

**Graduate Council Meeting**  
**September 26, 2023 • 3:00-4:30p • ZOOM**  
**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

**Quorum:** 10 (Current membership = 21)

Name of Member		Name of Member	
P. Berkelman, ENGR - A	x	N. Tarui, CSS- P	x
<b>W. Buente, CSS - A</b>	x	H. Tavares, COE - C	x
K.F. Cheung, SOEST - A	x	A. Tse, SONDH - C	x
J. Chung-Do, TSSWPH - A	x	<b>P. Williams, CNS - C</b>	x
Kara Miller, CALL - A	x	J. Yoshioka, COE - P	x
T. Grüter, CALL - P	x	<b>C.Stephenson, MFS - P</b>	x
A.Mawyer, CALL - C	EXC	B. Sipes MFS - P	x
P. Nerurkar CTAHR - P	x	Arby Barone, GSO	x
J. Stilgenbauer, ARCH/SCB/HSBK - C	x	GSO	
E. Szarmes, CNS - C	x		
M. Tallquist, JABSOM - A	x	J. Maeda, GD	x

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

Alternate(s)		Alternate(s)	
Derrick Higginbotham, CALL-for A. Mawyer	x		
			n=20

Guests: Nathan Murata, Dean, Education, Cris Stickley and Bennett Zazzera, Education, Lee Buenconsejo-Lum, Interim Dean, JABSOM, John Zuern and Kristiana Kahakauwila, English, Christine Acham, ACM-CINE

### Announcements/Reminders

- Fall 2023 Meetings: 3:00-4:30 p.m., October 24, November 28, December 12
- Graduate Division Dean's Office Hours
  - Thursday, September 21, 2023: 12:00-1:00 p.m.
  - Monday, October 23, 2023: 2:00-3:00 p.m.
  - Wednesday, November 15, 2023: 1:00-2:00 p.m.
- Graduate Assembly: Thursday, November 30, 2023; 3:00-4:30pm via Zoom
- Talk story sessions:
  - September 22 at 9:00 - 10:00a in QLC 412 - Graduate Chair Topics & Networking
  - Presenter: Julianne K. Maeda, Interim Dean and Associate Dean, Graduate Division
  - September 28 at 1:30p - 2:30p in WEB 114 Building Your Graduate Community (session 1) & October 6 at 9:00 - 10:30 in WEB 103 - Building Your Graduate Community (session 2) (Both sessions open to Graduate Chairs and Program Staff)
  - Presenters: Linda Voong, SHRM-CP, Human Resources Specialist, Office of Faculty Excellence-Academic Personnel; and Julianne K. Maeda, Interim Dean and Associate Dean, Graduate Division

- October 17 at 1:00 - 2:00p in QLC 412 - Advancing The Innovation Ecosystem in Hawai'i (Session open to Graduate Chairs and Program Staff)
- Presenters: Steve Auerbach, Chief Innovation Officer, Office of Innovation and Commercialization; George Yarbrough, Associate Director, Office of Innovation and Commercialization; and Katie Taladay, Senior Entrepreneur Programs Manager, Office of Innovation and Commercialization
- November 7 at 11:00 - 12:30p in QLC 412 - Navigating IX: IX Practical Takeaways For Your Graduate Program (Session open to Graduate Chairs and Program Staff)
- Presenters: Jennifer Rose, Executive Director, Office of Equity Assurance & Interim Title IX Coordinator, Office of Title IX; and Jennifer Matayoshi, Lead Deputy Title IX Coordinator & Senior Investigator, Office of Title IX

