete 24 core and 12 concentration hours
 - Accreditation recommended eliminating concentrations
- Majority of courses considered concentration courses are free electives
- Memo indicated that these six courses would continue to be offered in the upcoming semesters so that students can complete their degree program
- Tenured faculty are not affected (if so, secondary report considered, but not required in this case)
- Committee felt that the initial memo was too succinct. Put it to vote, did not have a majority vote. Major concerns:
 - Were appropriate procedures followed?
 - Were the right people on the COB review committee?
 - Students no longer being enrolled in MBA concentrations; programs already abandoned?
- Dead-locked committee means there is not a motion
- COB representatives here to answer questions
- Dean Agbenyiga: This goes back many years; concentrations were set up with separate coordinating board/system codes; this MBA program doesn't look like any other program in the system or in the state.
- Victor: For future program abandonment proposals, need the detailed information to make it easier for the committee to evaluate

- An issue was raised by two committee members related to procedure. They indicated a desire to separate the substantive from the procedural and challenged whether the college of business had followed the process outlined in HOP 2.38, specifically that (1) A program review committee was not convened, (2) there was a long period between faculty forum approval and graduate council consideration, and (3) the committee on programs and courses did not have a full report from a program review committee.
- College of Business Response: (1) They did not call their committee a “program review committee”, but rather a program “seal team” and its purpose and function was in line with the policy outlined in HOP 2.38. The proposal was also reviewed and voted on (and passed) by the MBA program committee and by the college’s faculty forum; (2) it took a long time for the proposal to make its way to graduate council, primarily because the college’s associate dean had to take medical leave, which delayed the process; (3) It is unclear to the college what constitutes a full committee report. The college’s memo sent to the dean and graduate council contained a summary of the committee’s work, recommendations and rationale. The graduate council requested additional information from the college, which the college subsequently provided.
- The above referenced committee members were not satisfied with the college’s response and insisted the college should convene a “program review committee” and submit a report from that committee.
- Additional council members challenged that conclusion, arguing that the “seal team” committee convened by the college to review the MBA program is identical to the definition of a “program review committee” provided in HOP 2.38, even if it wasn’t labeled as such. In addition, the college put the proposal through additional scrutiny (not required by HOP 2.38), including review and approval by the college’s entire faculty.
- Question: Was there opposition within the college?
 - Answer: Yes, there was opposition, but a majority (80%) support the changes
- Question (to program committee): In what ways does the college’s process not follow the procedure correctly?
 - Response: They did not organize a “program review committee”, and a report of that committee was not provided to the program committee.
- Two council members: It is completely unclear how the committee that has been described by the college is not a “program review committee”
- Motion: Give it back to the college; get them to resubmit the report;
 - Motion Seconded
 - Comments: It seems somewhat unfair, and out of step with the spirit of the process, to send this back to the college when their process clearly meets the spirit (and some would argue, the letter) of the policy outlined in HOP 2.38
 - Call the question:
 - Vote: Yes – 11; No – 11; Abstain – 1
 - Motion is considered dead
- Second Motion: Approve program proposal
 - Motion seconded
 - Question: Is it the case that the students want to specialize, but the accreditation body wants something different?
 - Answer: Not dropping the ability to specialize, just dropping concentrations, but tracks (i.e., specializations) are still possible and available;
- Request: A council member requested to change her vote on the first motion
 - Denied, indicating that you cannot do so after the vote tally is announced.

- It was observed that the council had lost its quorum, and discussion was ended.
- QUESTION: Can a motion be voted on electronically, if it was made and seconded while we had a quorum?
- Answer: We think so, but need to check on it.

C. Dean of Graduate School (**DeBrenna Agbényiga**)

- GAR Handbook
 - Handbook is pretty much done; will provide the GARs with everything they need to follow procedures
 - Handbook will come to the graduate council, probably at the first meeting in the fall
- Graduate Assistants: Will be able to appoint students as graduate assistants in the fall, for both fall/spring
 - Questions have been asked about whether this could include a full year appointment (fall/spring/summer)
- Grade grievances: There could be an accompanying discrimination claim; those claims need to be reviewed separately, but can be worked on simultaneously;
- Degree Works to the graduate side (currently used at undergrad level): Bring in a person who will work on this starting this summer for the graduate school

D. Secretary (**Jonathan Clark**)

- Secretary's Report (skipped)
- 2018-2019 Officers and Committees
 - No Chair nomination
 - Nomination: Corey as Parliamentarian
 - Nomination: Alistair as Secretary
 - No Member-at-large nomination
- Due to lost quorum, will have to conduct elections online

E. Committee on Graduate Program Evaluation (**Vacant**)

- No Report

F. Committee on Academic Policy and Requirements (**Elaine Sanders**)

- No Report

III. Unfinished Business

Summer 2018 Recap:

June: E-Vote

Topic 1: Motion to approve College of Business's closure of MBA concentrations.

Topic 2: Approval of nominees for next year's officers. The nominees as of loss of quorum were:

Chair	(none)
Secretary	Alistair Welchman
Parliamentarian	Corey Sparks

Results:

Topic 1 (yes = approve closure): 24 yes, 3 no, 2 abstain (motion passes)

Topic 2 (yes = approve officers): 28 yes, 0 no, 1 abstain (Corey Sparks continues as parliamentarian and Alistair Welchman becomes secretary)

July/August: Emergency Special Member Vote

Following Special Members Approved by Graduate Council Majority

Dr. Richard M. Eckman (Mechanical Engineering)

Dr. Gerry Dizinno (ELPS)

Dr. Paul C. Hershey (Electrical Engineering)

Dr. Sara Stolt (Music)

Dr. Yanyun Yang (MSS)

IV. New Business

V. Adjournment

- Motion to adjourn
- Seconded
- Meeting adjourned at 4:59pm