

Graduate Council Meeting
August 30, 2022 • 3:00-4:30p • Zoom
Minutes

Attendance:

Quorum: 11 (Current membership = 22)

| Name of Member | | Name of Member | |
|--|-----|------------------|-----|
| P. Berkelman, ENGR | X | H. Tavares, COE | X |
| W. Buente, CSS | X | T. Ticktin, CNS | ABS |
| K.F. Cheung, SOEST | X | A. Tse, SONDH | X |
| B. Fisher, CALL | X | J. Yoshioka, COE | X |
| T. Grüter, CALL | X | S. Brown, MFS | X |
| J. Guo, MBTSSW | X | MFS | TBD |
| A. Mawyer, CALL | X | GSO | TBD |
| P. Nerurkar CTAHR - sabbatical F 22 | EXC | GSO | TBD |
| S. Robertson - F22 / P. Williams - Sp23, CNS | ABS | | |
| J. Stilgenbauer, ARCH/SCB/HSBK | X | | |
| M. Tallquist, JABSOM | X | K. Aune, GD | X |
| N. Tarui, CSS | EXC | J. Maeda, GD | X |

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

| Alternate(s) | | Alternate(s) | |
|------------------------------------|-----|--------------|------|
| M. Esquivel for P. Nerurkar (F 22) | EXC | | |
| R. Juarez for N. Tarui | X | | n=16 |

Guest: M. Kataoka-Yahiro

Announcements/Reminders

- Welcome of new members starting in Fall 2022
 - Shana Brown, MFS Representative
 - Wayne Buente, School of Communication
 - Kwok "Fai" Cheung, Ocean and Resources Engineering
 - Theres Grueter, Second Language Studies
 - Ruben Juarez for Nori Tarui, Economics
- Introduction by current members
- Overview of Graduate Council (ppt)
 - Standing committees (3) and with descriptions of each one: AAA, Program, and Course
 - Responsibilities and Reminders for all members
 - Committee Compositions
- Announcements/Reminders: (please share with your college/school Graduate chairs)
 - Fall 2022 Meeting Dates: Tuesdays, 3:00 - 4:30p
 - August 30, September 20, October 18, November 15, December 13
 - Fall 2022 Graduate Assembly November 17, 2022 (location: TBD)
 - Open Office Hours via ZOOM w/ Graduate Dean and Associate Dean
 - September 15 at noon
 - October 24 at 2:00pm
 - November 30 at 1:00pm
 - Mirikitani Outstanding Dissertation Award - application deadline 10.15.2022

- GF 1 appointment opportunity for faculty in programs without graduate degrees
 - Information was previously distributed via email to graduate programs

Old Business

- Approval of May 10, 2022 draft minutes
- Highlighted sections were for others to address and have been addressed.

Motion to Approve. Vote: 14 in favor, 0 opposed, 2 abstentions

Discussion Items

- Graduate Faculty - categories, appointment review
 - There are three types of Graduate Faculty (GF): Regular (RGF), Cooperating (CGF), and Affiliate Graduate Faculty (AGF)
 - There are also three Levels - levels 3 and 2 were formerly known as Full and Associate, but were renamed to become 3 and 2. Level 1 was added to accommodate individuals to only serve as a member.
 - Dean Aune asked the Graduate Council members if they had any concerns about the types and levels, the process and to ask their constituent college/school Graduate chairs for any concerns on this topic.
 - There was a question relative to faculty without a PhD, but have a professional degree. Does a faculty member need to have a PhD to have a level 3 GF appointment?
 - Faculty do not need to have a PhD in order to have a level 3 graduate faculty appointment. There are many faculty who have another terminal degree or other degree that is not a PhD. However, they do need to at minimum have a faculty rank 3 in order to be eligible for a GF level 3 appointment. The nomination of a new graduate faculty member is determined by the program. Additionally, the level of the GF nomination is not questioned in the nomination of a new faculty member.
 - There was a question regarding Affiliate Graduate Faculty and whether or not their appointment could be longer than one year at a time. There is an administrative burden on HR and the program that is caused by the annual nature of this GF appointment.
 - Unfortunately, at this time, an AGF appointment can only be up to one year at a time.
- Concerns RE: University Representative (UR). Added item in relation to Graduate Faculty.
 - Dean Aune introduced this item as it is related to one's Graduate Faculty (GF) appointment. The UR is to be a UHM faculty member who also meets several criteria such as a level 3 GF appointment, dissertation committee experience (i.e., completion of service on at least one committee when student graduates), and is at arm's length from the student's committee chair and faculty in the student's graduate program. Members shared their experiences. One member shared his observations of strong collaborations between a student's committee chair and UR as their work intersects as faculty and within research units. He asked the question of how best to address this potential conflict?

Commented [1]: Clarification - is the thinking to redefine the role and responsibilities of the UR? Or, is it to redefine who this would be - maintain current UHM GF member and/or have an outside of UH member, but feasibility may be an issue? There was a bunch of issues raised, but not all of it was about the UR.