## Old Business

- Approval of August 29, 2023 minutes.
  - **Motion to Approve: 15 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 0 Abstentions**
- Doctor of Physical Therapy Proposal
  - There was discussion amongst the members of the Graduate Council prior to the guests for this proposal arriving. Concerns were raised about the process this proposal seemed to be following where the director could not be hired until the program was approved. The President and Provost were mentioned as being supportive, but letters of support from them to say they were willing to invest the funds and resources into this new program because it's valuable as well as a letter from KCC to share space there would have been helpful. General consensus of a DPT was favorable and all of the members agreed this would be valuable for the state, but not having a curriculum with new course proposals included with the proposal and that it would be done once a program director is hired is outside of the current process. The main question appears to be can someone be hired to develop the curriculum before the program is approved or is the person to be hired after the program is approved, but without the curriculum?
  - Someone asked, where in the accreditation documents does it say that the program has to be approved before the director can be hired? With all of the documentation received, it's unclear why it needs to be in this sequence, which is outside of UH procedure for all new programs.
  - Another member mentioned that the cover memo from the proposers cited an email from the Provost dated August 17, 2023 to utilize funding from Outreach College to hire a director to oversee the development of the program. J. Maeda responded that she thought they hired someone to help them with the first proposal we received in May. However, it is something to ask the representatives of this proposal to clarify what was meant.
  - The authors of the proposal along with leadership from the College of Education and John A. Burns School of Medicine joined the meeting at this point. A question about why this program was to be run via Outreach College started the discussion. Dean Murata responded that it was to generate funds to help run the program as students enroll. Those funds are to be re-invested in the program to cover various expenses necessary for running the program. The faculty involved with the DPT would be in G-funded positions. Another question was asked if there was a change in practice in terms of funds from programs run through Outreach College still being returned to departments? If funds were no longer returned to departments, how would this still fit? Dean Murata responded that to his knowledge there are still some programs that are run through Outreach College and they are still able to recapture funds for those programs. There was a change in terms of scheduling and registration in that students either have to

register through day school or through extension, but not a mix of both as was the practice previously.

- The discussion next moved to the proposal where a member of the Program committee, T. Gruter posed the first question. The Graduate Council was asked to review the program proposal and from the guidelines the program committee received from Graduate Division program proposals typically have UHM-1 forms for all new courses included with the proposal. The curriculum is also approved with the degree proposal. Acknowledgement was made that compared to the proposal in the spring, the courses were more fully described, but there were still no UHM-1 forms included so based on past practice and guidelines from Graduate Division, this is not sufficient. However, the committee and members of the Graduate Council understood this has something to do with the order in which a program director is hired and the program director is to develop the courses. The question posed, what prevents you/College of Education from hiring a program director now, developing a full program proposal including UHM-1 forms and then seeking approval from the Graduate Council? Dean Murata responded that they're trying to follow policy protocol with regard to Graduate Division courses and hence the reason why they are going through all the necessary procedures of following their own college's internal processes. He said they were following guidelines that they were afforded and they felt strongly that is the route to go, even without the UHM-1 and UHM-2 forms, those would eventually be done. In the case of physical therapy, they (accrediting body-CAPTE) require us to have a director hired at least 12 plus months prior to, that person's specific job is to work on the curriculum, clinical placements, and everything associated with that particular program. The question RE: why a program director cannot be hired now and then seek approval for the program from the Graduate Council was asked again. Per Dean Murata, "Well, I guess we can. That will make it a whole lot easier." T. Gruter asked if there was a problem that they were not seeing as it's very possible that they don't see the bigger picture with the accreditation process, but hiring a program director to complete the courses forms would make it a lot easier. Dean Murata said, "We can certainly look into that. My understanding is that the odd timing is also related to some specific requirements by CAPTE, which is the council that accredits PT programs and my understanding is that that is partly why it seems out of order. The authorization to plan is the first step and then the next step ideally is to hire the program director and then the curriculum could be developed and then you have to submit a proposal to continue on. That proposal has to be submitted to CAPTE 18 months after hiring the program director so the program director has to be employed full time for 18 months, but it would be nice to have a framework of curriculum in place ahead of time because CAPTE only reviews a maximum of six programs per year and so if we had a head start on having the curriculum in place, we're not going to get put on a waitlist and have a program director sitting around for two plus years waiting for the program proposal to go through. Ideally there would be a nice framework of the curriculum, although it's a program director's job to fine tune it but at least we have some sort of framework for the curriculum in place when they get here. Does that help or answer the questions?" The response was that this information was helpful, but the question of whether they could hire a program director to do the framework and flesh out the courses was asked once more. Dean Murata responded that they could look into that.
- The discussion at this point shifted to procedures being followed. The proposers referenced materials they looked at following the meeting in May that said, Form 1 "or equivalent" were required, but the question was what qualifies as equivalent? Further, the proposers said they attempted to fill out the Form 1's in the absence of a program director that then would potentially need to be redone when the program director is hired and wants to tailor the program different, they attempted to meet the "or equivalent" piece by expanding the proposal, but the question on what "or equivalent" means still remains. It was unclear what materials this "or equivalent" came from or where it was seen. J. Maeda clarified the process being followed is a University process, not

