

# MEMORANDUM

MINUTES  
March 22, 2022  
UNDERGRADUATE ASSEMBLY

The Undergraduate Assembly meets in regular session on Tuesday, March 22, 2022, at 2:15 p.m. via Microsoft TEAMS. The agenda for the meeting is as follows:

## Attendance

Tomlinson, Allison	Harris, Brenda Lynn	Smallwood, Amber M. K.
Semingson, Peggy L	Rosser, David	Purgason, Ashley M
Abolmaali, Seyedali	LaBrenz, Catherine	Smallwood, Aaron D
Johnson, Pamela C	Hageman, Kathryn Lea	Veerabathina, Nilakshi
Meeks, Salena	Peterson, Lynn	de la Fuente Iglesias, Monica
Lewis, Rebecca J	Passy, Sophia I	Reed, Edith
Ingram, Tom L	Espinosa, Sergio	Banda, Shanna Essiann
Tjuatja, Saibun	Holmes, Michael	Nason, Joshua M
Aswath, Pranesh B	Kydd, Conroy E	Tamplain, Priscila M
Kim, Young-Tae	Conrad, Paul	Prabakar, Srinivas
Jocius, Robin	Brown, Casey Graham	Hunter, Darlene E
Doughty, Teresa Taber, PhD	Flores, Ceil	Ezell, Sonja
Mydlarz, Laura D	Tate, Kimberly	Kruzic, Andrew P
Jennings, Leslie	Li, Jianling	Boyd, Jeanean B [3:18 pm]
Hao, Grace Qing	Deen, Rebecca	
Michael, Nancy L	Carroll, Bill D	

- Casey Brown is attending from COEd.
- Bill Carroll is subbing for Jackie Faye.
- Monica de la Fuente Iglesias is subbing for Cynthia LeBorde in Modern Languages.

## Welcome Remarks

**Pranesh Aswath, Interim  
Provost &  
Undergraduate Assembly Chair**

The meeting was called to order at 2:16 pm by Pranesh Aswath. Pranesh asked if there were any concerns with the meeting being recorded and that it is part of the transcription and minutes. Pranesh asked if there were any students who are not ex-officio members of the UA. Deborah Hansford (graduate student of Leslie Jennings) is attending (by phone?). Casey Brown is attending from COEd. Bill Carroll is subbing for Jackie Faye. Monica de la Fuente Iglesias is subbing for Cynthia LeBorde. Pranesh reviewed the general guidelines. No one from the press is attending. Pranesh reminded everyone of the general guidelines. Everyone has an equal change to ask questions. Use the raise hand feature and you have a minute to ask questions. The vote for the motion will be in chat to have a record and to check yes, no, abstain.

**Approval of January 18, 2022 Minutes (attached)**

**Pranesh Aswath**

Pranesh referred everyone to the minutes in the Files section of the Teams channel. Pranesh asked for a motion to accept the minutes as in the files section of Teams channel. Paul Conrad said so moved to accept the motion (accept the minutes as in the Files in the Teams channel) as Pranesh stated it. Then Catherin LeBrenz motioned to second. Motion carried and minutes accepted.

**Approved unanimously.**

**I. In Favor: ALL**

**II. Opposed: 0**

**III. Abstain: 0**

**Submissions from the UCC\***

**Tom Ingram, UCC Chair**

Tom thanked and commended the Undergraduate curriculum committee (UCC) for their work through the fall and spring sessions. Special thanks to Dr. Smallwood and Jenny Keen helping the committee navigate the UCC process. The UCC met on February 8, Feb 22, and March 8 since last UA meeting. Quorum was present at all meetings. One program proposal from COLA from Art/Art History for a minor in Museum studies was reviewed and approved by the UCC. It is posted in the UA file. A total of 182 courses, new, modifications, and deleted were presented. 66 were new, 96 were modifications, and 20 were deleted. All were approved unanimously. Catalog changes and/or modification reviewed and approved for CAPP, COBA, COED, COE, COLA, CONHI, COS, Division of Student Success, Honors and Interdisciplinary, and SSW. Of note: Women’s studies has proposed a name change to Gender, Women, and Sexuality studies. Approved tentatively based on university level approval of said name change. This appears on P. 121 (approximately) of the submission file. Tom Ingram recommends these changes for approval. Pranesh asked if there were any questions, comments, or clarifications from UA on this. It was quiet and no comments. Pranesh asked for a motion to accept the submissions from the Undergraduate curriculum committee. Josh Nason moved to accept the motion (accept the submission from the undergraduate curriculum committee). The second was from Saibun Tjuatja and Pamela Johnson. Motion carried. Pranesh thanked Tom Ingram and the UCC committee for their service. Tom Ingram thanked Pranesh for his support.

