

# HCIM Program Committee Meeting for November

November 17, 2017  
11:00 AM – 12:30 PM  
HBK4115

---

**Meeting called by:** Niklas Elmqvist      **Type of meeting:** Monthly Committee Meeting

**Facilitator:** Niklas Elmqvist      **Note taker:** Lacey Arevalo (HCIM GA)

**Timekeeper:** Niklas Elmqvist

**Attendees:** Niklas Elmqvist, Lindsay Sarin, Eun Kyong Choe, Bill Kules, Jeff Waters, David Weintrop, Christopher Robeck, Tamara Clegg, Timothy Richards

**Please read:** Agenda and related documents [here](#)

**Please bring:** None

## *Minutes of the Meeting:*

---

**Agenda item:** Discussion: UX Research Methods Proposal      **Presenter:** Bill Kules

### **Discussion:**

[Proposal](#) + [draft syllabus](#)

- Discussion on the course descriptions and learning outcomes
  - This course should replace INST701 (Research Methods)
  - Question: why Contextual Design is the backbone? – We want students to have depth in a research method being used in the industry
  - Better for students to go deep on Contextual Design than learning a little of many research methods (only high-level knowledge)
  - The Double Diamond, Design Thinking will be retained in the INST631(Fundamentals of HCI)
  - Need to produce a roadmap / document that will explain the 3 different courses and show where it all ties together– this should be passed on to all instructors teaching the courses
  - Bill to talk with Lindsay on logistical questions (replace Research Methods) – plan is to vote on this on the December meeting. (Plan for March)
  - Question if the course intends to also teach quantitative. Bill's suggestion is to cover quantitative in INST631 and focus on qualitative in the UX Research Methods course
  - Current Research Methods (INST701) is still very exploratory
  - Plan is to have a set of visual techniques

### **Conclusions:**

Proposal is still being revised ad the goal is to vote on it by December 17 program committee meeting.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Review INST701 syllabus and materials	Bill Kules	December 17
✓ Finalize proposal for voting	Bill Kules	December 17

---

**Agenda item:** Course Proposals      **Presenter:** Niklas Elmqvist

### **Discussion:**

- Research in Advanced Digital Curation (Richard Marciano) – 8 VOTES APPROVED
  - [Proposal](#) + [draft syllabus](#)

- Not too relevant for HCIM, more MLIS and MIM
  - This is a next level elective
- 1 credit WEKA – 8 VOTES APPROVED
  - [Proposal](#) + [draft syllabus](#)
  - Technical – Java
  - Visual Analytics and Data Analytics

#### Conclusions:

- Both Research in Advanced Digital Curation and 1 credit WEKA are both approved

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
<b>Agenda item:</b> Update HCIM Admissions	<b>Presenter:</b> Jeff Waters	

#### Discussion:

1. Update: HCIM Admissions (Jeff Waters)
  - Current application numbers: 77 submitted 16 in progress
  - To date, HCIM has the most applications than other programs in iSchool
  - Set up a January Date or Wait up to Feb 15<sup>th</sup>?
  - Faculty, Carlea and Jeff reviewed last year on reviewing applications
  - Last year, Jeff does Triage before (Grad school criteria) - Scores
  - Niklas will send personalized email for the “HELL YES” pile.
  - Jeff mentioned that he can make cases for Grad School who don't meet criteria like GPA (2.8)
  - Start Review in January remotely, have a spreadsheet
  - There are a few attendees for Info Session (but more than last year) but there are many email inquiries via HCIM email.

#### Conclusions:

- Faculty assignments in reviewing the applications (6 faculty, 4 categories)
- Jeff will continue to triage and send piles to the faculty below

Categories	Faculty Responsible
HELL YES	NE
YES	NE TR
MAYBE	BK, DW, EKC
NO	TC

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Work on actual written process / document	Jeff Waters	December 17
✓ Create a shared spreadsheet	Jeff Waters	December 17
<b>Agenda item:</b> Update: Karen Holtzblatt HCIM analysis & starting point for visioning (Bill Kules)	<b>Presenter:</b> Carlea Holl-Jensen	

#### Discussions:

Based from the Comparative Analysis (against competition) and Listening Campaign with faculty, Karen provided a preliminary analysis (Download slides [here](#))