Graduate Council's or Graduate Division's. The procedure being followed applies to all new programs being proposed at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Further, J. Maeda's understanding was that the program couldn't hire a program director until the program was approved. Program approval means that the proposal has gone through all of the steps at UH Manoa, which is Graduate Council, the college's review committee, Manoa Faculty Senate, President, and then the Board of Regents, where the new degree is then approved. Approving a degree without the actual course forms is scary for us because it is very different and not the University process. If the requirement is that you couldn't hire somebody to help with the curriculum, then I think we were willing to consider it as long as those proposals were acceptable in terms of the descriptions and the proposal was acceptable for a new degree. The question: is it a requirement of CAPTE that you cannot hire the program director until you have an approved program at the institution? Is this something CAPTE could clarify?

- Per Dean Murata: they were following what the accrediting body is asking for. He said, they specifically call for someone to be hired prior to. It's unusual. I'm not too keen on doing something that's like hiring someone with no program, but the program I feel is important like I think everybody else does and it requires that we hire someone to help develop this program. Are we hiring someone that's to a program that doesn't exist? Yes, at this point that's the gist of it. It's all based on accreditation. Are you going to send us a recommendation or should we just get clarification ASAP from the accrediting body or what needs to come first? J. Maeda responded that we have had accredited programs that have come through the review process and then applied for accreditation. The most recent was the Master of Architecture. If the proposers can get clarification about hiring a program director to help with the curriculum it would help this process. A member commented, there is broad consensus that a DPT program at the University of Hawaii would serve the state of Hawaii and our students; it's something everybody wants. We're trying to follow the process and it would be easier and more consistent with current practice if the proposers came back to the Graduate Council after they have hired a program director and have a full course proposal to be considered. Per one of the guests, part of the problem is that they cannot, based on CAPTE's requirements, they cannot give any indication that they are accredited. CAPTE requires that the program director design the curriculum. It's their duty to do that.

- 7.3 General Requirements of the Pre-Accreditation Program, CAPTE Rules of Practice and Procedure, p. 44

- (c) Developing programs must accurately describe their status in all information made available to prospective students, prospective faculty, and the public, including on institutional websites and in all advertising, throughout the development process to avoid any implication that accreditation is assured in any way, or that the program is already accredited. Such statements/implications constitute a breach of integrity in the accreditation process. [See §1.3(a)] Further, a statement accurately describing the program's status within the pre-accreditation process must be included on the program's home page with a link to it from all other institutional webpage(s) that include any information about the program.
  - (1) Prior to employing a qualified program director, institutions MUST NOT make any statement on a website or in promotional/advertising materials that could be reasonably interpreted to imply that the institution has initiated the candidacy or accreditation process, or that implies that accreditation is in any way assured.
- The discussion ended due to time constraints as there was other business to discuss. The proposers were asked to seek clarification from CAPTE.

