MALMÖ UNIVERSITY

COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KK153A	**Scope (hp):** 30,0 hp
Course title: Filmmaking I	
Course coordinator: Augustsson Dennis	**Number of registered students:** 27
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT26	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? Independent course	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) Each production assignment was followed by a formative evaluation in the form of discussions and comments on the content and structure of each module. 5 such feedback sessions were held	**Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):** 25
Summative course evaluation (obligatory) ☒ Only via Canvas ☐ Canvas and other form ☐ Only other form (written and/or oral)	**Number of students who participated in the summative course evaluation:** 8 students

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:

- The overall course evaluation was very positive (mean 5.0/6). Students particularly valued the practical, hands-on learning, clear and structured teaching, feedback, and the larger film productions.
- Achievement of the expected learning outcomes was rated very highly (mean 5.6/6; 75% selected 6). Assignments were rated as the strongest support for learning (5.8), followed by other teaching activities (5.4), lectures (5.2), seminars (4.8), Canvas (4.5), and reading of literature (3.5).
- The examination forms were rated highly (5.4), as was the opportunity to take responsibility for one's own learning (5.5). Several comments describe the course as creative, enjoyable and highly educational.
- Suggestions for improvement focused on more technical depth early in the course (and more preparation before filming.)
- Students also requested a clearer and more integrated film theory/history component, clearer communication of deadlines and more feedback on assignments. One comment raised teacher availability, and one suggested varying group constellations.
- several student expressed disappointment that Filmmaking II was not being offered. The low number of responses means that the results should be interpreted with some caution.

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

Summary of the teacher's views:

- The evaluation supports retaining the practice-based course structure. In particular, the assignment-driven progression and recurring feedback appear to support students' learning well.
- The lower rating for literature, together with comments on film theory, indicates a need to connect theoretical content more explicitly to the practical production assignments and to clarify the structure and feedback in this part of the course.
- The technical workflow around Blackmagic cameras and BRAW files creates avoidable obstacles. A more robust technical introduction and access solution should be in place before the next course round. This is also a symptomatic

feedback on the fact that the course is a broad introduction, but at the same time requires depth in knowledge. A lot of content above the generalized learning outcomes is up to students to achieve by themselves.

- Communication and staffing should be reviewed in modules where students experienced unclear deadlines or limited teacher availability.
- As only eight students completed the evaluation, both the strong positive results and the identified improvement areas should be treated as indicative rather than fully representative.

Action plan (To be completed by the course coordinator)

The underlaying analysis and the action plan should be based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from teachers in the course and the knowledge development in the research field. If identified problems are left without action, this should be motivated.

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?

- Expand the technical introduction with more explicit Blackmagic camera setup and a short basic colour-grading component. Responsible: course coordinator and relevant teaching/MediaLab staff. When: during planning and the first weeks of the next course round.
- Resolve BRAW access on relevant university computers, either through installation of the required plugins/codecs or an equivalent workflow. Responsible: course coordinator in dialogue with MediaLab/IT. When: before the next course round.
- Revise the film theory/history component so that structure, deadlines, feedback and links to the practical assignments are clearer. Responsible: course coordinator and responsible teacher(s). When: before the next course round and implemented throughout the module.
- Strengthen pre-production preparation before major shoots through a clear checkpoint covering planning, roles and technical readiness. Responsible: teaching team. When: before each major production in the next course round.
- Where pedagogically suitable, vary group constellations across productions. Responsible: course coordinator/teaching team. When: during group planning for the next course round.
- Review staffing, teacher availability and communication responsibilities in the relevant modules. Responsible: course coordinator in dialogue with the relevant manager/teaching team. When: during staffing and course planning for the next course round.
- Forward the expressed interest in a continuation course (Filmmaking II) to relevant course/department planning. This is outside the scope of changes to Filmmaking I itself.

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