Course report Faculty of Technology and Society

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.

Course name	Designing and Evaluating Innovation
Course code	DA629E
Semester	VT25
Number of registered students	15
Course coordinator	Dipak Surie

	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	7

The compulsory course evaluation has been conducted through:

X	Standard template via Reflex
	Extended standard template with *own questions* via Reflex
	Own evaluation method by the course coordinator
If own evaluation method was conducted, describe how:	

Additional evaluations that were conducted during the course

	Separate survey
	Oral evaluation in class
	Oral evaluation in smaller groups
X	Other evaluation method

If other evaluation method was conducted, describe how:

A discussion on the course—covering structure, content, assignments, teaching, communication, and literature—was held during the program council meeting with student representatives and faculty. This session is both important and valuable for gaining a deeper understanding of students' needs and perspectives, and for identifying meaningful improvements to implement in the next course cycle.

Comments on the course evaluations

The course evaluation survey had a response rate of 46.7%, which is reasonable given the class size of 15 students. However, a higher response rate—ideally between 80–90%—would provide a more comprehensive understanding of student perspectives.

The evaluation results suggest moderate achievement of learning outcomes, with variation across modules covering innovation processes to societal impacts. A deeper analysis is required, but initial discussions with student representatives revealed several key themes:

- **Excessive group work and presentations**: Students expressed that the high number of group tasks limited opportunities for individual, in-depth learning. Peer presentations were perceived as less effective due to limited teaching experience and narrow topic focus.
- **Fast pacing and heavy workload**: Many students reported that the course moved too quickly, leaving little room for reflection. Assignments felt rushed, which reduced engagement despite the theoretical appeal of the content. We will work to adjust the pacing and introduce more spacing between assignments.
- **Repetitive content**: Students noted that some topics overlapped with previous courses without adding significant new depth. In response, we are reviewing and restructuring the program to ensure progressive and layered content development.
- **Scheduling conflicts**: Issues with course scheduling impacted students' ability to plan and manage external responsibilities effectively. While this has been addressed for this course, we will prioritize earlier scheduling notifications in future offerings.

Regarding the **5 hp final assignment**, which determines the course grade, students felt the depth of work required did not align with its importance in the course. While we partly agree, the intention was for students to trace and analyze innovation processes in real companies, drawing connections to course literature and learning outcomes. To improve this component, we will provide clearer requirements and expectations. Although some students found it difficult to identify a suitable company, we continue to support this by encouraging networking within the local context—a valuable skill in itself.

This course, along with the broader program, intentionally explores alternative examination methods beyond traditional classroom exams. Weekly modules are designed to support flipped-classroom models, experiential learning, and challenge-based approaches. As a result, interactive forms of assessment—primarily presentations—have become prominent. However, based on student feedback, we will consider diversifying examination formats and reducing the reliance on group work and presentations.

Lastly, although scheduling for this course was addressed, we acknowledge the importance of early scheduling. All efforts will be made to publish the full schedule in advance, using platforms like Google Calendar. As this is a full-time study program, classroom activities will continue to be scheduled within regular working hours.

Examination results

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

The examination results aligned with expectations: some students performed exceptionally well, while others fell within the mid-to-lower range of the performance spectrum. Although the grades appear satisfactory on paper and are clearly linked to the 5 hp study, it is important to recognize that student engagement levels varied significantly. This variation may be attributed to external commitments, as well as differing levels of intrinsic motivation to go beyond the basic requirements needed for a grade of G.

The use of AI presented both an opportunity and a challenge—particularly in one case. It is essential that future examinations, regardless of format, explicitly state whether AI tools are permitted and, if so, define the extent of their acceptable use. The absence of clear guidelines created uncertainty for both students and instructors. As educators, we support the ethical and transparent use of AI, and we encourage students to utilize such tools to enhance learning—not to mislead or bypass the educational process.

Student evaluations indicate a limited depth of understanding in applying certain theoretical concepts. In line with Bloom's taxonomy, we aim to promote higher-order thinking and will revise course content to better support students in selecting and justifying appropriate methods, processes, and tools based on the specific problem and its context. This is a critical skill, as no single method is universally applicable to all situations.

Overall, student contributions were adequate, as demonstrated through their presentations and reports.

Recommendations and priorities for the course development

- Reduce the amount of group work and presentations to allow for more individualized learning.
- Design assignments that are more in-depth but paced more gradually, with built-in gaps to allow time for reflection.
- Ensure content is progressive and non-repetitive, with clearly defined modules that support deeper student exploration.

- Provide clear, fixed schedules well in advance, and improve communication to help students manage their external commitments effectively.
- Enhance the final 5 hp study that determines individual course grades by introducing additional requirements, ensuring it reflects its weight in comparison to other course components.
- Continue supporting students in building networks and accessing relevant companies for practical engagement.
- Foster intrinsic motivation through engaging challenges that encourage students to explore both the subject matter and their own interests more deeply.

