Graduate Council Meeting
December 14, 2021 ● 3:00-4:30p ● 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>A. Tse, SONDH</td>
<td>X C. Sorensen Irvine, MFS-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Berkelman, ENGR</td>
<td>X E. Biagioni, MFS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Mawyer, CALL</td>
<td>EXC B. Fisher, CALL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Tavares, COE</td>
<td>X S. Robertson, CNS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Ticktin, CNS</td>
<td>EXC J. Stilgenbauer, ARCH/SCB/HSHK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K. Suryanata, CSS - C</td>
<td>X M. Tallquist, JABSOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Karamperidou, SOEST</td>
<td>EXC Y. Xu, CSS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A Berez-Kroeker, CALL</td>
<td>EXC Sara Saastamoinen, GSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Guo, MTBSSW</td>
<td>X Alena Shalaby, GSO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Nerurkar CTAHR</td>
<td>ABS K. Aune, GD - on professional leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Yoshioka, COE</td>
<td>X J. Maeda, GD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

Alternate(s) | Alternate(s)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H. Dulai, SOEST for C. Karamperidou</td>
<td>X J. Jarrett, CNS for T. Ticktin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. Gruter, CALL for A. Berez-Kroeker</td>
<td>X A. Wong, ARCH/SCB/HSHK for J. Stilgenbauer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Winter, CSS for Y. Xu</td>
<td>X K. Lingley, CALL for B. Fisher</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Guests: David Rockwood and Bill Chapman, Architecture,

Announcements/Reminders

- Announcements/Reminders: (please share with your college/school Graduate chairs)
  - Spring 2022 Meetings: Tuesdays, 3:00 – 4:30p
  - January 25, February 15, March 22, and April 19
  - Join Zoom Meeting [https://hawaii.zoom.us/j/98469150795](https://hawaii.zoom.us/j/98469150795)
  - Meeting ID: 984 6915 0795
  - Passcode: gdgc2022

- Mahalo to the following alternates for their Fall 2021 service and work as members:
  - Joe Jarrett, CNS
  - Henrietta Dulai, SOEST
  - Ipo Wong, HSHK/Shidler/Arch
  - Theres Gruter, CALL
  - Kate Lingley, CALL

Old Business

- Approval of November 16, 2021 minutes
  
  **Motion to Approve. Vote: Unanimous in favor.**

- Course Proposals: K. Suryanata
- ASAN 671
  - The committee commented that this proposal looks like a relevant and carefully planned course. The syllabus contains all required information and is clear and informative.
    - UHM-1, #9: state number of hrs per semester; currently states hrs/wk
    - Justification, #5, specifies that it is a graduate course, but UHM-1 #15 does not list class standing restrictions. Should ‘graduate’ be put in box15?
    - The syllabus is missing the sections on resources (statement on disability, academic integrity, title IX, and public safety).
  - Motion to Approve with minor revisions. Vote: Unanimous in favor.

- ASTR 601
  - The committee commented that this looked like an interesting seminar. It fits in with the Rationale and expected learning outcomes provided by the department.
    - UHM-1, box 5b. Banner title exceeds 30 characters
    - Justification, #2: Contribution to learning objectives
    - Using action verbs following Bloom Taxonomy can help clarify the objectives and student evaluations.
    - Syllabus Item V: Course Assignments, Evaluation and Grading states
    - Descriptions of assessment criteria or a rubric would be helpful.
  - Motion to Approve with minor revisions. Vote: Unanimous in favor.

- CEE 612
  - There were more concerns and questions about this course proposal:
    - UHM-1 box 8: Should it be total meeting hours per semester, not per week?
  - Course justification and syllabus should be elaborated. This class has been taught before as CEE 696, the committee would appreciate seeing a fleshed out version of the outline. If this is to replace CEE 606, a clarification of the contents of CEE 606 would be helpful. What are the benefits of such replacement for students and the program?
  - Missing in the current syllabus:
    - Statement on disability, academic integrity, office of title IX, and public safety
    - Learning objectives, and how they tie to the institutional learning objectives.
    - Clear expectations for assignments, grading rubric
  - Motion to Revise and Resubmit. Vote: Unanimous in favor.

- THEA 668
  - There weren’t many questions or concerns with this new course proposal.
  - UHM-1 Banner title exceeds 30 characters.
  - Justification:
● The course is repeatable once, but on the UHM-1, the number of repeat allowed is 0.
● 4. It says that this course is a graduate version of the THEA 468. THEA 468 is also listed as a prerequisite. Are there substantial differences between THEA 468 and THEA 668? Will students who took THEA 468 basically repeat the same (or similar) class? In other words, should THEA 468 be a prerequisite?
● If THEA 468 or THEA 668 can count as prerequisites for THEA 768, does it make sense for 468 to be a suggested (or even required) prerequisite for 668?

■ Syllabus is well developed with a lot of information, including a Land acknowledgement. This was complimented on by the Course committee. The syllabus contains inconsistency regarding the mode of delivery (held on zoom/ or meet in Kennedy theatre room 101). This should be ironed out when the course is scheduled.
  ● The course syllabus still contains specific dates from Fall 2019 (page 4).
■ Bibliography: Clarify if this list refers to the course materials. The syllabus already has ‘required texts’. Should the bibliography be ‘recommended materials’? and be placed not at the end but following that section or after the course calendar?
■ Motion to Approve with minor revisions. Vote: Unanimous in favor.

