COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD418A	**Scope (hp):** 15,0 hp
Course title: Interaction Design in Society	
Course coordinator: Reitsma Lizette	**Number of registered students: 38**
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT26	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TGIDE-HT2024	

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):** All students, as we held it after the course's final presentations.
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:** **5**

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:

Student perspective (questionnaire)

There were only 5 responses. Overall course rating was very high: mean 5.6/6, with all respondents rating the course 5 or 6. One student described it as "one of the best courses in the programme so far." Students felt the course met their expectations well (mean 5.2/6) and particularly valued: working with real external stakeholders on a genuine project; the integration of theory and practice; the continuity of the group project across the whole course; and the critical and ethical angle on design.

The most effective learning activities were the assignments (5.4/6) and seminars (5.4/6). The oral examination was highlighted as a strong format (exam forms: mean 5.6/6).

Students experienced the course as giving them real responsibility for their own learning (mean 5.8/6), which most perceived positively.

Areas for development: Canvas organisation received the lowest score (3.6/6), and the literature reading received 3.8/6. Students indicated that some critical exercises felt more like seminars and were not clearly integrated into the project work. The annotated portfolio

was found confusing — partly due to a mismatch between provided examples and the actual assignment brief.

Student perspective (oral evaluation)

The critical exercises were consistently praised. The design game / materials of co-design exercise was highlighted as especially useful for designing co-design activities. Students appreciated that critical exercises had their own dedicated time slots, separate from project work, and felt three-hour sessions were the right length.

Working with real stakeholders, and with non-technological forms of interaction, was experienced as broadening. Students valued gaining experience with co-design approaches and engaging with a genuine design challenge in the public or civil sector.

Areas for Development:

The openness of the course was experienced as both a strength and a challenge. Some students appreciated the autonomy; others found the lack of structure during quieter weeks difficult and felt they had to seek out too much information independently. Inconsistency between teachers in their Canvas communication and around expectations for the final deliverables was flagged as a concern, in particular, different groups received different information about the final output. Students would have appreciated having two teachers present at group supervisions to receive broader perspectives and more consistent guidance. They would also have liked a critical exercise placed towards the end of the course.

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

Summary of the teacher's views:

The course structure, with clearly defined modules and a progression from project framing through fieldwork to final handover, worked well. The variety of critical exercises, covering themes of literacy, publics, governmentality, and politics of design, provided strong theoretical support for student reflection and directly improved the quality of the annotated portfolios. The range of stakeholder cases this year was broad and diverse, which was seen as a positive: students engaged with genuinely varied design challenges.

The quality of annotated portfolios was notably higher than in previous runs. The critical exercise themes gave students a well-structured vocabulary and set of lenses for reflection, which translated clearly into stronger analytical writing in the portfolios.

To support students with framing their portfolio examples, particularly as groups were not all working on library projects, making the provided examples a less direct reference point, a walk-in session was held where students could check whether their chosen examples worked for the assignment. This was a useful additional support mechanism.

Areas for improvement:

The content of the argumentative essay was not sufficiently reflected in the oral examination. The delivery of Learning Outcome 4 'communicating outcomes to an external stakeholder' was too minimal: in VT26 this was a presentation, which did not adequately capture the complexity and depth of what a real stakeholder handover requires. More shared (joint-teacher) supervisions are needed to improve consistency and give

students richer feedback. Students needed more dedicated time for project support, particularly in weeks where no critical exercise was scheduled.

The size of the student group this year made the course more demanding to run. A notable challenge was a relatively large number of students who did not appear to actively participate, whether in sessions, in their groups, or in the course as a whole. This placed additional pressure on the teacher team and affected group dynamics in some cases.

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.

- **Revise the oral examination** to include argumentative and critical content currently covered only in the essay, so that LO coverage is fully reflected in the exam format. *(Before VT27 course start)*
- **Change the LO4 examination** from a stakeholder presentation to a Stakeholder Communication and Handover Package (group assignment; HP4). *(Course redesign, VT27)*
- **Increase the number of joint supervisions** (with two teachers present), especially in Module 2, to ensure consistency and give students richer feedback. *(VT27 scheduling)*
- **Add more dedicated project support slots** in weeks without a critical exercise, so students have structured time for project work throughout the course. *(VT27 schedule revision)*
- **Add a critical exercise in Module 3** (the final module), to give students theoretical support in the wrapping-up phase. *(VT27 planner)*
- **Improve Canvas structure and consistency**: align all teacher communication and ensure all groups receive identical information about final deliverable expectations. *(Before VT27 course start)*
- **Clarify the annotated portfolio brief** and update or replace the provided examples so they match the actual assignment and the broader range of stakeholder cases. *(Before VT27 course start)*
- **Review the literature list** and consider replacing or supplementing readings. *(Before VT27 course start)*