COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD640A	**Scope (hp): 15**
Course title: Introduction to multidisciplinary interaction design	
Course coordinator: Henrik Svarrer Larsen	**Number of registered students: 15**
Semester in which the course is conducted: HT22	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TAIND22h	

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: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) Midway: brief. plenum) Final: longer iterative coffee table model, ending in plenum	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 12
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) standard web survey, ending medio November.	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 7
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback was given to the current student group) Formative: directly Summative: canvas	

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

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five university-wide questions should be included. Compilation from digital questionnaires can be appended.) The course got high scores across the main quantitative questions: mean of 5 in almost all, with 4.1-4.9 in av. and a moderate var. of 0.7-1.5. Overall, the summative evaluations were very positive. The discussion found understandings and ways. The class as a whole lifted the following: ~ the notion of 'reflection' (for the individual tasks) was hard to grasp, to see examples from previous years might help ~ A wish for Clint to have time to follow up on aesthetics in project work, and for visits from other teachers in the programme would be welcomed ~ First project period was a bit overwhelming, yet more on theory and physical computing was desired ~ Material workshop was generally received well, but also calls for more continuous use. ~ The planner is not an ideal tool (but better than mere canvas/Kronox) ~ Shortcomings of the studio and the rooms was referred to programme level discussions ~ Final presentation & exhibition should not be on a sportslov Monday, if we want more guests ~ The cross groups interactions was essential: o Multi-group supervisions worked especially well o Opposition was a great learning opportunity for all o Parallel studio work aided the process of all

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

Summary of the teacher's views/Results: (The comments on the course's implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' actual learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes, are summarised here. Both success factors and problems are identified).

~ First and foremost, the learning across project groups was great this year, and not solely because there were fewer students.

~ The first project will always feel a bit overwhelming in the beginning of such an education, yet there is in fact also a lot to take in. Thus, more elements should not be added.

~ The groupwork and supervisions didn't manage to deal all sufficiently with theory.

~ When to start physical computing, in project 1 or later in project 2, is a balance: getting enough time experience with it (ie from early on) versus not stuffing more into the 1st project. This year we didn't start until the 2nd project and the students made more out of it than ever before. In sum, physical computing does not have to start until the second project.

~ There were more difficulties with grasping what a reflection entail than ever before, which can be taken as a call for some clarifications that works better across disciplinary backgrounds (the tutoring session follow up on this individually)

~ Where relevant and possible, Clint and other teachers in the programme play a bigger part (as previously)

~ no staff showed up this year for the lunch time exhibition (in previous years there has been a handful).

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

Analysis: (The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the analysis is based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from relevant teachers and course administrators, knowledge development in the field of research and that this analysis is done in collaboration with the teaching team.)

In general, a great course this year. The level of the final design work and crit session was high. The key alterations needed are few, but the many constructive inputs from students can help on a more detailed level.

Action plan: (The changes planned to be made in the short and long term are stated here, as well as the timetable for when the actions are planned be carried out and who is responsible for the implementation. If identified problems are left without action, this should be justified. The follow- up of proposed measures according to the previous course report(s) is presented here.)

Follow up from last year :

~ "The first project should have a clearer introduction to the related design theory and follow up in supervisions" Further work has to be done here (in the next course by teachers).

~ In the first project, articulations of the design should be supported by a framework and addressed in supervisions. Has improved, but can always get better (in the next course by teachers).

~ In the second project, the presentation should be with the demo.
The demos where (re)used in presentations. The locomotion and interactions in an exhibition is not compatible with the in prepared in-depth crits that worked so well this year, so examinations has to be separate.

~ Ioio played a bigger role.

Planned key measures based on this year's evaluation:

~ Theory in the first project as well as design articulations in the second project need to be spelled out even more in lecture/exercises and emphasized even further in supervision (in the next course by teachers).

~ The very notion of reflection (and related tasks) has to be spelled out even more (in the next course by teachers).

~ Room issues has already been referred to in Programråd (by Course coordinator).

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

X The course report is published, and the students have been informed about the publication,

X The course report is archived according to the university's archiving rules,

X The course report is shared with the programme coordinator (if applicable),

X The course report is saved according to any additional requests on behalf of the department.