- Dean Aune responded that the UR serves in a semi-autonomous role and with an objective perspective. It would be helpful for information about the UR's role to be shared with the graduate faculty in one's program. The "Select a Committee" member tab on the Graduate Division webpage is also a resource to assist in identifying potential eligible faculty to serve as UR. Having a discussion with faculty on the importance of the arm's length distance between the chair and UR would be helpful aside from sharing information about a UR's role and responsibilities on the committee.
- The UR is not required to have expertise, but it is helpful. One member commented that having a UR completely disconnected disciplinarily may not allow for knowing whether or not the dissertation was passed. Procedurally, they could provide and offer feedback, but if they did not know the discipline or content, they would not necessarily be able to speak to the student's competence or if the dissertation had met the standard of a dissertation.
- If impartiality is an issue, a member commented that faculty should be able to determine that and maybe there is a better way than the current process to seek a UR? How about the UR being the 6th member to determine whether or not procedures were followed or not?
- In the discussion there was a comment regarding the unintended consequence of trying to maintain the arm's length criterion. One program deliberately does not invite colleagues to become cooperating GF so they can be asked to serve as UR. Some colleagues may want to become a CGF, but the program cannot have the same person serve as UR if they also then become a CGF.
- Another perspective was raised relative to the terms being used - impartiality/partiality. A UR is already partial in that they represent GD and the university. The term indifference to intellectual material of the student might be a more accurate term if the discussion is about the UR maintaining an objective/neutral perspective while also ensuring standards are met. However, aside from a faculty member serving as UR to be a good citizen, serving as UR is also an opportunity to engage with other students outside of one's program and experience a variety of intellectually stimulating research. Should this service be disincentivized? Participation may decrease or be discouraged if this work becomes purely for service?
- There was also an observation that appeared to have a shared sentiment from others that in some cases, the committee is set up to pass the student. The faculty try to find an easy way out for the student; the composition of the committee is that they're all friends and will "pass" the student. This is where there should be some control and authority by the UR. It was suggested that there should be more control by the Graduate chair to disapprove the committee. F. Cheung shared that ORE has a Form I A where the Graduate chair is able to review and approve the committee before the comprehensive exam. The process used to work similar with the paper form II before the online Quali process. M. Tallquist added that having a pre-committee meeting can serve this purpose to review the committee before the comprehensive exam. Form II is done after the comprehensive exam which may be too late to disapprove the committee.
- P. Berkelman shared that having an outside member from a different institution was seen as an important piece of the committee. A few other members

Commented [2]: Might be helpful to ask what they would like to see here?

concurred with this idea. Per F. Cheung, in Canada it's a standard to have faculty serving on a committee from another institution. Per M. Tallquist, it is also true in European countries. There are, however, potential logistical issues with having a member at another institution serving on committees here if it was in this capacity.

- Follow-up on Academic Probation

- Dean Aune provided a review of this issue and some background. There is sentiment to discontinue noting on transcripts the Academic Probation (AP) notation for time to degree. Some programs see it as important and it matters that students complete the degree in a timely manner; they see AP as one way to do that. It's a way to help nudge and police students to stay on track. Dean Aune conducted a review of peer and benchmark institutions to see what others do for this situation. From the information that was available, everyone has verbiage with some being more prescriptive than others. Typically, placement of a probation or not making satisfactory progress is done by the program. No transcript notation by other institutions has been found based on information that was available. Programs have typically informed the Dean or Associate Dean of the graduate school for action. Dean Aune also checked with the UHM Registrar and the notation has not been on transcripts at his previous institutions. He indicated that a hold has been used at other institutions where a particular threshold would trigger a process whereby a timeline and a request for the hold to be lifted would be submitted.
- A suggestion was made that perhaps another label could be used rather than probation? If the notation remains on the transcripts, it could affect employment opportunities.
 - The AP notation is removed if the student graduates within 10 years. If the student takes longer than 10 years, it will remain. This was a change that was recently made.
- Dean Aune mentioned that a Google form survey is forthcoming on this topic. She also asked the members to discuss this with their constituents and bring back feedback.
- A point of clarification was asked: Could you clarify if we are just talking about doing away with the AP NOTATION on the transcript, or AP itself?

- Graduate Admissions decisions

- As part of the Phase 2 Reorganization, graduate admissions was to move from Graduate Division (GD) to Enrollment Management. The VPEN, Nikki Chun, has interacted with Dean Aune and Graduate Division in order to integrate the admissions process, collegially.
- A topic that has also arisen is interest in learning how programs make particular recommendations or denials of decisions and how those decisions are made at the program level. Contributing factors such as number of faculty involved, who in the graduate program are involved, is it by a standing committee, what is the protocol that is used in the review of applications, DEI matters, weight of various factors and other variables, along with decisions with regard to GA hires, etc.
- A survey is forthcoming and Dean Aune and the VPEN are meeting with some Graduate chairs to gather more qualitative information.

- A member asked about programs maintaining the requirement of the GRE and its value or lack of value during the pandemic? Of particular interest is hearing how programs are working without it if they no longer require it as grants require some standard or documentation to consider besides GPA where the GRE can also fulfill that purpose. In ORE, F. Cheung shared that for them, if the applicant earned their degree(s) from a US university the GRE will count less, but if their degree(s) is from a university abroad, then they will look more closely at the GRE along with an interview. In Social Work, J. Guo mentioned the issue with standardized exams and other institutions with similar programs have removed the GRE requirement, e.g., Berkley and Chicago. M. Tallquist shared that the GRE could benefit an applicant. If their grades are borderline and their GRE scores are high - if it follows an increasing trend in the applicant's grades, it could help them in that case. In Second Language Studies, T. Gruter shared that their Graduate Faculty voted on whether or not to retain the GRE requirement for admission. The (unanimous!) vote was to retain it for PhD applications and do away with it for MA.

Commented [3]: Per K. Cheung

Adjourned: 4:30p

Next Meeting: September 20, 3:00pm