1. **Continuing Business**
   a. Graduate Student Mentoring Action Plan (GSMAP)
      i. Ad-Hoc Mentoring Committee Report (Peluffo)

   Committee Chair Kyaw Tha Paw U initiated the discussion of the mentoring plan by providing a brief overview of the proposed 12 point plan shared with the committee members. The following key items of discussion were brought up by the member:

   - Programs should be able to customize the mentoring guidelines, including quality control.
   - There should be a way for the forms to be made available online.
     - The online forms should be tracked
     - The online system will be useful for continuous progress check ups
   - The program review process should be used to make recommendations and make programs more accountable for addressing problem mentors.
   - Data related to mentoring should be tracked and 299s with the names of all students should be included as part of the faculty merit and promotion in order to make faculty more accountable.
   - The 2016 Distinguished Graduate and Distinguished Postdoctoral Scholar Mentoring Awards will be taking place on Monday, May 23rd at 3:00 pm in the Student Community Center.
     - The Academic Senate Chair would like it unified with the other Senate awards

**Online Progress Report Implementation**

- A set of forms has already been circulated for additional edits and feedback. The committee members are encouraged to work directly on the document to track changes.
- The members emphasized the importance considering the ratings that will be included in the report (i.e. satisfactory vs. outstanding) and making sure that these fields are mandatory on the online form to ensure this section is completed.
- It was suggested that an open ended agreement would make it more flexible for programs that the check boxes don’t really apply to.
It was suggested that it would be useful to have an open ended comments section.

A central “bank” that encompasses and increases the Office of Research bridging funding program and includes financial support for students who are switching from one mentor with funding to another mentor who might not have available funding. Extended funding offers at admissions.

- This recommendation is made as an option for students not to feel tied to a mentor because of funding.
- Members suggested adding a section stating that main funds will not be taken for the block grants.
- The Provost and Academic Senate will need to discuss implementation of this.

Graduate Council members stated that the mentoring plan provided still needs to be much more structured and additional work will need to be done to fine tune it.

Graduate students requested that the Ad Hoc committee, chaired by Ana Peluffo, meet more often to ensure progress on the mentoring plan.

II. Consent Calendar – Posted on the ASIS whiteboard

- Meeting summary from April 8, 2016
- Meeting summary from April 20, 2016
- Civil and Environmental Engineering – Degree Requirements
- Industrial Ecology – GAC
- Native American Studies – DE Affiliation
- NSHL – Health Professions Educator – GAC
- Communication – Degree Requirements

All consent calendar items approved.

III. New Business Items

a. Program Review Committee (PRC) Reports
   i. Child and Human Development

Presented by Fern Tablin, Ad Hoc Committee Chair

Professor Fern Tablin provided a brief overview of the Child and Human Development program review. The following points were made during the presentation:

- There is a need for postdoctoral students in this area.
- The program ranks well and is much regarded.
- Students are published in solid journals but the graduate group does not publicize this well.
- The website needs to be improved.
- The handbook needs to be updated.
• There needs to be more flexibility for students to get credit for attending the seminars at the MIND institute.
• It is difficult for students to get financial aid after the second year.
• The graduate group has been very successful with NSF pre-doctoral fellowships.
• The graduate chair needs to engage the faculty in the medical group.
• There was a lot of discussion especially with the outside reviewer regarding the preliminary exam. Students spent the entire summer studying for this exam.
• There is no plan to increase underrepresented minority students. For those currently in the program, having the right mentor helped.

Motion to Endorse the PRC report – seconded – approved unanimously.

Presented by Nicole Baumgarth
Nicole Baumgarth stated that the committee was overall extremely impressed with the quality of the faculty members for the Joint Doctoral Program at San Diego State University. The following points were made regarding the review of the program.

• The structure of the program is to spend the first year in SDSU, one year at UCD, and finish in SDSU.
  o The financial costs associate with moving are completely on the student’s. Stipends should be made available to assist students with relocation costs.
  o There are students that stay at UCD longer than a year.
• The reviewers commented on the lack of diversity. This is surprising since SDSU has a large number of underrepresented students.
• There is concern that there is so much restriction because there is not a large breadth of ecologist in SDSU.
• Faculty at UCD don’t know enough about the program.
• It is recommended that a joint retreat be held between the faculty at UCD and SDSU to increase interaction and awareness.