- New MFA degrees to require less than 60 credits?
  - Guests from English - Creative Writing (CW) concentration and ACM-CINE department chair were present.
  - This discussion started with D. Higginbotham sharing the differences between the MA and MFA degrees and their plan. A MA is typically a 2 yr degree and MFA 2 to 3 years. The MA in English, Creative Writing concentration is currently 33 credits with a thesis. The proposed MFA would have some overlap in terms of similar tasks related to creative writing, genre and pedagogy. The MFA in CW is planning to add thesis credits and it is also different in terms of size of the thesis. In MA, for prose it's 70 pages, for poetry 50 pages, but for a MFA, it is substantially higher. For research prose it's 150 pages and is publishable work. "The language in the proposal is that the MFA will be a publishable work. The MA, as it currently stands, students do often produce work that's publishable in certain ways, but they're not required to produce a publishable work so the MFA will be different in the sense that the final project will be something that is publishable in whatever genre or form they happen to be working, whether that's prose, poetry, nonfiction, or hybrid media."
  - Another sort of difference between an MA and an MFA that's really important for English, in terms of outcomes, is what can be done with an MA versus an MFA. An MA really implies that the student will go on in some sense to further study, presumably a PhD program, whereas the MFA is a terminal degree. In many ways, when looking at the job market for folks who are creative writers, lots of positions and not just academic or positions in universities, but positions in a variety of other fields that require creative writing, the actual MFA is what's the benchmark. That's the degree that people are looking for in terms of employment, thus the shift towards the MFA for precisely some of those reasons. It increases employability for the students.
  - There was a lot of research on comparable MFA programs and thinking about how they're structured in relation to structuring our proposal. Some things that are important to consider is the difference between a two-year program and a three-year program so in looking at 60 credits, those tend to be three-year programs. Two-year programs have fewer required credits, but there are many MFA programs around the country that operate on a two -year model and assign their credits in various ways to get to a benchmark. It's important to look at how even those programs operate, if they're on a quarter system, you wind up with more credits so I think the goal is to maintain the kind of studio research model, which is a blend of workshop classes and classes in literature because we believe that they give our graduates a more solid footing in looking for jobs because they can teach both literature classes and creative writing workshops. We do believe that a two-year program is appealing to the students that we're trying to attract to our program. We value what the MFA is as an endpoint, but also what it could be as a stepping stone to a PhD, which is not something we want to shy away from, we want to embrace, as one of the few Creative Writing PhD programs in the country we're really thinking about our placement here and who we are to the department and the university so that means, shying away from a six credit workshop course and keeping all of our classes at three credits and sort of where that lands us we were looking at that 39 credit is a really smart move.
  - Per D. Higginbotham, they are planning to stop the MA in English, Creative Writing track. The MFA will take its place entirely so there won't be a Creative Writing track at the MA level although there will be in other concentrations in our department. It will be the standalone MFA which will still allow people to go and do a unique thing offered here which is a PhD in English with a track in Creative Writing.
  - D. Higginbotham, K. Kahakauwila and J. Zuern shared further information about the MFA program they envision. Many MFA programs offer a 2 year model. In looking at how those programs operate, there is studio research which is a blend of research and teaching. Two year programs are appealing and would be what they would like to offer here. The MFA would also replace the CW concentration in the MA. The MFA would still

allow students to do a PhD with a concentration in CW. There are 25 PhD degrees related to CW in the US. UHM is distinctive in that way as it is one of those 25 programs and could draw people from different parts of the Pacific.

- The MFA in Cinematic Arts is at the proposal stage. This would potentially be the only cinematic arts program outside of Australia and New Zealand. A member asked what would be the gold standard in your respective areas, Creative Writing versus Cinematic Arts? The MFA in Cinematic arts is being proposed as a three-year program. They are using USC as a standard because it's considered the best film school in the country. Their program is 54 credits. For the MFA in Creative Writing, the common standard for a two-year MFA is somewhere between 32 and 36 cr. The English department is proposing a 39 cr MFA which shows the strength of what they're doing.
- The guests were excused. Some further discussion followed. Per J. Maeda, we already have 60 credit MFA degrees and it may be that number of credits is dependent on the field? From our last meeting, for Theatre and Dance, their MFA requires 60 cr; it is the standard amongst peers in Art as well. If 60 cr is the ceiling, what would the Graduate Council consider as appropriate for less than 60? Are there other fields besides creative writing and potentially cinematic arts that Manoa might consider because we should not only limit ourselves to just those two if there are potentially other programs that might consider a MFA down the road? For cinematic arts there does not appear to be a problem; it would fit within the range if they're looking at potentially between 50 and 60 credits. It's more for Creative Writing, they're looking at 39 cr versus 32 cr as a lower number. She asked for thoughts from the group.
- Members shared favorable responses in that it sounds reasonable to allow a credit limit lower than 60 cr as the arguments for Creative Writing were convincing. Other programs, like in Music, may potentially pursue one. MFA degrees do vary according to the fields and are very different so it may be best to leave this determination to the individual program. Per K. Miller, for Theatre and Dance, 60 cr is the standard across the US and they cannot consider less than that. The same is true for Art.
- After some further discussion of the points made earlier and differences between two and three year MFA degrees in Creative Writing, it was unclear how best to move forward. Time to think about the discussion as well as drafting of a motion in a timely manner was necessary since English was still at the ATP stage and the decision on this issue would potentially help them to move forward. J. Maeda asked D. Higginbotham to consult with his colleagues in English and draft a motion for the Graduate Council to consider at the October meeting. D. Higginbotham would collaborate on this motion with A. Mawyer since D. Higginbotham was serving as A. Mawyer's alternate at this meeting.

