

HCIM Committee Meeting Minutes

May 16, 2017, 10:00am - 11:30am, HBK 4113

Present Voting Members: B. Kules (8/8), C. Holl-Jensen (8/8), J. Waters (8/8), L. Findlater (7/7), G. Vanderheiden (6/8), N. Elmqvist (8/8)

Present Non-voting Members: L. Sarin (7/8), R. Marr (7/7), C. Boston (7/7), Jasbir ()

Absent: B. Butler (0/8), M. Brescia (6/8)

1. Program Development Update
 - a. Paperwork for Karen and Chris Robeck (for hourly work) is almost complete. The purchase order is in place, but conflict of interest needs to be completed before IRB can proceed. As there is a chance this will be written up later.
 - a. Moving forward on:
 - i. Contextual interviews with alumni who went into industry (Bill & Karen)
 - ii. Data collection about other programs (Chris) will take place over the summer.
 - iii. Reporting back to committee in late summer—there is a hope to hold a visioning session; the session would ideally take place the week before classes start
 - iv. The bulk of the research will focus on alumni in industry.
2. HCIM capstone:
 - a. Bill and several HCIM students presented at a CHI session for the Women in Technology pilot capstone project.
 - b. Value proposition to companies—access to team with good ideas and leadership. What they do with it is up to them.
 - c. Currently looking at particular projects for capstone, about four companies/partners that we want to reach out to; we really need 4 solid projects to start the semester; so far we have Karen/Women in Technology as a partner.
 - d. Capstone projects will now start in the summer, and students are expected to decide on their projects and email Bill.
 - e. The Capstone is in a 'bootstrapping mode' → this year, there are a lot of gaps in what they needed to know and what they learned in their first two semesters; scaffolding prep for students over the summer to understand overall HCI methodology for UCD/contextual inquiry process; preparation over the summer (for students, as well as forming teams)
 - i. Should we introduce courses that focuses on team-based work?
 - ii. This process will help us understand better what those gaps in our curriculum are, so we can better redesign courses → by August/September we should have an idea of where we need to go
 - iii. We are planning on holding the 're-envisioning' session to answer some of these questions.
2. Self-Study Update
 - a. Incomplete Self-study was submitted Monday, May 15th. Full self study to be completed by Niklas and submitted by Wednesday, May 24.
3. Updating Admissions Procedures
 - a. GRE procedures
 - i. GRE is not a solid indicator, and can sometimes be a barrier to applying to the program.

- ii. Application materials are always fully reviewed, process would not change much if GRE is not included for domestic students.
 - iii. For international students it can be a little bit easier, but the same biases still inform that. A piece not the whole puzzle. If they want to include the GRE scores than that is great. Wouldn't want to filter out.
 - iv. Because the scale for international schools does not line up, it makes sense to keep GRE mandatory.
 - v. **We propose the following:** GRE is not mandatory for domestic students (but remains optional), should be required for international students.
 - vi. **Vote:** yes: 6, opposed: 0, abstain: 0: Resolution passes.
 - vii.
- b. Essay
 - i. Carlea to draft an introduction to the essay portion in which there will be clarification of the difference between the statement of purpose and the application essay..
 - ii. **Vote:** 6 yay, 0 opposed, 0 abstain: Resolution Passes.
- c. Draft evaluation rubric
 - i. Evaluation criteria are tied to success in the program and in their career
 - ii. Feedback & suggestions for revision going forward
 - iii. **Action Item:** continue discussion offline, with final thoughts due to Carlea by June 15th.
- 4. HCIM Advisory Board
 - a. Purpose is to get guidance from professionals in the field
 - b. The goal is to add industry connections and increase engagement for the program
 - c. The board can help the program refine goals and objectives by meeting once a year (or possibly more)
 - d. We will need to structure meetings so that it is productive
 - e. Participants:
 - i. Possible participants include:
 - 1. Regional professionals
 - 2. Silicon Valley representatives
 - ii. Participants to be compensated with an honoraria
 - f. What is the timeline?
 - i. Over the next academic year.
 - ii. Reaching out to people at Symposium?
 - g. **Action Item:** committee to follow-up discussion