MEETING OF THE GRADUATE ASSEMBLY
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

DATE:        April 6, 2006
TIME:      2:30 pm
PLACE:      San Saba Room, University Center
PRESIDING:     Dr. James Grover

ATTENDING:     Mary Schira   Ernest Crosby   Joe Jackson   Rebecca Hegar
               Roger Mellingren   Ski Hunter   Jim Grover   Gary McMahan
               James Teng   Nancy Hadaway   Mark Cichock
               David Jones   Greg Frazier   Gerald Saxon, Ex Officio
               Jennifer Schnell   Amanda Pritchard   Hunter Dell

PROXY VOTE:    Farhad Kamangar

ABSENT:     Phil Cohen   Charla Markham-Shaw
             Vicky Cereijo   Sherman Wyman
             Brian Fontenot   Rex Crick

GUEST:     Megan Magaña – Shorthorn
              Victoria Farrar-Myers

I.   Call to Order
    The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m. by Dr. James Grover

II.   Approval of Minutes
    Minutes for February approved, with one change, Mary Schira attended Feb meeting

III.   Report of the Graduate Dean – Dr. Jackson
    A.   Update on trip to Taiwan

    B.   ACES very successful, students proud of their success

    C.   Thanked Dr. Grover for his commitment to the Graduate Assembly and all he did as chairman of the Assembly

IV. Committee Reports

A.   Committee on Graduate Students – Dr. Ernest Crosby, Chair
    The committee looked at three issues:
GSS, OGS and Committee has adopted the report on the first two of these issues—Handout—and checked with peer institutions so we are in line with others in UT System schools.

1. Leave of Absence for Graduate Students
   a. Leave of Absence proposed for one to two semesters for hardship. Not to substitute for Withdrawal.
   b. LOA policy will enable student to stop out and return with least amount of hassle—no reenrollment fees.
   c. Time limits dictated by work time OGS needs to process forms, several weeks.
   d. This will be very valuable to the students.

2. Continuous Enrollment of Graduate Students
   a. Continuous Enrollment, student must be enrolled in both long semesters to be continuously enrolled.
   b. Must have minimum enrollment that departments will decide.
   c. Minimum hours taken would have to be in students degree field, related to the student’s degree.

Concerns of the Assembly:
   a. What about e-mail access, ID cards, health center? Limited communication with professors—can’t do LOA instead of registering for dissertation/thesis hours and not pay for it.
   b. Can LOA and withdrawal happen at the same time? If need happens during the semester then student will need to withdraw, if before classes start, then can apply for LOA.
   c. How will this affect International students and VISAS? Both LOA and Continuous Enrollment will be decided on a case by case basis.
   d. What about privacy issues of the student?
   e. Track reasons for LOA, if always financial, re-address by committee.
   f. Can’t be GA or have loan or fellowship—will lose in-state waiver.

Motion made to accept by Dr. Teng and second by Dr. Jones, approved by all.

3. Annual report for doctoral students. After a student defends, we track. What do the students do each semester before that?
   1. Need a Policy—Recommendations:
      a. Tracking form to be completed online and in a timely manner.
      b. This process would address several concerns:
         Students stop out because “I didn’t understand what was needed from me.”
         Lets student know what they need to do & decide what they want to do
         Regular evaluation & regular statement of expectations of student and a way for students to respond
      c. Check around campus to see what programs have this communication and develop a flexible plan that can be used by all units.
Concerns of Assembly:
  a. Could CRM be used for this student communication?
  b. Is this aimed at retention or just student progress?
  c. Could this be SACS friendly report, this will remind students each year what is expected of them?
  d. The assembly’s students committee will work on this PhD process

B. Committee on Program Policy – Dr. Nancy Hadaway, Chair
Certificate in French or Spanish – revisions made, committee voted to accept Certificate Program the student can produce 18 hour certificate in French or Spanish in addition to training in other languages. This will give additional career options to students as they go out into the work force

C. Committee on Program Review – Dr. Roger Mellgren, Chair
Nothing to report

IV. Report of the Chair – Dr. Grover
  Told Assembly he enjoyed working with them for the past 5 years as a member of the assembly and as Chair. He could not have learned as much as he has, about what the University does, without this experience.

  Will send notice to remind Deans about elections for new Assembly members for next year (COE, COLA, COS)

V. Report of the Graduate Student Council Representative – Hunter Dell
  1. Graduate Student/Faculty mixer was a success and fun
  2. Resolution – Balanced Parking Policy, so you can park anywhere after 5 pm
  3. Resolution – Printing supplements for grad students if registered for thesis or dissertation hours (should be last semester), quota raised to $200 printing and next 500 pages for 5 cents each
  4. Human Subject Seminar on Research Compliance, open to all students and Faculty: How to work with human subjects, laws, regulations, Thursday, April 13 5:30 – 7:30 pm UH 106

VI. New Business – Dr. Victoria Farrar-Myers – QEP up-date
Three handouts, a QEP overview, a timeline for QEP completion including the SACS on site visit dates, and a status report were passed out.

  1. The QEP Coordinator discussed the “active learning theme” and the progress made thus far in the QEP development.
  2. She reminded the Assembly that the QEP is a faculty driven process and a QEP Steering Committee made up of representatives from the 9 academic units plus Honors as well as representatives from Faculty Senate, Academic Affairs, Student Affairs, Graduate School, Advising, the Library and Students will play a vital role in
developing the QEP. However, all of the UTA academic community needs to be involved in the creation of and be aware of what the QEP entails.

3. The Coordinator pointed out that the QEP is new to the SACS process. There has also been a renaming of the process from reaccreditation to “reaffirmation” to highlight that there will be an on-going conversation between SACS and UTA. She noted this is exemplified by the fact that SACS requires an impact report regarding the QEP to be filed in five years that will need to denote what we have learned from implementing our QEP and how we are using this information to strive for continued improvement in student learning. She reminded the Assembly that the QEP will be in existence for ten years.

4. The Coordinator reminded the Assembly that the QEP will be directed at the undergraduate experience, but designed in such a way to be incorporated throughout the University experience in the years ahead.

5. The Coordinator indicated that the QEP is important to those involved in graduate education because the QEP active learning theme strives to better prepare our undergraduate students with the skills necessary to be successful in graduate school and the workforce. Furthermore, much of what active learning strives to provide (e.g., research experience, problem solving, and critical thinking) are the very skills that graduate education has been noted for.

6. The Coordinator noted that thirty-eight QEP pre-proposals were submitted and the QEP Steering Committee is currently reviewing to select those that will be incorporated into the QEP. The Committee will make their selections by mid-April. A full outline of the plan will be disseminated to the UTA academic community via the web for comment prior to the Steering Committee beginning their drafting of the QEP this summer.

7. The Coordinator noted that in mid-to-late September a full draft will be released via the web for comment by the UTA academic community. She reminded the Assembly that SACS will be interested in how well the plan fits with UTA, how well our plan is defined including ability to carry it out, and how well our plan and assessment procedures are defined. Finally, SACS is interested in how well the academic community was involved in the planning process.

8. The Coordinator encouraged members to contact her with any questions, input, or if they would like additional information. She noted also the website listed on the handout that is currently available (under construction) and where important information will be posted in the coming months. (http://sacs.uta.edu/)

VII. Elected Officers:
   Chair - Nancy Hadaway
   Vice Chair - Greg Frazier

VIII. Old Business
   Old business none

IX. Adjournment
   Unanimously approved 3:28 pm