School of Computer Science
Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, June 21, 2016
1:00 – 2:30 p.m.
Reynolds Room 219

In Attendance: Pascal Matsakis (Interim Director), Dan Gillis, Mark Wineberg, Fei Song, William Gardner, David Chiu, Jennifer Hughes, Deb Byart, Lauren Zweep, Kyle Johnston, Deb Stacey, Fangju Wang, Dave Calvert, Yang Xiang, Greg Klotz

Regrets: Joe Sawada, Charlie Obimbo, Judi McCuaig, Gary Grewal, Stefan Kremer, Blair Nonnecke, Xining Li

1. Approval of the Agenda

Motion: To approve the Agenda.

1st: D. Stacey
2nd: W. Gardner
All in favour: Motion is passed.

2. Approval of Minutes from June 7, 2016

Motion: To approve the minutes.

Motion to approve June 7th Minutes moved to next scheduled Council Meeting due to a friendly amendment by M. Wineberg; this amendment will be expressed during next meeting: July 5, 2016.

3. Interim Director's Remarks – P. Matsakis

Renovations and Expansion Committee Updates

P. Matsakis advised that the decision for the SIF proposal for the Reynolds building renovations would be made very soon. If the proposal is accepted, all staff, faculty and graduate students will have to move out of Reynolds in December 2016 for approximately one year. The temporary re-location building where all Reynolds persons must move is currently unknown.

P. Matsakis also presented slides displaying the first floor plans for the new Reynolds expansion, as well as a mock-up of the exterior of the expansion. The expansion will include a two-floor-high atrium (at basement-level) and four floors (including basement level), with the potential to perhaps add another floor in the future as needed.

Some discussion followed after the expansion plans were displayed:

W. Gardner stated that the expansion does not have the same character as the heritage building, and look more modern.

D. Stacey stated the expansion does seem to have some of the architectural elements of the heritage building.

J. Hughes will email a copy of the slides that included the first plans for the expansion to the membership with the Council Meeting Minutes.

Staff Hiring Committee Updates

Office Clerk position – P. Matsakis reported that of the four interviews conducted for the Office Clerk position, a candidate has been selected, and an offer sent 06.22. The new Office Clerk is scheduled to start July 4, 2016, working the following part-time hours: Monday-Friday 10AM - 3PM.

Analyst position – The first draft of the Job Fact Sheet for the Analyst position has been completed by K. Johnston and reviewed by G. Grewal, F. Song and D. Calvert with some revisions. K. Johnston completed revisions and the second draft will be sent to M. Torcoletti. After the Analyst Job Fact Sheet is approved, it will be forwarded to HR and posted. The goal is to have this position start by September 1, 2016.

Counsellor position – The first draft of the Job Fact Sheet for the Counsellor position has been completed by G. Klotz and reviewed by M. Wirth and J. McGuaig K. with some revisions. G. Klotz completed revisions and the second draft was sent to M. Torcoletti. After the Counsellor Job Fact Sheet is approved, it will be forwarded to HR and posted. The goal is to have this position start by September 1, 2016.

Administrative Secretary position – The Job Fact Sheet for the Administrative Secretary position is currently in progress. Initially, required a replacement for a one-year term; however, we are now aiming for a permanent position.

Faculty positions – P. Matsakis reported that we will know more about the status of the three CL faculty positions shortly. One candidate is expected to sign an offer letter soon, to start in September 2016; The second candidate is nearing the end of negotiations for the offer, projected to start in September 2016 or January 2017; The third candidate is currently amidst negotiations for the offer and could start as early as September 2016 (however, will likely start in January 2017). There will be more information on all three hires by the next meeting in July.

4. Discussion on the Mobile Computing Major

The mobile computing major initiative was launched four years ago and the Undergraduate Program Committee is still working on this project. As this project has been in progress for a significant amount of time, the mobile landscape has likely changed significantly since it began.

P. Matsakis reported that he visited with T. Vannelli (CPES College Dean), and reported that the dean is no longer pushing for this program major. Therefore, the department must decide how to proceed with this project:

1. Abandon developing the Mobile Computing Major
2. Continue developing the Mobile Computing Major; or
3. Develop a Mobile Computing *Stream* rather than a major

P. Matsakis also noted that if the department decides to move forward with continuing to develop the Mobile Computing Major, it may take up to three years before the first students enter the Major.