○ THEA 768
  ■ The committee complimented this proposal as being well-thought. There are some minor revisions to be done.
    ● UHM-1: Banner title exceeds 30 characters
    ● Same question on the placement of bibliography as for THEA 668.
  ■ Motion to Approve with minor revisions. Vote: Unanimous in favor.

● Academic Probation (AP) Letter - Discussion started following approval of the course proposals until guests for the program modification arrived. Please see notes from the discussion below under Discussion Item.

New Business

● Program Modification - C. Sorensen Irvine
  ○ Request for Provisional Status of Master’s in Architecture Degree + 3 courses
    ■ The proposal for this new degree looked good and there weren’t any major questions or concerns by the Program committee. The numbers look optimistic and there is also helpful information from employers. The MArch is a different degree program from the DArch. Both are professional licensure programs with potential for licensure in all 50 states. The MArch is one year shorter than the DArch.
    ■ Initially, the DArch is projected to shrink as the MArch is projected to be more popular among students. Most programs offer a MArch. UHM is the only one to offer a DArch. The DArch is part of a global dual degree program with Tongji University. Students from Tongji earn the DArch from
UHM and a master’s degree from Tongji. The program hopes to maintain similar enrollment numbers in the DArch once the MArch is launched. Both have their own market of interested students.

• The MArch students will share courses used by the DArch program, but their culminating project is different. This is the reason for the proposals for two new courses.

• **Motion to Approve pending approval of the new courses. Vote: Unanimous in favor, 0 opposed, 0 abstentions.**

  ○ **ARCH Course Proposals - K. Suryanata**
    - The proposal is for an alpha course with two related courses - ARCH 783 (Alpha) for **ARCH 783 D and 783 R**. Feedback was sent to the proposer ahead of this meeting. The feedback from the committee is copied here. There were similar comments for both and questions/comments apply to both course proposals:
      - **UHM-1 Forms:**
        - #2 - Term of effect: Spring 2023 - should be noted as such since the justification states Spring 2023 will be the first time it is offered.
        - #8 - Entry is missing - include “none” if none.
        - #9 - Total number of contact hours per semester, rather than per week.
        - #11 - Repeat limit is 0, but in the syllabi and in Catalog description has repeatable one time. Is the course repeatable?
        - #17b - Prerequisites require a minimum grade of C. The Course committee suggests a minimum grade of B.
      - Neither the syllabus includes a weekly schedule nor a specific breakdown of all deliverables; it’s more vague that other proposed syllabi we have reviewed. The proposer was asked to provide a (rough) weekly schedule for each course, as well as a list of all deliverables that count towards the students’ final grade with the % of the final grade that each contributes. Are there drafts of deliverables due - and if so, about when?
      - Attendance policy only refers to prior to the add/drop deadline. Are there any requirements on attendance for the remainder of the semester?
      - No readings were listed. Both syllabi simply states, “Required readings may be distributed periodically.” Is this sufficient?
      - Syllabus item #12 - Grade Evaluation Criteria - there is a general guideline for “A” and “C”, but not “B”, “D”, or “F” students. A complete grading rubric should be included.
      - Use proper Hawaiian diacritical markings in official documents (add okina for Hawai‘i).

    - **Motion to Revise and Resubmit. Vote: Unanimous in favor.**

Discussion Item (continued from November meeting)

  - **Academic Probation (AP) Letter Discussion**
The discussion on this topic took a few different perspectives from the language of the letter to repercussions to the student if AP is on their transcript to this form of AP (i.e., time to degree) being the same for both master’s and doctoral students. Other issues that were mentioned included the advisor not receiving a copy of the AP letter. The AP letter is sent to the student with a copy to the graduate program.

AP is an academic action that is taken by the University when a student is no longer in good academic standing. For time to degree, AP can be requested by a program, but it is typically put on a student’s record at the end of 7 years with a letter explaining it sent that also includes how to request more time, if necessary. A similar discussion by the Graduate Council occurred in 2018. Dean Aune had approved that the AP notation be removed from the transcript if the student graduated in 10 years, but the AP notation would remain if the student was approved and graduated after more than 10 years.

For some programs, the AP notation is helpful and is used as a means of motivation for those students. It is a way for programs to nudge students to finish or help in advising them out of the program.

A suggestion was made to consider leaving up to 7 years for master’s students and going to 10 years for doctoral students. In the 2018 Graduate Council discussion, C. Sorensen Irvine shared that when this was looked at for other institutions, it was different for master’s (e.g., typically 5 yrs) and doctoral students. Some committee chairs do inform their students of where they are in the 7 year timeline - maybe more work needs to be done with the committee chairs? There is an annual doctoral student progress report that is to be submitted by the Graduate chair to Dean Aune in May. This report should clearly indicate where all doctoral students are in their time to degree and could be used internally to programs to have information shared with doctoral committee chairs.

Another suggestion was made to consider surveying graduate programs to collect information on what programs consider too long and circumstances that potentially contribute to students taking more than 7 years to finish.

Adjourned: 4:33p

Next Meeting: January 25, 2022