KSU KANSAS STATE UNIVERSITY *Manhattan, Kansas 66502*

DEPARTMENT OF COMPUTER SCIENCE

February 29, 1972

TO: Computer Science Faculty

FROM: R. F. Sincovec

SUBJECT: Meeting with COCAO, February 28, 1972, State Office Building, Topeka

I. The computer science representatives were R. Hetherington and R. Sincovec.

II. The approved minutes of the joint faculty meeting which was held at KSU on December 7, 1971, were distributed to COCAO.

III. The meeting began with a brief progress report. The main points were:

1. Brochure is in production which gives Ph.D. requirements, facilities, faculty, courses, and serves to recruit good graduate students.

2. Operating procedures for joint faculty meetings are being finalized.

3. Ph.D. aspirants have been formally accepted into the program.

4. Steering Committee meetings and a joint faculty meeting have been held.

5. Specific departmental Ph.D. requirements are being finalized.

6. Computer Science colloquia are announced on both campuses.

7. Exchange of faculty, students, and courses is being investigated.

IV. The following problems, opinions, and recommendations were cited:

1. Communication is the number one problem.

   a. This makes it very time-consuming to prepare joint documents.

   b. WATS lines are inadequate.

c. A committee structure within each department and within the Steering Committe is being organized for better communication with counterparts. In addition, students and faculty have been encouraged to contact their counterparts.

2. Effective telecommunication system between the two campuses was stressed since -

   a. it is vital to the success of the joint doctoral program,

   b. it is vital for other educational and research activities,

   c. the combined computing facilities on both campuses and the ability to access them directly is vital to support a really good Ph.D. program,

   d. it is vital to help eliminate the communication problem.

3. Inconsistencies have become apparent such as discrepancies in graduate school policy's aid in stipends for graduate assistantships. These should be resolved through the efforts of the Steering Committee over a period of time.

4. A quality program is the goal. At times progress has been slow not only due to communication problems but due to deliberate and cautious reasoning to produce a solid foundation on which to build a quality program. It should also be realized that working faculty can not take off two or three days per month to meet face to face in planning meetings.

5. The following pertain to KSU only:

   a. Definite lack of funds to operate a new department has resulted in a freeze on travel funds. Sincovec broke every departmental rule on travel expenses in order to get reimbursed for his trip to this COCAO meeting. This situation tends to aggrevate the communication problem.

   b. Aggressively looking for senior faculty to strengthen the program.

V. COCAO's response:

1. Progress has been good.

2. The intent of COCAO was and still is every Ph.D. student to attend both campuses or have formal course or seminar contact with the other department. This can be achieved by -

   a. exchange of students,

   b. exchange of faculty. For example, a course or seminar can be given on a once-a-week basis by a faculty member who commutes to the other institution. Temporary or permanent exchanges should also be considered,

c. courses given via a telecommunications network,

d. courses given during intercessions.

Comments: It was stressed that the people involved, faculty and students, will determine the success of the joint program. Hence, required exchange of people without the correct attitude of the people involved will destroy the joint program. It appears that here again communication may be the solution. That is, certain courses at one institution should be readily available at the other institution through a communications setup whereby eliminating the need to physically move people. This will also help to maintain the differentiation of specialties because there would be no need to compete for faculty to offer courses in the other institution specialties since they would be readily available via the communications setup.

3. COCAO expressed definite concern on maintaining the differentiation of specialties and the procedures and safeguards that have been incorporated into the program to achieve this.

4. COCAO expects a progress report in October, 1972. Contents of the report will be discussed at the next Steering Committee meeting.

5. Some members of COCAO were surprised at the "lack of jointness" in the program especially when they were told that it was possible for a student to obtain a Ph.D. degree without any formal course content at the other institution. The computer science representatives requested COCAO's definition of jointness. This led to Item 2 above.

6. COCAO stated that due to this meeting they are now aware of how vital communication is to the joint program. They proposed to investigate restoring the $20,000 to support the telecommunication system that was deleted from the budget.

7. COCAO would like to see inovative ideas:

   a. Joint seminars with outstanding computer scientists which are attended by virtually the entire joint faculty. This will help bridge the communication problem and result in familiarity between the faculty and students. Personal note: maybe this should be part of recruiting new faculty.

   b. Instead of using WATS lines, hookup into TELENET which is seldom used during the working day.

   c. Implementation of 2 above.

   d. Joint course offering for next semester with or without transportation of people.

Comment: Chalmers stated that he has yet to be asked for financial assistance to incorporate any of the preceding ideas or, for that matter,

anything pertaining to the joint program. He added that any good proposal has an excellent chance of receiving financial support; just ask!

8. COCAO expects a unified program; would prefer students to minor or take courses in specialties of other institution, and expect to see initiative at all levels.