COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KD647A	**Scope (hp):** 15,0
Course title: Interaction Design: Thesis Project II	
Course coordinator: Niedenthal Simon	**Number of registered students:** 11
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT25	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. TAIND23	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional)	Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):
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: 1**

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:
Scant feedback came in the online survey, only one student responded:

What do you think about the course as a whole?

"Supervisor and examiner assignments where chosen well. However, inconsistency of information on the Canvas page, especially formal guidelines had created some confusion."

What has been good about the course?

"Supervisor and examiner assignments, and responding to our request for a formal evaluation rubric which seems as if it helped in making the examination process smoother for both sides."

What can be improved in the course?

"Definitely would be good to update the Canvas page formal requirements. Could be interesting to provide some sort of guidelines for peer-review. It seems some people take it more seriously than others."

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

Summary of the teacher's views:
Following TP1, this student cohort expressed serious concerns about consistency in examination. We responded by:

1. Initiating meetings in which the supervisor/examiner faculty discussed the LOs. Where do students tend to fall short? Can we unpack the terms of each LO to make expectations clearer to students while still in supervision? This is a daunting task as the range of project types and theoretical stances that currently fall under the umbrella of interaction design make it difficult to develop concise LOs that apply in every case.
2. Based on these discussions, the course coordinator (me) began to shape rubrics to more closely define the pass/fail threshold and better articulate the terms and key challenges of each LO. This remains a work in progress, as IDM curriculum revisions will soon render this effort obsolete.
3. Exercising extra care in supervisor and examiner assignments, looking for pairings that would both support students and challenge them where necessary. Examiners were also chosen, as usual, on the basis of "best fit," in hopes of eliciting the best possible discussion in the oral examinations. New supervisors and examiners received some extra support.
4. We took greater pains to make sure examiners and supervisors had the opportunity for dialogue about the strengths and weaknesses of theses before grading, especially when the thesis was heading for a fail grade.
5. The course coordinator (me) sat in on every examination to ensure an overview perspective.
6. We also had a grading seminar following examinations during which all projects were discussed before grades were finalized. There was good unanimity on the judgements of examiners.

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.

1. I will make the effort to do a better updating of the Canvas information when importing the material from the previous year's course.
2. I will do a better job of contextualizing the first draft peer review expectations.
3. As with TP1, communication with students, supervisors and examiners during the course. was sometimes patchy and caused confusion. I will streamline communication with students, supervisors and examiners as much as possible, relying upon shared online documents rather than emails.

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