

## 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> 15,0 hp
<b>Course title:</b> Introduction to multi-disciplinary interaction design	
<b>Course coordinator:</b> Henrik Svarrer Larsen	<b>Number of registered students:</b> 30
<b>Semester in which the course is conducted:</b> HT25	
<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.</b> TAIND25/TAINE25	

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

<b>Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)</b> midway & end	<b>Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):</b> 18
<b>Summative course evaluation (obligatory)</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Only via Canvas X <input type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form (oral at the end) <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral)	<b>Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:</b> 8 (sunet) 18 (oral)

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

<p><b>Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:</b></p> <p>Sunet</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Generally: The following factors limit how much can be learned from the Sunet: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>very few participated (normally it is twice as high),</li> <li>high deviations, upp to 2.2 (also compared to previous year) ; literally several spreading from 1 to 6</li> <li>comments often point in different directions</li> </ul> </li> <li>The scores directly relating to the course itself range from 3.9 to 4.9 (but as mentioned with high deviation). The only exception is 7 ("..given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?") which all is high (5.6).</li> </ul> <p>Oral (very broad and lengthy session, so here solely significant coherent items)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The idea of a workshop on intercultural communication was promoted; yet, group troubles were otherwise not lifted forward let alone analysed</li> <li>Drama teacher and sessions were really good for designing and class bonding</li> <li>Sharing between groups is valuable</li> <li>Room was disturbed by verkstaden</li> <li>The structure built around DD model was helpful</li> </ul>
---

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

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

- The single project structure worked well (suggestion from last year's report).
- Separate exhibition and presentation days worked well (suggestion from last year's report).
- Lowering the ambitions with MicroBits (suggestion from last year's report) and lifting general ideation methods seemed to work well and was well supported by the TA.
- This year, the reflection tasks were less open and more structured (suggestion from last year's report). Despite this and even though this intro course is fairly light on the academic side, we this year saw many students struggling with basic writing and reflection (with the effect that the first tutoring session often became more like basic teaching and that many almost failed). It also seemed like some students were surprised by the expectations of some bachelor level academic skills. This is new.
- The class was bigger than ever, double the size of several other years. Thus, we had to improvise a room near the Verkstad's noise, plus we kept the Studio for supervisions and so students could go there when needed. The proximity to Verkstaden seemed to support more use of it. Overall, the room situation generally kinda worked despite taxing instances of noise during class.
- The course has a planner with day-to-day instructions and rely on the master students running a design project. Normally there is barely any absence from the course. This year, however, was different with absences from day 1. Unsurprisingly, such create tensions in groups.
- The collaboration with drama teacher around workshops were a great success with regards to curiosity, learning and social cohesion, but also where we saw the most absence.
- The social cohesion was weaker this year; perhaps due to the combined effect of the following:
  - big class size
  - not having their own room to decorate/and inhabit (like normally in the studio)
  - too many students' (early) absence.

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

### **The following changes are planned in the short and long term:**

Inspecting the acceptance criteria/procedure:

- to get students that benefit from this education  
[Programme responsible; already happening];
- avoid the extreme fluctuation in student number and subsequent room improvisation when class is big  
[has been communicated to leaders, process unknown] .
- If the latter is not possible,  
then in forehand organize a suitable (noise levels, studio-type, ownership) big class sized room.  
[has been communicated to leaders, process unknown].
- There has previously been an external part on collaboration skills which didn't add anything. While intercultural understanding is key (and possibly generally under-addressed in K3), the locomotion we saw is more readily explained by the tension between the this year very different ambition levels internally in the groups. Nevertheless, it is definitely worth keeping an eye on.  
[course responsible, short and long term].

Remember to 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