

**Graduate Council Meeting**  
**May 7, 2024 • 3:00-4:30p • ZOOM**  
**Minutes**

**Attendance:**

**Quorum:** 10 (Current membership = 20)

Name of Member		Name of Member	
P. Berkelman, ENGR - A	ABS	N. Tarui, CSS- P	EXC
<b>W. Buente, CSS - A</b>	x	H. Tavares, COE - C	
K.F. Cheung, SOEST - A	x	A. Tse, SONDH - C	EXC
J. Chung-Do, TSSWPH - A	x	J. Yoshioka, COE - P	x
Kara Miller, CALL - A	x	<b>C.Stephenson, MFS - P</b>	x
T. Grüter, CALL - P	EXC	<b>B. Sipes MFS - P</b>	x
A.Mawyer, CALL - C - proxy for P. Williams	x	A. Barone, GSO	x
P. Nerurkar CTAHR - P	EXC	GSO	
J. Stilgenbauer, ARCH/SCB/HSHK - C	x		
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)	
D. Higginbotham for T. Grüter, CALL	x	H. Yu - Sp24 for N. Tarui, Sabbatical	x

**Announcements/Reminders**

- AY 24-25 Meetings:
  - Fall 2024: September 17, October 15, November 12, December 10
  - Spring 2025: January 28, February 25, March 25, April 15, May 6
- Future Graduate Assembly Meetings, Thursday, 3:00-4:30pm:
  - Fall 2024: November 21
  - Spring 2025: April 24
- Thank You to the following outgoing Graduate Council members who have completed their term:
  - Peter Berkelman, Theres Grüter, Alexander Mawyer, Pratibha Nerurkar, Judith Stilgenbauer, Michelle Tallquist, Hannah Tavares, Jon Yoshioka, and a representative from MFS, Brent Sipes.
  - Working on having a designated alternate for each college/school to contact if a member cannot make it to a meeting.

**Old Business**

- Approval of April 16, 2024 minutes.
- No comments, questions, or edits.
- **Motion to Approve: 12 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

**New Business**

- Program Modification
  - Master of Public Health (MPH)
    - Includes UHM-1 PH 692 and UHM-2 791

- General question RE: faculty, the split of one credit in one semester and two credits in another semester. In particular related to workload of the faculty. Per J. Chung-Do, it's the same instructor, she's an 11-mo faculty. Course is typically taught in the summer. The faculty noticed the students need time to prepare before the practicum is set up. Same type of class with one credit in the Spring and the practicum in the summer. This shouldn't affect her workload.
- Course committee feedback - relatively straightforward course proposal, but some ambiguity in the course form - mention of 240 hrs of practicum, but UHM-1 includes 90 hr course?
- Total number of 240 hrs is for the practicum and there might be some confusion with the 90 hrs. J. Maeda will request the proposers to revisit the form, syllabus and justification so everything is aligned for PH 692. Also, it would be helpful to revisit information for PH 791 so that information is also aligned.
- In the course description it is described as a 20 hr course and in another line at least 20 hrs is stated? Which one should it be? It's in two different spots in the combined forms. The language didn't line up for two sets of numbers. Ensure alignment between the two course forms and the numbers that are involved.
- Equating of 2 cr = 90 contact hours? 2 cr would be 30 contact hours for a traditional course. For practicums, it is considered a nontraditional course where time and credits would not be calculated the same way. Credits and contact hours for non-traditional coursework are calculated differently from traditional coursework.

**Motion to Approve Pending Revision of Discrepancies: 14 in Favor; 0 Opposed; 1 Abstention**

- Discussion
  - Doctor of Nursing Practice (DNP) - Proposal to change Scholarly Project Paper Process
  - Per J. Maeda, changed to discussion only. The changes being proposed are to change their Scholarly Paper, the process for it. It would be better to discuss and develop criteria for what should be
  - DNP, EdD, and D-ARC and a DPT is in the pipeline. The concerns at the moment only affect the DNP and D-ARC. The issue is the committee portion. Their committees have a 3 person committee - two members from the program and one from the community. All three programs follow this model. The reason they use this model was to get their degree programs passed to try to address requirements currently held by the PhD degree. The professional doctoral degree is a different degree from the PhD. The challenge is finding enough members to complete the committee. For DNP is also trying to address the reinvigoration of their PhD. The DNP is proposing to have a review panel instead of a committee. They have cohorts of about 30. They would follow a course based model whereby each course serves as part of the Scholarly Paper process. Three faculty members would then advise/mentor 10 students each and shepherd them

through each course. Those three faculty members would serve as the review panel. The content expert would be a non-voting member, but would help support the student and ensure the student's project is applicable to their site.

