Graduate Council Meeting
November 20, 2018 ● 10:00 – 11:30 ● Gilmore 212

Minutes

Attendance:
Quorum: 11 (Current membership = 23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member</th>
<th>Name of Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R. Babcock, ENGR</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X N. Stalker for K. Jolly, A&amp;H</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Braun, MBTSSW</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X K. McQuiston, A&amp;H</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Lemus, SOEST</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X E. Biagioni, CNS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Jha CTAHR</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Guentner, CNS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Shannon, SONDH</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Maaka, COE</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chang, JABSOM</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sorensen Irvine, COE</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Ka'aloa, HSHK &amp; SPAS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Powell, MFS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Park, ARCH, TIM, &amp; SCB</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Stephenson, MFS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Berez-Kroeker for C. Bacchilega, LLL</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. (Trish) Tupou, GSO</td>
<td>EXC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M. Park, LLL</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Valdez, GSO?</td>
<td>ABS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Heyer, CSS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Aune, GD</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Juarez, CSS</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Maeda, GD</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alternate(s)                  | Alternate(s)
--------------------------------|------------------|
C. Higgins for A. Berez-Kroeker | ABS

Welcome
- Carolyn Stephenson, second MFS liaison

Announcements/Updates
- Graduate Assembly – 11/28/2018 KUY 101; 2:30p – 4:00p
- Frances Davis Undergraduate Teaching Award for GTAs – Deadline for nominations: December 1
- Peter V. Garrod Graduate Mentoring Award – Deadline for nominations: December 1
- Individual Development Plans Graduate Chair Matters Session (today!) KUY 106

Old Business
- Approval of October 16th Meeting Minutes
  - Vote: 10 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 5 Abstentions
- GGC: Graduate Grievance Committee Process
  - GSO Rep not present

New Business
- AAA committee - R. Kaalooa has volunteered to chair this committee.
- Course committee - K. Heyer has volunteered to chair this committee for the Fall term and K. McQuiston for the Spring term.
Course Proposals: UHM-1 forms (ASTR 750, ASTR 790, EDCS 696, GEOG 736, LTEC 661, LTEC 682, ME 612, MUS 636E, PHIL 616, SUST 696)

- Recommendation to request more attention by proposers of new courses to proposal guidelines, items #4 and 5 - where does course fit into current graduate program (impact on faculty workload), will the new course affect new degree programs the need for those items to be addressed more clearly by programs. Having clearer and more information to directly respond to the questions will help in the review process.

- LTEC 661: General question: What are students designing? This aspect was not clearly presented. Is a learning experience being developed? C. Sorensen Irvine, faculty member in LTEC shared this course proposal’s content was offered as an experimental course previously and it was successful. The content is more about the process of design thinking. Design thinking is how one thinks about solving problems from a design perspective.
  - Course committee recommended approval.

- LTEC 682: The proposal didn’t explain the role of this course (item #5 from the proposal guidelines) in graduate program very clearly. Per C. Sorensen Irvine, this course would be an elective in the program.
  - Course committee recommended approval.

- ASTR 750: Course committee commented the course was well designed. No questions.
  - Course committee recommended approval.

- ASTR 790: Course committee commented the course was well designed. One question about whether or not others had a course similar to ASTR 790? The course proposed is a seminar to discuss research in the field and introduce students to the journal club at the Institute for Astronomy. K. Braun shared PH has a similar course, but students discuss their research primarily; the focus is less on published research. Others have a journal club, but not necessarily in the way this one is being proposed and it relates to other discussion that members of the Grad Council are not opposed to courses, which can be relatively generic, but can also be very disciplinary specific.

  - Motion to approve LTEC 661 & 682 and ASTR 750 & 790. Vote: Unanimous in Favor.

- ME 612 - The Course committee commented that this was a well-designed course.
  - Course committee recommended approval.

- MUS 636E - A signature from the Arts and Humanities Dean’s office was missing on the form. Addition of Conducting to currently offered instrumental and vocal areas.
  - Course committee recommended approval.

  - Motion to approve ME 612 and MUS 636E. Vote: 15 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions

- EDCS 696 - Syllabus was incomplete and did not include much content to be reviewed. The Committee understands the purpose of the course and that it will differ based on the instructor as well as the capstone projects to be done. However, it would be helpful to have a sample of what such a course might look like. There was also a question on whether or not such a course could be approved with the syllabus as submitted. Similar
to other new course proposals, a more complete sample syllabus is often provided and this one should not be different.

- **Course committee requested a more complete sample syllabus.**

  o GEOG 736 - The information submitted in this course proposal is more similar to an undergraduate course in tone, readings to be done, and in the writing content, than a graduate level course. Graduate courses are to have a higher standard than undergraduate courses.

    - **Course committee requested a revised proposal and syllabus for this course that is more aligned with the high standards for a graduate level course.**

  o PHIL 610 - Questions - Appears there may be some overlap with CUL 610? (Item #5 in the proposal guidelines was not clearly addressed). There was a question about the Repeat limit - what will students learn the second time, if repeating the course? Another question related to Grading with 80% of the grade going to the final project, is this an issue? Per members of the Graduate Council, this does not appear to be an issue as it’s common in the social sciences. A second syllabus would be helpful to see how content would be different if the course is repeated. What is the thinking behind being able to repeat the course?

