School of Computer Science Council Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 11, 2016 1:00 – 2:30 p.m., REYN 219

<u>In attendance</u> - *Faculty*: Luiza Antonie, David Calvert, David Chiu, William Gardner, Gary Grewal, Xining Li, Pascal Matsakis (Interim Director), Judi McCuaig, Blair Nonnecke, Joe Sawada, Stacey Scott, Fei Song, Deborah Stacey, Fangju Wang, Mark Wineberg, Michael Wirth, Yang Xiang; *Staff:* Deb Byart, Monaliza Gill (Recording Secretary), Jennifer Hughes, Greg Klotz, Phyllis Reynen, Lauren Zweep; *Student Representatives:* Nick Beirne

Regrets – Faculty: Rozita Dara, Dan Gillis, Fatima Hussain, Stefan Kremer, Charlie Obimbo (on sabbatical); Staff: Kyle Johnston

1. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda moved by D. Chiu and seconded by Y. Xiang. Amendment made by W. Gardner to delete item 8 (*Director Search*). The item will be discussed informally after the Council meeting, without the presence of the Interim Director and with no minutes taken. No objection to adopting the amendment. All in favour. **MOTION PASSED**

2. Approval of Minutes from September 27, 2016

Motion to approve the minutes moved by M. Wirth and seconded by J. McCuaig. In favour: all but 1. Abstentions: 1. **MOTION PASSED**

3. Interim Director's Remarks

3.a Director Position

Members were advised of the discussion after the Council meeting to review the options for the Director search. P. Matsakis outlined the external reviewers' recommendations: "Appoint an interim director asap for approx. 1 year. Start an internal and external search for a new director who will be willing to serve a full term, to start in approx. 1 year." "A formal search for a new director should consider both internal and external candidates to mitigate against the risk of a failed external search that would leave the SOCS leadership in limbo."

He explained that the search committee would be chaired by the Dean, composed of three members elected by the School and four members selected by the Dean. He also quoted Article 20.16 of the UGFA Collective Agreement: "The Dean, in consultation with the Search Committee, may recommend to the Provost that an internal search be conducted."

There was a brief discussion on the impact in the quantity of the currently approved faculty positions should an external candidate get appointed for the Director position.

P. Matsakis reported that some faculty and staff members asked him if he would be willing to serve a full term. The answer is no, but he would be willing to consider serving for another 2 years.

3.b Teaching-Focused Faculty Positions

Three faculty members were nominated for the Teaching-Focused Faculty Search Committee: Dan Gillis, Deb Stacey and Michael Wirth. There is no need, therefore, for an election. The Director may now appoint up to two additional persons. The Committee's first meeting will be in November.

3.c Research-Focused Faculty Positions

Faculty members were reminded that nominations for another Search Committee are due by next Wednesday, October 19, 4:00 p.m.

3.d Analyst III Position

Two of the 19 applicants for the 2nd Analyst III position have been shortlisted. The first interview will be on Wed, Oct 12, and the second interview on Fri, Oct 14. The members of the Interview Committee are Gary Grewal, Kyle Johnston and Kaizaad Bilimorya (SHARCNET).

3.e Contractors for Reynolds

P. Matsakis reported that five contractors were invited by Physical Resources to submit proposals for the renovation of Reynolds Building. Three of the five contractors have been shortlisted. The first interview will be Wed, Oct 12. A member of the School Renovations and Expansion Committee, Deb Stacey, will participate in the interviews and represent the School.

In response to a question by W. Gardner regarding the aesthetic elements of the building, P. Matsakis mentioned that further information will be available and there will be further discussion on the renovation after the interviews and selection of the contractor.

P. Matsakis also mentioned that the Provost now understands the decisions made by the School (through the Renovations and Expansion Committee) in cooperation with Physical Resources and WalterFedy. She believes the proposed design is a good long-term plan and she is currently working on a short/medium-term solution for the student and research labs.

