HCIM Committee Meeting Minutes

HBK 4113,10:00am-11:30am, May 3, 2016

Present: N. Elmqvist (8/8), M. Chetty (5/5), C. Holl-Jensen (8/8), M.Brescia (7/8), J. Waters (8/8), J. Golbeck (7/8), B. Butler (5/8)
Non-Voting: L. Sarin, R. Marr, A. Weeks, C. Boston

1. Update on program development & enrollment (Dean Butler)
    a. Identifying "showcase" areas where the HCIM program/faculty/students excel; ex: wearable technology, number of publications, mobile technology, etc.
    b. How does the program grow sustainably?
        i. What would it take to reach threshold for viability (~60-80 student a year)?
        ii. How big should classes be in 2017, 2018, etc?
        iii. Current growth on target for 35 students next admissions cycle
    c. Increasing the number of faculty and courses, especially those with industry orientation
    d. Committee has been working on a list of courses to create; ex: HCI-specific research methods course
    e. **ACTION ITEM:** Identify/strategize HCIM's showcase areas
        i. Faculty should be creating courses in their areas of interest
        ii. Pathways for students to get invested
        iii. Identifying, developing, and supporting outstanding faculty
2. Proposed conversion of Special Topics to Permanent Number Course:
    a. Spring 2016 enrollment: 13; feedback was positive; course is viewed as a complementary to M. Subramaniam's LBSC course
    b. Voting: 6 yes, 0 abstain, 0 no
3. Proposed new Special Topics course:
    a. One-credit reading seminar on online harassment; offered in summer and fall; 15 hours over 10 weeks
    b. While this course does not need committee approval, is there any feedback from the committee?
    c. Consider creating more reading seminars (ex. Ben Bederson's reading course for CHI papers)
4. Changes to policy and procedure for transferring programs (Jeff)
    a. Several students have recently transferred between iSchool programs; there is presently no Graduate School policy, so iSchool policy may change in future
    b. The current process is:
        i. Student meets with their program advisor and evaluates transfer
        ii. Advisor reaches out to the host program
        iii. Student then meets with the host advisor
        iv. After the transfer has been approved by the host program, the paperwork is then sent to Student Services

        v. Student Services then contacts to the Graduate School
        vi. This process is slightly different for international students (student must meet with ISSS regarding their visa status)
    c. Students should switch early on. Recommended to change by the second semester; otherwise they might need to extend their time in the program.
    d. It would be helpful to better understand the reasons why students are transferring
    e. Does the committee give Jeff/Niklas/Carlea power to authorize students to transfer to HCIM on an ad hoc basis.?
        i. **Vote:** 6 yes; 0 no; 0 abstain
5. Update on changes to online application (Carlea)
    a. After discussing with other graduate programs and Student Services, the language has been updated. Changes are due in Hobsons on May 15th, should be posted by August 15th.
    b. **Action Item:** Carlea will send update on language used
6. Internship status update (Evan)
    a. All but 5 students have secured internships. Of those five, most have leads
    b. If students are unable to secure internships, Niklas and Jen will work on helping them find placements
    c. Timing of internship and professionalization events will be moved up next cycle to help minimize this challenge
    d. **Action Items:**
        i. Carlea to send out call for summer internships (Marshini, Jen, Niklas)
        ii. After summer, send out a note to partners to maintain relationship
7. End of term housekeeping
    a. Niklas will talk to the new Dean about selecting a new committee member
    b. Items that should be completed over the summer
        i. Prepare for orientation (Jeff is already working on this)
        ii. Incorporate mandate from new Dean
8. Students are curious why they cannot work in groups on the capstone project
    a. Capstone was historically offered as a thesis alternative. Thesis cannot be done in a group, so capstone was not offered in a group.
    b. Pros for group work:
        i. Would allow for more large scale projects
        ii. Representative of how students will actually work in the real world
        iii. In terms of scalability, might be helpful to move to a group project model
    c. Cons for group work:
        i. Capstone would have to be revised to accommodate group work
        ii. Difficult to evaluate individual effort; could also be more difficult for students to showcase their contributions (i.e., in a portfolio)
        iii. Easier for there to be unequal distribution of work in groups
        iv. Capstone must be equivalent to a thesis in terms of the amount of work
    d. Committee feels Capstone should continue to be done individually
    e. **Action Item:** Reevaluate next year after current class finishes capstone.