Motion to Endorse the PRC report – seconded – approved unanimously.

iii. Education 10:15 AM
Presented by Michael Neff Ad Hoc Committee Chair
Professor Michael Neff provided a brief overview of the review for the Education program and outlined the following:

• There are four different programs that were reviewed:
  o Credential with M.A.
    ▪ Tuition and fees seem to be coming from this program given the number of students enrolled.
- It would be more beneficial if faculty didn’t have to teach undergraduate courses.
- Teaching undergraduate courses should not be the priority, this is a detriment to the degrees being awarded.

- **Master of Arts (M.A.)**
  - The program has separate bylaws.
  - The program is theme based, one faculty will lead a theme for two years. This makes it difficult to attract student’s long term.
  - Only 2-7 students a year.
  - Capstone is an oral and written exam done in the classroom, the reviewers felt this was not rigorous enough.
  - It was suggested to consider if the program wants to actively continue with this program.

- **Doctor of Philosophy**
  - There is concern that there is no feedback on the final assignments submitted.
  - There are some concerns about office space. This seems to be tied to the grants.
  - There is concern among students about courses that address diversity.
  - There is an issue with courses being listed in the catalog but not being taught. It is recommended that the website be updated to only reflect the courses being consistently taught.
  - It is recommended to possible have a forum to address issues with faculty around diversity.

- **Capital North Doctorate in Educational Leadership (CANDEL)**
  - Students are enthusiastic about the existence of this program.
  - The program is advertised as a three year degree but very few students finish within that timeframe. This seems to be tied to the thesis. The structure of this does not seem likely to be successful.

- The report cites deficiencies in leadership.
- Senate and Federation faculty need better communication and relationships.

Graduate Council members recommended outlining more specific recommendations in the PRC transmittal letter to the program. Especially regarding the budget model and the issue with undergraduate teaching.
Motion to Endorse the PRC report with GC recommendations – seconded – approved unanimously.

b. Program Review Closure Committee (PRCC)
   i. Recommendations for Closure 10:35 AM
      1. Biomedical Engineering
      2. Ecology
      3. Entomology
      4. Epidemiology
      5. DE African American Studies
      6. DE Classics and Classical Receptions
      7. DE International and Community Nutrition
      8. DE Vector-Borne Diseases

Motion to approve the recommendations for closure – seconded – approved unanimously.

IV. Announcements – Tabled 10:40 AM
   a. Graduate Council Chair (Paw U)
   b. Vice Provost and Dean Graduate Studies (Mohapatra)
   c. Graduate Studies Associate Deans (Calvert & Delplanque)
   d. CCGA – Coordinating Committee on Graduate Affairs (Beckett)
   e. GSA – Graduate Student Association (Washington)
   f. PSA – Postdoctoral Scholars Association (Ashby)
   g. GSADC – Graduate Student Assistant to the Dean and Chancellor (Vonasek)

V. Subcommittee Reports (Posted on ASIS Whiteboard)
   a. Academic Planning and Development (Bolander)
   b. Administrative (Paw U)
   c. Bylaws (Burman)
   d. Courses (Longo)
      Nothing new to report. We continue to review all courses as they come in. We do not have a backlog.
   e. Educational Policy (Sundaresan)
      1. Proposal reviews completed 23 total this academic year
         Pending proposals ~ 10 or so in various stages of review, one or two new proposals expected this month.
      2. Last meeting on 4/29/16. Major topic of discussion was the new Hydrological Sciences proposal. EPC Chair Sundaresan and GC Vice-Chair Nicole Baumgarth had met with the Program Chair Greg Pasternack. To expedite the review process, it was suggested that EPC could conduct a preliminary review to identify any major issues, while the Program was still developing new Core courses. This suggestion was discussed by members of the EPC, and it was agreed that the parallel review could proceed provided the Program understood that any preliminary review was subject to revision after the complete proposal was submitted.
3. The EPC member from the Academic Federation was replaced. The original member resigned at the start of the Spring quarter, because the EPC workload had become unmanageable given her current other responsibilities.

f. Program Review (Baumgarth)