P. Matsakis presented slides to the membership that included the points of discussion on this topic from the following members who could not attend the meeting: J. Sawada, C. Obimbo and J. McCuaig.

A discussion followed with various points of view on the Mobile Computing Major.

D. Gillis - Recommends that rather than creating a program or major for mobile computing, we could add a stream or option for mobile to existing degrees and test this out first (before making it a new major).

M. Wirth - Disagrees with Charlie's point that the Mobile Computing Major is a unique program, because Carleton University offers a similar program with a Mobile stream. It also appears that not too many schools are currently adding new majors, because provincial criteria have become more astringent and it has become a rather long process to get a new program approved (e.g. years).

P Matsakis - Reiterated that Tony is no longer pushing this major, so the department must decide how to proceed. We must also consider the time it takes to get a major approved, meaning the major likely will not be implemented until 2019.

M. Wineberg - What is the timeline for implementing a stream?

M. Wirth - Adding a stream versus a major would likely be more efficient and take less time, but it may not be easier to implement. M. Wirth also agreed that the Mobile Computing Major was a great idea four years ago, but believes the landscape has likely changed too much. He also believes that this major may be too specific, and that there may be a lack of interest from students.

W. Gardner - Being on the committee and helping put together the first drafts for the Mobile Computing Major, W. Gardner expressed that it was important to solicit student

feedback on the project. As a result, computer science students were surveyed regarding feedback for implementing a Mobile Computing Major.

There were 41 respondents, of which only 17 expressed positive feedback about the program. Of the 7 respondents who participated in the written survey, 2 solicited positive feedback for the program, 3 solicited negative feedback and the remaining 2 were mixed results. Overall, the results of the survey found that the students liked the idea of having mobile computing courses available, but did not want these courses to be restricted to only students enrolled in the major. Some students also felt that this major may be too specific.

D. Stacey - While Deb does not disagree with W. Gardner completely, she argued that this study did not target the right cohort of students, as we need to aim for prospective students, rather than computer science students we already have.

W. Gardner - The purpose of the survey was to get feedback from computer science students because they have knowledge of the content of the survey, and would thus be representative because they understand the implications of the program.

D. Stacey - Disagrees, because surveying different cohorts can have different results.

D. Calvert - Feedback from one survey is better than no surveys, and it is important to understand why these remarks were made by the students, especially the remark about the program being too specific of a major. One of the reasons that the students did not like the idea of this Mobile Computing Major is that they felt that the courses offered would be exclusive only to students enrolled, so what if we were able to get around this, by adding 2 of the same courses? For example, one course code for mobile major students only, and a different course code for everyone else; this way, the Mobile Computing Major students feel it is exclusive to them, while the other students can still take mobile computing courses.

M. Wirth - Yes, but implementing the Mobile Computing Major is 3 years away, so we need the faculty resources who will be available for this program hired already to pass the provincial approvals, etc. So we will have to find these faculty members something to do in the meantime (for 3 years!).

D. Gillis - So if we can quickly implement the Mobile Computing Stream, perhaps this can be evidence to see if the Mobile Computing Major may work?

D. Stacey - Perhaps we can advertise the Mobile Computing Stream on OUAC? This way the students can choose a major in Computer Science or Software Engineering with an emphasis on Mobile. But we are not sure if stream can be advertised this way in OUAC, because otherwise this could only be advertised to only in-course students; we should see how Carleton advertises their Mobile Stream in OUAC.

G. Klotz - How do the majors work?

D. Calvert - There is an Area of Application, which is the Breadth Requirement.

M. Wirth - Perhaps we should provide the students with an Area of Application, or at least a suggested one.

D. Calvert - We should not replace the Area of Application with more computing courses, but agrees that maybe we can make suggestions for the students.

W. Gardner - With the dean backing off pushing this program, if we give up on the Mobile Computing Major idea, will we still have leverage to ask for more faculty positions in the future?

