In attendance: Nicole Baumgarth, Chris Cappa, Anabelle Yu, Andy Waterhouse, Jeanelle Hope, Jonathan Minnick (Proxy for Elyssa Fogleman), Chuck Bevins (Proxy for Jeffrey Schank), Rena Zieve, Beth Levy, Greta Hsu; Roy Taggueg, Prasant Mohapatra, Carlee Arnett, Pauline Holmes.

I. Subcommittee Reports
   10:00 AM
   a. Academic Planning and Development (Schank)
      No new updates.
   
   b. Administrative (Baumgarth)
      Dealt with two requests, one regarding the grandfathering policy and an embargo request. The committee is working on rewriting the Grandfathering Degree Requirements policy.
   
   c. Bylaws (Burman)
      Material Science Bylaws pending program response. Will likely be ready for the next GC meeting.
   
   d. Courses (Longo)
      No new updates.
   
   e. Educational Policy (Cappa)
      Continue to review. Working on scheduling a meeting for March.
   
   f. Program Review (Zieve)
      Continue with program reviews. The committee is working on revising the DE Guidelines and DE Reviewer Report Template. The revised DE questionnaires will be presented to GC today.
   
   g. Program Review Closure (Temple)
      Waiting on program responses from the administration.
   
   h. Support (Arnett)
      The committee is working on reviewing the Fellowship applications and is discussing the data that has been provided by the Office of Graduate Studies. The information will be presented to GC.
   
   i. Welfare (Levy)
      The committee is working with JP Delplanque on website updates to make mentoring documents more accessible to Post-Doctoral students. The Post-Doctoral award cycle has begun and the committee will be meeting in March to review the applications submitted. The committee has received a request regarding student disability accommodations, the committee is hoping to bring this topic up for discussion to GC this academic year.

II. Consent Calendar – Posted on the ASIS Whiteboard
   10:25 AM
   a. Meeting Summary from February 8, 2018
b. **Affiliation Request: Study of Religion w/DE in Science and Technology**

**Motion to approve:** Unanimously approved.

### III. Continuing Business Items

#### a. Chemical Engineering Response

**10:30 AM**

The Chemical Engineering Program provided a response to the GC letter regarding the apparent practices of the Program to place the burden of finding a Major Professor solely on the incoming Ph.D. students. The response from the program was deemed appropriate and there were no further concerns from GC members. The Program has now submitted updated degree requirements, which are currently under review by the Educational Policy Committee.

**Action Item:** Nicole to respond to Program, thank them for response and submission of updated degree requirements, and emphasizing hope that this incident was unique.

### IV. New Business Items

#### a. EDUCATIONAL POLICY COMMITTEE (Cappa)

**10:40 AM**

i. **GAC in Future Undergraduate Science Educators**

There was a lot of interest from the students to create this Graduate Academic Certificate (GAC). The program has support and a good plan of courses, however, the program needs approval for the proposal to create a new course code. The program is starting by prioritizing College of Biological Science students and envision the GAC growing to be offered to other students.

There were concerns regarding the proposal not clearly stating that the GAC was open to students in the affiliated programs. There were concerns that the proposal required 24 units of coursework, but it was clarified that this was not the case since the sample completion plans indicate that the GAC requires 12 units. It was noted that it was not specified in the proposal whether the Program conferred with the College of Education to determine if there was any overlap with other programs already in existence. EPC was not too concerned with overlap, given that the College of Education focuses primarily on K-12, which makes it difficult for graduate programs or proposal to take advantage of any of their resources. There were also concerns with oversight to ensure that students would not become the instructor of record. GC discussed whether the proposal should include language that states that graduate students would not be expected to be the instructor of record during the academic year. GC determined that the proposal would not be the appropriate place to insert this language. The students pointed out that the GAC included the elective course FSE 320: Partnership with CEE seminar, which already provides a certificate to students who complete the requirements. Students were wondering why someone would want to enroll in the GAC when the Partnership with CEE seminar already provides a certificate. It was noted that the Certificate of Completion for this course was different than a GAC.

