

## Course report

This course report is based on student feedback and submitted course evaluations, exam results and the teacher's idea for further development. The course report is published on the course website and Canvas-site.

<b>Course name</b>	Prototyping Technologies
<b>Course code</b>	DA623E
<b>Semester</b>	VT25
<b>Number of registered students</b>	14
<b>Course coordinator</b>	Benjamin Maus

	Course report is published on Canvas-site
	Course report is published on course webpage

### Compulsory course evaluation

Number of responses to the compulsory course evaluation:	5 on <i>wooclap</i> and 4 on <i>SSR</i>
--	---

The compulsory course evaluation has been conducted through:

X	Standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report)
	Extended standard template with <i>own questions</i> via SSR
	Own evaluation method by the course coordinator

### Additional evaluations that were conducted during the course

X	Separate survey
	Oral evaluation in class
	Oral evaluation in smaller groups
	Other evaluation method
Additional evaluation questions were collected through a customized survey conducted via the <i>wooclap</i> tool. This survey primarily focused on the course content.	

## Comments on the course evaluations

The average score for the question on the *wooclap* survey "What do you think about the course (1=worst ever, 10=best ever)?" was 8.8, with ratings ranging from 7 to 10. This indicates that students evaluated the course positively overall, which is also in line with the SSR survey results. Similarly, when asked to describe the course in three words, all responses were positive in tone. Students highlighted the process-oriented learning ("prototyping", "iteration", "feedback"), the experiential and interactive format ("interactive", "hands-on", "experiential", "empowering", "engaging", "fun") and the overall perception of the course ("insightful", "thought-provoking", "challenging", "informative", "entertaining", "good teaching").

In evaluating how different course elements supported their understanding of prototyping technologies, students rated the workshops (including Figma, ProtoPie, physical prototyping, and laser cutting) an average of 4.2 on a 5-point scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"). The group project, which introduced a new topic for the first time this year, received the same average rating of 4.2. The seminars equally received an average rating of 4.2.

When asked to highlight positive aspects of the course, most students (n=4) emphasized the value of practical, hands-on learning. Additional points mentioned included the pace of assignments (n=1), Sunday submission deadlines (n=1), the balance between individual and group work (n=1), and the support provided during assignments and design crits (n=1). Overall, the course structure was described as "great" by the majority (n=3), with two students noting that it "could be better."

Regarding potential improvements, two main themes emerged. First, several students expressed a desire for more time and/or credits for the course. One student suggested expanding it to 15 credits, while another recommended reconsidering the full-time 10-week format to allow for more exploration and comprehension. Additionally, one student felt that the time allocated for the individual paper was too short. The second key point was the need to better connect the group project to prior work or research. Suggestions included linking it to a previous course or to earlier assignments within the prototyping course itself. It was also proposed that the course could be moved earlier in the program, as prototyping was seen as a relevant skill for several other courses. Finally, students requested more practical sessions, particularly with ProtoPie and possibly laser cutting.

Lastly, regarding the course's integration into the broader program, three out of five students said it fit "extremely well", while the remaining two selected "quite well." All five stated that they would have taken the course even if it had been offered as an elective rather than a mandatory component of the program.

## Examination results

X	Examination results are as expected
	Examination results are not as expected

Overall, the examination results for both the project work and the individual pictorial papers reflected the typical range of outcomes observed in similar courses and in previous years.

### **Recommendations and priorities for the course development**

Overall, the course demonstrates a mature structure, and students generally feel that they achieve the intended learning outcomes. However, there are areas where adjustments could improve the overall experience. Based on the identified opportunities and additional student suggestions, the following recommendations are proposed:

- Consider linking the group project to an existing project or, at least, providing a clear starting point grounded in ethnographic research insights.
- Offer more time and more detailed guidelines for the pictorial paper (such as the need for visual documentations and clearer scope definitions) as this format is new to most students.
- Include more practical sessions focused on ProtoPie and, potentially, laser cutting, as these prototyping technologies received limited exposure during the course. However, expanding these sessions would require an increased course budget, which has previously been declined.
- Consistent with evaluations from previous years, there is potential to expand the course in both duration and credit value. Additionally, from a program perspective, scheduling the course earlier in the master's is viewed as beneficial by the students.