Meeting Date, 9/15/2010
Taken by C. Langlas and K. Morris

Present:
- Ken Morris (Chair),
- Chuck Langlas,
- Scott Saft,
- Michael Shintaku,
- Cathy Zenz,
- Aaron Jacobs (new Faculty Congress Liaison and Pharmacy rep),
- Natalie Beam (new Library rep),
- Yoshiko Fukushima,
- Don Price,
- Kenny Simmons,
- Jan Zulich,
- Jerry Calton,
- Bryan Kim

Topics Discussed:
1. Introductions

2. Meeting frequency: After a short discussion, the chair decided that the council should meet weekly for now in order to clear our agenda.

4. Status of the Grad Council charter: The charter has been approved by the council and sent on. The chair will check on its current status.

5. Council structure reviewed: The council has three standing committees,
   - Program Committee (Chair Bryan Kim, Tony Wright, Mahealani Jones)—examines new program proposals and program reviews, reports to the whole council for approval/disapproval
   - Admissions Committee (Jerry Calton, Jan Zulich, Mahealani Jones)—decides on admission of candidates who don’t meet the admissions requirements and approves/disapproves
   - Course Committee (Mike Shintaku and others)—examines new course proposals and approves/disapproves

6. Doctorate in Physical Therapy: discussion was postponed to the next meeting, to allow the members to review the ATP and the Program Committee review, which were sent out to members ahead of the next meeting.
Kenny noted that the ATP for the new doctorate should include information on what the pre-requisites of the program are, in order to help get some idea of what undergrad courses might be impacted by students preparing for admission.

8. Governance:

Curriculum Review is governed by the University of Hawaii at Hilo Curriculum Review Process, which can be found at http://hilo.hawaii.edu/uhh/vcaa/documents/CurriculumReviewFlowDiagramNotes10-6-09-FINAL.pdf

- **Authorization to Plan** requests for new degree programs come to the graduate council from the College.
  - Once approved, the ATP goes to the Campus-Wide Curriculum Review Body
  - The Faculty Congress voted last spring that the Campus Wide Curriculum Committee would send its recommendations to the Congress as a whole before transmitting them to the VCAA.
  - With the VCAA’s signature, the ATP goes to the Council of Chief Academic Officers.
  - If endorsed there, the ATP is signed by Dr Linda Johnsrud, VC for Academic Planning & Policy.
  - It comes back to the host campus, where the Chancellor signs it. Then the Authorization to Plan becomes official.

- The unit then develops the official **Program Proposal**. This document goes through the same on-campus process.
  - Again, the VCAA takes it to the Council of Chief Academic Officers. At that level it should receive an endorsement from Dr Johnsrud, who recommends it to the President.
  - With her support, the Chancellor takes it to the Board of Regents for approval.

- After a new program is approved, it is a “provisional” program. Within 2 years after graduating its first students, the program must come forward with a **Provisional-to-Permanent application**, to seek permanent program status.
  - In the case of graduate programs, this document is viewed in draft by the Grad Council and a report is made.
  - The program responds to the Grad Council report.
  - The final state in the on-campus approval process is that the Chief Financial Officer must sign off on the cost/enrollment template.
  - Once this is complete, it goes to the Council of Chief Academic Officers for review. With Dr Johnsrud’s endorsement, she takes it to the President.
  - With her support, the Chancellor takes it to the Board for approval of permanent status.
9. On the docket

- The chair requested members to send him topics which the council has not dealt with and which need additional work.
- Two topics: pending approval of two provisional M.A. programs for established status—CHUS and MILCE.

10. Comments by Chancellor Straney; opening remarks and ideas about the planning process and financing of new programs.

- The Chancellor emphasized the critical role of the GC in the developments planned for UHH. He noted that graduate students are the engines of research and hence the responsibilities of the GC must foster graduate programs. New programs might include a Professional Science M.S. for example. In answer to specific questions the Chancellor pointed out:
  - The GC charter approved by the GC is being sent to the VCAA by Dan Brown in the next step in adoption
  - Structurally, the details of the chain of reporting are still being examined
  - There is a clear need to recognize the effort required to supervise graduate and professional students and programs to balance faculty loads.

- The new program approval process is now thankfully in place and the Chancellor recognized that the campus wide curriculum committee should be able to abide by the vote of the GC but this means that we must hold the new program proposals to “high standards” and make sure what we send up is properly vetted and ready to proceed, including:
  - The program proposal should come with a “business plan” for how to find new resources needed. If there isn’t enough funding available from the state, generation of income by non-credit instruction in order to fund new programs should be explored. But it is essential to be clear upfront about the need for additional resources in order to have a dialog about how to find them.
  - Kenny Simmons added that the program proposal for a new graduate program should include an estimate of both the explicit and implicit impact on undergraduate programs and that impact should be addressed in the “business plan” for the program.
    - e.g. the Doctorate of Pharmacy program has added load to the existing undergraduate chemistry courses, with (in retrospect) UHH not providing sufficient resources for them. A plus and minus is that not only do students in the PharmD. program take those courses, the program also attracts excellent undergrads who hope to enter the Pharmacy program.