DATE: Thursday, February 1, 2018  
TIME: 2:30 pm  
PLACE: San Saba, University Center  
PRESIDING: Peter Kroll, Chair of the Graduate Assembly

MEMBERS ATTENDING: Ali Abolmali; Ard Anjomani; Karabi Bezboruah; Jinny Choi; Courtney Cronley; Bradley Davis; Lauri John; David Jorgensen; Peter Kroll; Prajal Mishra; Sophia Passy; Barbara Raudonis; Panos Shiakolas; Terrance Skantz; David Sparks; Mark Tremayne; Mahmut Yasar.

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS ATTENDING: Pranesh Aswath; Duane Dimos; Raymond Jackson; Kelly Visnak

GUESTS: Brenda Davis; Shelby Boseman; Les Riding-in

I. Call to Order
   • The meeting of the Graduate Assembly was called to order at 2:31 pm by chair, Dr. Peter Kroll.

II. Introduction
   • Dr. Kroll introduced university attorney, Shelby Boseman.

III. Consideration of Minutes
   • Minutes from November 2, 2017 were discussed for the following clarification and modification:
     • Dr. Jackson proposed for clarity in the November Minutes (Section VIII – Old Business) about the role of non-tenure track faculty. Dr. Jackson sought clarification in how the “case by case” basis of determining the role of non-tenure track faculty in different units across campus will work out.
     • In previous GA meetings, it was discussed that the role of non-tenure track faculty are to be determined by each unit’s Graduate Studies Committee (GSC). Members stated that each department knows whether the non-tenure track faculty can serve on masters and doctoral committees, and so, departments should determine their role.
     • Dr. Jackson suggested recommendations and specific language in the HOP to reflect the Graduate Assembly’s discussion. There are several types of non-tenure track faculty and it is expected that their roles in teaching, research and advising masters and PhD students will increase. Dr. Jackson proposed that the minutes be modified to reflect the thinking of the graduate assembly.
     • Dr. Kroll read out the standards regarding non-tenure track faculty, and proposed the reconsideration of the “case by case” basis of the November minutes.
     • Proposal was to create a full committee statement that clarifies and specifies the boundaries of the work responsibilities of non-tenure track faculty. This statement will then be integrated in the HOP.
• Action item:
  o Committee on Graduate Program Revision will work on creating the policy statement.
• Dr. Kroll closed the discussion on this item, and suggested edits to the discussion on role of non-tenure track faculty in the November 2017 minutes.
• Minutes from November 2, 2017 were approved.

IV. Shelby Boseman, University Attorney
• Discussed proposed amendments to Emeritus faculty privileges per HOP Policy 6-201 and HOP Policy 4-200
• Boseman said that different university committees reviewed the current policy about the role of Emeritus faculty in student advising and serving on PhD committees, and the collective feedback was sent to the President for approval. The feedback was a little bit clear regarding the rights of emeritus faculty. The feedback was presented as proposals to the GA as it decides the role and responsibilities of Emeritus faculty.
• Two proposals presented to the GA:
  o Proposal: 1. If departments allow, Emeritus faculty can serve on PhD committees;
  o Proposal 2. If Emeritus faculty wishes to conduct research, they can use university facilities and labs for research.
• Suggestion was to define the limits of the role of Emeritus faculty and for broadening of the scope of their work.
• It was discussed that department’s Graduate Studies Committee determine the role of Emeriti. Need to also specify the role of Emeritus faculty.
• Boseman suggested going back to the HOP committee regarding changes to language in the Emeritus faculty portion of the HOP.
• Members discussed specificity of language in the HOP regarding Clinical faculty. Clinical faculty is based on practice, and Professor of Practice is more academic and some practice. However, there exist some inconsistencies in implementation.
• Boseman stated that the UT System requires some consistency / standards in the use of titles such as Clinical, Adjunct etc.
• Action item:
  o Committee on Program Revision will review the language regarding role of Emeritus faculty.