P. Matsakis - The plan is to hire ten more faculty for the department, and it does not seem that proposing a new major or not will change that.

M. Wineberg - Where did the number ten for the new faculty come from? It was assumed that these new faculty were coming from the 3 new majors we were going to develop, but if the rationale has changed, why is it still ten?

P. Matsakis - The rationale is based on growth projections, so we will need ten new faculty whether we add new majors or not.

L. Zweep - Reviewed Carleton's OUAC offerings, and confirmed that streams can be advertised in OUAC.

D. Calvert - Each stream has four new courses (not restrictive), but in terms of the costs of teaching, implementing a stream would be the same as implementing a new major (minus the overhead costs of a new major).

D. Calvert also agrees that the Mobile Computing Major is unique, but that we should take a cautious view for implementing this. That is, we will have to keep incoming student recruitment at 300+ per year. The assumption is that the new major will attract more students, but there are fluctuations with student recruitment; so if we cannot reach the minimum recruitment of 300 students for a certain year, we may have to cut funding elsewhere, for example GTA positions and/or Graduate funding.

Once we figure out course projections, we can determine how many faculty we need soon – we are unsure if we can accommodate a new major with only seven extra faculty.

M. Wirth - We currently have a lot going on in the department, with Reynolds undergoing potential renovations, implementing the new PhD.CSCI program, etc. We also have other things to focus on such as the need to start splitting classes and start working on offering summer session courses - these things will all need additional faculty as well.

D. Stacey - Perhaps we can make our Mobile Computing program more academically rigorous than Carleton's, with more meaning to industry. While we may not be in direct competition (in different cache areas), our program would be way more attractive to students.

M. Wirth - But we do not have Carleton's reputation, and we need to figure out projections for how many students this could attract per year - does industry want this and how many students are interested in this?

D. Calvert & D. Stacey - Both agree that there is a demand for this.

D. Stacey - Carleton would not be a model to follow. If we were to implement a Mobile Stream, we would add high quality courses.

M. Wirth - This brings up the question: Are we looking for quality or quantity?

D. Calvert - This is more of an argument related to the quality in our program.

M. Wirth - Yes, but we need to discuss if our goal for the Mobile Computing Major or Stream would be to increase the quality of our program, or the enrollment of our program.

D. Stacey - This is an issue across majority of universities; most universities have good and exceptional students, some lower quality, with the majority being mediocre.

W. Gardner - Is not in favour of the majority as this will represent a new paradigm with the co-op office. That is, they may not support this program because they would have to create a new co-op schedule to accommodate.

D. Stacey - A new co-op schedule will have to be created anyway. This is because we cannot accept anymore co-op students, and this needs to be fixed as soon as possible.

P. Matsakis - Seeing as though the Dean is not interested in pushing the Mobile Computing Major anymore, the co-op may be a more important issue.

D. Calvert - It is worth noting that students were able to do co-op after three semesters

M. Wineberg - Needs clarification between a stream versus a major; can we begin with a stream and leverage it up to a major, or does this make things more difficult?

M. Wirth - We likely do not need to get a stream approved by the province to advertise it on OUAC.

D. Stacey - We should confirm this.

M. Wirth - Will look into confirming if provincial approval is required to list stream on OUAC.

P. Matsakis - Overall, it seems faculty are not sure how we should continue with the Mobile Computing Major; some are against and some feel as though we should continue developing this program.

D. Stacey - The co-op program needs to be fixed now, as we cannot increase the number of co-op students currently. This should be the number one priority for the Curriculum Committee, and it is really important to begin working on this as soon as possible.

M. Wirth - Agrees with D. Stacey.

D. Stacey - We could even tackle both mobile and co-op issues simultaneously, and design the co-op so that mobile can be added or not.

P. Matsakis - Agrees that the co-op issue is a priority and we need to look into fixing these issues as soon as possible. Pascal asks D. Calvert if he could look further into these co-op issues and how to fix them.

D. Calvert – Agreed.

The council requires further discussion before any motions can be put forward. P. Matsakis agreed that the current co-op issues take precedence, and assigned D. Calvert to look further into these issues.

