COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD400B	**Scope (hp):** 7,5 hp
Course title: Interaction Design: Methods I	
Course coordinator: Anne-Marie Hansen	**Number of registered students: 43**
Semester in which the course is conducted: HT25	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGIDE25	

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):**
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) x Only via Canvas ☐ Canvas and other form ☐ Only other form (written and/or oral)	**Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: 13 out of 48**

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:
- The overall feedback was that the course was medium to very good on all accounts.
- Good in the course: forced to think out of the box and work with people you did not know. The course helped to set a base for future courses. It introduce what interaction design is with a lot of practical exercises. The structure was good – a balance between lectures and practical work. The content was easy to understand.
- Improvements: More precise instructions for assignments. It starts very slowly. Students would have liked more time for the develop and deliver phases in the double diamond. The content on canvas needs improvements, but there were no comments on how it could be improved.

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

Summary of the teacher's views:
- The course went well with engaged student groups that understood the assignments and seemed to enjoy the practical work. Their presentations showed that they learned a lot from the practical work, and most groups were able to critically evaluate their work, pick up on their learnings and give the project a new direction.
- Note: the teacher from the programming course asked if it is possible to keep deadlines for the course assignments inside the timeframe of the course. Thus, also based on the student feedback as well: a suggestion is to shorten the two first phases of the double diamond to last 1.5 week instead of 2 weeks, and have the develop and deliver phases

take up the rest of the time, leaving room to do the final written assignment within the timeframe of the course.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

The underlaying 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?

- shorten the two first phases of the double diamond to last 1.5 week instead of 2 weeks, and have the develop and deliver phases take up the rest of the time, leaving room to do the final written assignment within the timeframe of the course. The course responsible should plan the course slightly differently next time.

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