**Approved unanimously.**

**I. In Favor: ALL**

**II. Opposed: 0**

**III. Abstain: 0**

Universities Studies Representation

Pranesh Aswath & Ashley Purgason,  
Assoc. VP of Division of Student  
Success

Last academic year, the Division of Student Success went through its program review with two external reviewers.

One recommendation by the two reviewers was to have a faculty committee that would oversee the curriculum for the program for the DSS. Deans recommended names for people who could serve. Pranesh listed the names of those who would be serving. Kristin Jakovich, Doug Klahr (CAPP), Bill Venable (COBA), Carter Tiernan (COE), Holly Hungerford-Kresser (COEd), Tyler Garner (CONHI), Laura Mydlarz (COS), and Alicia Rueda-Acedo (COLA). This committee will oversee the curricular aspect of University Studies. Recommendation for University Studies in UA. Need a representative for Undergraduate Curriculum Committee for this. Key element is to have faculty oversight with a curricular committee. Next step is representation. Ashely Purgason spoke and added the faculty steering committee would ultimately choose this person. This would be a peer faculty member serving, selected by the committee selected by the deans. Vote is required for approval. Pranesh asked if there questions. Nancy Michael requested that Tom Ingram (chair of UCC) share his opinion. Tom said he doesn't see an issue with it. He said Dr. Purgason and her team members requested to be invited to 2-3 of the meetings. They cannot make a formal motion to approve without a voting member on the current UCC for them. He sees no issue with adding a member to the UCC. Motion to allow an elected member from University Studies Curricular committee representative from the committee to serve on the University Undergraduate Curricular Committee (UCC). Rebecca Deen moved, Peggy Semingson second. Motion carried.

**Approved unanimously.**

**I. In Favor: ALL**

**II. Opposed: 0**

**III. Abstain: 0**

### **Conditionally Admitted Students**

**Pranesh Aswath, Ashley Purgason,  
& Andrew Kruzic, Academic  
Standards Committee**

Pranesh started with the question: what do we do with conditionally admitted students? Pranesh shared data on his screen. Pranesh acknowledged Ashely Purgason pulling this info together. The slides showed comparing conditionally admitted versus unconditionally admitted students. This is primarily FTIC (first time in college) not transfer students. About ten percent of students coming to UTA are conditionally admitted. Then they melt into the background. There is no special requirement they do anything different than an unconditionally student. [Pranesh shared data on slides]. Nila V. asked what is the criteria for conditionally admitted students? If better than 3.25 GPA, then admitted unconditionally, if 3.0-3.25 GPA then conditional admit. Some are admitted below 3.0. There are also additional criteria in the catalog, e.g., top 25% of class. Issue during the pandemic is some students are not taking SAT/ACT. Also, some schools are not ranking students. Student's GPAs can be on a non-standard scale. That is as Pranesh understands it. Dr. Li had a question about criteria—are they all required? Pranesh said you do not need to meet to all of them—you could meet any of them. That is the tricky part as we are test optional. Students are not required to submit test scores. Ranking in high school class is problematic as many high schools don't rank. GPA piece is most important criteria. [Pranesh is referring to slides]. Slide-conditional student comparison. Pranesh shared a regression analysis of clear correlation of higher high school GPA and higher GPA at UTA (“UTA First year cumulative

GPA vs High School GPA”-slide). Ask: Should students below a 3.0 HS GPA be admitted? What should conditions be for students who are admitted conditionally? Admission standards for conditional admits?

Pranesh turned it back over to Ashley Purgason. Amber Smallwood shared Nila’s (chat) question, “Why do we admit conditional students”. Pranesh offered a response: Every student has an opportunity to succeed. Moral responsibility to make sure they succeed. Admissions managed by enrollment management. Provost’s office is to help students succeed (e.g., wrap-around services). Catherine LeBrenz asked whether anyone has reached out to conditional students what are barriers to their education. Pranesh said one piece is to understand support structures and secondly role of UA is to establish what those guidelines are. It’s the first year that is the most critical piece. Peggy shared about needing to differentiate those who are doing fine and those not doing fine. Pranesh said we want them to feel special—to help them succeed, if we know who these people are. We need to make sure they are a quasi-cohort. Pranesh turned it over to Ashley Purgason.

Ashley shared ideas like “emerging scholars program” or “student success scholars” and programing for them. Another idea is requiring certain number of tutoring hours. An idea is using the UNIV course so dedicated sections for these students to tailor the content for what they might need. Another idea is a TSI boot camp with Upskilling in the summer before they actually matriculate—a range of options. Academic standards committee will discuss what those options might be.