GC agreed that the proposal needed further clarification and that the following items need to be addressed by the program:

1. The proposal needs to state that it is open to students in the affiliated programs.
2. The word “theses” appears twice in the document, this should be changed to “dissertation”.
3. A section in the proposal is inconsistent with policy, the proposal needs to state that faculty members need to be voted in.
Action Item: Proposal will be sent back to the program to address the three issues outlined by GC. Once required changes are made and approved by EPC, the Chair of EPC will discuss request for approval at one of the upcoming GC meetings.

b. PROGRAM REVIEW COMMITTEE (Zieve)

i. DE Questionnaires 10:55 AM

Question #5 on the Graduate Student Survey was updated to reflect the discussion at the last GC meeting. No further concerns from the committee regarding the suggested edits on the questionnaires.

Motion to approve DE Faculty Questionnaire: unanimously approved.
Motion to approve DE Graduate Student Questionnaire: unanimously approved.

ii. Designated Emphasis In Reproductive Biology 11:05 AM

The DE has had various faculty retire and is in the process of reinventing itself. The DE currently has 9 students enrolled, if this continues it seems it would be a problem. However, given that the DE is working to make changes, this might not be an issue in the future. It was noted in the review that all participating students were from one department, PRC did not necessarily view this as a major problem at this time and no other major weaknesses stood out.

Motion to endorse the PRC report and ask program to respond to the recommendations: unanimously approved.

Action Item: Nicole Baumgarth will draft the GC Transmittal Letter.

iii. Civil and Environmental Engineering 11:20 AM

(Chris Cappa recused from discussion and voting)

Overview provided by PRC Chair Rena Zieve

The number of Masters Students was impacting the program. The Program has now scaled back from Masters Students. It was noted that there are serious issues with mentoring and the way graduate students in the program are being treated. This issue was raised in previous program reviews, but has yet to be addressed by the Program. The financial offers were also brought up as an issue, these were not considered to be competitive. Lack of space was also identified as a major impediment for students in the program. PRC felt strongly that if Masters students are brought into the Program to bring-in money but are not being given adequate office space, this is a major problem. The time to degree for the Master’s Program was also considered a major issue. It was noted that students were not able to complete their degree in a timely manner because required courses are not offered consistently.

The department has 5 subfields that appear to act quite independently from each other. PRC (and it appeared also the review team) had difficulties assessing whether the identified challenges were broadly affecting all students in the program, or only one or some of the 5 subfields. The statistics provided were not broken down by subfields.
Based on these discussions GC felt that additional information is required from program to clarify these issues. Therefore, GC will reach out to Program to request the following information:

1. Number of faculty and graduate students in each subfield of study.
2. Distribution of MS/PhD and domestic/international graduate students for each of the subfields.
3. Degree completion rates broken down by subfields and degree objective.
4. Amount of extramural research funding by subfield (to address questions whether there are subfields in which students can or cannot be supported with GSR positions).
5. Compensation plan/financial support for students offered GSR positions.
6. Number of PhD students financially supported via GSR and TA-positions. (% of funding of PhD students)

**Action item:** Nicole Baumgarth will draft a letter from GC asking the Program for more information in order to move forward with the review.

### MISC Announcements

**Nicole Baumgarth:** An issue was brought up regarding the ESL requirement for graduate students, GC will discuss this issue at the next GC meeting. Associate Director for ESL Dana Farris and Director of Admissions and Academic Services Brian Gallagher will be invited to present the issue.

**Prasant Mohapatra:** The Office of Graduate Studies is looking to create mini awards for programs to develop best practices for mentorship. This will be in lieu of the Mentoring at Critical Transitions (MCT) award.

### iv. Physics

*(Rena Zieve recused from discussion and voting)*

Overview provided by PRC Vice Chair Simona Ghetti

The students noted that the Preliminary exam was a major cause of stress, however, this did not strike the Program Review Committee as overly stressful compared to other programs. It was noted that lack of student cohesiveness seemed to be a problem. GC noted that this was not addressed in the PRC report. PRC noted that in the big scheme of things this did not seem to stand out, so it was not emphasized as a problem in the report. One of the major concerns for this program was that new faculty were being hired but adequate space not being provided to them within a reasonable time. PRC cited this as a weakness and noted that this might affect particularly faculty with a higher ratio of individuals from underrepresented groups. GC members were interested to know whether there are data to back up that claim and thought this would be worth looking into more closely. It was recommended that if there is a disproportionate loss of new (and URM) faculty this should be pointed out in the GC transmittal letter to the program.

**Action Item:** Nicole Baumgarth will draft the GC transmittal letter. The Transmittal letter and the Program Review Report will be placed on the consent calendar at the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned