EDUCATION MEETING MINUTES

The first meeting of the semester was convened by Larry Davis on Friday, October 28 at 2pm.

1. Topic: Course Restrictions for Graduate Students – SE/PL/HCI Field Committee Recommendations

Ben Shneiderman began the discussion by giving an overview of the issues facing the field committee given its size, the decisions that graduate students must make when registering for their courses. Because, currently, there is a regulation which states, that the student must take 7, 600 – 800 level courses spread over at least 5 areas, with no more than 2 courses in any one area, this can limit what graduate students may wish to take because the “area” is so large.

One solution is to split the field committee; however, since this is a subject to be revisited during the faculty retreat, further discussion of this specific subject was not pursued at this time.

Since the intent of making a change is to increase the breadth of a graduate student’s exposure to varied subject matter, the suggested proposal was to change the wording of the regulation to: “except that you may take up to 3 courses from the Software Engineering/Programming Languages area with a sub-list to be provided by the field committee which will contain no more than 2 courses in any one area. “

It was noted that informal surveys had been conducted and some students have mentioned that they could not take all of the courses in which they were interested due to the current regulation.

A motion was made to accept the proposal and the motion was seconded. A vote was taken with the following results: 37 in favor of the revised proposal; 1 abstention; 0 against the proposal.

2. Topic: Peer Review Policy on Teaching Evaluations (refer to policy document)

Dave Mount summarized the document and the reason why this policy statement needed to be developed. Officially teaching evaluation information is needed for APT reports but the thought is that regular evaluations will cause faculty to think about the teaching process and enhance course development. This is meant to be a constructive process with positive feedback and exchange of information. There was one suggestion made that all faculty members, including full professors, be visited at least once during a teaching session.
There was no further discussion of this topic so Dave moved onto the next topic.

3. **Topic: Department Criteria and Procedures for Instituting the Title of Senior Lecturer (refer to policy document)**

Dave gave some history regarding how the title came about within the University and the need to establish internal Department policies and procedures. This document was modeled on similar documents in two other departments within CMPS. The document outlines the criteria and procedures for promotion review. There was one suggestion that criteria be added which demonstrates the lecturer’s attempts to keep course curriculum current as technology evolves.

A question regarding whether there was any type of time limit/tenure clock associated with this title. There is none. Another question regarding the availability for a salary increase based on a promotion to this level was asked. Larry responded saying that he felt the Department and the Dean’s level would look favorably on this situation and would provide a promotional salary increase if possible.

There was no further discussion. A motion was made and seconded to accept the document as proposed with the added criteria noted above. The vote was 38 in favor of accepting this proposal with 0 against and no abstentions.

4. **Topic: Sabbatical and Buy-out Paperwork Deadlines**

Larry explained the need for the internal sabbatical and buy-out deadlines primarily so that courses can be scheduled without late changes which effect students’ semester schedules. It is especially important that these dates be followed for UG course scheduling. In exceptional cases, there will be consideration of a change to a graduate course if the person scheduled to teach can identify someone who can replace him/her. Sabbatical dates are needed to comply with the procedures set by our Dean’s Office. If a faculty member receives research funding beyond the date listed for buy-out notification, the person may need to wait until the following semester to consider a buy-out. The setting of class schedules is considered to be the primary importance.

**Dates:**

**Fall Semester**
Sabbatical Request-February 1  Buy-out Request-March 1

**Spring Semester**
Sabbatical Request-July 1  Buy-out Request-October 1

5. **Topic: Appeal Process Regarding Course Projects and Exams**
Larry discussed the appeals process regarding course projects and exams. He gave an example of a situation that occurred this fall semester. The following steps will be followed when an issue other than a grade arises:

- a. A student first discusses the issue with the faculty member;
- b. If the issue is not resolved, the student will contact the Associate Chair;
- c. The Associate Chair and the faculty member will review the issue;
- d. If the issue can not be resolved, the matter is referred to the Dean’s Office for a final decision.

It is important to note that student rights are given more credence than the wishes of the instructor. So, the Department would prefer if issues were resolved without referral to the Dean’s level and faculty members should realize that their decisions may not be upheld.

6. **Topic: Department Logo**

Four examples of a possible Department Logo were passed around but there was no discussion regarding options. It is thought that the University would not permit the official university logo to be altered as shown in several of the proposed designs. A student was responsible for the development of the examples that were circulated.

7. **Topic: New Graduate Web Page**

Heather Murray showed the existing web page and then changes that she has been working on for the new page. The intent is to continue with the same theme as the Department’s web page and to have information easily located on the page. Overall people felt that her work reflected an improvement over what currently exists. A suggestion was made to make the page broader and shallower with detail at lower levels. Ben Shneiderman volunteered to provide suggestions/guidance on its further development.

Evan noted the need to revise the UG web page. It is missing important information and/or that information is difficult to find especially for students who may have questions regarding the CS program.

8. **Topic: Presentation on New Technology Installed in Rom 115 CSIC**

Evan Golub gave a brief demonstration of new technology that has been installed in the large lecture hall in CSIC. Campus seems to be pushing the use of the technology. Students would have clickers in class so that if the instructor wanted to give a pop quiz or ask a series of questions, students could respond and given the software used, “Turning Point” a graph can be produced in class to show the audience’s response. The technology can be installed in other classrooms. Receivers would need to be purchased and they run approx. $100 per item. If anyone has questions, please send them to Evan and he will try to get a response from campus personnel.
9. **Topic: Field Committee Structure and UG/Graduate Curriculum Development**

It is Larry’s intent to discuss this in depth at the faculty retreat scheduled for March 2006. He has appointed Alan Sussman to chair a committee to review the graduate education program. Essentially, the purpose of the committee will be to explore what the Department should be trying to do regarding the further development of its curriculum. Alan will be contacting faculty members requesting that they be members of the committee.

Mike Hicks has been asked to chair a committee to review UG 400 level courses. This committee will also asked the question, what should the Department be doing regarding the further development of the upper level UG curriculum as well as what should all graduating students know upon receiving their degrees? Mike will contact faculty to be members of this committee.

There will probably be a third topic developed for discussion at the faculty retreat. Most likely it will be, “Outreach Aspects of the CS Program e.g. Computational Biology and other possible areas to be explored”. Larry emphasized the need for the Department to broaden its scope. The professorial size is currently 48 faculty members with the possible hiring of two additional faculty members this next year. The teaching and outreach expectations of campus administration for this faculty are high and if the Department expects support, it is important to show that members are busy and productive.

The meeting was adjourned at 2:50pm