Graduate Council Meeting  
December 15, 2020 ● 2:30-4:00p ● Zoom

Minutes

Attendance:
Quorum: 11 (Current membership = 22)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Member</th>
<th>Name of Member</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O. Boric-Lubecke, ENGR (leaving 3:30p)</td>
<td>X B. Fisher, CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Guo, MBTSSW</td>
<td>X K. Sands, CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Karamperidou, SOEST</td>
<td>X S. Robertson, CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Jha CTAHR</td>
<td>X T. Ticktin, CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Tse, SONDH</td>
<td>X M. Maaka, COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Chang, JABSOM</td>
<td>X C. Sorensen Irvine, COE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Ka’aloa, ARCH/SCB/HSHK</td>
<td>X J. Potemra, MFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q. Liu, ARCH/SCB/HSHK</td>
<td>X C. Stephenson, MFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Berez-Kroeker, CALL</td>
<td>X M. Willingham, GSO/E. Turner, GSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Suryanata, CSS</td>
<td>X M. Singh, GSO/E. Turner, GSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y. Xu, CSS</td>
<td>X K. Aune, GD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* A = AAA Committee; C = Course Committee; P = Program Committee; bold = chair

Alternate(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternate(s)</th>
<th>Alternate(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Announcements/Reminders

- Open Office Hours via ZOOM with Graduate Dean & Associate Dean
  - December 16th 12:30p - 1:30p
- Graduate Council Spring 2021/Fall 2021 Meeting Dates (Tuesdays, 3:00-4:30p)
  - Spring 2021: January 19, February 16, March 23, April 20, May 11
  - Fall 2021: September 21, October 19, November 16, December 14

Old Business

- Approval of November minutes
  Motion to Approve. Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention

New Business

- Course Proposals:
  - **ANSC 682** -re-submission
  - There was a question about the Advanced Degree ILOs and if they should be added verbatim to the Justification document and syllabus. Wording of
the ILOs should be included verbatim, rather than personalized. A suggestion was made to change the syllabus so the Advanced Degree ILOs are the same as what is on the Graduate Division website.

- There was a comment made relative to the revised syllabus. On p. 2 section 3, letter b: ILO - graduate MS course. There is wording to suggest this is an undergraduate course. The Advanced Degree ILOs should not map to an undergraduate course. Per R. Jha, this was an error. One p. 2, letter c for the program course learning objectives, a suggestion was made for higher level verbs to be used. They seem to be relatively low for a graduate course.

- Summary: Include the Advanced Degree ILOs verbatim in the Justification and syllabus, refer to Bloom's taxonomy to differentiate levels of learning and to help identify higher level verbs for the objectives, clarify on p.1 numeral V - Grades: there is verbiage to suggest the course may be taken CR/NC. Per R. Jha, the course is to be taken for a letter grade. He indicated he would clarify that part.

- **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions. Vote: 21 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

- GEO 685 -re-submission
- Change contact hour information on UHM-1 form and resource information in the syllabus. It’s important to clearly see campus resource information for Title IX and KOKUA. There was a suggestion to place campus resource information together and more clearly indicate them in the syllabus as campus resources (e.g., section heading, use bold titles for the campus resources).

- **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions: Vote: 21 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

- GEO 725 -re-submission
- Change contact hour information onUHM-1 form and resource information in the syllabus. It’s important to clearly see campus resource information for Title IX and KOKUA. There was a suggestion to place campus resource information together and more clearly indicate them in the syllabus as campus resources (e.g., section heading, use bold titles for the campus resources).

- **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions. Vote: 21 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

- PH 611-re-submission
- Change starter: “By end of this course…” rather than By end of this class. Use Student learning objectives. All other requested changes were made.

- **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions: Vote: 22 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions**

- NURS 607 - related to program modification
- No concerns with this course proposal.

- **Motion to Approve: Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**
NURS 681 - related to program modification
There were some questions RE: the fit of this course into the curriculum. This seminar is flexible in terms of when students would take it since it is also based on an internal program rotation as students go into clinical sites.
No concerns with this course proposal.
Motion to Approve. Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention

NURS 701 - related to program modification
There was a request for clarification related to the terms age-related changes and changes that are not age-related. Some discussion occurred to try to help A. Tse to identify clear, yet appropriate terminology to denote changes that are not related to age. There was a suggestion to revise the Catalog description and syllabus. The suggested language was along the lines of, to distinguish normal age-related changes from other changes.
In the syllabus, on p. 2, there was a suggestion to make the objectives more concrete; actionable. Use of Bloom’s taxonomy was also mentioned as a reference to use to strengthen the objectives. A comment was made RE: the content in the course outline at the end of the syllabus. There didn’t appear to be any connection to readings or assignments, even if tentative. Per A. Tse, each course is paired with a Laulima site and assignments have their own rubrics and instructions. Evidence-based materials are required for courses and they use the textbook as a guide. Instructors don’t assign specific readings because students are to contribute readings and share them with the class. They’re expected to seek out information and their own references. A suggestion was made to make this expectation of students clearer in the syllabus and connect more closely the information in Laulima with the course outline.
Summary: Revise to use higher order student learning objective verbs, clearer expectation of students relative to readings section, and revise Catalog description on UHM-1.
Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions: Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention

NURS 735 - related to program modification
There was some confusion in the Justification about program evaluation. It was described as wordy and unclear. There was a suggestion to re-word sentences and make them tighter. A. Tse was revising and noting changes necessary during the discussion. There was also a request to correct the term complimentary to complementary.
Similarly, in the syllabus, the Catalog description is in need of a revision. This information should be identical to the description proposed on the UHM-1 form. Tighter wording and clearer verbiage was suggested.
The Student Learning Objectives need to be more actionable (i.e., measurable). A similar comment as for NURS 701 to connect the list of required resources/readings with the course outline in the syllabus.
Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions: Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention
- **NURS 740** - related to program modification
  - The Student Learning Objectives need to be more actionable (i.e., measurable). A similar comment as for NURS 701 to connect the list of required resources/readings with the course outline in the syllabus.
  - **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions. Vote: 18 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

- **Program Actions:**
  - **Nursing DNP modification**
    - This is an update to the program tracks and to align them with national standards and curricular trends. It allows for more flexibility for courses in terms of when they are taken and for the faculty. The courses being proposed are required depending on the track being pursued. This modification doesn’t change workloads and it will remove redundancies in the current curriculum.
    - **Motion to Approve. Vote: 18 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**
  - **HWST + TCH BAM**
    - There was some discussion about this pathway proposal, but overall comments were positive.
    - On p.2 there was a suggestion to change “comprise" to “compose”.
    - There was a question asking for clarification of the 7 excess credits. Per. M. Saffrey, the students enroll in the MEdT as a cohort and courses are set-up to be taken by cohort. Plus, this program requires more credits than a typical MA program as 46 cr are required. With the cohort model and the number of credits that are required, there are specific courses that need to be taken in the first year. The group that worked on this proposal built in the idea of students taking excess credits to meet MEdT requirements and taking advantage of doing it during the last undergraduate year of the BA degree. M. Saffrey also shared that should students be unable to complete the excess credit courses in their Senior year, an alternative was also built in so these students can still remain in the pathway.
    - There was a comment about this pathway being less clear in terms of how it is meeting a need for teachers in this area. Per K. Faria and according to Article 10 Section 4 of the state constitution, the State will provide a Hawaiian education program that includes language, culture and history in the public schools. This pathway and the Hawaiian language pathway would address this requirement.
    - **Motion to Approve. Vote: 20 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**
  - **HAW+TCH BAM**
    - There was a question about the provided Curriculum chart on p. 6 (for both pathway proposals) where in the year 1 of the MEdT column, they have 15 cr to be taken by graduate students. Is this workload appropriate? Per J. Yoshioka, for their regular program, their students taking 12 cr is typical. Taking 15 cr is heavier, but not unusual. K. Faria further clarified that ITE 610 is a field course that has a credit load of 6 cr. Students are planning and in the field during the week. It helped the Graduate Council members to better understand the make-up of courses in a 15 cr load. Of those 15 cr, 6 cr are from ITE 610.
    - **Motion to Approve. Vote: 21 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions**
○ **Music Program Modification**

- There were comments about this proposal. L. Paxton, addressed a comment and suggestion to consider stating that the MA Plan B is an applied degree. Per L. Paxton, in the field of Music, the term applied would be confusing since it is one of three categories that are used. In the first category is the term applied which refers to 1 on 1 instruction. The second category uses the term practicum which refers to a group lesson. Last, the third category is academic program like Music History and Music Education. The Ethnomusicology track is considered an academic program, similar to Music Education.

- Another comment related to how students would apply directly to the PhD in Music program. Per L. Paxton, applicants with a MA in Ethnomusicology could apply and for those who do not meet the qualifications of the current MA program track in Ethnomusicology would take coursework as part of the doctoral coursework. If a student is unsuccessful in pursuing the PhD, they may exit with this proposed MA Plan B track in Ethnomusicology. He shared that there are professions for graduates with a MA Plan B.

- There was a comment that suggested that it sounded like the modification was to make the degree easier and take less time. Per. L. Paxton and J. Moulin, the modification would still have the same requirements, but the Plan B is intended to shorten the time necessary to complete the degree. They shared that the time to degree will hopefully be shorter, but does not mean it would be easier. The thesis requirement was a challenge for students to finish in a timely manner. Part of the review of the MA in Music degree indicated that students in this track were taking too long to finish. This proposal to add a Plan B option was a way to provide another path for students as well as a way to respond to changes in the field and become better aligned with other programs. They were the only program requiring a thesis without a Plan B option.

- There was a typo identified on page 3.

○ **Motion to Approve Pending Minor Revisions. Vote: 22 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions**

○ **MMPP GCERT Proposal**

- In general, there were no major concerns with this proposal. It was complimented as being cutting edge, presented good use of resources on campus, and is timely. The strength of the proposal was also complimented.

- There was discussion RE: the student learning objectives and the need for more actionable verbs on p.1.

- On p. 12, #7 Program Effectiveness - paragraph 2, there were comments that program effectiveness cannot be measured from student evaluations. A suggestion to consult with the Assessment and Curriculum Support Center was made to help with this section.

- A. Berez-Kroeker complimented the authors on the proposal but also expressed surprise that the Linguistics Department was not consulted. The Linguistics Department did not necessarily need to have an active role, but if desired, could offer courses or participate in some other way. It was suggested that the authors consult with the Linguistics Department.

  - G. Crookes shared that he initially spoke with the chair of the Linguistics Department, well prior to the submission of the current proposal. The proposal has since been revised and is stronger and he acknowledged it
would be a good time to revisit the consultation with the chair of Linguistics.

- **Motion to Postpone Full Consideration of Proposal following Consultation with Linguistics and Minor Revisions.** Vote: 18 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions

Adjourned: 4:20p

**Next Meeting:** January 19, 2021