

## COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

### Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

<b>Course LADOK code:</b> KD640A	<b>Scope (hp):</b> 15
<b>Course title:</b> Introduction to multidisciplinary interaction design	
<b>Course coordinator:</b> Per Linde	<b>Number of registered students:</b> 17
<b>Semester in which the course is conducted:</b> HT24	
<b>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+TAINE24h</b>	

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

<b>Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)</b>  2 times: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Midway</li> <li>- Final</li> </ul>	<b>Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):</b>  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Midway: 12 students</li> <li>- Final: 14 students</li> </ul>
<b>Summative course evaluation (obligatory)</b> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas <input type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	<b>Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:</b>  7 students out of 15 active students

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

<p><b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Points 1,2 &amp; 3 from the survey: Overall, the course was received well with high rating (6.4; 0.5). Generally positive, both in contents and execution. Some improvements: It was a recurring theme that two projects in the course had been challenging.</li> <li>• Points 4 &amp; 5 from the survey: High score (4.9) and low deviation (0.9) on achieving the learning outcomes. Working methods and activities: Lectures, seminars, assignments, other teaching activities: Similarly, high score (4.6-4.9) and low deviation (0.7-1.3). The verbal evaluation indicated that:           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Especially the class exercises worked well,</li> <li>○ The students struggled to benefit from the two-project structure.</li> <li>○ The second project was experienced as more time-consuming because of the inclusion of micro:bit, as some students had further ambitions.</li> <li>○ Opposition and double-groups supervisions were very helpful.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---

- The lectures on Aesthetics could benefit from including more examples of tangibles.

However, Canvas as a platform got a lower rate of 3. The verbal evaluation indicated that:

- The combination of communication channels and some of the ad hoc planning troubled the students.
- Points 6, & 7 from the survey: The students think they got the opportunity to show how well they achieved the ILOs: High score (4.1) deviation (1.1), and good opportunity to take responsibility for their own learning (4.1; 1.3). Nonetheless, some students had expected that the pass/fail mark was to be accompanied by detailed descriptions.
- Point 8: Regarding the used time in the course, the score of 7.7. which equals an average 40 h. However, some students felt overwhelmed by the work load.

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

#### **Summary of the teacher's views:**

Generally, the class worked well. However, this year several students struggled with more reflective tasks (especially the reflective stance on the design project models and designing the design process); nonetheless, they managed to pass.

This year's increased emphasis on Artefact behaviour played out well.

This year, the use of electronics overall worked well, but to some degree also risked derailing the design process at one point.

Due to practical circumstances, at times the planning became a bit too ad-hoc.

### **Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)**

The underlying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

For consideration to the next course:

- Given the tech-heavy course now coming right after this course, we might lower the emphasis on electronics (also to remedy the risk of tech fixation)
- Regarding the experience that two projects in the course become too tight: It has been possible to do before, but perhaps the layout of the course can be redesigned to only have one project -or two projects with different distribution of elements (Course responsible).

- The Aesthetics part t might play a stronger role once the students have completed one iteration in a single-project layout, or after the first project, in a two-project layout. (Course responsible).
- This year we had separate exhibition and presentation dates, which was experienced as positive. (Teachers)
- 
- Perhaps reflection needs to be further facilitated / scaffolded. (Teachers)

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