

Graduate Council Meeting Minutes
October 18, 2016
Gilmore 212
2:30-4:00p

Quorum: 11 (Current membership = 23)

Present: C. Yano, D. Drake (for A. Sherwood), A. Wiczorek, K. Oliveira, (V. Jun for C. Bacchilega), D. Rockwood, M. Godinet, T. Hangelbroek, D. Sanders, R. Juarez, K. McQuiston, B. Shiramizu, J. Purvis, F. Sansone, M. Karaoke-Yahiro

Excused: C. Sorensen Irvine, K. Rao, C. Bacchilega, A. Sherwood, M. Babcock, R. Babcock, M. Park, A. McKee

Guest: Lurana O'Malley, THEA

Welcome and Introductions

A general welcome and background of the Graduate Council was provided. Additionally, the role of members representing their respective units was shared..An updated electronic copy of graduate chairs will be distributed. Members are asked to share information from meetings with colleagues in their respective colleges/any other units that they represent on Graduate Council.

Committee Assignments – Dean Aune provided a general background on the role of the Graduate Council to OGE. The Graduate Council is an advisory group to OGE for policy, curriculum, and other business related to Graduate Education that meets monthly. Council members are rotated to all committees during their terms of service.

- AAA – deeper review of issues, provides recommendations and is advisory to the Dean of OGE. This group may also be asked to draft recommendations for the rest of the Council's consideration.
- Course –reviews all UHM-1 forms and recommends approval by the rest of the Council members.
- Program – modifications, changes, spearhead new program initiatives. Background was shared regarding a MFS liaison serve as chair of the committee and usher any program actions directly to MFS. This streamlines the approval process (academic actions no longer route through what was CORGE).

Question posed regarding who comprises membership of the Graduate Council. Typically, members are former department or graduate chairs or others in department or other leadership experience, preferably tenured with extensive experience in graduate education.

Dean Aune requested a volunteer to chair the Course committee. Having a chair to help coordinate the group as well as present recommendations on behalf of the group can help provide a clearer way to share committee recommendations with the rest of the Council members. The

role of the committees is to review items related to their committee and present a recommendation to the rest of the Council.

Chair of committees –

R. Juarez – AAA

D. Sanders – Program

Course – there was a nomination for C. Sorensen Irvine to serve as Chair. Of this committee's members, she is the only returning Council member from last year.

Minutes

Approval of May minutes – No corrections or edits suggested. **Vote: Unanimous**

Announcements

- Graduate Assembly, November 30, 2016; 2:00-4:00p
- AAUW International Doctoral Women Scholarship Opportunity
- Award committee members are assigned to review the Peter V. Garrod Mentoring Award nominees, the Course Committee members are assigned to select the Frances Davis Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching, and the AAA Committee members have been assigned to award the UHF Scholarships overseen by OGE.

Old Business

- Teacher Leader GCERT proposal – Proposal submitted near the end of last Spring that underwent minor revisions over the summer.
 - **Vote: Unanimous**
 - Dean Aune requested a resolution be drafted for MFS Agenda

New Business

- **Program Actions**
 - THEA – L. O'Malley provided a brief overview of the changes THEA has proposed for all of their MFA and PhD tracks. They're mostly minor changes to correct, clarify, and adjust info on program sheets, essentially, housekeeping adjustments and clarifying requirements so they're clearer to everyone.
 - Question – is the primary change a reduction to 1 core course?
 - Per L. O'Malley, yes, all of the tracks have very similar requirements with slight variations between the tracks. However, none share an actual course that could be considered a core requirement. Thus, the one teaching course that is being proposed is the only one that the faculty agreed upon and is the same across all tracks. They're formalizing their core requirement and clarifying other related, more track-specific requirements.
 - **Vote: Unanimous**
 - ORE – Proposed changes are to add a track that would include a few ENGR courses, courses outside of SOEST. Support from the former Dean of ENGR was obtained to list the selected ENGR courses. There was a concern about space available in courses outside of a program's college for students who might be in

the new track. The proposal was edited to include language suggesting students in this new track may take the ENGR courses on a space available basis.

- Question: The term “Free elective” was included in the proposal. It’s unclear what is meant (e.g., elective outside of any ORE or ENGR courses without advisor approval, any elective outside, but with advisor approval, etc) and clarification is requested. Dean Aune to ask program for clarification and language to ensure a clear understanding of what is meant.
- **Vote: Unanimous**

