COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD640A	**Scope (hp):** 15,0 hp
Course title: Introduction to multidisciplinary interaction design	
Course coordinator: Yénika Castillo Muñoz	**Number of registered students:** 34
Semester in which the course is conducted: Autumn 2023	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name: TAIND, TAINE	

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) Two formative evaluations were carried on, orally in the classroom after each module: 28 september 2023 3 november 2023 Besides this, two program advisory meetings were carried out with the participation of two student representatives, on: 20 september 2023 6 december 2023	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 34
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) The course evaluation survey that is managed by the student administration 20 november 2023	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 18
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback was given to the current student group) On the formative evaluations, the format was more of a dialogue, with students receiving comments and feedback in the same session, as well as written feedback on their examination submissions.	

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

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five university-wide questions should be included:

1. To what extent do you feel you have achieved the course's intended learning outcomes?

89% of students answer in the higher numbers (average 4.5/6), with 17% answering "to a very large extent". 12% of students (2 persons) answered on the lower side.
The comments are overall positive, however already in this part we can see that people mention the tensions arisen from group-work in a totally new setting.

2. To what extent do you feel the course's working methods/learning activities have been a support in your learning to achieve the intended learning outcomes?

In general, the methods evaluated have a good average, with the assignments (projects, more practice-based) having the highest average of 4.4/6. In the comments, students appreciated the lectures and literature as a way of anchoring theory and practice, however the literature seminars were experienced as more general and difficult to participate in given the amount of students and questions, which would have to be updated or rethought in case of a similar setting.
A question that we missed to add in the survey was about individual tutorings: Students rated "other teaching activities" (unspecified) with 81% of answers in the higher side of the scale, with an average of 4.4/6. In the comments, the individual tutorings are mentioned as a valuable moment to reflect on their progress.
The Canvas as a tool was the one receiving lower average and more mixed reviews, both in the survey and in the formative evaluations. Some students found it very useful and others found it cumbersome and difficult to navigate, as well as the anxiety produced by having Canvas+Kronox and an inherited *planner*, a file with details on activities, readings, etc, that we tried to adapt in the best way. For upcoming courses, the use of these tools should be streamlined for the students to experience consistency.

3. To what extent do you feel the course's examination forms have given you the opportunity to show how well you have achieved the intended learning outcomes?

The main examination forms were the team presentations and a final individual reflection, which were rated as a general question with 4.4/6.
In the last formative session, students commented that they would like to have a stronger individual examination to assess individual process and skills, as they mention that it is easy to repeat skills they already know in a group setting with limited time, so less room to experiment or acquire new skills.

4. To what extent do you feel the course has met your expectations in general?

The average was 4.4 out of 6, with 72% students answering in the higher side of the scale. The comments range from "It actually exceeded my expectations" to "… For me a bit repetitive, but I understand it was to give us a base of knowledge". Again, comments mention the difficulty of working in groups with different backgrounds and interests, even when they feel the results were over their expectations. A person mentions that the first project was very insightful, whereas the second one felt more of a repetition (even if the implementation of some sort of technology and prototyping was expected here).

5. To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?

The response here is very high with 69% of students answering with 5 or 6 out of 6.
The Arduino guidance sessions are mentioned as very well structured for self-learning, but also with the comment of that the videos provided can be very good to use as preparation *before* the work with the Teacher assistants.
Another comment points out at the work load was more used into managing the projects rather than learning new skills, something that can be reinforced and encouraged through group contracts.

Compilation from digital questionnaires can be appended.)

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).

This edition of the course posed significant challenges:
- Main responsible teacher on sick leave
- An amount of students that overrated the expectation of previous years' enrollment
- Facilities that were insufficient to hold full class sessions because of this reason

However, the team of teachers that was assigned to this class handled things in a very professional way, with both expert professors such as Simon Niedenthal and Per Linde and younger teachers like Sarah Skavron and myself, willing to adapt the circumstances to sustain the course. The suppot of the teacher assistant Josefiné Klintberg was very appreciated not only for the content on digital prototyping but as a link to what they can expect from the second year.

The single biggest challenge from the course administration point of view, was finding the right facilities for the students, when realizing in the first day of class that the Studio was going to be insufficient; as well as some workshop access and preparations, and equipment. The studio though, shouldn't be dismissed as an important resource to access for independent work.

The students themselves also had some challenges derived from the rich cultural diversity of the class, being teamwork both an asset and an obstacle. This, in terms of handling conflict, is always difficult to predict as teachers working with a whole new generation, however it seems like the students overcame these difficulties. Most students report being satisfied with the results of the course, as well as the team of teachers with the progression and outcomes presented.

The learnings of this course regarding management of times and facilities were transferred in time to the following course.

We as teachers also saw a good progress in the last exhibition where students showed their final projects.

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, and according to what I stated before, the main issue with this year's course was the unexpected high amount of students and the last-minute adaptations we needed to do un order to accommodate all expected sessions and individual tutorings, which require a good amount of extra hours by teachers.

Ideally, there should be a way for the course responsible to know what amount of students should we expect to plan accordingly if everything is meant to be kept. As well as being ready to adapt or enrich certain parts as we see are in need in the class, such as group work and its

difficulties. The openness and professionalism of the team was very appreciated.

If we see ourselves again in a similar situation, from all the planned learning activities, we might then have to discuss what to prioritise, to still have time and space for other things that the students consider important for their learning, for example, skill-sharing.

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.)

For consideration:
- To the expectation of having more time for skills-sharing, more dedicated or efficient Arduino learning or even simply to get to know the group and engage with theory, the answer could be to reduce to one single project in the course that can leave more room for other activities, instead of two short projects that may repeat themselves a bit.
- Reducing individual tutorings in case other things need to be prioritized, simply for the amount of human resources they require – or increasing the pool of teachers that can be engaged in different stages and offer the students different perspectives in the three moments of individual tutorings.

Important things to be implemented:
- An earlier and more effective introduction to the prototyping facilities (workshop and ioio), with the respective fees and responsibilities.
- Students really appreaciate feedback so we might make more space for richer discussions in their project presentations.
- Literature was well curated but literature seminars need to be rethought or planned in a way that they really support the reflection and connection of theory and practice, and not an activity that can easily be skipped.
- We the teachers need more facilitation tools to support the group work and arising conflicts due to cultural or professional backgrounds.

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.