<u>**Present**</u> –
Faculty: D. Calvert, D. Chiu, R. Dara, D. Flatla, D. Gillis, M. Gong (Director), G. Grewal, A. Hamilton-Wright, H. Khan, J. McCuaig, D. Nikitenko, C. Obimbo, S. Scott, F. Song, D. Stacey, F. Wang, M. Wineberg, M. Wirth;
Staff: O. Adesina, D. Byart, C. Hosker, G. Klotz, K. Gardiner (recording secretary), J. Hughes, K. Johnston, D. Rea, L. Zweep;
Student Representatives: None

<u>**Regrets**</u> –
Faculty: L. Antonie, R. Chaturvedi, A. Dehghantanha, S. Kremer, X. Li, X. Lin, P. Matsakis, B. Nonnecke, J. Sawada, Y. Xiang;
Staff:, None
Student Representatives: J. Fraser, S. Modi

1. Approval of Agenda for May 28th 2019

Motion: That the agenda for May 28th be approved
(C. Obimbo, D. Nikitenko)
In Favour: All. Abstentions: None. **MOTION PASSED**

2. Associate Dean – Karen Gordon
- **Course outline management tool**

Associate Dean K. Gordon addressed council and explained that the entire college is being encouraged to move to using the University's online tool for populating course outlines. The new tool is AODA compliant and automatically populates and updates course outlines to course link. There will be a co-op student starting in two weeks who will work with faculty to pull content from previous course outlines and put it into the new online system, at which point faculty will have the ability to further edit if they wish. This co-op student is a one-time hire in order to assist faculty getting their course outlines populated through the new system. After the student's co-op term faculty, will not receive any help in this process. K. Gordon explained they are hoping this tool will eventually be used University-wide. She also explained that most of the bugs have been worked out by previous colleges going through this process before CEPS.

C. Hosker inquired about courses that are taught by sessional instructors. These courses will have to be added to the online system as a skeleton and then can be adjusted.

- **Presentation by Richard Gorrie (Open Ed)**

R. Gorrie from Open Ed presented a slideshow demonstration of the new online tool for course outlines. C. Obimbo inquired regarding learning outcomes for courses that don't currently have them. K. Gordon explained the process would be to send the outline to the student who will then populate the content into the online tool.

D. Stacey asked the reasoning behind having a third party involved in the process. K. Gordon clarified that faculty can do the process on their own if they wish. She also noted we are following other colleges who have completed the process and strongly suggested getting a student. These colleges had faculty who were not interested in the additional workload, but faculty do have the ability to populate their course outlines without the help of a student if they wish.

G. Grewal pointed out on the slideshow that the courses were organized by week and explained that they may not always know how many weeks it will take to cover various material. K. Gordon clarified that this week-by-week setup can be changed. C. Obimbo expressed concern that this new online tool would be similar to Sedona, R. Gorrie responded that nobody who has gone through using the software thus far has made that comparison.

C. Obimbo also asked regarding the public availability of the course outlines populated through the online tool. R. Gorrie explained that the archive of course outlines would be internal only.

M. Wirth noted he would prefer to do this work himself rather than have a student complete it and then have to check that student's work. He also noted that since students cannot access this archive, faculty will still have to upload their outlines to a place where students can access, as it is currently only available within the department.

A. Hamilton-Wright asked about course outlines that include tables. R. Gorrie explained that they are in place but are tricky and will follow up with A. Hamilton-Wright after the fact through e-mail. C. Obimbo asked if using the online tool was voluntary. K. Gordon explained that yes, but it is strongly encouraged that everyone give it a try. There are many advantages and few very disadvantages.

D. Stacey asked if components such as academic misconduct policy were automatically populated and K. Gordon confirmed yes this is the case. F. Song noted that this online tool structure has a lot of information and asked if faculty could add their own course descriptions with links etc. K. Gordon confirmed that these course outlines are 8 pages but that that components like the course calendar, even though repetitive, should be written out in full in each outline rather than posted as a link.

J. McCuaig asked if the tool has the options of adding additional documents such as a lecture schedule or assessment policy. K. Gordon expressed that no, you can only fill in the fields provided. D. Stacey also confirmed that paper outlines were not necessary to hand out. Students can look up these course outlines through course link.

4. Associate Director – Dave
- ### Requirement on course outlines due to academic misconduct cases

D. Calvert explained a recent problem of students trying to reuse material and justifying their attempts. He asserted that faculty need to be clear on what students can and cannot

reuse and what the rules are in each faculty's course. He further explained that students are citing their code as if it were an academic research book. He stressed the importance to indicate on the course outline that students cannot take other people's code and simply cite it. He also said faculty should be specific on their individual policy about students reusing code from another course.

