COURSE REPORT - Course Evaluation Documentation

Background Information

Course Code (LADOK): KK407A	Credits: 15.0 hp
Course Name: Graphic Design and Media	Course Name: Graphic Design and Media
Course Coordinator: Elizabeth Ashley Fox-Jensen	Course Coordinator: Elizabeth Ashley Fox-Jensen
Term: Fall 2025 (HT25)	Registered Students: 77
Course Type: Both freestanding and program course. Students from various programs participated, including Graphic Design, Media Technology, and Interaction Design.	Course Type: Both freestanding and program course. Students from various programs participated, including Graphic Design, Media Technology, and Interaction Design.

Course Evaluation Forms and Feedback

Formative Evaluation (optional)	Approximate number of students: Continuous dialogue via Canvas comments and feedback on submissions.
Summative Evaluation (mandatory) ☑ Canvas only ☐ Canvas + own evaluation ☐ Own evaluation only	Number of participants: 22 of 77 students (28.57% response rate)

Student Perspective

Summary of student feedback: OVERALL RATINGS: Course 5.0/6.0 (68% rated 5-6), Learning outcomes 4.9/6.0, Met expectations 4.7/6.0 STRENGTHS: Excellent Canvas structure and clear instructions, engaged instructors (especially Elizabeth), flexible design with recorded lectures, neurodivergent-friendly. LEARNING ACTIVITIES: Assignments 5.3/6.0, Canvas 4.9/6.0, Lectures 4.7/6.0, Literature 4.6/6.0, Seminars 3.8/6.0 IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED: Minimum requirements too low, course ended 2 weeks early, more individualized feedback needed, too basic for some students, to much AI focus, more tool tutorials and examples needed, all credits registered at end caused CSN issue. TIME COMMITMENT: Average 21-25 hours/week, Student autonomy 5.5/6.0

Teacher Perspective

Summary of instructor perspective:

STRENGTHS: High student engagement, flexible design accommodated diverse backgrounds, effective Canvas structure for distance learning, strong development in design thinking and design methods and theories

CHALLENGES: Low evaluation response rate (28.57%), balance between flexibility and rigor needs adjustment, mixed student preparation levels, Adobe license access issues, time constraints for deeper seminars

REFLECTIONS: Course met main objectives (5.0/6.0 rating) but needs clearer level expectations at admission, language use (Swedish/English) requires clarification in description, AI theme relevant but needs better balance with classical design

Development/Action Plan

Planned changes based on evaluation analysis:

1. Increase minimum requirements to 2 assignments per module (Elizabeth)
2. Explain AI focus in assignments (Elizabeth)
3. Improve feedback: more individualized comments (Elizabeth+ co-teachers)
4. Encourage Digihub access for Adobe and Figma (Elizabeth)
5. Restructure to fewer, larger projects requiring more analysis (Elizabeth + colleagues)

MAINTAINED: Flexible structure with choice, recorded lectures, Canvas organization, English materials (with clarified description)