J. Hughes will email a copy of the slides that included the points of discussion on this topic from: J. Sawada, C. Obimbo and J. McCuaig to the membership with the Council Meeting Minutes.

5. Discussion on the Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics MSc

The new Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics Master's Degree program was proposed to the membership. D. Stacey explained that the new MSc would be a course-based DE program aimed to capture a cohort of professionals looking to upgrade their education.

P. Matsakis reported that the department needs to decide if they support the decision to move forward with the new MSc, before the meeting with the Provost (scheduled for end of July 2016).

P. Matsakis presented slides to the membership that included the points of discussion on this topic from the following members who were unable to attend the meeting: J. Sawada, C. Obimbo and J. McCuaig.

A discussion followed with various points of view on the Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics Master's Degree program.

D. Gillis - Disagrees with Joe's point about the timing of implementing the new MSc program; it seems we have industry backing this program, so we should move forward with this opportunity.

D. Calvert - Was under the impression that most teaching would not be done by our faculty.

D. Stacey – We could build up to offering all nine graduate courses over time, bringing industry professionals in to teach courses; we already have three to four industrial partners willing to assist with providing resources for this program, such as physical resources, scholarships, etc.

Also, we can split CIS*4110 and crosslist the resulting two courses at the Graduate level by next year; this is generally a quick process, involving minimal paperwork. Charlie could likely teach one of these courses.

M. Wirth - Charlie did not seem to want to teach the Security course.

D. Stacey - Charlie may have a renewed interest in teaching this course for the new program.

But overall, there appears to be a high industry interest for funding a program like this; Cisco and Intel Systems are industry partners already on board, and IBM, Microsoft and eSentire have already expressed interest. Intel is about to launch a multi-million dollar education effort, and are interested in partnering with Guelph. So it is now or never.

We do need to determine how much funding the university will provide for this program; however, overall, this would be a great opportunity for SoCS! If we pass up this opportunity, the University will have no issues giving this funding to Engineering (especially because it stays within CPES), who will likely add this new program to their MEng program.

W. Gardner - Would this program be basically targeted to people already in industry looking to upgrade?

D. Stacey - Yes, the program would be offered online, similar to how a professional MBA program is offered. Therefore, it would not take up any physical classroom space.

W. Gardner - If there is no classroom space needed, how is hands-on learning to work?

D. Stacey - Through the use of Virtual Labs such as VMs, Sandbox, etc.

W. Gardner - Would we have to go through OpenEd?

D. Stacey - We are hoping to bypass OpenEd and use another off-campus agency/third party; however, there is a chance the university may not approve this. We may have to try to pitch the new program as a professional program similar to the calibre of a MBA (that has a more sophisticated audience). We also need to determine how professional MBA is currently delivered, etc. Thus, there is a chance that we *may* be forced to operate courses via OpenEd, apart from virtual labs (which will be hosted by their respective vendors).

D. Calvert - It is new territory, but the University is willing to back this, so it seems like a good opportunity; we just need to ensure we carefully agree.

F. Song - Will this increase our numbers for grad students? How about GTA resources?

D. Stacey - Course-based masters do not generally offer funding or GTAs – only thesis students; therefore, this would not take away resources from current SoCS grad programs. So without taking away resources, the student for this course-based masters could still generate graduate growth dollars for the department.

Y. Xiang - Can on-campus Cyber Security MSc students still apply for GTAs?

D. Stacey - Yes, they can, but we do not have to give them GRAs, and we do not have to provide them with the Growth Funds they generate

P Matsakis - The meeting with the Provost is near the end of July, so we need to confirm the support of the department to move forward with this before that.

D. Stacey - Is open to questions, feedback and requested additions to the proposal for the Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics Master's Degree program.

Motion: School of Computer Science to support the development of a course-based Masters in Cybersecurity and Digital Forensics [In principle and subject to funding]:

1st: P. Matsakis
2nd: D. Stacey
All in Favour. Motion passed.

J. Hughes will email a copy of the slides that included the points of discussion on this topic from: J. Sawada, C. Obimbo and J. McCuaig to the membership with the Council Meeting Minutes.

6. Any other business

N/A

Meeting concluded at 2:30pm