COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: PD178A	**Scope (hp): 7,5**
Course title: Product Related Interaction Design	
Course coordinator: Castillo Muñoz Yénika	**Number of registered students: 32**
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT24	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. KGPRD22h	

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) Midway evaluation – 28 feb 2024 Final – 21 march 2024	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 32
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) Program council and course evaluation survey	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 4
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback was given to the current student group)	

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

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five university-wide questions should be included: 1. To what extent do you feel you have achieved the course's intended learning outcomes? The median was 4.8/6 but with a significant deviation, having one that answered 3.0 and another one answering 6. 2. To what extent do you feel the course's working methods/learning activities have been a support in your learning to achieve the intended learning outcomes? The students answered that the assignments, the practical component of the course, was more helpful to learn (5/6, dev. 0.8) than the lectures (3.2/6, dev. 1.5) and seminars (2/6, dev. 2.0). The fact that very few students answered the survey makes it very hard to understand a full picture. 3. To what extent do you feel the course's examination forms have given you the opportunity to

show how well you have achieved the intended learning outcomes?
The average was 4.0/6, dev. 1.5.

4. To what extent do you feel the course has met your expectations in general?
The students answered in average 5.0/6, dev. 1.2.

5. To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?
The average answer was 4.8/6, dev. 1.0.

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 edition of the course was very challenging, as it was scheduled as a 5-week full time course instead of a 10-week half-time course. This created time constraints on the student's independent work time, and in general in the pace of the course. As me and Stina were assigned to this course with short time in advance, we tried to keep the structure of assignments but some aspects of them had to be simplified a bit because of this time constraint. In the formative final session, some students thought it became too much.

The support of the teacher assistant with the Micro:bits was invaluable. The students mentioned in the formative evaluations that it was very helpful.

In spite of this fast paced course, most of the students appreciated not having two courses at the same time, meaning that their attention and effort were more directed.

In the formative evaluations, some students expressed that the theoretical content is very abstract until they can actually work with the micro:bits and understand what we mean. But undoubtedly, they have very good prototyping skills that made them achieve the learning goals once the interactive part was integrated. So we could have coupled the lectures better to fit their ongoing progress in the practical part.

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.)

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.)

As this course ran with specific adaptations this time, and with substitute teachers, there are no changes suggested.

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.