COURSE REPORT – Summary of course evaluation

Background information (To be completed by the course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KK642C	**Scope (hp):** 15,0 hp
Course title: Media and Communication Studies: Collaborative Media	
Course coordinator: Reinhard Handler	**Number of registered students:** 32
Semester in which the course is conducted: VT26	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. HAMKV-HT2025	

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

Formative course evaluation, for example dialogue during the course (optional) **yes**	**Approx. number of students who participated in formative course evaluation(s):** **15**
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:** **5**

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

Summary of the students' oral and written feedback:

5 of the 32 enrolled students completed the course evaluation. Given the low response rate, the results should be interpreted with caution and may not be representative of the student group as a whole.

Among the responses received, some students expressed concerns that the course relied heavily on self-directed learning. Students also indicated that they would have preferred to become more actively engaged in the course and project work from the outset.

In addition, comments pointed to a need for clearer organisation and stronger alignment between different course activities and teaching contributions. That point was also discussed with the students during the course.

At the same time, students highlighted positive aspects of the course, particularly the opportunity to develop collaborative media prototypes and to work with theoretical concepts in a practical design context.

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

Summary of the teacher's views:

The feedback concerning organisation and alignment between course components is valid and aligns with observations made by the teaching team and discussion with the students during the course. These challenges became apparent early in the semester, leading to adjustments in the course structure and the development of additional materials to better support the connection between theoretical concepts and practical design work.

The students' comments regarding self-directed learning also merits reflection. The course included weekly seminars centred on assigned readings and key themes. To support preparation, student groups produced reading prompts each week, and seminar sessions were dedicated to discussion, clarification, and collective engagement with the literature. The intention was to provide structured opportunities for students to work through difficult theoretical material together while also developing independent analytical skills.
I want to note that a substantial degree of independent engagement with academic literature remains an essential expectation of a master's-level course. Students are expected to prepare for seminars, critically engage with assigned readings, and use seminar discussions as opportunities to deepen and refine their understanding. While the teaching team will continue to improve course organisation and strengthen support for connecting theory and practice, these expectations will remain an important element of the course design.

In addition I want to point out that active participation is a central component of the course design. The course is not intended to be a lecture course but a continuous interaction between theoretical reflection and prototype development starting with the beginning of the course. In practice, student engagement with project development tended to increase later in the course, once project ideas had become more clearly defined. This experience suggests that future iterations of the course should provide more preparatory work for students at the beginning to facilitate a broader engagement with project work at an earlier stage. Preparatory materials such as worksheets has already been produced during this year's iteration of the course and they will be ready for next year's course from the start.

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?
Based on this year's experiences, the teaching team has identified several improvements for future iterations of the course. In particular, shorter weekly workshops will be replaced with fewer but longer workshop sessions that allow for more extensive supervision and support. We will also add tools such as target plans that help students to track their own work. In addition, practical design work will begin later in the course, allowing students more time to engage with the theoretical material and develop ideas before applying it in their projects. The aim is to strengthen the transition from conceptual understanding to practical implementation.

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