## Discussion

- Review of BAM Guidelines – assigned to AAA committee
  - Per the AAA committee chair, W. Buente shared that the guidelines have some grammatical issues that, once corrected, would allow for more consistency of the information. There was a question regarding double-counting on allowing a pool of eligible courses to be available. It would help programs to not get locked into a few that were selected. J. Maeda clarified that since the start of the Combined Pathway guidelines more choices were being accepted to be double-counted. The issue of allowing for more options to help with scheduling as well as fit for students based on their last year of required bachelor's degree courses was somewhat resolved by having a larger pool of eligible courses available to be double-counted.
  - Another question was on the purpose of the gateway course. The gateway course provides a means by which the graduate program can get an idea of potential of the student for graduate work, in addition to GPA and overall academic performance up to the third year. The gateway course is typically a required course(s) so all eligible and potential BAM students would take it in their third year of the undergraduate degree. In

some programs it is an undergraduate research methods course. It is a course used to gauge student success and potential for graduate work, in addition to other factors.

- How many gateway courses are typically assigned? Other questions relate to the memos that need to be sent where confusion has emerged in terms of who should be sending the memos? Additionally, W. Buente shared information about a study that examined a BAM program or four plus one and one of the findings was that the students were confused which advisor they were to be working with. J. Maeda responded that for the gateway courses, at least one must be identified. A program could have more and some have more than one as she was aware of one that requires two. That is at the discretion of the program. In terms of communication, it's difficult because it will vary who submits the memos. In some pathways it's the graduate chair and in others, an undergraduate advisor or the BAM coordinator. However, there should be communication between undergraduate and graduate advisors and the BAM coordinator. N. Tarui shared that Economics' BAM has two gateway courses, whether they were both required or not, he wasn't sure, but prospective BAM students must take at least one. They were the first program to have a BAM pathway. The guidelines grew from that program and he mentioned that maybe it is time for them to revisit their pathway to see if any changes are needed since there have been changes to the guidelines.
- In terms of students who start a BAM pathway, but then do not continue on to the master's program, that does happen. There was a case where the student couldn't continue due to their own personal situation, but they returned the following year. They had to reapply to the master's program and they continued on and the double-counted courses counted, but that was within a year of them leaving the program. It is something to think about, if a student leaves - how long between a BAM student graduating with their undergraduate degree and returning later to complete the graduate degree. We have not had that situation yet as it does defeat the purpose of a streamlined program for two degrees, but it is not an unforeseeable situation. This came up in the AAA committee's discussion because MFA students will often graduate with a BA or BFA and will pursue their career and then will want to return to complete graduate work. J. Maeda responded that in a case like that, the policy on courses five years and older would be used. There are graduate students who leave for various reasons and then they return and their courses are five years old or older. At that point, it is up to the program to petition whether or not those can be still counted and used toward the graduate degree. Depending on the courses, things change, content changes, and how current then is that graduate student's knowledge of that content? It is something to think about.

- Question regarding asking Graduate chairs about tracks and them being included on the admissions application. J. Maeda responded that the survey is not yet ready to be sent. It has not been put onto the agenda since it has not yet been sent to the members.
- Question regarding Tuition Waiver committee per request sent to SEC
  - Per C. Stephenson, a request came to the SEC to recommend people for the tuition waiver committee. They had originally asked for department chairs but we asked them why if this has to do with graduate tuition waivers, why wouldn't that also include graduate people, graduate advisors, and they agreed that that was appropriate. If anybody is interested in serving on this tuition waiver committee she asked people to contact her and she would then report back to the SEC. A related question was that shouldn't this be coming to the Graduate Council and not just going to a tuition waiver committee? Have they consulted with the Graduate Division, and should this be on the agenda for Graduate Council at some point? Per J. Maeda, those are great questions. I have not been contacted yet about this discussion on tuition waivers. Is this the monetization of tuition waiver? C. Stephenson responded yes. I've heard of the

committee, but I have not yet been asked and maybe it will happen but not yet, but yes, this is definitely something that we can discuss as a Graduate Council and if there are others who are interested in serving on the actual committee, I think we could do both. We can discuss it and also maybe hear from members who are serving, and have a full discussion about it because there's going to be a lot of challenges to resolve for this new system to work.

Adjourned: 4:31p

**Next Meeting:** October 24, 2023