Education Committee Meeting Minutes
Friday, October 12, 2012

The meeting was convened at 2:10pm. The first and second agenda topics were reversed in order of presentation. For purposes of recording the minutes, the topics will be listed in the order of the original agenda which is attached.

1. **Establish a Process for Graduate Student Selection for Internal Competitions:** Yiannis lead the discussion. Please refer to the corresponding document for his proposal. In summary, Yiannis proposed that a committee of faculty with a representative from each field committee and possibly graduate students be formed to provide recommendations to the Assoc Chair for Graduate Education. The objective is to insure a "fair" process and, potentially, increase the number of students who will be awarded the most prestigious fellowships/awards within the scientific community/CS discipline.

    Jeff Foster mentioned that he had put together a list of such fellowships/awards and had sent them to the professorial faculty. It will be the responsibility of the graduate office to broadly advertise such information to graduate students and faculty members.

    There was much discussion about additional work that could be done to increase/improve student nomination packages. One suggestion was that nomination letters/materials could go to a committee who would make suggestions for improvements in student submission packages. A questions concerning what campus resources existed that could help the committee better package nominations? A suggestion was made to check the Graduate School web site for additional student fellowships/awards. It might also help to put one faculty member in charge that would assist students in developing their nomination materials. Remarks were also expressed that faculty should concentrate on nominations for the most prestigious awards vs. submitting nominations for a broader list of fellowships/awards.

    A suggestion was made to submit revisions to the proposal. Jeff Foster said he felt it was problematic to have representatives from every field committee and did not agree that it would be helpful to appoint graduate students to the committee. Others agreed that too large a committee could be cumbersome but all agreed that the concept of a committee with representation in the specialty area would be good to form and prevent any conflict of interest. Jeff Foster agreed to follow this objective, would announce the committee members to the faculty in advance of student nominations being considered for any fellowship/award. Modifications to the committee would be made as needed.

2. **Graduate Course Requirements and Outcomes:** Jeff Foster led the discussion. Please refer to the corresponding document for a summary of the topic and his proposal. Jeff mentioned that he obtained from Jan Plane, information on the

graduate program submitted to the Middle States' evaluation process. Three of the four questions and responses collected made sense to him. However, he is not sure the professorial faculty has reached consensus on what knowledge graduate students get out of their courses (knowledge/understanding of the subject matter) and, more importantly from his perspective, what does the faculty want the students to learn. Students should be receiving advanced computing skills but are they? What graduate courses are students actually taking?

Jeff suggests that he form a committee of representative from each field committee/area to begin this review and collection of information. A suggestion was made to collect the information and submit an interim report to the faculty and then return with final recommendations. The report should also list the consequences to any change in the current graduate program. As part of the review, students could be asked a set of sample questions.

Hanan gave a summary of how the current graduate program requirements were established and emphasized that it represents a compromise so that it would please a variety of faculty members with different views.

Jeff will send email to the professional faculty listing who will be on the committee.

3. **Proposal for a Concentration in Cybersecurity for ECE Majors:** Alan Sussman led the discussion. Please refer to the corresponding document. Alan said that this is the second review of the ECE proposal and no changes have been made in the document since last discussed. At the time, student enrollment levels were raised as a concern by CS faculty. Alan presented ECE's rationale for the proposal with the hope it would provide additional information to the CS faculty. An independent study course is listed because ECE currently feels that there are an insufficient number of Engr. faculty members in the cybersecurity area to develop a specific course description and staff the course approriately. The question was raised as to why ECE students should be encouraged to take CMSC 451? What is the enrollment impact to CS of additional ECE students registering for courses? The estimate is that the additional number of students would be 13 – 16 over six CS classes.

The question was raised, "Do we accept the proposal as submitted"? A suggestion was made that ECE resubmit its cybersecurity proposal once the program is properly staffed. A comment was made regarding the number of ECE UG students who are leaving the program and moving into CS.

An amendment was made to the motion to approve the proposal subject to removing ENEE 499 from it. A vote was taken with 16 in favor of the amended motion, 4 abstentions and 0 against.

4. **Modification of the ECE Category F Requirements – Teaching Electives:**
   Alan Sussman led the brief discussion given the time limitations. Refer to the corresponding document for details. As there were no questions regarding the information, a motion was made to accept the modification to the ECE requirements. The vote was 15 in favor, 3 abstentions, and 0 against.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:10pm.