HCIM Program Committee Meeting for September

September 10, 2021
11:30 PM – 1 PM
Virtual meeting

Meeting called by:	Wayne Lutters	Type of meeting:	Monthly Committee Meeting
Facilitator:	Alex Leitch	Note taker:	Emilia Azar
Timekeeper:	Alex Leitch		

Attendees:

Voting members: Wayne Lutters (1 / 1), Alex Leitch (1 / 1), Pam Duffy (1 / 1), Amanda Lazar (1/ 1), Victoria Van Hyning (1 / 1), Bill Kules (1 / 1), Jeff Waters (1 / 1)

Ex officio: Kate Izsak (1 / 1)

Others in attendance: Carol Boston (1 / 1), Emilia Azar (1 / 1), Dustin Smith (1 / 1)

Agenda and related documents here

Minutes of the Meeting:

Agenda item: 1. (11:30) Welcome, introductions, and a bit about committee operations

Discussion:

- Wayne introduced himself as the new HCIM Program Director and Alex as the new Assistant Director. He welcomed everyone to the HCIM Committee for the 2021-2022 academic year.
    - Wayne asked the Committee to consider what they would have an interest in working on in subcommittees, and they will volunteer on work of their choosing in today's meeting.

Agenda item: 2. (11:45) [For adoption] May meeting minutes **Presenter:** Wayne Lutters

Discussion:

The May meeting minutes were adopted unanimously.

Agenda item: 3. (11:50) Intro to the HCIM Program- Operational and enrollment updates
   a.   Some history, trajectories, and current numbers
   b.   Notes from the opening weeks (including INST 710/711 sequence experiment and preparation for expanded Spring 22 electives)
   c.   HCI PTK search

Presenter: Carol Boston & Wayne Lutters

Discussion:

- Carol walked the Committee through the HCIM program's background and current status, including the recent redesign period which guided the program's pivot from a PhD prep program (founded in 2011) to a more UX-industry facing degree over the past 4-5 years.

- ○ The Fall 2021 cohort includes a diverse group of 72 students, the largest ever.
- Wayne spoke to the three background skills of our incoming students: technology, art/design, and social science/research.
  - ○ The program should be branded as a strategic academic path to strengthen all three, and support students as they become well-rounded in the UX field.

Agenda item:	4. (12:05) 2022 Action Items - Program Work	**Presenter:**	Wayne Lutters

    a. Balancing research & industry imperatives
    b. Pathways through the program: starting points (4+1 info sci/info design, waivers), timing (full/part time, Spring starts?), delivery (in-person, hybrid, online), specializations (accessibility certificate, +), cumulative experience (thesis, capstone, +?)
    c. Student experience: Part timers, DEI, gathering student feedback (listening sessions, survey, alumni interviews)

Discussion:

- Due to the growing number of thesis-oriented students, we are looking at how to best support them. This includes connecting them with good mentors, building strong thesis committees, and providing peer support networks in workshops.
- The iConsultancy is growing into a more formal and significant role, and building deeper industry connections that benefit the HCIM program through industry-relevant projects.
- The HCIM leadership team is also considering alternate pathways for the program:
  - ○ 4+1 programs (undergrads beginning electives as upperclassmen and then wrapping up a master's degree in a final year of study) can lead to different starting places for the students; we need to consider how to ensure that works well with the cohort model
  - ○ The program is allowing for more opportunities for part-time attendance, i.e,. holding at least one section of core classes after 6 pm
  - ○ Spring cohort possibilities
  - ○ Hybrid possibilities that grew out of the pandemic instructional experience
  - ○ Specializations or concentrations of electives (e.g., accessibility)
- Wayne emphasized the need to maintain a warm and welcoming program for all students.
- Amanda Lazar is working with a team on a proposal for an Accessibility certificate. The Committee will see this proposal later this Fall.

