Course Evaluation – DM2630 – User Experience Design and Evaluation

Students' perspectives on the course were collected in three ways:

1) The class chose three student representatives in the first class of the course. These student representatives were tasked with collecting data about student experiences in the first three weeks of the course and feeding this back to course teachers through an email.
2) During the last class of the course we asked the students to provide feedback on the course in a pre-designed Miro board. This Miro board asked students to reflect on what they had learnt in the course; what they thought went well; what could be improved for future years; and finally to write a letter to their futures selves which we agree to email to them next December.
3) A stand 6-question course survey run by KTH was made available after the course ended until January 20th. 22% of students responded to the course survey.

The teaching team met on Jan 27th to discuss the feedback and plan changes to the course for HT 22.

Overall thoughts on feedback
Overall, the course was well received by students. According to the survey there are not substantial gender differences in course experiences; nor are there substantial different in perspectives that are linked to the programme of study. The average response to LEQs is above 6 (out of 7) which we believe indicates that students were satisfied by the quality of the course, the content, the workload, and the assessment feedback.

Reading seminars
During this academic year we had made changes to the reading seminars and associated assignments. This included revising the suggested readings and reducing the volume of reading reflections submitted by students from 6 to 2. However, qualitative feedback in the survey and miro board suggest that students still struggle with finding the format engaging and useful. It was also clear from attendance at reading seminars that students were not finding the time to read the papers and therefore not attending the seminars. The feedback was discussed amongst the teaching team and we have agreed the following changes:

- Reading Reflection Period 1: Ask students to submit an earlier reading reflection about about 'user experience' theory.
- In classes – student groups become responsible for presenting only 1 paper and discussing only 1 paper across the semester.
- Reading Reflection 2: students revisit UX Reading Reflection 1, and select 3 new papers to integrate into the reflection to offer a revised understanding of the concepts and theories. Due mid early Period 2.
- On UI design: We can put the links on nice parts to learn
- Portfolio: mid- way feedback in P1 on Portfolio & 2-3 design challenges

Interaction critique

Students continue to struggle with this assignment. Feedback in the course survey and in the Miro board highlight that students found the instructions unclear. Teaching staff asked for resubmissions of a number of unsatisfactory assignments which increased student and teacher workload. Based on this feedback the teaching team agreed the following changes:

- Provide a more engaging introduction to interaction critique which includes a live dialogue of the teaching team delivering an interaction criticism on an existing user experience
- Integrate an opportunity for peer-feedback on students interaction critiques to ensure students engage better with marking scheme in particular

Other

Portfolio

The teaching team felt they could do a better job of providing feedback on portfolio assignments. We agreed to:
- Provide an opportunity for individual bookable slots where we give oral feedback in period 1.

Final Project

Students reported that they enjoyed bookable slots with the teaching team for individual conversations and feedback on design work. We agreed to:
- Provide at least one more individual bookable slots