Update on Program Review
All 16 program reviews scheduled for academic year 2015/16 have been completed by on-site review teams. The reviewed programs are as follows:
1. Mechanical and Aeronaut Engineering
2. BMCDB
3. Immunology
4. Masters in Preventive Veterinary Medicine
5. Geography
6. Biophysics
7. Economics
8. SDSU- Joint Doctoral Program in Ecology
9. Child and Human Development
10. Cultural Studies
11. Education (ALL)
12. Psychology
13. Forensic Science
14. Linguistics
15. Spanish
16. English

For 14 of 17 reviewed programs (one reviewed in 2014/15) the PRC has received the reviews and has completed its review. Reports have been submitted to Graduate Council for deliberations:
1. Epidemiology (reviewed in GC in 2014/2015)
2. Mechanical and Aeronaut Engineering (discussed by GC on 1/28/16)
3. BMCDB (discussed by GC on 2/15/16)
4. Masters in Preventative Veterinary Medicine (discussed by GC on 2/15/16)
5. Immunology (discussed by GC on 3/17/16)
6. Biophysics (discussed by GC on 04/08/16)
7. Economics (discussed by GC on 04/08/16)
8. Geography (discussed by GC on 04/20/16)
9. Child & Human Development (to be discussed by GC on May 20th)
10. SDSU- Joint Doctoral Program in Ecology (to be discussed by GC on May 20th)
11. Education (to be discussed by GC on May 20th)
12. Linguistics (to be discussed by GC on June 15)
13. Forensic Sciences (to be discussed by GC on June 15)
14. Spanish (to be discussed by GC on June 15)

PRC reports and GC transmittal letters have been sent to seven programs (1-7); 1 transmittal letters (Geography) remains to be drafted by GC.
Of the remaining three reviewed programs, both ad-hoc and external reviewers reports have been received for the following two:
1. English (to be reviewed by PRC on 6/08/16)
2. Cultural Studies (to be reviewed by PRC on 6/08/16)
The ad-hoc committee report for Psychology is late and has not been received (the external report was submitted on time, ad-hoc reviewers have promised to submit by May 18th). PRC review will be June 08 or June 22nd, depending on availability of ad-hoc review.
There are 2 remaining PRC meetings scheduled: June 8th, June 22th.

g. Program Review Closure (VandeVoort)
h. Support (Arnett)
   The Graduate Student Support Committee finished its work and awarded all the fellowships.
i. Welfare (Peluffo)
   The Graduate Student and Postdoctoral Scholar Welfare Committee met on May 6.
   Members in Attendance: Ana Peluffo, Jean Pierre Delplanque, Beth Levy, Amory Meltzer, Ching-yao Fong, Bryan Rodman
   The purpose of the meeting was to select the Distinguished Postdoctoral Scholar Mentoring Awardee and the Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Awardee. There were 33 nominations for the Graduate Mentoring Award and 7 for the Postdoctoral Award.
   First item on the agenda was conflict of interest. We proposed that anybody who was a nominator or a nominee for either of the awards recuse himself or herself from the discussion. We also requested disclosure of the least appearance of a conflict of interest. It was pointed out that a conflict of interest existed only as long as the nominees at issue remained potential awardees and that it was the committee’s discretion to decide to what extent a conflicted committee member should be allowed to participate in committee deliberations.
   I recused myself from the Distinguished Graduate Mentoring Awards’ deliberations because I was a nominee. Jean-Pierre Delplanque disclosed that he was familiar with two of the nominees and offered to recuse himself, should the committee think it best. The committee thought it best to hear what Jean-Pierre had to say and then put his comments in perspective.
   Committee members were extremely impressed with the high quality of the applications. After a lengthy discussion, the committee unanimously agreed to recommend Vicki Smith (Department of Sociology) for the Distinguished Graduate Award and Jean S. VanderGheynst (Department of Food Science and Technology) for the Distinguished Postdoctoral Award pending Graduate Council approval.
The third item on the agenda was the need to revise the 1999 mentoring guidelines. I shared with the committee revisions I made to the document following discussions with the Mentoring Action Plan Task Force Committee. We discussed those revisions and decided to use a Google Docs document version that would allow each committee member remote access and track each committee member’s suggested revisions. The committee agreed on the need to expand the mentee’s responsibilities, as they exist in the current document to emphasize the collaborative nature of mentoring.

We also added a part on diversity to make mentors more aware of the particular mentoring needs of underrepresented groups. The committee agreed that it was best for the draft document to remain short and to take the form of a Mentoring Statement of Principles to facilitate circulation among mentors and mentees.