

COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

| Course LADOK code: KD401B | Scope (hp): 7,5 | |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|
| Course title: Interaction Design: Graphical User Interfaces | | |
| Course coordinator: Love Lagerkvist | Number of registered students: 59 | |
| Semester in which the course is conducted: HT22 | | |
| Is the course an independent course, programme been completed within a programme, enter the | | |

Administration's perspective (To be completed by course administrator)

| The administration's views: | |
|-----------------------------|--|
| | |

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

| Formative course evaluation: Programråd 2022-10-26. | Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: 2 class representatives. |
|--|--|
| Summative course evaluation: The summative report was conducted through Reflex and ran from 2021-11-03 to 2021-11-19. | Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: 34/59 students. |
| Feedback to students: Via Canvas, Programråd and the course introduct | ion. |

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

Summary of the students' course evaluations:

Conducted through survey.

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

Summary of the teacher's views/Results:

The course ran in a hybrid fashion, with most lectures and teaching activities over Zoom. Students faced the challenges expected when running a course with an on-site syllabus online, with difficulties staying focused on the computer and lacking social context. We dealt with these issues by providing on-site TA sessions and plenty of breaks during online lectures. The student survey response was mixed, with some reporting satisfaction over remote teaching and others finding it difficult to find motivation without the social space that the classroom provides.

We reworked the material, schedule, and assignments with an increased focus on the design of the titular graphical user interfaces, as opposed to what had previously amounted to a more generalist approach to graphic design. The new course content was more opinionated and extensively used Figma as a single place for lecture slides, exercises, and assignment work. This effort was primarily a success, as indicated by positive student feedback in the survey and the quality of student work displaying an increased understanding of matters relating to interaction design in general and GUIs in particular.

We used interactive courses from the service Scrimba as the primary programming course material, covering a curated subset of topics during lectures. This structure mirrors the next course, "Programming." Some students experienced this as a bit disconnected. Most submissions to the programming assignment displayed an expected level of proficiency and understanding.

Analysis and action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

Analysis:

Most of the issues identified by students and staff would be addressed simply by running the course on-site, per the syllabus's intention. The reworked material and course structure resulted in a sharper understanding of GUI design. However, some students experienced the programming aspects as disconnected from the rest of the course.

Action plan:

More programming aspects could be addressed during the lectures. In addition, a mid-course programming checkpoint would help ensure that students are on the right track. This might not fit into the current assignment structure, but could be something done in conjunction with TAs.



Publishing and archiving (To be handled by the course administrator)

- The course report is published, and the students have been informed about the publication,
- The course report is archived according to the university's archiving rules,
- The course report is shared with the programme coordinator (if applicable),
- The course report is saved according to any additional requests on behalf of the department.