- An evidence-based project serves as their Scholarly Paper. The way other DNP programs do this varies.
- DNP is pioneering, so to speak, to change the way they are proposing to implement their culminating requirement. A comment made by a member was that it would be helpful to have criteria for professional programs to then use as they propose a change that is most appropriate to a professional degree and their accrediting body.
- A member expressed concern in the way this proposal was brought forward. Per J. Maeda, she had worked with Nursing and in conversations to try to re-think how we're looking at professional doctoral degrees. She takes responsibility for not having brought this discussion to the Graduate Council before the submission of the program modification.
- It may be helpful to look at the MD degree and LAW degree. J. Maeda will ask MD and LAW school what they do for their culminating scholarly work. Law School offered a SJD (Doctor of Juridical Science). They did not have a committee. There could be two members, but it was not required and a community member was also a possible member. They had requested to use the Dissertation 800 number to which former dean K. Aune and J. Maeda denied that request. All of the professional doctoral degrees use another number for their culminating scholarly work.
- There was concern expressed about Nursing using its own forms rather than GD forms and a requirement of submitting those forms to GD.
- There was a question regarding the process between the professional doctorates, is it similar between them? How does it compare to other professional doctoral degree programs? Current professional doctoral degrees at UHM follow the same process - they have a committee of at least three members with two from the graduate program and one from the community to serve as an ad-hoc member or nominated as an Affiliate Graduate Faculty member. For D-ARC, it is a challenge to have two faculty members so they often include an Affiliate Graduate Faculty member on the committee with a UHM Architecture graduate faculty member. It is the only doctoral degree in Architecture in the nation. Most of the faculty do not have a PhD and instead have a professional degree in Architecture. Per J. Stilgenbauer, they do a project and write a book length document. There was also a suggestion to perhaps have equivalencies to the Master's Plan A, B, and C for the culminating scholarly work process. All faculty who teach graduate level courses and work with graduate students technically are to be graduate faculty. However, there is a range for the Master's Plan B - a project, review of literature to what is very similar to a thesis.
- A question was asked if this is the standard are there any comparable programs across the nation? Is UH innovating in this way? Common or normative nationally? Per J. Maeda, based on Nursing's look into other institutions (peers and benchmarks), it varies.

The review panel part that the DNP would like to use would be new. They don't know of any other programs doing that. It may be a more objective way to evaluate their students. They don't currently use rubrics to evaluate their students' Scholarly Projects. It's hard to say that what we're doing is that different since it does vary. Their accrediting body has said they do not need to do a dissertation.

- Is it common for professional doctorates to receive a degree for a group doctorate? In some institutions, Australia and New Zealand, they do group dissertations. In Indigenous research is common. The DNP was considering thematic work in that way, but the individual parts would differ (e.g., depending on the topic, one student might look at children, a second student would look at adolescents and the third student would look at adults. Each student would then collect their own data, analyze their own data, and write up their own part, but they would collaborate together on the introduction, literature review, and discussion. However, DNP decided to continue with individual projects. They do require a defense and a poster presentation.
- In the DNP proposal, each of the new courses is related to a portion of their Scholarly Project. The first one is the ideas and the proposal for the Scholarly Project. They would be evaluated based on each course. The second course would be implementing the project and the third, writing it up and defending it.
- Suggestion to meet with the three professional doctoral programs as a way to come up with criteria that would be appropriate for them, a template? J. Maeda has also requested to meet with the interim program director of the DPT to also get their input regarding their culminating work. To be discussed at first meeting in the Fall in September.
- Should this be brought up, pass on to other graduate chairs? Feel free to share. Graduate chair of ARCH are aware. He and Graduate chair of Nursing did meet to discuss the proposal from Nursing. Concern that it has not yet been shared with curriculum committees, at this stage it's not yet ready for a larger discussion.

## Discussion

- GA Tuition Remission - no updates from the last meeting. Discussion is still on the mechanism to do it and how this could work. There's not been anything firm that has come from the discussion yet. Discussions have been on the challenges and issues without reducing current numbers. Grants cannot be charged currently if we're currently waiving tuition for all. There needs to be a system in place for this to happen. Tuition remission is being seen as the way this would move forward. It's been difficult with the different types of grants and which ones can include tuition and which ones cannot. Per M. Tallquist, she shared information about the discussion and suggested the submission of examples of grants and how those could cover tuition for GAs is included or if there is a cap on certain grants. For instance, for a training grant, it potentially means reducing GAs on that grant because there is a cap. She suggested that if people know of grants that can cover tuition or grants that have cap, to submit those examples. M. Tallquist also mentioned there is thought to developing a survey for the faculty for the Fall.

To explore grants faculty have or have seen, which ones can charge tuition, how much of tuition could be covered, if there is a limit, etc. What are the conditions to do that? It is still very much in the discussion phase. Information collecting stage currently and looking at how best to do this without hurting graduate students while also having some return on tuition. It takes about \$2 million when raising GA salaries which is the reason why for this coming Fall campus wasn't able to raise the minimum salary to Step 16.

- A. Barone asked is this an ad-hoc committee? Group of administration and a group of faculty who have volunteered to serve on this initial committee. It is a preliminary group, but will not be the only group to discuss this topic. Once there is a preliminary draft, there would be much more to share and opportunities for feedback. It is not yet at any stage where consultation and feedback can be requested. Everything would remain status quo for the upcoming year. There would also be a transition period, but prior to that, there would be a consultation phase with all groups invited to participate.
- Per A. Mawyer in CPIS, with their Title VI funds, would potentially lose the ability to fund GAs which relate to concerns of if they keep GAs then they would lose funding for outreach, or lose GAs if continuing outreach. He suggested University-wide data collection from ORS would be helpful.
- Clarification on MFS representation by C. Stephenson. She will be continuing for a second year as a representative of the SEC. The second representative has yet to be determined by CAPP. That person will not be known until August or early September once CAPP meets.

Adjourned: 4:20pm

**Next Meeting:** September 17, 2024