Meeting Notes
Ph.D. Funding Working Group
Nov 8, 2012, 9:00-10:30 a.m., HH 309

Attending: Ruben Campos, Crystal Valliant, Charles Kinoshita, Yuko Otsuka, Torben Neilson, Chip Fletcher, Tom Gaarder, Laura Lyons, Martin Raynor, Byron Gangnes, Richard Chadwick, Pat Cooper, Ron Bontekoe, Stacy Roberts, Tom Apple, Susan Hippensteele

1. SP Update—SPC looking at draft implementation plan for initiatives 4 and 5—intent is to form WG by end of semester
2. Discussion with Chancellor Apple
   --TA strongly supports strengthening Ph.D. programs by funding them adequately
   --UHM 51st in country for receipt of federal funding for research which means we should be able to attract excellent Ph.D. students
   --support, mentoring and funding of our students is critical and sometimes we need to ‘cull the herd’ when we identify students who are unable to make adequate progress—doing so will need to go hand in hand with providing support packages
   --need to be preparing students to become stewards of the discipline
   --over time, we need to ‘right size’ Ph.D. programs but we still need to determine what this means on a case by case basis
   --all Ph.D. programs need to be student centered rather than department or faculty centered, i.e., we should not be bringing in and keeping Ph.D. students around because we need TA’s
   --tuition waiver issues are different in science and non science fields (TA comment: no Ph.D. student should be paying tuition, one option to consider might be an output based model, i.e., funding based on # of Ph.D. students graduated and placed)
   --mentorship models need to be more fully examined and regularized across disciplines although not to the extent that discipline specific mentoring needs and practices are eliminated
   --clearly, funding is not enough—need to change culture of support for students
3. Cost Estimate Discussion with Pete Garrod
   --currently 1000 Ph.D. students in first 5 years; 144 w/ no funding
   --‘net’ figure of 70 unfunded students calculated by shifting funding patterns where funds have been allocated to Ph.D. students beyond year 5 or to M.A. students
   --40 of these students are in 4 departments which suggests the problem of lack of funding is not campus-wide
   NOTE: major problem with these data is that they under represent the number of unfunded students as this initiative intended to define them because the data include those students who have cobbled together lectureships and multiple jobs in the funded student category
   --according to PG and PC, it is very difficult to obtain an accurate count of the total number of unfunded students consistent with the intention of the initiative
   --WG members questioned whether the cost estimate is even relevant but others felt it was at least a starting point
--as we refine the cost estimate we need to account for the increased monies needed and the reduced tuition we will generate—for example, the 70 unfunded students in the “net” figure generate $3M in debt and $3M in tuition

4. Work Plan
   Funding Models:
   --consider creating a new scholarship fund, e.g. 23K GA level, and offer the money to students rather than departments—can be a line item of c.v. because competitive (NYU model)

Next Steps/Follow-Up Issues:

1. Next Mtg: continue discussion of possible funding models
2. SH will explore alternative ways of gathering cost estimate data

Next Meeting: Thur. Dec 6, 9-10:30 a.m. in HH 309