Graduate Council Meeting
October 17, 2017 ● 3:00 – 4:30 ● Gilmore 212

Minutes

| Attendance |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Quorum:** 11 (Current membership = 23) |
| R. Babcock, ENGR | X | K. Jolly, A&H | X |
| K. Braun, MBTSSW | EXC | K. McQuiston, A&H | X |
| J. Lemus, SOEST | X | E. Biagioni, CNS | X |
| T. Miura, CTAHR | X | E. Guentner, CNS | X |
| M. Shannon, SONDH | X | M. Noonan, COE | X |
| B. Shiramizu, JABSOM | X | C. Sorenson Irvine, COE, MFS | X |
| R. Ka’aloha, HSHK & SPAS | X | B. Powell, MFS | X |
| H. Park, ARCH, TIM, & SCB | X | J. Adams, GSO | X |
| C. Bacchilega, LLL | EXC | T. Lewis, GSO | EXC |
| M. Park, LLL | X | K. Aune, OGE | X |
| K. Heyer, CSS | EXC | J. Maeda, OGE | X |
| R. Juarez, CSS | X | |

Alternates

| V. Yontz, MBTSSW – for K. Braun | X | | H. Leibreich, GSO – for T. Lewis | X |
| V. Jun, LLL – for C. Bacchilega | X | |

**Guests:** John Chen, BIOM, C. Clayton, ASAN, Rich Gazan, LIS, C. Ceria-Ulep & A. Tse, Nursing

**Welcome**

**Introductions**

**Announcements**

- Graduate Assembly – November 30, 2017 3:00 – 4:15p.m. WEB 203
- Frances Davis Undergraduate Teaching Awards for GTA Due: Dec 1
- Peter V. Garrod Distinguished Mentoring Award Due: Dec 1
- 3MT April 28, 2018 Location: Business Administration buildings
  - Inaugural event in 2016. Data recommended for presentation.
- Committee chairs for AAA & Course committees
  - AAA: Tomoaki Miura
  - Course: Ruben Juarez (Fall) & Roger Babcock (Spring)
  - Program: Christine Sorensen Irvine

**Old Business**

- Approval of September 19th Minutes
- **Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 abstentions**
• Update on BA/MA Pathway Guidelines
  o Delete seminar from language in the pathways
  o Programs must identify gateway courses; meeting upper division requirement for undergraduates
  o OVCAA will approve pathways with review from OGE
  o Baccalaureate / Masters pathways – if interested, contact either or both, Wendy Pearson, OVCAA and Krystyna Aune, OGE.
  o GSO – event from graduate students about the pathway; many questions from graduate students. Compiling questions received.
    ▪ Concerns of students at a different level; GPA requirements; changing culture of the class; tuition dollars divided for student fee?
  o ECON is the first approved pathway program. SLS in the queue.
  o Revised version to be shared on OVCAA web site. Dean Aune to share the revised version.

New Business
• Program Modifications – The order in which the modifications were discussed was based on the written feedback provided by the Program committee. The order below reflects the discussion of each program modification and is different from what was on the agenda.
  o Learning Design and Technology
    ▪ No questions. Approval was recommended by the committee.
    ▪ VOTE: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention
  o Asian Studies
    ▪ No questions from committee. Other members from the Graduate Council asked a few questions. One question related to the advantages of requiring a 695, rather than 699 for Plan B students. Dean Aune and C. Sorensen Irvine responded that a 699 can be very broad and used in myriad ways in a graduate student’s program. A designated course provides some structure, but also credit to the faculty member and unit. No credit is awarded for 699 courses to faculty or the unit. Another question asked if students were informed of the requirement of taking 18 cr of 600-level courses. C. Clayton shared that there is some confusion in that students may take graduate courses outside of ASAN or students may fulfill all of their course requirements within ASAN. Regardless of where students fulfill their credit requirements in or outside of ASAN, they’re all informed of the minimum 18 cr requirement.
    ▪ By eliminating the requirement of taking courses outside of ASAN from three Arts and Science (A&S) areas, would enrollment in those A&S courses be affected? C. Clayton
responded that it’s difficult to say. It could, but she didn’t think by too much. Students in ASAN are encouraged to take courses from across campus and it would be difficult to say how much of an effect this change to their program of study would make to courses outside of ASAN. About 40% of the courses in ASAN are cross-listed.

- Approval was recommended by the committee.
- **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor**

- *Library and Information Science* (written response from LIS attached)

  - The committee requested clarification regarding two courses, LIS 663 and 684. If they still met program SLOs, why were they still not listed as options to take? R. Gazan explained the courses are actually being deleted from the Catalog. Courses being added were included in the packet that was reviewed.
  - There was a question by the committee regarding the replacement of courses since the total credits were remaining the same with the modification, despite the addition of two new required courses. R. Gazan responded of the new seminar courses to be added, one is 1 cr and the other is 2 cr.
  - Approval was recommended by the committee.
  - **VOTE: Unanimous in Favor**

- *Doctor of Nursing Practice*

  - C. Ceria-Ulep and A. Tse verbally responded to questions/concerns posed by the Program committee. The first concern related to the proposal mentioning $10,000 as needed for reviews of students, but it was unclear as to the source of those funds. The proposal mentioned they would use the differential in tuition they receive, but further clarification was necessary. It was unclear if they already receive differential tuition or if they were going to request differential tuition. C. Ceria-Ulep responded they currently have differential tuition: Nursing students pay about $1,001 per credit and with most of their students pay $637 of that, the difference is what they will use. The $10,000 are not new funds. Further clarification was requested because if Nursing is currently using the differential tuition, how will be cover this new item of reviews of students? Are there expenses that will no longer be covered being covered if the funds will be used for a different purpose? This is where the committee was unclear and requested clarification. C. Ceria-Ulep clarified there have been internal adjustments within the
School and they envision more students in the program to help offset this new cost.