    - **Course committee requested information in response to the questions posed.**

  o SUST 696 - This course is to be offered out of the Institute for Sustainability and Resilience (ISR) - campus level institute. Questions for this proposal: Who is running the seminar? Are the students to be the speakers? This part was unclear. Additionally is every student required to speak and present per week? R. Juarez shared this seminar has been offered previously and speakers are invited to present in the course to the students. There is a strong list of presenters asked to share in this course. The requirements don’t clearly specify if students are required to present too? Also, there were questions about alignment between the SLOs and assignments, how students would be meeting SLOs and how the participation by students is to be determined? Could a student’s presentation be considered a form of participation? P. Ka’aloa shared there is a similar course, HWST 631. R. Juarez shared ECON also has one, ECON 696.

    - **Course committee recommended approval with also a request for information from previous terms on how the course was implemented, clarifying speakers are invited to participate, as well as addressing questions raised regarding how SLOs would be met in this course.**

    - **Motion to approve with feedback to addressed. Vote: 15 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention.**

**Program-related Actions**

- Master of Music focus area in Conducting proposal

  - **Performance track to add Conducting; choral, orchestral, and wind. Two faculty to teach in this area, presently an active search for a third faculty member. Need curriculum to be included in the proposal, this information is missing from the proposal. There was a question regarding the likelihood for students to pursue a degree in this area? Per K. McQuiston, anecdotal information from high school ensemble directors, they have asked about a master’s program in conducting. There are many reasons this would be attractive to bachelor’s degree graduates.**
Another question regarding if the graduate courses would be offered during the summer due to audience for this track? As a summer program? No discussion at the moment for online courses. Much of the work is through individual lessons. Will there be an impact on the Music Education master’s degree? Per K. McQuiston, it depends on a student’s objectives. A Master of Music in the area of conducting is more performance related. A Master in Music Education would be more likely for those pursuing a PhD later. It’s a nice alternative for Bachelor of Education students who may not be as serious about music education, but are more interested in performance skills. A small number (1-2) are to be enrolled per faculty member, hence there seems to be minimal impact on the program with the addition of this track.

- Program committee requested the missing curricular requirements for this track.

  o Sustainability and Resilience Education GCERT proposal
    - B. Powell reported he had learned this proposal had not yet been reviewed by the College of Education’s Curriculum Committee. C. Sorensen Irvine shared the ATP was approved in October 2017. This GCERT is based on placed-based education. On a related side note, B. Powell expressed there is a growing concern of the potential for uncoordinated growth of programs related to Sustainability with units submitting proposals, but remaining as silos when a more coordinated approach to interdisciplinary and collaborative work in this area would be more aligned with the concept of Sustainability. C. Stephenson shared that the CAPP committee of MFS has also been reviewing proposals in this area and they’ve not been inclusive of all areas related to Sustainability. A suggestion was made to consider having some type of review, endorsement, or letter from Makena Coffman, Director, Institute for Sustainability and Resilience for all proposals in this area. Such notice from her would allow for approval groups to know she is aware of the effort. This would also allow for coordination and communication of efforts by different units as well as a means by which growth of programs, undergraduate and graduate level, can be systematic, informed, and more of a collaborative effort among units, as appropriate. There was discussion by the Council members on issues related to sustainability and how to best coordinate efforts at both the undergraduate and graduate levels. Dean Aune shared a discussion at a recent Dean’s meeting and the work to be done to re-envision interdisciplinary education at UHM at the undergraduate and graduate levels.

    - There was a question about a course being proposed as part of the Sustainability and Resilience GCERT. The question pertained to the sustainability content in this course? There was also some discussion that it is difficult to define sustainability. The term came out of the field of environment, but in how it’s used now, there are instances where there does not seem to be much relation to environment in the way that was initially intended.

    - Program committee recommended this proposal undergo review by the College of Education’s curriculum committee. Other issues related to the content being more clearly on sustainability also need to be addressed.

  o Measurement and Statistics GCERT proposal
• A new course was also proposed. The new course proposal is still being worked on and will be provided to the Program and Course committees for consideration at the December meeting.
• There is a comment made in the proposal that this GCERT would be open to all graduate students. However, the courses proposed for this GCERT have prerequisites and conflicts with how this GCERT can be available to all. The learning objectives could be articulated more clearly.
• **Program committee briefly reported on this course. B. Powell is still awaiting feedback from the committee’s review.**

  o Program Evaluation GCERT proposal
    • There was similar feedback for this proposal. More clearly articulated objectives for this GCERT are necessary. Also, what are the requirements for this program? What is expected in order to earn this GCERT? The Capstone project needs to be articulated more clearly. There was some discussion of assessment in general and how we know students graduate knowing what was intended for them to learn.
    • Dean Aune shared some information about a platform called Portfolium. It’s an online web tool which can display/exhibit students’ (and faculty, post-docs) accomplishments. The discussion is underway of how to have an interface to show the evolution of a student’s journey and their development of skills and knowledge.
    • **Program committee also briefly reported on this course. B. Powell is still awaiting feedback from the committee’s review. In general, as proposed, this proposal and the Measurement and Statistics proposals should be fine for approval at the next meeting.**

Other Business

- Time to degree. There was a question from M. Park about students who pass 7 years and do not graduate. An academic program (AP) notation is placed on their transcripts at the end of year 7. Previously, this was done at the end of 5 years and removed once students graduated. The AP notation remains on transcripts after students graduate presently. There was some discussion that the allotted time to degree at other institutions is 10 years. There are diverse issues and reasons for delays to earn an advanced degree. Dean Aune has requested this issue to be discussed by the AAA committee.

Adjourned: 11:27a

**Next Meeting: December 11, 2018**