<div align="center">

School of Computer Science
Council Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 31, 2017
1:00 – 2:30PM, MCKN 318

</div>

Present *– Faculty***:** L. Antonie, R. Dara, G. Grewal, A. Hamilton-Wright, S. Kremer, P. Matsakis (Interim Director), B. Nonnecke, C. Obimbo, J. Sawada, S. Scott, F. Song; *Staff:* D. Byart, C. Hosker, J. Ilic, K. Johnston, G. Klotz, S. Mousseau (Recording Secretary), D. Rea; *Student Representatives:* J. Fraser, P. Houlding

Regrets *– Faculty***:** D. Calvert, D. Chiu, R. Chaturvedi, D. Gillis, X. Li, J. McCuaig, D. Nikitenko, D. Stacey, F. Wang, M. Wineberg M. Wirth, Y. Xiang; *Staff:* L. Zweep

SPECIAL GUESTS:
L. Brown (Associate Dean, Research & Graduate Studies)
N. Dery (Manager, Research & Graduate Studies)

L. Brown introduced N. Dery. N. Dery started in August, has experience with grants and awards, and comes from the University of Toronto. He is available to help with award and grant applications. Any interested faculty members will need to submit their applications to him a month prior to the submission deadline. This can be difficult to manage but L. Brown mentioned that statistics show the process is helpful. N. Dery has also pulled together a spreadsheet of grants and awards that are available. There were several that the School did not already know about.

With a history in creating proposals for CRCs, IRCs, etc., N. Dery mentioned that he would like to help early career researchers and meet everybody one on one. His strengths include research funding, research communications and graduate studies.

J. Sawada asked for examples of awards that N. Dery could help with. L. Brown responded that faculty awards are a priority as graduate student awards are more or less streamlined. We need to do the same with faculty. This includes NSERC and the Royal Society Rising Stars category. There are also professional societies that we have not tapped into.

S. Scott asked if there was any progress on covering international students as the gap is still quite wide and needs to be filled. L. Brown responded that they have been in talks; everyone agrees that they want more funding for international graduate students, but they haven't agreed on a solution yet.

L. Brown mentioned that the University will now match funding without proof of the competing University's funding offer. They will not accept students with below an 80% average. S. Scott asked if that was for both PhD and Masters students and L. Brown confirmed that it is for both.

1. Approval of Agenda

Motion: That the agenda be approved (A. Hamilton-Wright/G. Grewal)
In favour: All. **MOTION PASSED**

2. Approval of Minutes from Oct 17, 2017

Motion: That the minutes from Oct 17 be approved (A. Hamilton-Wright/S. Kremer)

S. Kremer noted that SoCS Faculty Teaching Awards should be used to nominate our faculty members for awards at the College and University levels. R. Dara responded that this was on the agenda of the Awards and Scholarships Committee.

In favour: All but one. Abstentions: One. **MOTION PASSED**

3. Interim Director's Remarks – Pascal

UGFA Strike Vote

P. Matsakis shared that there will be a new collective agreement soon.

G. Grewal asked if we could request someone to come by and discuss what is being done about the pension plan concerns. S. Kremer replied that in the most recent UGFA meeting, they had a full presentation that showed what they have been doing over the past twelve months. G. Grewal responded that it would be good to have someone come so that more exploratory questions can be asked within a smaller group. P. Matsakis responded that although there have been a few UGFA meetings in which questions could have been asked, we can still request a representative to discuss with the SoCS Council. F. Song suggested they may have some FAQ that can be shared. S. Scott also suggested that negotiations are still in progress and that a vote will be called before any decisions are final.

Upcoming Open Houses

L. Zweep was away during the Council meeting, but P. Matsakis reminded everyone that there are two open houses coming up and we still require faculty volunteers to represent the school and speak to prospective students about the Bachelor of Computing program. It would be nice to have some new faces as A. Hamilton-Wright and S. Scott have volunteered quite a bit of their time for these events. Fall Preview Day is happening on Sunday Nov 5 from 10:30AM to 3:00PM. Science and Engineering Sunday is happening from 10:30AM to 1:00PM on Nov 12.

Director's Position

P. Matsakis shared that based on the (previous) collective agreement, the Search Committee will be comprised of the Dean (chair), two members from outside the School, two non-members affiliated with the School, and three members elected by the School. C. Hosker was appointed as a non-member affiliated with the School. P. Matsakis also notified J. Fraser that the Dean would like to appoint a graduate student on the Committee. Faculty nominations are due by Friday, Nov 3 at 12PM.

P. Matsakis also shared that he believes the search will start internally with a review of the current internal applicants, then a shortlist of qualified applicants followed by interviews, and finally a ranking of the candidates. If no suitable internal candidate is found, then the search will be extended externally.

Fall Study Break

Currently, there are no classes on the Tuesday after Thanksgiving. There are discussions about extending the Fall Study Break. This will impact everyone at the University as the semester schedule will need to be shifted in one way or another to accommodate the additional study days. Please vote for one of four options by submitting your preference(s) to P. Matsakis by 12PM, Nov 3.

Student Engagement Systems

Votes are also being collected by K. Gordon (Associate Dean, Academic) for adopting a single student engagement system. Please submit your preference(s) to K. Gordon by Nov 6 at 5PM.

