Education Meeting Minutes  
Friday, February 21, 2014

The meeting was opened by Prof. Alan Sussman to discuss topics associated with the undergraduate program. Based on the agenda, topics #1 and 2 were discussed. Topics #3 and 4 were held for another meeting due to lack of time to adequately cover them.

1. **Revision to the 400-level Course Prerequisites (see attached document for prerequisite structure, summery of the problem and proposal).** Alan mentioned that this topic was first discussed in fall 2013 when he was asked to revisit the subject and bring a proposal to the committee. Several questions were raised:

   Is this a real problem? Didn’t a committee several years ago try to reduce the number of prerequisite? Why is the department now trying to tighten the prerequisite structure? A number of faculty members felt that insufficient information was presented on the number of students currently affected. However, there was sentiment expressed by others that this was a good proposal as it helps a reasonable number of students and does not hurt others. Students who are not doing well in their courses (low grades) will be prevented from advancing too far into the 400 level courses without having taken required courses. A question was asked if there was another method of achieving the same results and the response was that by changing the prerequisite structure, this would be a shorter process than other type changes that could be made.

   A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposal. A vote was taken with 24 in favor of the motion and 4 against. The proposal was accepted.

2. **Proposal to Change Course Enrollment Policy for CS Minors (see attached document for a summary of the problem and resulting proposal).** Concern was voiced that this proposal would result in students planning on a CS minor to be limited on when they could register for a course. This could result in these students not obtaining a minor prior to graduation through no fault of their own. The response was that these students will still have one and one half months to register for their courses before all other non-majors/minors.

   A motion was made and seconded to accept the proposal and the vote was 28 in favor and 4 against the proposal. The proposal was accepted.

The floor was turned over to Prof. Jeff Foster to present topics related to the Graduate Program. Jeff took the topics out of order due to limited time in which to discuss the topics.

1. **Proposal for Restricting non-CS Enrollment in CS Graduate Courses (see attached document for the proposal).** There was a request to remove all comp/science, CBCB courses, and HCI courses from the list contained in the
proposal. Jeff said that it was an HCI course, CMSC734, which caused this issue to be raised. The response was that this is the wrong way to resolve the problem. The department should increase the number of people teaching these classes. There was a suggestion to create a “Hold File” so that students who qualify could be moved into the course quickly should a vacancy occur. Questions were raised:

Are statistics being kept? What do other campus departments do? What are the courses that are generally affected? It was mentioned that a mix of students tend to enrich a class. UMIACS exists to encourage interdisciplinary research. Graduate students from other disciplines should not be closed out of CS graduate courses. This will give a bad impression to the rest of the campus.

Jeff ended the discussion of this topic due to a time-limit and said he would try to gather additional information on the subject including some statistics for further consideration by the committee.

The Conflict of Interest Policy for Department Representatives on Student Committees was tabled. Jeff said the intention of the revision is to insure that the department representative will not have any conflict with the student’s advisor or will not have been a Co-PI with the advisor on a proposal.

Jeff briefly summarized the first agenda topic which was the results of the Middle States review. He said that M.S. Scholarly papers were not rated below good. What should be done to fix this? It reflects poorly on the department. One suggestion was that a second person should approve the paper beyond the student’s advisor. It should be mentioned to incoming students during orientation what the expectation is for an M.S. and exactly what work needs to be done and when the papers are due. Students don’t seem to understand what is needed and many of the papers have been submitted past the deadline. The scholarly paper is a university requirement.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm.