COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: **KD641**	**Scope (hp):** **15**
Course title: **Embodied Interaction**	
Course coordinator: **Susan Kozel**	**Number of registered students:** **34**
Semester in which the course is conducted: **HT2023**	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. **It is part of the first year of the IDM (Interaction Design Master programme)**	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) We had a brief and quite general discussion following the project presentations in January 2024. We did not have a dedicated discussion for course feedback, deciding instead to devote the time to project preparation.	**Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):** 25
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) ☐ Only via Canvas ☐ Canvas and other form ☐ Only other form (written and/or oral)	**Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:** 13 students completed the course evaluation

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:

- According to the evaluation results most students enjoyed the course, or were neither happy nor unhappy
- They found the content engaging but felt it was either not structured enough or confusingly structured.
- The fairly open design brief was difficult for some – they wanted more explicit guidance
- Most students liked the introduction to a wide range of literature and prototyping methods
- They appreciated the contribution by Charles Windlin on somatic prototyping techniques
- An ongoing problem is that this course is divided by the Christmas break and momentum is broken
- Students wanted more teacher time
- There was a lot of knowledge to consume in a short time
- most students felt that the working methods and learning activities supported their learning and their ability to achieve the expected learning outcomes.

- They felt that the course's Canvas page did not support them in the way they needed

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

Summary of the teacher's views:

- This group was energetic and diverse, largely because of the extremely large numger, however having 35 students placed strain on resources such as teacher time, materials experimentation, and project support.
- We were too large a goup for the IDM year 1 studio and this meant we had our classes, seminars and prototyping in many different rooms in Orkanen and Niagara. This fragmentation had a strong impact on this course, making it confusing and contributed to the students feeling that the course was unstructured.
- The lack of a home studio, due to running from classroom to classroom, meant that the actual physical design processes occurred much later in the 10 week time frame.
- Despite this, the students produced surprisingly good prototypes and their written papers were of a good quality, but most of the work happened on their own over the Christmas break.
- The student's technical prototyping abilities were mixed (this is normal), but the technical support provided by the TA's and the project prototyping guidance from Charles Windlin were very valuable.
- Despite (or perhaps because of) the structuring difficulties, I believe the students cultivated maturity, independence and ethical collaboration. They were very generous with each other and with us, their teachers.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

The underlaying 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.

The following changes are planned in the short and long term:
WHAT should be done, WHO should do it and WHEN should it be done?

- This course will be moved in the calendar so that we will not longer struggle with the Christmas break.
- It will be restructured and streamlined (with fewer seminars and more emphasis on supported design work)
- I will teach the course with Anne-Marie Hansen so that some of the more-than-human and relational design approaches from the old Relational Design course will be integrated into the course plan. (This is consistent with the syllabus, so no redesign is required for 2025)
- As the third course it the first year (rather than the second course) it come after a prototyping course, so the students should enter it with more confidence and skills in working with digital and other materials
- Next year we will have a dedicated time for course evaluation. This will be particularly important given the shifts to structure.

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