V. Dr. Duane Dimos, Dean of Graduate School, Vice President for Research
• No additional report.

VI. Report from Graduate Studies – Dr. Joe Jackson
• Office of Graduate Studies Report 2016-2017 Academic Year
  • In Fall 2017, 48 PhDs graduated. Metric is 200 PhDs each year.
  • Graduate office supports graduate students in academics and professional development.
  • Report from Dr. Brenda Davis, Office of Graduate Studies:
    o Several opportunities for graduate students
    o The Office of Graduate Studies held 50 workshops for graduate students. Partnered and engaged with different colleges and departments. 1000 people
participated, and 400 were PhD students. Survey results stated that the workshops helped the participants.

- The popular one was the career advancement series that reviewed both academic and non-academic careers.
- Other workshops include:
  - Data and resource tool
  - Responsible conduct of research
  - Navigating graduate school
  - Research grant series, which is expanding
  - Grant writing workshops, and

- The Office of Graduate Studies provided funding through dissertation fellowships. 51 students were funded, of which 96% graduated with PhD.
- Dissertation Lab is a 2 day quiet study for writing. 72% of participants graduated in the same semester. And altogether 92% graduated.
- Dissertation support of $2000 to assist with students’ writing.
- IENGAGE initiative pairs doctoral students with undergraduates. This summer, there are 8 pairs. Doctoral students get mentoring experience. 87% of the undergraduate students helped doctoral students to complete their research, and undergrads were helped with schoolwork.
- Writing groups of students – Grants forces them to finish their work.
- Graduate Adviser training series – 2 workshops each semester to understand how to advise students, navigate GMAP, and advise for graduation.
- Open to suggestions and plan to offer more programs to enhance graduate education.
- Dr. Davis can be invited to talk to colleges/ departments about these initiatives.
  - Dr. Jackson clarified that these initiatives are to complement what faculty do. These are extra help for students to complete their work. These are to support students and help them be productive.

VII. Report of the President of the Graduate Student Senate – Prajal Mishra

- The first meeting of the Graduate Student Senate was on January 24
- Informed the GA that there were three proposed items in the Graduate Student Senate
  1. Early start of GTA and GRAs;
  2. Stipend of GTAs/GRAs; and
  3. Minimum enrollment required for a class to be dropped.

VIII. Committee Reports

A. Committee on Program Creation, Edmund Prater
   - No Report

B. Committee on Program Revision, Barbara Raudonis
   - No Report

C. Committee on Graduate Students Diane Mitschke
   - No Report
IX. Old Business

• Clarification of “role of non-tenured faculty in Graduate Faculty — regarding HOP Policy 4-200” was discussed in November Minutes consideration.

X. New Business

• Discussion of the RAND report “Managing the Expansion of Graduate Education in Texas” by Dr. Les Riding-in, UTA Representative at Graduate Education Advisory Council (GEAC)
  o Discussion of the 60x30 strategic plan of Texas, which calls for at least 60% of Texas ages 25-34 to hold a postsecondary degree by 2030 (educated population goal). This means expansion of higher education opportunities particularly masters and doctoral / professional degrees.
  o The RAND corporation produced a study to develop a strategic plan for graduate education in Texas, and one of the emerging themes of the study is “Should PhD programs include more exposure to careers outside higher education?”
  o There is a strategic plan in draft stage. The original plan of the GEAC has changed as have to consider different possibilities on how to present the plan before the State.
  o There is some concern about the proliferation of online programs, and therefore, there is an impetus for discussing how to assess the quality of online and campus classes.
  o Policy implemented per this plan should be able to be measured.
  o Another point from the RAND report is the difference between masters and PhD students. Originally, this difference was seen as a pathway. Now, there is separation between Masters and PhD students. Smaller PhD programs are not represented in the report although they help fulfill the research mission. Some Masters programs have accreditation concerns. These will be addressed in the strategic plan.

• 2018-19
  o Call to stand for offices (Chair, Chair Pro-Tem, and Secretary positions) on April 5 meeting of the GA for April 2018

XI. Adjournment

• Meeting adjourned at 3:45pm

XII. Next meeting

• April 5, 2018

Respectfully submitted,
Karabi Bezboruah
Secretary, Graduate Assembly
College of Architecture, Planning, and Public Affairs
02/09/2018