- Karen Holtzblatt is willing to lead visioning discussions in February
- Key Findings are the following:
  - Weak course programming

- Very weak professional development and job readiness
- No coordinated program planning or leadership
- Lack of practical skill from the faculty (industry experience)
- No path for practitioner-oriented students. Need to have both academic and practical paths
- Need to change the current organizational structure
- HCIM Director should focus on partnerships, not much teaching or research
- Establish an industry advisory board and a faculty advisory board
- Need to discuss the staffing questions raised further

#### Conclusions:

- Analysis drawn from the comparative analysis and listening campaign will be triangulated with the data to be gathered from alumni interviews (ongoing) and the current student survey and listening sessions (c/o Lacey)

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
✓ Conduct interviews with hcim alumni	Bill Kules and Karen Holtzblatt	January
✓ Complete current student survey	Lacey Arevalo	December 17

---

<b>Agenda item:</b>	Update: Listening Session with HCIM Students	<b>Presenter:</b>	Lacey Arevalo
---------------------	--	-------------------	---------------

#### Discussions:

we had a total of **24 participants** (50% of the current student population). We got a total of **34 questions** and a total of **136 votes** (in the q&a software we used - pigeonhole live there is a way to vote questions they resonate with)

The questions asked by the students verbatim can be downloaded [here](#).

#### Insights from the Listening sessions

- Students are conscious about the ranking of the program compared to other universities.
- Students are concerned with the image of the program within the UX industry.
- Students feel the need for seminars covering topics related to the industry.
- There is anxiety over the lack of industry partners (i.e. opportunities for internships and capstone projects).
- There are issues on Portfolio specifically with timing of HCIM deliverables (from courses and capstone) versus the industry internship / job application timeline.
- Capstone / Thesis should have a roadshow in the end of the program and should be published for publicity.
- Students are expecting help and support from the program to get internships / jobs (apart from career fairs). There is reluctance on paying for the internship course in particular.
- There were questions about partnerships within the university (Art, Computer Science Departments)
- Students are requesting for free or subsidized organization licenses for design tools like sketch, Invision, framer etc.
- There are suggestions for having a prototyping lab where all design tools are available to students.
- There is desire to create an HCIM student organization (apart from HCIL)
- Current Students want to see short term changes apart from long term changes.

- Students want more interactive prototyping related courses / workshops.
- There is clamor to add design related courses or electives such as visual design / graphic design, product design, interaction design and workshop on actual tools (Sketch, Adobe Creative Suite, Axure, Invision, etc.)
- Specifically, on INST630 Introduction to Programming, there is a great imbalance amongst students – students who already know how to code and those with zero knowledge. This creates frustration on the pace at the same time professors have difficulty managing different levels of capability.
- Students are interested in different tracks like some would like to be more technical (more programming and tangible hci) and some want to focus on domains like industrial design, interactive computing, medical informatics, data visualization etc.
- There are conflicting outlooks on “workload” a first year feel it is too easy and a second year felt it was too much (capstone student specifically said it is too much).

### Conclusions:

- Insights are mostly aligned with the Comparative Analysis and Listening Campaign sessions
- Problem areas are currently being addressed by the 3 established working groups (Core courses, Electives and Professional Preparation)
- Data will be triangulated with survey results

### Action items

### Person responsible

### Deadline

✓

### Agenda item:

Update: Working Groups

### Presenter:

Niklas Elmqvist

### Discussions:

#### Electives:

- identifying existing courses
  - manually check testudo to see in different departments
  - coordinator maintains what is offered
  - Feedback
- wish list and rank them
  - Graphic Design
  - Mobile HCI
  - Web dev
  - Game Design
  - Psychology
  - Tangible computing
  - Cybersecurity
- Plan 3 electives we can advise by February to take for the fall
- Independent studies? For undergraduate class

#### Professional Preparation:

- February need course proposals for professional development (end with an 8 or a 9)
  - Skills and professional preparation (2 separate 1 credit courses)
  - Scheduling a year in advanced
- 1 credit HTML / CSS (6-week course)

**Action items**

**Person responsible**

**Deadline**

---

***Other Agenda Items***

---

**Special notes:**