

COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD641A	Scope (hp): 15
Course title: Embodied interaction	
Course coordinator: Susan Kozel	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) A discussion was conducted in class on the day of the final project presentations: 2023-01-09	Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: The whole class: 15 students
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) Online survey administered by K3 student services	Number of students who participated in the course evaluation: 9 students
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback was given to the current student group) Feedback was part of the general discussion. This report will be circulated to the group (those that have stayed to be part of the second year) and will be presented to the new class in November.	

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.)

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 is a multi-layered course that spans the Christmas break. Students have lectures, seminars, prototyping instruction and support for academic writing. This is reflected in the deliverables of a group project based on

a functioning or semi-functioning prototype and a sole-authored paper. Uniting the 2 strands of the course is always a challenge but in 2022 the teachers (Susan as course responsible and David co-teaching the prototyping parts) mostly managed very well. Of course there can always be improvements.

The actual outcomes corresponded almost exactly course's learning outcomes: students learned design elements, theories and methods relevant to embodied interaction; they engaged with the academic literature; and they integrated methods, materials, and critical/theoretical perspective into their design work.

In terms of metrics, the course got a 5.2 out of 6 overall, with 5.3 and 5.4 and 5.3 on literature, lectures and assignments.

This was a successful course and in 2022 it was particularly satisfying to teach. The students were engaged and supportive of one another. They discussed freely in class and provided peer feedback on group projects. Their projects were based on mostly strong design concepts and demonstrated varying but acceptable degrees of functionality. Their academic papers ranged from satisfactory to very strong. The field trip to Copenhagen Contemporary was an important excursion both pedagogically and socially.

Problems were mainly relating to a need for further support on the part of Susan and David for project development, and the speed plus contact hours of the programming component. Some issues were reported regarding the calendar and timing of deliverables. These issues will be addressed further in the next sections.

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.)

This analysis is done in relation to student feedback.

Strengths (some words reproduced directly from student evaluations):

- Inspiring and engaging course. Exceeded expectations. "In general this course was superb." The course provided insightful perspectives into social matters, backed up by literature and inspiring articles.
- What worked about the course was the balance between readings, discussion and project. Students liked the wide range of literature, and the emphasis on journalistic perspectives to emphasise the real-world aspects of embodied Interaction. Liked the way the seminars were organized according to different topics. PPTs were clear
- Students appreciated the dedication and flexibility of both teachers
- They liked the trip to Copenhagen and being treated as 'master's students', which included being able to decide on how to spend some of the budget on materials.
- In terms of quality of student life: the transition from the Intro course was effective, where they were able to shift gears (to de-stress) and think and discuss before accelerating into projects once again. A deepening occurred. They appreciated being able to do readings and programming tutorials from home, and the zoom based writing seminars.

Areas to be addressed:

- Some students wanted the theories explained more clearly with examples.
- The programming could be explained better and more slowly to support students without technical experience. They said they had to learn from their peers.

- Some students felt that the projects though didn't reach their potential, due to lack of guidance from all teaching staff.
- Some Canvas glitches need to be ironed out (mainly calendar), and calendar is requested more than 2 weeks in advance of the course. Groups assigned earlier (possibly assigned by the teacher) because "Something has to be done about the Christmas break". This break is a major source of disruption for the course and the strategies we implement can never fully bridge the gap, but we always try new ones.
- The timing of the final project presentation after Christmas needs to be examined. A big problem was the verkstaden not being open in the first week of January. Students were not able to make as much progress as they hoped.
- Getting the groups to interact more reflectively into each others projects
- Susan more present during the project development.

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.)

The main item on the action plan is not to tamper with the aspects of the course that are working very well. These action items are more or less fine-tunings in relation to calendar, staff hours and content that can make it even stronger. They map directly onto the areas for improvement above. All items are to be implemented by Susan as course responsible and will be implemented for the 2023 delivery of the course:

1. Ensure more examples are given to ground theories
2. Implement a different approach to prototyping instruction in 2023 (with greater presence of the teacher responsible for prototyping) and for teacher support throughout the key weeks prior to Christmas and in early January.
3. more scheduled time with both teachers, and with TA's, during the course.
4. Release Canvas calendar earlier. Assign groups earlier.
5. Restructure the deliverables for the course so that the paper is due when the project is usually due (around 6 Jan) and the project is due the final day of term.
6. Assign respondent groups for both the milestone and the final project presentation
7. Susan to arrange a sign up system for her support during project development and not only during pre-arranged seminar times.

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.