

COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

| | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------|
| Course LADOK code: KK149A | Scope (hp): 30,0 hp |
| Course title: Storytelling - Narration Across Media | |
| Course coordinator: Berndt Clavier & Patra Ragnerstam | Number of registered students: 34 |
| Semester in which the course is conducted: HT25 | |
| Independent course | |

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

| | |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| We had several formative course evaluations, dialogues with the students during the course. | Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s): 30 |
| Summative course evaluation (obligatory) <input type="checkbox"/> X Only via Canvas <input type="checkbox"/> Canvas and other form <input type="checkbox"/> Only other form (written and/or oral) | Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation: 10 |

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

Overall, the course evaluation indicates that students were positive about the course as a whole. The overall rating was high (mean 4.4/6), and several respondents emphasised that the course was interesting, engaging, and informative. Particularly appreciated aspects were the teachers' commitment and subject knowledge, the combination of theory, seminars, and creative work, and the use of assignments rather than traditional written exams. Students also highlighted the choice of course material and storyworlds, especially the contrast between the *Pride and Prejudice* section, where transmedia perspectives were foregrounded, and the *Dracula* section, where literary analysis and interpretive perspectives were more central.

At the same time, several recurring areas for improvement emerged. The most common concern was course organisation and communication. Students reported that schedules, locations and information on Canvas were sometimes changed at short notice or were difficult to access, which created uncertainty. Several respondents also asked for earlier and clearer publication of the schedule, more reliable communication, and quicker responses to student questions.

Another recurring point concerned the structure of the course's second half. Some students found this part less clearly structured than the first half, especially regarding the links among theory, analysis, and creative practice. The instructions for seminar questions and assignments in the *Dracula* section were also described as too long or insufficiently clear. In addition, some students felt that the creative project in the *Dracula* module would benefit from somewhat clearer framing and a few more guidelines, so that the creative work more obviously supports the later analytical assignment.

Students were generally positive about the pedagogical model and the examination forms. Ratings for the extent to which the course met expectations and supported achievement of the learning outcomes were positive overall (both mean 4.2/6), and the examination forms were rated relatively highly (mean 4.5/6). At the same time, responses suggest that Canvas functioned less well as a learning support (mean 3.6/6), reinforcing the need for clearer organisation and communication. A few students also noted that the workload was uneven at certain points in the

semester, and that more scheduled time for discussion and guided work could strengthen students' sense of support and continuity.

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

The course evaluation suggests that the course functions well overall and that its central pedagogical idea is appreciated by students. The combination of literary analysis, theoretical perspectives on storytelling across media, and creative assignments appears to be one of the course's main strengths. Students also seem to value the choice of primary material and the relatively open examination forms, which encourage independent thinking and engagement. At the same time, the evaluation points to a need for stronger coherence in course design and communication, especially in the second half of the course. A central issue concerns structure: students experienced the first half as more clearly organised, while the second half was perceived by some as less transparent in terms of progression, assignment design and the relation between creative work and analytical reflection. This suggests that the overall pedagogical alignment between learning activities, teaching content, and examination tasks can be made more explicit. The evaluation also indicates that course information needs to be easier to locate and more stable over time. In future course rounds, it will be important to reduce late changes where possible, ensure that Canvas contains up-to-date and consistent information, and clarify where students should look for authoritative scheduling information. The comments also suggest that response routines for student questions should be reviewed to make communication more predictable. From a teaching perspective, it may also be beneficial to strengthen coordination between the teachers responsible for theoretical content and those supervising the creative projects, particularly in the Dracula module. A somewhat clearer framework for the creative assignments, including examples of how the projects can later be analysed in relation to course concepts, could help students make stronger links between practical work and the intended learning outcomes. At the same time, such revisions should preserve the openness and creative freedom that students valued.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

1. Clarify course organisation and communication before the next course round. The course coordinators, together with participating teachers and administrative support, should review how schedules, room information, and assignment instructions are published on Canvas. A clearer structure should be established before the course starts, with one designated place for current scheduling information. This should be implemented before the next course offering.
2. Revise the second half of the course to make progression and expectations more explicit. The teaching team should review the Dracula module, with particular attention to the sequencing of reading, seminars, creative work, and written assignments. The aim is to create a clearer connection between theory, analysis, and creative practice. This revision should be carried out in the planning phase before the next course round.
3. Develop clearer instructions for the creative assignments while preserving creative freedom. Teachers responsible for the creative components should formulate a small set of common guidelines that explain what is expected from the project and how it can later be analysed in relation to course theory and learning outcomes. Shorter and more concrete written instructions for seminar questions and assignments should also be considered. This should be prepared before the next course offering.
4. Strengthen coordination within the teaching team. The teachers involved in the theoretical and creative components should coordinate the design of assignments more closely, especially in the second half of the course, to provide students with more coherent guidance. This can be addressed through one or two planning meetings before the course starts and through follow-up during the semester.
5. Review workload distribution and opportunities for support. The teaching team should examine whether reading and assignment deadlines can be distributed more evenly across the semester and whether some additional scheduled time for discussion, workshop supervision, or guided work would benefit students. This review should be included in the next course planning cycle.

Remember to orally feedback the results of the course evaluation to

- the students who have completed the course evaluation
- the students of the next course round, i.e. the next time the course is given