School T&P Guidelines

The new guidelines have been approved. There were 20 in favour, none opposed, and only three abstentions. This is a very strong approval rating, considering that the goal was for a 2/3rds majority. The next step is to get approval from the College T&P Committee and then the Provost. We will probably be requested to make some changes.

4. **Associate Director's Remarks, Undergraduate Studies – Gary**

Academic Integrity Committee

Dhiren Audich, our Academic Integrity Officer for F17, visited with CIS*1250, CIS*1500, CIS*2430, CIS*2520, and CIS*2750 to give a talk on integrity and encourage students to write the online integrity course. G. Grewal was interested in the number of students

who completed the online course after the talk. As seen in the corresponding slide, there was a small number of students who did comply. However, this number increased greatly after the professors gave an additional talk and then reminder emails were sent out. In the end, there has been about a 95% compliance rate this semester which seems to be on par with other courses that did not receive talks. An anomaly is CIS*4780, which has a high number of non-compliance.

The number of Academic Misconduct cases is at ten right now with an expectation that it will increase by 20-30 more in the next few weeks. All ten cases are from courses that received an integrity talk by our AIO. There are 21 students involved in the 10 cases. Of those 21 students, only 1 has not completed the online integrity course. In addition, one individual is not a computer science student.

For each academic misconduct case, the cover letter alone takes up to thirty minutes to complete. The full document itself is quite significant and takes hours to put together involving the time of many individuals. Faculty have been responsible for this in the past. B. Gardner headed the Academic Integrity Committee for a while and then J. McCuaig so there has been some consistency over the semesters. G. Grewal questioned whether a faculty member needs to head the committee or if a newly hired position like a lab assistant could put together cases.

P. Matsakis agreed that addressing academic misconduct takes time and man power that the School does not possess. We catch a few people, but is it worth the amount of time that goes into the process? Maybe we should focus more on education and prevention. P. Matsakis also agreed that we may need to hire somebody specifically for the handling of academic misconduct cases.

S. Scott asked what the process is within other units. G. Grewal replied that individual instructors handle the cases. In our school, it starts with G. Grewal (Chair of the Academic Integrity Committee) as a proxy who tries to identify the key cases and which are worth pursuing. It then goes back to the instructor and there is some back and forth between the Committee and the instructor to put the case together before it goes to P. Matsakis (Interim Director) and then the Assistant Dean, Academic.

S. Scott asked if there was a shorter process for smaller infractions. She noted that if it's a case where the assignment is worth 1%, the effort might not be worth it. G. Grewal suggested at that point it's a philosophical question. Has the student done what was asked of him/her? Perhaps it's a good opportunity to bring them in and have a one on one conversation. S. Scott asked what the repercussions are for academic misconduct. G. Grewal responded that it's a three-strike system. He also mentioned that he is seeing the names of students he recognizes and they are coming up again.

S. Kremer elaborated on the three-strike system. The first offence goes on file. The second offence they receive zero for the assignment and then there is a sliding scale of consequences based on the circumstances and gravity of the situation.

G. Grewal also put together a graph showing the number of matching lines from submitted assignments generated by MOSS. This is a great example of what the Dean's office likes to see as they are interested in the bigger picture. See slide "Global and Detailed Evidence" for detail.

C. Obimbo asked what effects the compliance had on numbers. G. Grewal responded that there are privacy issues with generating that information.

Undergraduate Program Implementation Committee

The process for hiring TAs for W18 is now underway. The Undergraduate Program Implementation Committee is working with the Academic Staff Hiring Committee to allocate and assign TAs to course instructors. They are currently putting together a document of steps for the process.

Once the enrollment numbers are final on Nov 2, faculty will receive an estimate of the number of TAs for their course. Either faculty members will be happy with the estimate, or they will not be happy and provide feedback. As long as it is reasonable feedback, their concerns will be addressed. G. Grewal does not believe the estimates have been inaccurate in the past and the numbers have been fairly liberal. Feedback will be required within 24 hours.

At that point, faculty will receive a copy of the job description for UTAs and/or GTAs. This is an opportunity to amend or update the job description. C. Obimbo asked in what format the job descriptions are submitted. G. Grewal answered that they are bullet points. A. Hamilton-Wright commented that if the description has worked in the past, it shouldn't need revision.

5. Graduate Curriculum Committee - Stefan

The second PhD learning module, Operating System Tools in Linux, was brought forward by Y. Xiang and has gone through two drafts. All faculty comments are positive.

MOTION: To approve the OS Tools in Linux PhD learning module (S. Kremer/G. Grewal) **MOTION PASSED**

Next up will be Data Management and should come before the holiday break.

6. Any Other Business

S. Scott reminded faculty to fill out the Wellness @ Work survey. When she last checked, approximately 17% had completed it.

S. Scott also inquired about the current guarantee for GTA positions. J. Sawada responded that it's currently two positions per year for domestic students, and same for international students with good English skills. He also mentioned that we currently receive $9,500/year per domestic PhD student and $5,500/year per domestic Masters student. We are given free rein to do what we see fit with the funds, as long as they go to graduate students. Currently, they go directly to the student and we only pull back funding when the student has a major award. However, there are discussions about how to better use the funds (e.g., research trips, international students).

Meeting adjourned at 2:12PM