

KURSRAPPORT - Samlad dokumentation av kursutvärdering

Bakgrundsinformation (Fylls i av studieadministratör)

Kursens LADOK-kod: KK408A	Omfattning (hp): 15,0 hp
Kursens namn: Interaktionsdesign och medier	
Kursansvarig lärare: Lizette Reitsma	
Termin som kursen har genomförts: HT25	Antal registrerade studenter: 40
Ange om kursen är fristående kurs, programkurs eller uppdragsutbildning. Om kursen har genomförts inom ett program ange programnamnet.	

Kursvärderingsformer och återkoppling (Fylls i av kursansvarig lärare)

Formativ kursvärdering, t ex dialog under kursens gång (frivilligt)	Ungefärligt antal studenter som deltagit i formativ kursvärdering:
Summativ kursvärdering (obligatoriskt) <input type="checkbox"/> Endast via Canvas	Antal studenter som deltagit i den summativa kursvärderingen: 12 out of 45 (response rate: 26.67%)

Studentperspektiv (Fylls i av kursansvarig lärare)

<p>Sammanfattning av studenternas muntliga och skriftliga synpunkter:</p> <p>Overall course impression (Q1): Mean score 4.2 out of 6 (SD 0.8). No students rated the course 1 or 2. 25% gave a 3, 33% gave a 4, and 42% gave a 5. The course was generally well received.</p> <p>What worked well (Q2): Students highlighted the teachers' enthusiasm and expertise, particularly Yenika, who was described as pedagogically skilled, calm, and inspiring. Group work was highly appreciated, as were the creative freedom, the milestone structure with supervision, and the opportunity to work hands-on with Figma and tangibles. The course workload was considered manageable, with engaging and relevant cases.</p> <p>What could be improved (Q3): Several students requested clearer pass requirements and assessment criteria. The Canvas structure was experienced as disorganised with unclear navigation. Supervision quality varied depending on which teacher led the session. Students noted confusion about who was the course coordinator (Yenika vs. Lizette). Zoom guest lectures should be mandatory and better structured. One student missed recorded lectures. Inconsistent use of Swedish/English created confusion.</p> <p>Expectations and learning outcomes (Q4–5): The course largely met student expectations (mean 4.2/6). Students reported achieving the learning outcomes to a high degree (mean 4.8/6). Lectures received the highest support rating (4.7/6), while seminars scored lowest (3.3/6) with high variance. Literature studies and Canvas scored 3.5 and 3.9 respectively. Assignments and other activities (e.g. group work) scored 4.2 and 4.1.</p>

Forms of examination (Q6): Mean 4.2/6. The milestone examinations were valued for providing direction. One student felt two individual reflection assignments was one too many.

Independent learning and time use (Q7–8): The course was seen as offering strong opportunity for independent learning (mean 5.5/6). Most students (45%) spent 31–35 hours per week on the course. Several found the overall workload very intense.

Lärarperspektiv (Fylls i av kursansvarig lärare)

Sammanfattning av lärarnas synpunkter:

[To be completed by the course coordinator Lizette Reitsma, based on the teaching team's own reflections from the HT25 course run.]

First time as course coordinator: This was the course coordinator's first time in this role for this course, and in this case, there was limited time to establish structures and processes from the outset. The preparation period was constrained, making it difficult to build a fully coherent course framework before the course began. It was also not fully clear what the language requirements were for this course, so the teaching team decided to be flexible about it, letting the students choose what they felt most comfortable in, with the teachers responding in English.

Reflection on course leadership: The teaching team agrees with the student feedback that having one central, visible person carrying the course is important. Students benefit from a single point of continuity — someone who is present throughout and who they can clearly identify as responsible. This was not fully achieved in HT25 and is a key area for improvement going forward.

Christmas scheduling: Running a course over the Christmas period is inherently challenging, but the course structure was designed to mitigate this as much as possible. The prototyping and testing phases — which can be carried out more independently — were placed over the Christmas break. Having a milestone just before Christmas meant students had a clear sense of direction and knew what was expected of them going into the break. The teaching team feels this worked reasonably well given the constraints.

Assignments and assessment criteria: The teaching team agrees that some assignments were overlapping and that the evaluation criteria were not sufficiently clear. This is a priority area for improvement. In particular, the assessment structure for the social innovation component needs to be revised and made more transparent, with explicit criteria that students can refer to throughout the course. Specifically, students confused the individual reflective essay on their personal contribution to the project with the separate social innovation essay - we need to look deeper into what caused this. A proposed solution is to integrate the personal reflection component into the group report itself, with each group member contributing a short individual section on what they personally learned and contributed. This would reduce double work for both students and teachers, while still capturing individual learning and accountability within a shared document.

Utvecklings-/åtgärdsplan (Fylls i av kursansvarig lärare)

Analysen bakom utveckling-/åtgärdsförslagen ska bygga på en sammanfattning av studenternas individuella kursvärderingar, synpunkter från kursens lärare och kunskapsutvecklingen inom forskningsfältet Om identifierade problem lämnas utan åtgärd ska detta motiveras.

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

- 1. Canvas structure:** Review and simplify the organisation of course materials in Canvas so that students can easily find files, links, and course literature.
- 2. Clearer assessment criteria:** Develop clear, written pass criteria for each assignment and milestone, available from the start of the course.
- 3. Continuity in supervision:** Ensure that the same supervisor follows a group throughout the entire course to provide consistent and relevant feedback or that a stronger follow up between supervisors is put in place.
- 4. Clarify course coordinator role:** Clearly communicate who the course coordinator is from the very start of the course.
- 5. Guest lectures and language policy:** Make Zoom-based guest lectures mandatory and ensure they are well-structured with proper introductions. Establish a consistent language policy (Swedish or English) clearly stated in the syllabus and Canvas.