Graduate Council  
Meeting Minutes  
February 17, 2015  
Gilmore 212


Excused:  H. Pourjalali, D. Halbert, B. Sipes, M. McNally, B. Kim, A. Wertheimer

Welcome

Approval of Minutes – January meeting
- Minutes were sent ahead of the meeting for review. No discussion or questions.
- Vote: Unanimous approval of Minutes

Announcements/Reminders:
- UHM forms due 4/3/15
- April meeting date moved to 5/5/15, 2:30-4:00p, Gilmore 212
- AAA standing committee chair – John Rieder
  - Per feedback to improve the productivity of discussions during Graduate Council meetings, Dean Aune requested a committee chair from the AAA committee to coordinate/facilitate discussions off-line and report back information to the Council. Dean Aune acknowledged and thanked John Rieder for volunteering for this role.
- MFS meeting 2/18/15 agenda item re: Graduate Council Program Committee
  - This is to propose and share information with the Mānoa Faculty Senate RE: moving the Graduate Council Program Committee to become the standing committee in place of the graduate education portion of CoRGE. This way, any program changes that are discussed and voted on by the Graduate Council may be more effectively and efficiently prepared and submitted to be addressed by the Mānoa Faculty Senate.

New Business
- Awards – process to determine groups were based on workloads of each committee.
  - AAA committee members assigned to UH Foundation Scholarships: Mary Babcock, Debora Halbert, Hamid Pourjalali, John Rieder, Brent Sipes, Hamid Pourjalali
  - Access to the STAR awards site will be requested by Dean Aune for each committee member. Information about each of the awards and amount available to be awarded is on the STAR site. There are multiple awards, each with multiple applicants.
  - Submit a ranked list for each award to the Dean along with recommended award amount for applicants.
Course committee members assigned to the Peter V. Garrod Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Award: Rhonda Black, Rich Gazan, Merle Kataoka-Yahiro, Mark, McNally, Krysia Mossakowski, Thomas Ranker, David Sanders
  - Applications for this award will be file dropped to each committee member.
  - Evaluations are to be made based on the criteria for this award and information submitted by each applicant.

Program committee members assigned to Frances Davis Award for Excellence in Undergraduate Teaching – Graduate Teaching Assistant: Gurdal Arslan, Kathryn Braun, Henrieta Dulaiova, Bum Jung Kim, Christine Sorensen Irvine, Andrew Wertheimer
  - Applications for this award will be file dropped to each committee member.
  - Evaluations are to be made based on the criteria for this award and information submitted by each applicant. All materials required to be submitted would determine eligibility for consideration.

- Report from AAA committee re: double counting of credits between a degree and certificate.
  - Due to three members being out of town, there wasn’t much chance for the committee to discuss this issue. However, general consensus from the Council members at a prior meeting was in favor of reverting back to previous language. Previous language left the total number of credits to be double counted between a graduate degree and graduate certificate up to the graduate program(s). If neither graduate program allowed double counting credits, or if one program had restrictions on what courses could be double counted with a graduate degree, then those would be followed. Decisions would be left up to the graduate certificate and graduate degree program faculty. A memo with regard to the procedure to be followed by a graduate program is requested to be sent to Graduate Student Services to assist in the degree and certificate audit processes.
- Vote: 13 in favor; 1 abstention; no opposed.

- Emeritus faculty and chairing new students.
  - This is a growing issue with regard to Emeriti faculty continuing to be actively involved with current graduate students in their program. They are considered similarly with Affiliate graduate faculty. Associate Dean Maeda shared the question of whether or not Emeritus faculty should be able to chair a new graduate student’s committee (i.e., not a candidate prior to retirement of faculty member; new to program) as it has come up in about 2-3 programs, recently.
  - Council members discussed this issue and also asked good questions with regard to handling Title IX issues RE: Emeritus faculty, small number of regular faculty in a program due to retirements or resignations, as well as what if the Emeritus faculty was a PI on a grant? Per Dr. Ranker who checked with ORS; according to ORS, if the individual has BOR approved Emeritus status, he/she can be a PI on a grant. Thus, could they chair the committee of the student he/she was funding? The possibility of co-chairs was also discussed. While it’s possible, logistically, it
is very difficult to recognize co-chairs. The Banner system doesn’t allow for side-by-side listing of chairs and instead, requires a hierarchical listing where the first co-chair would be considered primary. There was also concern that Emeriti faculty may not be familiar enough or aware of the day to day practices in the program since their retirement; they may also not be aware of changes to policies and procedures. Time to degree was also acknowledged as a concern with Emeriti faculty. Their responsibilities are not with the University anymore and there is a concern that students may not receive the guidance or attention they may need to complete their degree in a timely manner. In contrast, an Emeritus faculty member could have the time to commit to the student, as compared to regular faculty.

