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	IoT prototyping and user experience
Course code	DA641E
Semester	HT2025
Number of registered students	28
Course coordinator	Carl Magnus Olsson

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

Compulsory course evaluation

Number of responses to the compulsory course evaluation	6

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
X	Oral evaluation in class
	Oral evaluation in smaller groups
	Other evaluation method
If other evaluation method was conducted, describe how:	

Comments on the course evaluations

Overall, the course has a similar evaluation results as in previous years: few respondents (6) who are largely *very* positive (75% or more on all questions).

Among all 14 questions, only two questions had individual student answers that were below average. Two such answers came on question 2, regarding the extent that course activities had provided support for achieving the learning outcomes. One free-text comment was also given to this, where the relation between knowledge goals and examinations was commented as unclear. I am not sure how that can be so, however, as the instructions for each assignment is very explicitly addressing this – including with recommended strategies for ensuring all knowledge goals are covered and common problems to avoid. I therefore suspect that the 2 negative answers are more related to project courses do not offer the same 'do this' instructions and instead rely on students driving parts of their own learning through group work and their own problem-solving. Given that the other 4 student answers to this question were positive, we will keep this question under observation next year but not likely make any changes. I have personally reflected when examining different parts of the course that it may be better with fewer knowledge goals, as some students struggle in addressing the different nuances of them in separate sections. An argument can ofc then be made that this actually emphasizes the relevance of having them separately, but from a learning perspective I personally prefer full answers to few questions as that says more about the overall understanding and critical thinking.

The remaining one answer which was below average was on question 3, which deals with the opportunity to show how well they had achieved the learning outcomes. There was one free text comment to the question which aligns with a likely lower than average answer, this is helpful to consider. In essence, I agree with the student that the individual reflection at the end of the course (which sets the individual grade) does not test the first parts of the course regarding product design and UX. While that was by design, as the group work part of the course is 90% of the course time, I may want to change the individual reflection submission next year. It could be feasible to have an individual submission which covered both parts of the course more, but I am concerned with asking even more from the students. The course is a project course first and foremost (as indicated in the course plan), where the introductory lectures and lab only serve to ensure that all groups have a reasonable concept to work on in group, rather than test each student's understanding of UX design and evaluation skill. I have discussed with some of the others involved in running the course if there could be a way to emphasize the UX and product design aspects more, so this comment is a good indicator that there may be such interest from the students as well. One of the external factors that influences the course design to focus on the group work part is that the winter holiday period breaks the project work up, and previous iterations of the course saw a need for starting the project work earlier. Doing more with the intro parts and do an individual examination of that would postpone the start of the project. Thus, without moving the course to the start of the semester (possibly part time), I do not see an obvious way of solving this dilemma even if I fully understand where the student comes from with this comment.

Examination results

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

The project course tends to result in active students who finish all parts, possibly needing one re-submission if they missed including a particular part of the group report or individual reflection. The overall results were thus as good as usually is the case.

Recommendations and priorities for the course development

This year's change to give one extra week to the project work was beneficial for several groups as they managed to get more work completed and tested before the winter holiday period. That will thus be used in the future also.   It is relevant to consider revising the knowledge goals to a higher abstraction level, possibly with subgoals within them or translate these into instructions for good content to larger general knowledge goals.   It is also relevant to consider how/if UX and product design issues can be better tested than in the current individual reflections. Potentially, that could be done by placing greater emphasis on individual work focusing on extending the group results rather than primarily reflect on it.

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.