

## COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

### Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD400B	Scope (hp): 7.5
Course title: Interaction Design: Methods I	
Course coordinator: Anne-Marie Hansen	Number of registered students: 72
Semester in which the course is conducted: HT24	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGIDE24h Interaction design bachelor.	

### Forms of evaluation and feedback (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)	Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s): none
<b>Summative course evaluation (obligatory)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: 29

### Student's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)

<p><b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Majority of the students seemed satisfied with the course. Comments were that the course was relaxed, yet challenging. This must be due to a relaxed atmosphere in the group work and between teachers and students. Students expressed a lot of learning. Several students enjoyed the group work and experienced it as a good and welcoming start of the study.</li> <li>Students expressed that the course has a good structure, was well thought out, and it was hard to fall behind. Other students thought that the course operated too much on the surface level, but also acknowledged that it as an intro course and that other courses might go into more depth later.</li> <li>Some felt that the exams were harshly graded (response to the analysis of the artefact) and that the comments were not fair.</li> <li>Some students felt that feedback in supervisions was sometimes contrasting. Others felt that it was supportive and informative. Many expressed that teachers were friendly and helpful.</li> <li>A fair amount of students asked for more theory on interaction design and UX.</li> <li><b>Suggestions for improvements:</b> learning from other groups' questions in a shared workshop. The instructions and critique from the artefact assignment was harsh and needs to be more fair. Clarifications on the requirements for the artefact assignment needed. Examples of student work for the exams would have been helpful. More lectures and theory to support this assignment. More classes on interaction design and UX. The room situation where there were not enough room for all students and the lecture halls did not support group work needs to be improved. Clearer instructions for presentations. Wishes</li> </ul>
--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

for more teambuilding activities. Issues with classrooms too far apart, so that students lost 30 minutes of a workshop because there was transportation between the two classrooms.

### **Teacher's perspective (To be completed by the course coordinator)**

#### **Summary of the teacher's views:**

- This year we had 15-20 students more than expected. This created problems in terms of finding appropriate classrooms for group work in in-class workshops. Furthermore, classrooms were spread across Malmö city and students missed 30 minutes of a workshop because they had to transport themselves from one place to another.
- Because of the big number of students, student groups were bigger than usual (7-8 persons per group). This did not create more group conflicts than usual. However, a few students mentioned that the group was too big for the amount of project work they could do.
- Because of the bigger number of students, we asked an adjunct who was not a teacher in the course to grade the analysis of an artefact exam. The course coordinator and the adjunct had a meeting about the grading. However, the grading procedure for this assignment could have been following a grading rubric to make things more fair.
- There can be misunderstandings in terms of how the artefact analysis should be conducted. Students would have liked more theory on interactivity and UX to support their work with this assignment.
- Most groups worked well together in spite of the big groups. This also became obvious when reading the written reflections. The tools for organizing group work worked well.
- Many students did not follow the instructions for the individual reflection in terms of references and figure text. Students were reminded to follow the instructions by having to resubmit the written reflections to add references and fix figure texts.
- Some students experienced conflicting feedback from teachers. Teachers see this as part of the learning where it is up to the students to take their own stand and form their own opinions. Sometimes teachers challenge students by giving conflicting feedback. This is why we have two teachers present in supervision sessions and at presentations.

### **Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)**

The underlying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

#### **The following changes are planned in the short and long term:**

WHAT should be done, WHO should do it and WHEN should it be done?

- Teachers: Reformulation of the written reflection so that it covers more aspects of the design process and group work. It should be possible to fail this assignment in case students were not so active in group work.
- Teachers: Review of the instructions for the analysis of the artefact. Teachers should consider to have two lectures about interactivity and UX and more theory related to these topics.
- Teachers: review of the instructions for presentations.
- Course coordinator and administration: We need a backup plan in case we have more students entering the study than we have room for. In other words, we need to plan differently, so that we assume 70 students and have a plan B ready at hand and the resources that it requires already planned for 6 months before the course starts.

Remember to orally feedback the results of the course evaluation to

- the students who have completed the course evaluation
- the students of the next course round, i.e. the next time the course is given