Agenda item:	5. (12:05) 2022 Action Items - Curriculum Work	**Presenter:**	Wayne Lutters

    a. Operationalizing Approved Program Learning Outcomes (with draft assessments & rubrics - key work from 2020-21)
       i. Next steps: Applying and refining assessments and rubrics in core courses
      ii. Long-range: Tracking meta progress across courses, badges, portfolios; remediating low performance at the individual student level

        b. Proposed course reviews (conducted by committee)
- i. INST 630: Introduction to Programming
    1. Right balance of "intro" and practical.
    2. Pre-req "fundamental"? "712"-Part II? Overall need to increase our tech competencies
- ii. INST 775/76: Capstone variations (including "Spring admit" section, virtual component)
- iii. INST 710: UX Research Methods/ INST 711: Interaction Design vs. 711/710 arc (data collection this year)

        c. Proposed course developments (will come to committee this year for approval)
- i. Accessibility specialization (future certificate), including new courses in Design & Aging (Amanda) S23; Guidelines, Standards, Management (Bern) F24
- ii. New Visual Design II/Product Design (perhaps in conjunction with the Art Department)
- iii. New Special Topics (UX & Business with Fran Polito, S22)
- iv. New one-credits, including Data Infrastructures (Dennis Frezzo), Empathic Robots (SJ Terp), Creativity (Susannah Palatz & Joel Chan)

Discussion:

- Last year's Committee created Program Learning Outcomes, and this is the year to dive into applying those within the classroom and grading system.
  - Alex spoke to the usefulness of the newly established Program Learning Outcomes. They allow professors and students to come to an understanding about grading and what indicates their level of mastery and corresponding grades.
    - Bill agreed and emphasized that the PLOs are important, but do not cover the entire picture of learning. There are a few gaps in the PLOs that can be continuously revised and reviewed in the future.
    - Wayne added that the outcomes allow professors to emphasize the academic basis of this program, rather than a purely career-driven focus.
- Core courses are reviewed on a 2-3 year cycle INST 630: Programming and INST 775/76: Capstone are up for committee review this year. Wayne described the process as follows:
  - The review process includes collecting and reading syllabi, talking with instructors, engaging with current and past students, looking at products that came out of the courses, and analyzing peer institution curriculums.
  - The Committee will then review what changes would improve or add to the courses.

- ○ Wayne noted that INST 630 is often waived by students who have a background in programming. The leadership team is considering whether a part two of this class should be created, or if it should be re-designed completely so that there is an appropriate challenge no matter the level of programming background a student brings. Committee input will help guide these decisions. (It's important to note that we don't traditionally waive social science or design core courses; ideally programming would fall into the same category.).
- ○ Further, this year, INST 710: UX Research Methods and 711: Interaction Design can be taken in either sequence rather than consecutively in the Fall and Spring. A Committee member could see which sequencing made sense for which students by convening student focus groups, watching their outcomes, etc.
- ○ The faculty members of the committee expressed interest in dividing into sub-committees as follows, with Pam's strengths as a student member noted in programming instruction:
  - ■ **Victoria:** Course review of INST 775/776: Capstone (two semesters; will include interviews with Bill Kules, current instructor)
  - ■ **Amanda:** Course review of INST 630: Introduction to Programming (can include interviews with David Patrick and Scott Dempwolf, current instructors)
  - ■ **Bill:** Course sequencing of INST 710/711 this year: Does order affect student learning and other outcomes? Should we keep the sequence, reverse it, or allow them to run concurrently since different students may benefit from different sequences, depending on prior background

---

Agenda item: (2:25) Review action items & wrap up

The program team will share syllabi and other materials to help with initial scoping of the course reviews. In October, faculty subcommittee leaders will bring back a short presentation of what they've learned so far and timelines for their course reviews, culminating in final recommendations in April.

Action items	Person responsible	Deadline
❐ Short presentation on scoping the INST 775/776: Capstone review	Victoria	October 8
❐ Short presentation on scoping the INST 630: Introduction to Programming review	Amanda/Pam*	October 8 October 8
❐ Short presentation on structuring the course sequencing for INST 710/711	Bill	October 8

*In a follow-on memo, the Committee discussed Pam, Wayne, Alex, Carol, and Emilia's availability as resources for faculty leads.

Next Meeting: Friday, October 8, 2021, from 11:30 to 1:00pm
via Zoom
Rolling agenda items for future HCIM meetings