Instructions

The instructions part of the course report is only intended as support for the course coordinator to create the course report and the pages below are to be removed before the publication of the report.

Course name refers to the complete course name as listed in the syllabus, e.g. *Computer Science: Research Methodology or Introduction to Programming and Embedded Systems.*

Course code refers to the identification code of the course, e.g. *DA350A or MT158A.*

Semester refers to the semester that is referenced in the course report, *e.g. Spring 20 or Autumn 19.*

Number of registered students refers to the number of registered students three weeks after the start of the course (meaning the number of registered students after early withdrawals).

Course coordinator refers to the name of the teacher who is the course coordinator and who is responsible for writing the course report. The names of other teachers who may have been involved in the implementation of the course and compilation of the course report are not stated in the report.

It must be registered in the course report that it is published on the course website and the current course's Canvas page. This is filled in by the person responsible for the publication of the report.

Course evaluation

Number of responses to compulsory course evaluation refers to the number of students who submitted a course evaluation or who actively participated if an

alternative evaluation method was used (this section is to be filled in by the study administration if the course evaluation is carried out by the study administration via SSR).

***Compulsory course evaluation has been conducted* through** refers to
the approach that has been used for the course evaluation. The chosen approach is indicated by checking one of the three listed options — only one option should be checked:

• ***Standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report):*** This is the template that is set up by the study administration unless the study administration for the course has been instructed otherwise. Check this option if you used the standard template via the study administration without making any adjustments.

• ***Extended standard template with own questions via SSR*****:** Check this option if you have extended the study administration's standard template with your own course-specific questions. The added questions do not need to be reported here. They are archived as part of the course evaluation.

• ***Own evaluation method by the course coordinator:*** Check this alternative if the course evaluation has not been carried out using one of the two alternatives above. The course evaluation has been set up by the course coordinator without the study administration. In this case, the course coordinator is also responsible for summarising and compiling the course evaluation. If the course coordinator has chosen their own method to conduct the course evaluation, the method must be described briefly. The specific questions do not need to be reported here but must be reported in the course evaluation summary which is done by the course coordinator. E.g. *The course evaluation has been conducted anonymously on paper in connection with presentations at the end of the course* or *The course evaluation has been conducted anonymously with Mentimeter in connection with the lecture in week 22.*

If any additional evaluations have been conducted, they are reported as described below. It is not necessary to carry out additional evaluations. If no additional evaluations have been conducted, this section is left blank.

Additional evaluations that were conducted during the course refers to any other organised evaluations aside from the compulsory course evaluation that might be included in the course report. "Organised" in this case means that the evaluation has been announced to the students in advance, so that they know that an evaluation is taking place and that they will have the opportunity to express their opinion at this occasion. This section does not refer to any spontaneous discussions with students or viewpoints given that may have taken place and that are included in the course report, instead this section only refers to any additional, formally organized

evaluations, where students were given the opportunity to evaluate the course. There are four options — it is possible to check more than one option:

• *Separate survey* refers to whether one or more formally organised surveys have been conducted that involve some form of course evaluation. Surveys can be conducted digitally, via e.g. Canvas or Mentimeter, or by handing out paper surveys.

• *Oral evaluation in class* refers to whether there have been one or more formally organised opportunities for students to give oral feedback and/or to discuss their opinion on the course in the whole class.

• *Oral evaluation in small groups* refers to whether there have been one or more formally organised opportunities for students to give oral feedback and/or to discuss their opinion on the course in smaller groups than the whole class where each student has more space to express their opinions.

• *Other evaluation method* refers to any other formally organised evaluations that may have been carried out in another way than the three alternatives listed above. If so, the method needs to be described briefly.

Comments on the course evaluations means that the course coordinator must comment on the results of the course evaluations. The comments are aimed at current and future students on the course. The reader can be expected to have knowledge of the course's structure and organisation. It is therefore not necessary to explain the different course activities (or similar) in the comments section. Relevant things to comment on are, for example, whether there were any unexpected evaluation results or whether there are any results or occurring criticism that may need to be explained or put into context.

Examination results
Examination results refers to results from all types of examinations that have been conducted on the course (e.g. in-class exams, laboratory work, assignments, etc.). Indicate whether the examination results were overall as expected or not.

If some types of examinations differ greatly in how they turned out in relation to the expected result (for example, the expected number of students passed a written exam but only a very low number of students passed an assignment), then both options can be checked.

If the examination results deviate from what was expected, it must be commented on and indicated what reasons might be responsible for the deviation. Even in cases where the examination results are as expected, it might be necessary to comment if there are special aspects that need to be highlighted.

Recommendations and priorities for the course development
Briefly state which recommendations and priorities should be made for the upcoming course based on the results of the course evaluations and in relation to the examination results.