

**School of Computer Science
Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, March 7, 2017
1:00 – 2:20 p.m., MCKN 307**

In attendance – Faculty: Luiza Antonie, David Calvert, David Chiu, Rozita Dara, William Gardner, Dan Gillis, Gary Grewal, Andrew Hamilton-Wright, Stefan Kremer, Xining Li, Pascal Matsakis (Interim Director), Judi McCuaig, Blair Nonnecke, Stacey Scott, Deborah Stacey, Fangju Wang, Mark Wineberg, Michael Wirth, Yang Xiang; **Staff:** Deb Byart, Monaliza Gill (Recording Secretary), Jennifer Hughes, Janice Ilic, Kyle Johnston, Greg Klotz, Dana Rea, Lauren Zweep; **Student Representatives:** Patrick Houlding

Regrets – Faculty: Fatima Hussain, Charlie Obimbo (on sabbatical), Joe Sawada, Fei Song; **Staff:** Phyllis Reynen; **Student Representatives:** Samuel Opawale

1. Approval of Agenda

Motion to approve the agenda moved by D. Chiu and seconded by A. Hamilton-Wright. P. Matsakis mentioned that the approval of the minutes from February 21, 2017 would be postponed until the next Council meeting (March 21, 2017).

All in Favour. **MOTION PASSED.**

2. Interim Director's Remarks – Pascal

Graduate Program Assistant

P. Matsakis introduced Janice Ilic, our new Graduate Program Assistant, who will temporarily replace Jennifer Hughes.

Make-up exams

Any make-up exam must be scheduled after the regular examination or must be completely different from the regular examination.

Course Evaluations

Faculty members have the right to choose on-line or in-class course evaluation. They are not obliged to explain or justify their decision. Deb Byart will be circulating an email to all faculty members; they will be asked to let her know whether they would like to proceed with on-line or in-class evaluation for their courses. Monaliza will conduct all in-class evaluations for small classes, while both Deb and Monaliza will conduct in-class evaluations for large classes. In-class course evaluation will be done at the beginning of the class and may take up to 45 minutes of lecture time.

P. Matsakis presented some stats based on the last two years. He reported that for in-class course evaluation, 43% of the enrolled students will respond on average to the evaluation, but only 4% will provide written comments; for on-line course evaluation, only 27% on average will respond but 11% will provide written comments (and these comments are more thorough). In response to S. Scott's inquiry if someone analyzed the polarity of the comments, P. Matsakis stated that they are usually a mixed bag of positive and negative comments.

Renaming of College

CPES might be renamed CEPS (College of Engineering & Physical Sciences), and P. Matsakis noted that he did not receive any satisfactory alternatives from faculty.

CL Faculty Positions

There are two two-year teaching-focused positions and 112 applications were received by the deadline in January. The Search Committee has shortlisted 5 candidates and the interviews will be scheduled in April.

IQAP

P. Matsakis briefly reviewed the timeline of the Institutional Quality Assurance Process (IQAP). The follow-up report was submitted to the SCQA on March 6, and emailed to faculty and staff. The report has been reviewed by Patricia Tersigni (Director, Academic Programs and Policy) and Sofie Lachapelle (Acting Associate Vice President, Academic); the Provost signed off on it; a support letter has also been sent by the Interim Dean. The report will be reviewed by the SCQA on Mar 20. If the SCQA is not happy with the report, the School may be asked to submit a mid-term internal review report in 2018 instead of 2022. P. Matsakis thanked all the contributors.

Meeting with the Provost

P. Matsakis will have a 45-minute meeting with the Provost on March 8 to discuss faculty positions, the summer academic semester, the MSc in cybersecurity and other issues regarding the School.

3. Assistant Director's Remarks – Michael

Renovation Update

M. Wirth reported that there was a fence around the building. However, the demolition is two months behind schedule. There have been issues with budget and design enhancements. It seems that Physical Resources did not do their

homework: they submitted a request for proposal without considering significant issues like the flooding in the basement, all the plumbing in the building that needs to be replaced, the presence of asbestos, and the standard size required for offices. The project is now above budget by \$1.4M, mainly due to design enhancement costs. At this point, we do not know when the renovation will begin.

S. Scott inquired on the federal grant's end date when the building has to be done, and M. Wirth said April 2018.

P. Matsakis commented that we may have to give up the \$1M for furniture and the lab renovation in the Thornbrough building, as changing the floor plans to decrease the renovation costs is out of the question. He noted that all projects on campus were over budget.

Survey

M. Wirth discussed the results of a recent survey conducted in the School. A large majority of faculty members believe that large 1st/2nd year classes have a negative impact on learning experience and upper year classes are less prepared than in the past. Moreover, a large majority have experienced problems delivering 3rd/4th year classes due to growth. They also feel their workload has increased over the past 5 years, resulting in increased stress and less time for research.

4. Strategic Planning Committee – Dan

D. Gillis reported that the Strategic Planning Committee met in January and did a SWOT analysis on SoCS, i.e., assessment of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. From the SWOT analysis, the Committee is trying to develop principles and a planning strategy for going forward.

Six categories were considered for the analysis: undergraduate, graduate, staff, faculty, lab and teaching space, other. D. Gillis mentioned that we currently have 51 undergrad offerings and 23 faculty members, while we would need at least 24 faculty members. He enumerated the main strengths of our undergraduate and graduate programs, but also noted the weaknesses and threats (see slides).

5. Graduate Curriculum Committee – Yang

Y. Xiang reviewed the progress on the grade-average for PhD admission. The Graduate Curriculum Committee discussed the faculty comments received on February 21 and has formulated a new recommendation to address these comments: the recommendation is to replace the requirement “a minimum B-average” with “a minimum 75% average.” Y. Xiang discussed the merits of the presented recommendation and encouraged feedback.

**Motion to replace the PhD admission requirement
“a minimum B-average” with “a minimum 75% average”
moved by W. Gardner and seconded by A. Hamilton-Wright.**

All in favour. **MOTION PASSED.**

6. Any other business

N/A

Meeting adjourned at 2:15 p.m.