COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD414A	**Scope (hp):** 15,0 hp
Course title: Interactivity	
Course coordinator: Clint Heyer	**Number of registered students:** 41
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. TGIDE24	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) Programråd	Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s): Whole class via class reps
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) ☐ Only via Canvas ☒ Canvas and other form ☐ Only other form (written and/or oral)	Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: In-person discussion: 15 students Online survey: 2 students

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:

- Studio was noisy to work in, this made it difficult for some to concentrate. Especially the case during the audio-based module
- Journal
  - Could use more feedback sessions, felt it was neglected after the start of course
  - Could be made more explicit that feedback was available to students afterwards
- Coaching
  - Variation would be useful – eg avoiding where the same person is giving feedback two days in a row
- Show'n'tells
  - Like the informal format
  - Midway show'n'tells useful, an advantage to those that get to present. Random selection is OK, would be nice if whole class could present. Maybe it could be done in clusters?
- Pairs: For some working in a pair didn't give any benefit, for others it did. Some confusion at the beginning (also brought up in programråd) about whether people need to work on separate sketches or together.
- Literature
  - Would be good to have this spaced out
  - Reading questions appreciated
  - Timing of lit seminars could sometimes be better
- Tech
  - Some would have liked more in-depth explanation of how the material worked (eg computer vision)
  - Liked that first module was so simple, gave a chance to ease into things

- o CV module was particularly fun
- Exchange students:
  - o Used to very concrete assessments and rubrics. Like that it's not just trying to find a solution, but more explorative

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

Summary of the teacher's views:
- There were fewer pair conflicts this year, but for the first time a lot more cases where people essentially worked individually. We're not sure why/how that came about – it has never been an issue previously.
- Overall attendance and participation was more problematic this year. This causes a number of issues: pairs don't get feedback together, or have to work in parallel, people find it more difficult because they weren't at seminars/workshops or able to ask a teacher in person, people are out of the loop of what the goals are etc. This could in part be explained by the larger cohort.
- We used audio input as a material for a module, for the second time. It seemed more challenging than last time, perhaps this too is due to more people and noise in the room.
- We also saw a lot more usage of AI to make sketches. While this is not necessarily a problem, it did lead people to have sketches they weren't able to iteratively tweak or nuance according to the module.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

The following changes are planned in the short and long term:
- If we use audio as an input, we probably should provide microphones too
- We requested some noise-absorption panels to help with the studio space
- Timing of literature seminars, and who's coaching when can be looked at more carefully
- Clarify pairworking in terms of sketches
- Consider ways of stretching out journal feedback over the course