AAA Committee Report

- The AAA committee was asked to review documents submitted by selected graduate faculty members as part of the Appointment Review Process (<https://manoa.hawaii.edu/graduate/content/appointment-review-process>)
 - Background – A review of graduate faculty members is now part of Program Review. Program Review is now being coordinated and overseen by the OVCAA, rather than OGE. To streamline the process, CVs already collected for Program Review are made accessible to OGE for a review graduate faculty how they’re continuing to meet the graduate faculty standards. We have changed to a numerical system (3, 2, 1) to denote level of privileges. This was done to reduce confusion of previously used terms, Full and Associate with faculty rank. Level 1 was added to better fit a change the Graduate Council made in 2015 regarding Affiliate Graduate Faculty (AGF). AGF should only serve as committee members (excluding University Representative [UR]) and not as chair. Level 1 is to serve as a committee member (excluding UR).
 - Question regarding definition of AGF and Cooperating Graduate Faculty (CGF). AGF are otherwise qualified individuals who are not employed by the University of Hawai‘i (any of the 10 campuses). CGF are any UH faculty outside of a UHM graduate program or a faculty member from any UH campus in the system.
- R. Juarez – shared the process the committee used to review documents submitted by 7 graduate faculty members who did not clearly meet the Graduate Faculty standards during the initial review conducted by J. Maeda during the Program Review. The AAA members met and discussed all materials (e.g., CV, cover letter, unsolicited letter from dept/grad chair, etc) submitted by the selected graduate faculty members. A handout was distributed that included the recommendations for each faculty member.
 - Individual 1 – recommend one year to demonstrate progress toward publication of a book that has been completed
 - Individuals 2, 3, and 4 – recommend maintain level 3 appt
 - Individuals 5, 6, and 7 – these faculty do not meet the second standard. Recommend change to level 2.
- Question: How were these graduate faculty selected? – As part of Program Review, which is conducted by OVCAA about every 5 years, graduate faculty are also reviewed. These faculty were identified via an iterative process as not clearly meeting the standards. The procedure prior to the AAA committee review is J. Maeda reviews all CVs and

determines if there is information to show the standards are met. If information is unclear, she communicates with the Graduate chair who then works with the faculty to submit further information.

- Question: With the range of scholarship, how is this defined? The committee took into account information that was included in the faculty member's DPC document as well as information submitted. Scholarly work varies by field and the standard for this area is written in a way to allow all faculty members can meet it. This review process is similar, but also different from the tenure and promotion process.
- **Vote: Unanimous**

Related to Graduate Faculty Behavior/ Mentoring

- Dean Aune would like to have a process for review for unbecoming/bad mentoring behavior (essentially, abuse/neglect by a graduate faculty mentor). She has tasked the AAA group to discuss and draft a white paper on potential procedures similar to the review process for graduate faculty who do not clearly meet the standards.
- The process would need to be fair and not unfairly change appointment level. Such a document would need to be shared with all relevant groups (e.g., UHPA, GSO, etc). A path to improvement should also be provided such as a procedure to improve behavior – attending workshops, trainings, etc.
- A few members shared experiences and suggestions on how help with mentoring would be beneficial. Dean Aune reported information provided by the Council of Graduate Schools about mentoring – how to, what not to do, policy and process. Early training for new mentors as well as tune-ups, etc. could be helpful.
 - Question, if the faculty member is successful in terms of their work and productivity, how can concerns regarding their mentoring be addressed? There are few tools for chairs to use. How can they start initial intervention for something that is not right?
- Procedures for grievances – try to resolve at the most proximal level in program and college then OGE. Rather than a punitive approach, it may be more effective to use a positive approach – best practice and knowing policies and procedures. The lifecycle of mentoring changes over time with students.
 - J. Purvis shared she is willing see how GSO can also help; stories from the students' perspective, information students are receiving regarding mentoring as well as offering to help with surveying mentoring on campus.

Annual Doctoral Student Progress Report

- Requests grad chairs to submit a report for doctoral students who are not making progress. Part of a procedure implemented about three years ago to help graduate chairs be more aware of doctoral student progress. The graduate chair need not meet with each student, it could be the student's advisor/committee chair. A process should be in place for such reviews to occur, for tracking progress.
 - The intent is to have something useful for programs to use. If programs already have an annual process in place, they can submit the form they use, rather than use the OGE sample.
- Would this be a useful procedure? J. Purvis shared that it might be helpful for students – helpful to ensure balance between academic work and other duties (i.e., GA).

- Most of the members appeared to agree that it can be helpful as long as whatever form is necessary to be submitted is easy to complete. Some already have a procedure in place. A flexible process that is helpful and easy to do.

Online Application Process

- Efforts to streamline the submission of supplemental documents is currently in progress – supplemental materials are to be submitted at one central point in a system currently being developed by ITS. Dean Aune will follow-up with Hae Okimoto on progress of this system.

Other

- Is it possible to make Keyword searches better? It seems with changes to the titles of offices and services on campus, a search using keywords does not seem to find them. A few examples were shared: parking, health services, etc.
- More recruitment efforts by OGE are occurring – 3+2 partnerships, fast track programs/pathways, centralized recruitment, more focus to be placed on retention.

Adjournment – 4:00p

Next Meeting: November 15, 2016; 2:30 – 4:00pm Gilmore 212