- The second concern also related to the first was the proposed hiring of a new 0.5 FTE clinical site coordinator. This wasn’t mentioned as a cost to cover or a need for additional funds. C. Ceria-Ulep responded that the School would cover the position. The position would support the undergraduate and graduate programs, which includes the DNP. C. Sorensen Irvine indicated the source of this funding was not clear in the proposal. Reference was made to this position also being funded by differential tuition, but it was not clear how that source of funding could also support this position. C. Sorensen Irvine requested OGE work with Nursing to revise this section of the proposal.

- A third concern was on the new course proposals for the DNP program that were included after the committee downloaded the program modifications. There are 8 course proposals (i.e., 3 new; 5 modifications) that were included in a separate folder.
  - Per A. Tse, the new course proposals are the result of the program breaking NURS 675 into individual courses. She explained it was difficult for students and the program to track progress in one practicum that was repeatable multiple times. With separate practicum courses, each one can focus on different populations (e.g., older adults, children with disabilities, etc)
  - C. Sorensen Irvine suggested the way it was verbally described also be used in the proposal.

- The Program committee requested a revision to the proposal to clarify the source of the $10,000 and funding the projected 0.5 FTE position. This would be reviewed again at the November meeting. They also would like the time to review the UHM course forms related to this program modification.

**DECISION: Tabled to November.**

- Biomedical Science (written response from BIOM attached)
  - Some of the concerns expressed by the Program committee were addressed in the written response that J. Chen provided and were sent to the committee. However, there were still concerns with regard to the changes that were being proposed by the program and the clarity with regard to the full context of those changes since they were the outcome of a Program Review process. The Program Review process is a collaborative effort initiated by the OVCAA with assistance from OGE. All programs that are not
accredited are on a five year cycle for this review process. The report from the Program Review and the unit’s response to the report were not provided to the Program committee so it was difficult for the members to fully understand how the findings from the Program Review and the changes in the program modification proposal were connected. There was discussion amongst the members of the benefit to seeing the Program Review report. It was also mentioned that it might give a better understanding of the program modification and provides a way to see if changes to the program would address identified issues from the review. However, would ensuring that the proposed changes addressed the contents of the report extend the responsibilities of the Graduate Council beyond its purview? Clarification was requested from Dean Aune on the Program Review procedure with regard to what happens between reviews and who oversees that process. There is a year 1 report after the Review and then an interim report in year 3 with another Program Review scheduled at year 5. These reports are submitted to the OVCAA. After some further discussion, it was determined that the program report need not be submitted to the Graduate Council and that the Council would continue to review program modifications. The program modifications, however, should still be clear in terms of what is being proposed and the related rationale.

- There was a question on the needs assessment and whether or not there is a need for the Clinical track now? It appears the Quantitative Health Science emphasis seems to be the strength and focus, how does the Clinical Research track fit? J. Chen responded that there is a need for both tracks because physicians will have different preferences with regard to each track. Some will want to pursue more of the statistics and data analyses track whereas others would prefer to only understand what is necessary to pursue clinical trials.

- Another question asked if there is enough faculty for the program? J. Chen responded that two units in JABSOM were merged, the Office of Quantitative Health and the Complementary and Integrated Medicine Department (formerly Complementary and Alternative Medicine). He said they also recruited from faculty from other units to serve on their graduate faculty.

- The proposal also referenced quizzes as the means to evaluate student performance. This seems to be misaligned with outcomes and the 70% pass rate is rather low. J. Chen responded that in other fields like Computer Science and
Engineering, pass rates of 70% are not unusual and for some may be lower. The difficulty level of the questions included in the exam also contributes to the pass rate threshold.

- There was a question as to why is the program offering a Plan A and B, when the emphasis seems to be on research? J. Chen responded that it was a request from their Dean’s office to offer both. Physicians prefer to complete a project option, rather than a research-based thesis. Offering both routes allows a choice as to what may fit their students.
- Send Program review report to Program Committee. Ensure issues were addressed.
  - OGE to work with program on modifying the program modification proposal.
  - Recommendation: Revision to program modification to be submitted. Program committee to review written response and will submit any further questions/concerns.
- **DECISION: Tabled to November.**

- Advanced Degree ILOs
  - Dean Aune requested Graduate Council members to share with their respective constituents the ILOs and ask programs to revisit alignment between the ILOs and program learning outcomes. The ILOs were developed from the majority of program learning outcomes.

- Waiver of Liability “Research Abroad Release”
  - This form was developed as a request from a program. It is a good source from which to start the conversation about the risks of research away from campus, here in Hawai‘i, the mainland, or abroad. Students should be informed and aware of the environment they would be going into for their research. This is more than in conducting the research, but in general of health advisories, travel advisories, etc.
  - A suggestion was made to add project so that it may also include practicum/clinical or related types of experiences for students.
  - Another suggestion was to revisit this form at the next meeting after time to review it. Graduate Assistants are
already covered. There was not enough time for a discussion, so it will be added to the next meeting agenda.

Adjourned: 4:33p

**Next Meeting: November 21, 2017 in GILMORE 212**