- General consensus was that Emeriti faculty should not chair the committee of a new student. They may finish their student(s) if they have reached candidacy or potentially are within the process of reaching candidacy. However, this is a situation that the Council seemed to agree to have addressed on a case by case basis. Specifically, if a graduate program had a compelling situation and reason for an Emeritus faculty member to chair a committee, a petition may be submitted to the Dean of Graduate Education for consideration.

- Related issue: Should the physical presence of the student, chair, and University Representative (UR) still be required at a doctoral defense?
  - Each role (i.e., student, chair, UR) was not explicitly discussed nor were they differentiated to see if any consequences differed by role.
  - Discussion and general understanding seemed to be that it is better for all of the committee members and the student to be physically present. This is the ideal situation.
    - The online Nursing PhD, which started in the 90’s, was shared as an example. M. Kataoka-Yahiro shared that their students’ defense requires that the student be physically present, but all other parts of the degree are online. It makes for a more enhanced and complete experience when everyone is present. Technical glitches can still affect the situation with a remote participant, and even with all of the advances in technology, it’s still not quite the same when everyone is not in the same room. M. Tigchelaar and R. Carroll shared their preference as graduate students to be physically present when they defend their dissertation. They understand the direction with technology and advantages to not having to return to campus to defend. They also acknowledged that there may be situations when allowing a student to defend from afar may also be more appropriate. There are many reasons students do not or are not able to defend prior to leaving UHM.
  - General consensus was that while it would be ideal for everyone to physically be in one place together, times are different. With the advances in technology, online degrees, and funds involved when students have to fly back to UHM, members agreed that maybe allowing more flexibility to this policy is necessary. Members agreed that the decision on how much flexibility would be allowed should be left to the respective graduate programs to decide.
For those graduate programs who want to allow for more flexibility in physical attendance at a doctoral defense, those graduate chairs are to submit a formal memo outlining this process to the Dean. If no memo is submitted, current practice will be required for those programs.

- For online defenses, memos are to also include that an accessible physical location on campus will also be provided. This location would need to include appropriate equipment to allow appropriate attendance at the defense by others since a doctoral defense is also considered a public presentation. The required announcement of a doctoral defense would need to include information about the physical location of the defense.

- 5-year probation versus 7-year probation

  This was initiated by a former Associate Dean of Graduate Education as a means to try to decrease time to degree. Currently, if a Plan A or doctoral student does not progress to candidacy within five years, they’re placed on probation. The process of placing students on probation, while important, also is very work intensive relative to the Student Services staff. There are multiple offices to inform of this academic action. Dean Aune inquired as to its effectiveness and whether or not programs needed to have this “stick” to ensure students and faculty were on the same page with regard to appropriate progress toward their degree. For some members, this process is helpful, but overall, it is unnecessary as programs should also take on this responsibility for ensuring their students are making appropriate progress toward their degree. D. Sanders asked if it was possible to use STAR to note students who are or are not making appropriate progress. Discussion to incorporate STAR more into graduate programs was initiated a year ago and is still be considered. J. Maeda responded that she would look into such an option for graduate advisors.

  General consensus was that the automatic probation at 5 years is not necessary. Council members expressed that graduate chairs can take on more of this responsibility with their colleagues. The annual review of doctoral students can also help to identify problem cases so they can be addressed early on in the student’s program.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:00p.

Next meeting: **March 31, 2015; QLCSS 412 2:30p. [CHANGE IN LOCATION]**