



Report - DM2601 - 2021-02-18

Respondents: 1
Answer Count: 1
Answer Frequency: 100.00%

Please note that there is only one respondent to this form: the person that performs the course analysis.

Course analysis carried out by (name, e-mail):

Pedro Sanches, sanches@kth.se

DESCRIPTION OF THE COURSE EVALUATION PROCESS

Describe the course evaluation process. Describe how all students have been given the possibility to give their opinions on the course. Describe how aspects regarding gender, and disabled students are investigated.

The course evaluation questionnaire was available during the last 2 weeks of the course. In the last lecture, the last 30 minutes consisted of a group activity, based on the wallet design exercise by Stanford d.school, where the students were given the task of re-designing the course. They did not have to share the results with the teacher, so that they could speak between themselves more freely, but in the end it generated some discussions, which I encouraged them to write in the course evaluation. They also had some minutes to fill the course evaluation at the end of this lecture.

DESCRIPTION OF MEETINGS WITH STUDENTS

Describe which meetings that has been arranged with students during the course and after its completion. (The outcomes of these meetings should be reported under 7, below.)

Due to the covid-19 pandemic, the lectures were online, and the seminars and workshops were given in a hybrid format: there was a classroom meeting but it was also streamed live, allowing for students to participate safely from their homes. Some of the workshops given by guests were "hands-on", but these were still streamed for students to follow at home.

With regards to supervision, students were given the option of online or in-person meeting. Most students took the online option.

COURSE DESIGN

Briefly describe the course design (learning activities, examinations) and any changes that have been implemented since the last course offering.

The course ran over 7 weeks and consisted of:

- 7 lectures
- 4 workshops,
- 3 crit sessions + 3 supervision sessions, intermingled
- 3 reading seminars,
- 1 final conference (exhibition + presentation)

Examination is in two parts:

INL1 - Written assignment, individual self-reflection, 2.5 credits, Grading scale: P, F, divided into 4 parts, formatively assessed throughout the course

PRO1 - Group interaction design project within mediatechnology, 5.0 credits, Grading scale: P, F, 4 deliverables over the course, formatively assessed



THE STUDENTS' WORKLOAD

Does the students' workload correspond to the expected level (40 hours/1.5 credits)? If there is a significant deviation from the expected, what can be the reason?

Workload is on par with the expected and observed in previous course offerings.

THE STUDENTS' RESULTS

How well have the students succeeded on the course? If there are significant differences compared to previous course offerings, what can be the reason?

Students have succeeded well on the course, on par with previous course offerings.

STUDENTS' ANSWERS TO OPEN QUESTIONS

What does students say in response to the open questions?

In general, students found this to be an inclusive course with regards to gender balance, with many positive answers both by female and male students regarding this aspect. However, international students have had complaints with regards to feeling included in Swedish-speaking groups, and in group forming. This has also been observed in previous course offerings. The students praised the course content and structure but would have suggestions for improvement namely better alignment of theory and practice in the timeline of the project, and being given possibilities for deepening or widening knowledge in methods beyond the scope of the course. Many students, specially international ones, would like to have more face-to-face interactions, which is something specific to the covid-19 situation.

SUMMARY OF STUDENTS' OPINIONS

Summarize the outcome of the questionnaire, as well as opinions emerging at meetings with students.

Based on my interactions with students throughout the course, and also expressed in the course evaluation, international students feel very isolated. This is both due to the pandemic, and also with problems related with lack of diversity in group formation.

OVERALL IMPRESSION

Summarize the teachers' overall impressions of the course offering in relation to students' results and their evaluation of the course, as well as in relation to the changes implemented since last course offering.

The changes in the course towards more practical aspects have been received positively. There still needs to be more alignment of lectures and workshops with the project work.

ANALYSIS

Is it possible to identify stronger and weaker areas in the learning environment based on the information you have gathered during the evaluation and analysis process? What can the reason for these be? Are there significant difference in experience between:

- students identifying as female and male?
- international and national students?
- students with or without disabilities?

Since this is one of the first courses in the program, the students felt that we should have been doing more to introduce international master students to KTH. This can be done at the course level, but can also be done at the programme level. Also, there should be tools to access student wellbeing, and group dynamics, at a distance. Student wellbeing was mostly reported at the level of international/national student differences. Gender balance evaluations were very positive, and we have had not received any formal evaluation regarding students with /without disabilities.

We have had, however, discussions in class regarding accessibility and the importance of teaching the accessibility chapter in the book, and the last lecture was, per request of the students, about that chapter. In future course offerings, I recommend that chapter to be included as part of the core topics in the course.

PRIORITIZED COURSE DEVELOPMENT

What aspects of the course should be developed primarily? How can these aspects be developed in short and long term?

-
- Improve group formation, with regards to mixing students of different skills and different backgrounds (international/national).
 - Introduce group dynamic evaluation, by making it an item to reflect on during the individual reflection deliverables.
 - Provide a better alignment of lectures/workshops and methods applied in the project.
-