

**UHH Graduate Studies Council
Meeting Minutes**

October 4, 2011

Attendance: Ken Morris (Chair), Aaron Jacobs, Natalie Beam, Mahealani Jones, Cathy Zenz, Tony Wright, Charles Langlas, Michael Shintaku, Tam Vu, Jan Zulich, Steve Lundblad, Scott Saft, Don Price

Meeting brought to order at 3:00pm

- I. Review of minutes from September 27, 2011 meeting
 - a. Corrections to be made.
 - b. Tony: Moved to approve minutes.
 - c. Chuck: Second motion to approve.
 - d. 9 in favor.
- II. Discussion on Graduate Committee
 - a. Ken: stated that the graduate students have no voice for their concerns and they need to elect a representative.
 - b. Mahealani: stated that there is potential money that they can apply for from the student government.
 - c. Jan: voiced that she just doesn't see the graduate students doing it, they don't communicate with one another.
 - d. Chuck: when students have a reason they will agitate but if they don't have a reason they won't. He suggested that one student from each program serve as grad rep.
 - e. Jan: stated that the TCBS needs to talk to the M.Ed people. She also posed the question if we can be the student's venue.
 - f. Ken: stated that if they have a representative they can go to them but we don't have the authority to force anyone.
 - g. Tony: suggested that we build into each program for someone to be an advocate.
 - h. Ken: stated that all we can do is inform them again.
- III. Discussion on Review of Provisional Acceptance Policy
 - a. Jan: emphasized where the "teeth" to this is.
 - b. Mahealani: stated the "teeth" is to track them.
 - c. Jan: stated that we may need to institute something regarding tracking.
 - d. Ken: stated that it shouldn't be that much of a burden to track them.
 - e. Mahealani: stated that if they come through her she will know who to keep an eye on. She suggested that there be something centralized.
 - f. Don: questioned if there is anything in banner than can be used to track these students?
 - g. Cathy: stated that we could put a hold on them until they document their success. She stated that after the 1st semester we could place a hold on them. Stated that when admissions admit them they put a hold on them.
 - h. Mahealani: stated that they have to undo the hold then put it back on.
 - i. Cathy: stated that their record is anemic to begin with. At other schools if students were able to take all these classes but were not fully admitted then say that you took their money.
 - j. Jan: stated do we need to state what it's based on.
 - k. Chuck: stated that it might need to be stated.
 - l. Ken: stated will stating it make those who wouldn't have applied apply.

- m. Jan: stated that then the burden is left on the admissions committee that you have potential for success.
- n. Mahealani: stated that each department can add their own. We can leave a space for the department to add their own terms.
- o. Aaron: stated that it may confuse students to receive two letters.
- p. Mahealani: stated that the two letters go together.
- q. Chuck: stated that individual program chairs will be sending out the letters.

Note: Provisional Acceptance letter to be revised.

- r. Jan: questioned whether we can put a hold until the student gets their grades.
- s. Cathy: stated that we could have it start late so they are still able to withdraw, etc. but not able to register.
- t. Steve: stated that if you get a C they can't continue in the spring anyway.
- u. Mahealani: stated that we just need to wait for fall grades.
- v. Jan: questioned does that mean we won't be getting any more applicants 2.6, etc.
- w. Don: stated that anyone below a 2.75 doesn't even apply.
- x. Jan: stated that it's a lot of personal heartache for the student.
- y. Mahealani: stated that if they really want it they do it.
- z. Jan: stated that Mahealani looks at the last 60 credits.
- aa. Chuck: stated that it's not very clear in the catalog.
- bb. Mahealani: stated that some things were edited for the handbook.
- cc. Cathy: stated that we could put something in the online catalog about it.

IV. Discussion on Review process for students denied to grad programs

- a. Ken: stated that we should have some sort of process to follow for students who would like to appeal.
- b. Mahealani: stated that if the students will be doing interview with one person but we have always had multiple.
- c. Ken: stated that we could find fault but it needs to be tailored by program.
- d. Mahealani: stated that the point is that we don't have an appeal process and we should come up with one.
- e. Don: If there was something generic we could have different people look at it.
- f. Chuck: suggested that we should just state that if you want to appeal contact ____.
- g. Mahealani: stated that we shouldn't advertise provisional acceptance.
- h. Chuck: suggested that we could say that students may be accepted provisionally if they do not meet all the requirements.
- i. Jan: Stated that we should all be looking at our own appeals process.
- j. Mike: voiced concern that Psy is a special case. Conservation Biology is just passed on grades so there wouldn't be a need for an appeals process.
- k. Mahealani: suggested that it be worded may be instead of will be.
- l. Jan: suggested if it would be possible to have it be a work task.
- m. Ken: stated that if someone has a 2.75 to 3.0 you no longer need approval from the committee
- n. Ken: clarified that if you have a 3.0 you still may not be accepted. Then they can appeal to the department.
- o. Tony: suggested to appeal to program director.
- p. Mahealani: stated that it will go into the catalog
- q. Ken: stated that appeals process is part of each individual program but the language about the appeals

- V. Discussion on Early Enrollment for grad students, implementing Cathy's plan
- a. Cathy: stated that new graduate and professional students will register at the same time as the transfer and returning students, the summer is open for everyone.
 - b. Mahealani: stated that students will be able to register in April instead of August. Students can't register because they are terminated when they graduate.
 - c. Jan: stated that we want students to graduate but some students stay on. Aren't we supposed to be encouraging them to graduate?
- VI. GC recommendations for revision of outdated BOR policies for UHH Graduate Programs and Personnel
- a. Ken: stated that these policies need to be updated because it is an old set of policies. Looking at the adjunct faculty and Ch.12 on research post docs, adjunct faculty can be post doc as PI's cuts on funding for us.
 - b. Aaron: stated that it excludes a lot of post docs that apply for fellowships. The BOR has no post docs and the post doc as adjunct faculty.
Note: Ken & Aaron to draft what language they want to recommend.
 - c. Tony: questioned whether they are going to fight it.
 - d. Ken: stated that system wide they may fight it.
 - e. Tony: questioned how it works with masters and PhD students.
 - f. Ken: stated that's system wide.
 - g. Chuck: stated that Manoa may want to change too.
 - h. Don: voiced concern that some people in some agencies here would like to have grad students, essentially free faculty.
 - i. Chuck: voiced concern that we should find a definition of adjunct and affiliate.
 - j. Tony: stated that affiliate is outside within the university.
 - k. Tam: stated that affiliate is both inside and outside of UHH. It is confusing a lot of UH faculty. It is system wide cooperating and Manoa has a different system. She is inside cooperating with Manoa.
 - l. Steve: stated that since we don't have adjunct they need to be affiliate, there's no choice. Is there a definition of affiliate faculty?
 - m. Chuck: stated that they can teach, can co-chair unofficially and adjunct faculty could possibly chair a committee.
Note: Check old version of BOR polices.
 - n. Chuck: stated that we want to be sure what to use.
 - o. Steve: it allows flexibility in some programs.
 - p. Ken: stated that it depends on the economics of the department.

Meeting adjourned at 4:10pm