D. Calvert also noted another issue of students using GitHub, as they can use this tool to show their code to potential employers. But unfortunately, students are posting assignments before they are submitted or marked by faculty which leads to academic integrity issues. He explained that if students ask, they can get free private GitHub accounts and faculty should encourage their students to do so. With these private accounts, they can share their coding with employers, but not other students in the course.

D. Calvert reiterated the three main issues and directives:
1) No citations should be default
2) Specific each faculty's code reuse policy
3) GitHub accounts should be private only

M. Wirth asked if there was a GitHub policy in place about not posting until the end of the semester. F. Song further asked if the policy could simply be assignment specific. D. Calvert confirmed yes this is possible. O. Adesina expressed a concern about allowing students to pull an assignment even after the course is finished in case they are assigned a similar assignment in the next academic session, and that perhaps GitHub should always be private for that reason. D. Calvert acknowledged that we cannot stop them from posting, but if they do it within the context of the course they run the risk of academic misconduct. M. Wirth suggested putting this information directly into the course outline. It was also noted that the minute a student writes an assignment in becomes that student's intellectual property.

5. Dan
- ### SoCS Museum/Display Case & the School of Fine Art and Music Collaboration

D. Gillis explained that he is looking to get a senior student from the School of Fine Art to curate the museum/display case on the first floor of Reynolds. This student will work with a SoCS students to set up it, ideally in time for the next alumni awards night. The case will include historical elements of the school's 40-year history as well as awards etc. If anyone would like to see anything added to the case, please let D. Gillis know.

6. Report from SoCS Committees

*D. Flatla – TA Hiring Committee

TA applications are now in and being compiled. Faculty will receive an e-mail shortly with all of the applications for their courses and instructions on how to rank them. J. McCuaig noted that students were being asked to commit to the lab schedules set out in the TA postings

before the lab schedules had been posted. This leads to students complaining and having to essentially lie on their application. D. Flatla noted this is not a new problem.

*M. Wirth – Reynolds Space Committee

M. Wirth reiterated that as of now there is no more available space in the Reynolds building so any further requests will be rejected. If faculty want space they must speak to the Dean; all space in Reynolds is accounted for, including upcoming retirements, until January 2020. M. Wirth also noted that the Dean has announced a space audit across campus taking place summer 2019 which may provide additional space.

7. Minglun

- ## Discussion on the Sedra report

M. Gong explained that after speaking to everyone, it appears as though there is a range of opinions on the Sedra report. Some faculty view it as an opportunity to separate from Engineering while others see benefits in staying connected with SOE. He noted that a few faculty are willing to consider both options, the majority have already made their decision. He also noted experience comments about SOE being a toxic environment and disregarding the research of SoCS. He noted that we all agree that our school is on the right track with a bright future and thanked all for the assurance.

M. Gong noted that, if we have to choose between the two options provided by the Sedra report, he will support Option B based on the feedback he collected. M. Gong also pointed out that splitting one college into two could mean staffing two Deans offices, requiring a large amount of money and resources. Hence, he is also open to letting SOE to be departmentalized but we all stay in the same college.

M. Gong explained that a working group is being formed with two people representing each unit, the director and a faculty representative, as well as one staff person to represent the entire college. The purpose of this working group is to collect feedback; they are not in charge of making any decisions. He explained that the Dean has retained the right to disapprove of any candidates for the faculty representative. L. Zweep questioned the rationale of this, M. Gong explained perhaps it was to ensure the working group would function well.

D. Gillis asked how the unit will determine their representatives. M. Gong explained that while they will not be a voting member, he recommends someone with a more neutral stance on the matters involved. He has identified two people that could be potential candidates, has spoken with each and confirmed they would both be willing. The Dean also approved both candidates. These people are Y. Xiang and J. Sawada.

D. Chiu asked if this working group would become a voting group, M. Gong did not think this would be the case. M. Wirth asked if a union member would be present on the committee. M. Gong could not remember but would follow up. M. Wirth expressed a belief that a union member should be involved. C. Hosker noted that if an UGFA rep were to be present, other

unions would require representation as well, since the working group consists of both faculty and staff members.

The Council agreed to have Y. Xiang represent SoCS faculty in the working group, M. Gong noted he will speak to Y. Xiang and share this information and confirm his involvement.

- **Consultation on school's focus**

This will be discussed as part of the next council meeting, due to time.

8. Any other business.

No other business
Meeting adjourned 2:26pm.