COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD418A	**Scope (hp):** 15,0
Course title: Interaction Design in Society	
Course coordinator: Reitsma Lizette	**Number of registered students:** 25
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT25	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGIDE23	

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):** Approx. 15
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:** 7

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback: Students were notably positive about the overall experience of the course. One student described it as the "best course so far", noting that it had a different tone from other courses and that this was greatly appreciated.
Online questionnaire (7 respondents, 28% response rate). Overall course satisfaction: 4.7/6 (SD 1.4). Students' expectations were met (4.6/6). Learning outcomes were clear and achievable (5.1/6). Exam forms felt appropriate (4.9/6). Students rated their own learning highly (5.1/6).

Highlights from comments:

- Real stakeholders, genuine briefs and real risks made the project meaningful
- The library partnership and access to professional context was valued
- Feminist design literature was appreciated as a new perspective
- Freedom and trust given to students was positively noted
- Jens's seminars (including the paper on war and peace in co-design) were highlighted
- Per's critical exercises with follow-up activities were praised

Areas students flagged for improvement:

- Canvas scored lowest (2.9/6, SD 2.0): calendar not in place from the start, pages not updated after changes, unclear deliverable information, feedback not experienced as sufficiently critical
- Structure and organisation: some content felt delayed or poorly sequenced; one large reading assigned in the same week as its seminar felt spontaneous
- Some literature felt too heavy given the project workload
- Seminars had the widest spread (3.9/6, SD 2.0), indicating mixed experiences
- Some sessions had to be postponed due to unforeseen reasons, which was uncomfortable for students planning activities outside university
- During the half-way presentations some of the students felt they did not get equal time for feedback.

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

This was the first year the course used oral exams, and the format worked very well. The teaching team gained a much deeper understanding of what students had actually learned. Students were also noticeably engaged, and several groups produced work of direct value to the library. Some were asked by the library to share their results and to come back for additional presentations. The students were active in there collaboration with the partners as they themselves initiated the handovers.

The teaching team was pleased with the range of cases and the engagement of the library as a real stakeholder. The partnership with the library, including the use of the library space and access to professional context, worked well.

Areas the teaching team reflected on:

- There was a handover to the stakeholders at the end of the project but they did not feel like a formal ending because we had to split up the groups, due to limited space, only around half the class could attend in each session. This was a practical constraint, not a sign of student disengagement
- The introduction and conclusion of the course could be stronger. Students lacked a clear sense of what to expect at the start, and there was no shared, formal close
- The openness of the assignments was intentional but created uncertainty for some students; the scope of the topic was broad
- More shared supervisions and dedicated time for supporting students with project work would be beneficial
- Because some sessions had to be postponed due to unforeseen reasons, the structure of the course was not performed as planned, causing messiness in the sequences.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

All actions will be carried out by the teacher team, with Lizette Reitsma as main responsible.

- We will design a clear and formal closing of the course: a final presentation where all students can attend, followed by a shared evaluation session.
- We will strengthen the introduction of the course so that students have a clearer picture of expectations, structure, and deliverables from the start.
- We will plan more shared supervision sessions to provide consistent and adequate support for student project work.
- We will update and maintain Canvas consistently throughout the course, ensuring the calendar, deliverable information, and any changes are communicated promptly.

For the next round of the course we will create a Canvas guide for students and an internal communication protocol for the teaching team.

- We will structure the halfway presentations to ensure all groups receive equal time for feedback.

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