Pranesh turned it over to Andy. Andy Kruzic shared. They need to set admission standards by Fall 2022 for Fall 2023. Committee will have to work fast on this issue. Some colleges will have different ideas/issues. Andy asked, how will they deal with getting this approved in time? Pranesh said if they can get this in front to the UCC late summer/early fall when they get started with their meetings, can move as quickly as possible. Pranesh wants proper deliberation as it is making a substantial change in the admission process. He said if you take a little longer, so be it. Andy agreed. Academic standards committee will be in touch with their colleges or schools. Pranesh thanked Andy. The PowerPoint will be shared in the file section (they will check with University Analytics). It is an internal document.

Saibun clarified his statement made earlier—how are students going to have a plan to improve? He wondered the granularity of the criteria. Pranesh clarified, 3.0 GPA in high school. We don’t want to just label them conditional admits. They need support services, e.g., supplemental instruction, peer advisor, etc. There is currently nothing in the catalog about conditional admits.

Question in chat: Do these students need to meet certain GPA in the first year? Pranesh: No, nothing special. No other standards right now. Peggy shared she likes the emerging scholars name. Sophia shared a suggestion: some of the tougher classes in some other colleges have prerequisites, e.g., they do this in chemistry. Students have to do modules for all students who may struggle. It’s a class pre-requisite. Pranesh said they have disaggregated data in this area. Nila raised her hand to better understand the process as students do not know they are conditional students and instructors don’t know they are conditional students either. Nila also likes the emerging scholars name. Pranesh: there is nothing in the catalog. A label alone is not

meaningful. We need broad guidelines on how to set the standard and help people move forward. Nila asked is there a comparison to UTD....? Pranesh said they are in the 80% range, as well. They are looking at threshold of admission standards to maintain access. As we get better and better students, the standards will naturally go up.

Andy Kruzic shared is it is his understanding a grade repeat policy will be under examination very soon. This has an impact on student success. He said math and chemistry is keen on looking at requirements for students to enter the first course. Those are usually tied to a specific department. Pranesh said this brings up an issue-- co-requisite issue. It's now a law that they have to take the co-requisite for support.

Syedali—how much emphasis on DEI? He would like them to look at social justice in the curriculum. Ashley: equitable outcomes are critically important. This work is critical for equitable outcomes.

Pranesh said this process will be systematic and careful.

Jianling Li asked can they share the ppt with faculty. Yes as long as retained within the faculty and not externally published. Only internal consumption.

### **Student Complaints and Appeals**

**Amber Smallwood, Rebecca Lewis,  
Heather Snow, and Kathryn  
Hageman**

The last agenda item is student complaints and appeals. Amber, Rebecca, Heather, and Katie are presenting. Issue: Not consistent with language across policy documents e.g., HOP, website, etc. Amber shared: They are preparing for a fifth-year review for SACSCOC and they have to share a log of written complaints. They need to define what constitutes a formal written complaint. They have been working through various policy documents. Need a link for colleges for students to submit complaints—original request to Heather Snow. Taking two steps back--need to look at policy language and policy language changes. They want to tighten up the language. Proposed edits have been shared with chairs and program directors and will be shared with graduate assembly. They are in the Teams drive for this meeting.

Katie Hageman shared the policy language changes (e.g., informal resolution, appeal, formal complaint, written complaint). Bill Carroll suggested this be discussed at faculty senate, as well. Katie Hageman said yes, they will get on the senate meeting agenda. Katie shared they are not changing the process, so everyone is using the same terminology. Syedali suggested this be reviewed by student senate body and whether this includes grade grievances. Katie confirmed this policy is not applicable to grade grievances. They have some cleanup to do to the document and talk to graduate assembly, students, and faculty senate and then president for approval

May be in place by fall of next year. Will go through HOP Policy. SACSCOC is due March of next year. Nancy asked is there not a similar policy each dept/college? Isn't there an appeal form for complaints? Pranesh, the appeal remains within the college unless there was some other type of issue, e.g., if they can demonstrate some type of bias. Laura Mydlarz asked about grade grievances—is there a formal definition of a grade grievance? Pranesh—usually the final grade

is where the grade grievance occurs. Pranesh said there is flexibility for the colleges. Seyedali shared about COE and grade grievances—students have one year to file a grade grievance they have a grade grievance committee. Rebecca Lewis shared HOP policy will help clarify the procedure but that it is not formalized in the HOP. Nancy Michael added it would be helpful to have a standard link or form for students across the university for the other items. Heather does have that in place of a centralized form, but it doesn't attest someone went to every appropriate level up to that point. Katie: Dean of students website has information on one page. Pranesh thanked them for the discussion.

Pranesh thanked everyone and wished everyone a great rest of the semester.

### **Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 3:48 pm.

*\*Details regarding agenda items have been posted online for Assembly members to review.*

*Respectfully submitted, Peggy Semingson, College of Liberal Arts.*