COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: PD178A	**Scope (hp):** 7,5
Course title: Product Related Interaction Design	
Course coordinator: Larsen Henrik Svarrer	**Number of registered students:** 29
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. KGPRD23	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) midway oral	Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s): Ca. 15
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) Canvas and final oral	Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: sunet: 8 oral: ca11

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:
- Only 8 (of 27/28 active) handed in a SUNET. Few participated in the final verbal summative. Generally, the formative midway (with more students) was more positive than the sunet that this year came after the marks were given.
- Learning activities (5) were rated around average [2.7-3.8] and (6) examination was average [3.5], while the general take on the course below average [2.8]; all with fairly low deviation. On point 7 ('To what extent has the course given you the opportunity to take responsibility for your own learning?'), the score is high (4.8), but also with high deviation.
- The above could be consistent with a take on the course as challenging/difficult/frustrating, yet giving what it should, which is in coherence with several of the comments (e.g. 'we are product designers, not interaction designers', others stating that the newness was good); generally, comments often go in opposite direction.
- Students pointed to the following:
  - Messages from teachers/TA deviated.
  - Need for rotating supervision order.
  - It's difficult to learn new concepts in English.
  - Some students' learning is impeded by the noisy environment.

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

Summary of the teacher's views:
- The course aims to complement the other parts of the program's curriculum by introducing digital elements (embedded in physical products), as well as prepare the

students for the likely collaboration with interaction designers in their future career and possibly consider further studies within this field. The methods taught are of general value to PD, even if the specifics are turned towards interaction. This year, a lot of students struggled to build on their previous education (they are halfway in their education); concretely especially with ideation, but more generally with having a take on methods rather than just doing. The bit of 'outsider' status of the course provides an opportunity to reflect and see one's study-so-far / practices from somewhat another angle, and thus a rich learning possibility; alas, this year only for very few.

- The course is project-based and rests on studio pedagogy, where course elements are introduced and often played through in workshops and the like before similar activities take place in the design projects. Such a K3 pedagogy requires certain study skills as well as high attendance on campus. Thus, students who miss key parts of the course (and especially in the beginning) risk struggling, especially if the groups are not able to lift the burden and especially when study skills are weak. The unprecedented number absence from day1 and through the beginning of the course seriously impeded not only the work of singular students, but also several groups. This in turn created an extra workload for the teachers and turned many supervisions into repeat sessions of lectures/workshops/etc.
- Often students seemed to have their attention on the parallel course, for instance working on these in the pauses or flooding their tables.
- The course has a detailed day2day guide of activities and preps as well as files defining tasks as basis for going through these in class plus a list of key terms explained. While we as teachers were generally in sync, it is always a challenge in new collaborations with the many details.
- The room gets too noisy: impedes learning and wears us out.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

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?
- Continue to develop ways to point to and raise discussions around meta-views; e.g., on aesthetics and on ideation methods that speak to the students (so not to just lower the level) [Teachers, short term].
- As discussed in PR, there seems to be a need to look at study skills [Teacher collegium of PD] .
- Work on being in total sync in the teacher team [teachers, short term] [staffing continuity & workload for new teachers, heads, long and short term].
- Rotating supervision order [teachers].
- Try to find ways to supplement/alter/change the room (noise concerns) [course responsible & parallelcourse/verkstaden/localbokningen].