3.f Reynolds Floor Plans

P. Matsakis briefly reviewed the floor plans circulated in past Council meetings. The third floor includes 16 offices for faculty, a small lunchroom, and grad pods delimited by glass walls. The second floor includes 14 offices for faculty, a small copy room, grad pods delimited by glass walls, and a seminar room — which could be split into 2 offices if needed. The main floor includes 11 offices for the director and staff members, a meeting room, a lunchroom adjacent to a large seminar room (which will be used for the Council meetings), a mail/copy room, a storage room (e.g., supplies), and waiting areas by the Program Counsellors' and Director's offices; the Director's office and meeting room will have special acoustic insulation; there will be a large corridor to the anticipated expansion building.

In response to a question by W. Gardner regarding the glass-wall design, P. Matsakis stated that the intent is to have a more open, less claustrophobic space, with a more modern look. Glass walls will not be used for offices so as to maintain the privacy of faculty. However, large transom windows in the walls between the offices and the corridors will allow natural light into the building. S. Scott suggested having frosted glass along the base of the glass walls. P. Matsakis mentioned that details and the final design will be discussed with the contractor.

M. Wineberg inquired about the elevator and the stairwell. P. Matsakis commented that the elevator will not be replaced and the stairwell will remain. M. Wirth added that there is no funds for the stairwell, and he also mentioned that access from Reynolds to the expansion building will be through the main floor only.

L. Zweep questioned about the windows. P. Matsakis confirmed that all windows with be replaced.

4. T&P Guidelines

P. Matsakis mentioned that there are lots of issues with the current School T&P Guidelines (e.g., ambiguities, omissions, inconsistencies with the Collective Agreement). Therefore, they must be revised.

He said that since the motion to approve the Guidelines proposed by the College along with the Addendum proposed by the School was defeated, there were 2 options: the first option is to revise the current School Guidelines, possibly including some elements from the College Guidelines; the second option is to revise the Addendum to the College Guidelines, possibly including some elements from the current School Guidelines. A discussion followed:

- J. McCuaig commented that the issue with the College Guidelines is that they are generic and faculty from different units (e.g., Computer Science vs. Chemistry, or Physics) cannot be assessed on the same basis.
- D. Calvert suggested that a new vote regarding the College Guidelines and the Addendum could be conducted in January, when the 3 new faculty have joined the School; but he also mentioned the benefits in revising the current School Guidelines, as we are used to them.
- S. Scott inquired about the process once a motion has been defeated; P.
 Matsakis referred her to the Council By-Laws and Membership document.
- D. Stacey commented that the School Guidelines had been revised in the past but that the revision had been rejected by the Provost; M. Wineberg asked why, and D. Stacey stated that the reason was unclear, but this was before the Union was established.
- D. Chiu commented that the School would be seen as non-conformist if we chose not to revise the Addendum and approve the College Guidelines.

In the end, G. Grewal moved a motion to have the School T&P Committee revise the current School T&P Guidelines (i.e., first option) and present a draft to the Council. The motion was seconded by M. Wirth. In favour: all but 2. Abstentions: 2. **MOTION PASSED**

Due to time constraints and the high priority of the last agenda items, the motion to postpone item 5 (PhD QE and Thesis Defence Regulations) to the next Council meeting on Oct 25 was moved by P. Matsakis and seconded by Y. Xiang. All in favour. **MOTION PASSED**

5. Summer Semester

D. Calvert briefly reviewed the curriculum items to consider for this semester, including Co-op plans. In particular, he mentioned the benefits of a new Co-op Schedule.

He then moved the following motion, seconded by J. McCuaig:

The School of Computer Science will replace the existing Co-op schedule with one which includes a summer academic semester. This is contingent upon the school receiving funding for the three new tenure track faculty members necessary to support the additional teaching requirements associated with this new schedule.

All in Favour. MOTION PASSED.

6. Target Enrolment

M. Wirth provided an overview of enrolments since 2009-2010. In particular, he mentioned that there was a 297% increase in incoming students between 2009 and 2013.

A discussion followed on the resources needed to keep the target enrolment at 250. M. Wirth will assess the need in terms of faculty, and a plan will be presented to the Dean and the Provost.

Meeting adjourned at 2:34 p.m.