COURSE REPORT

Background information (To be completed by course administrator)

Course LADOK code: KK648A	**Scope (hp): 15**
Course title: Media and Communication Studies: Network Society Studies	
Course coordinator: Bojana Romic	**Number of registered students: 18**
Semester in which the course is conducted: HT22	
Is the course an independent course, programme course or contract course? If the course has been completed within a programme, enter the programme name. HAMKV21h	

Administration's perspective (To be completed by course administrator)

The administration's views:

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

Formative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed)	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:**
Summative course evaluation: (Describe the form of course evaluation and when it was completed) *SUNET digital survey completed on 1 February 2023*	**Number of students who participated in the course evaluation:** 6 (30%)
Feedback to students: (Describe how and when the feedback was given to the current student group) *The course includes two two-hour sessions dedicated to discussion about the course and oral feedback (16 November and 16 December 2022). The last session offered an opportunity for an extended discussion on what can be improved about the course. Even though only two students joined the session, they did provide valuable feedback.*	

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

Summary of the students' course evaluations: (The five university-wide questions should be included. Compilation from digital questionnaires can be appended.) *Judging from the course evaluation, most students were satisfied with the course. Their responses varied from "very good" (1 response) to "satisfactory" (1 response). There were no "bad" or "very bad" responses. The mean grade is 4,5 (out of 6).* *Most students enjoyed the structure of the course, which engages students on a weekly basis and aims to reduce procrastination. They enjoyed discussions in small groups and an opportunity to give feedback to each other (this we learned during feedback session on Dec 16). Several students expressed satisfaction with the content and the themes covered by this course.*

In terms of critique, the students suggested using only several chapters from Bruno Latour's book, instead of the whole book.
Even though most students appreciated weekly assignments, two students felt that such structure was too rigid and could not accommodate private emergencies. The students didn't want to get out of the loop and miss an opportunity to get a point for peer review. I will discuss this with the next course responsible.

One student suggested moving Theoretical Seminar to end of this course.
One student felt that there is an element of bias in some teaching. This will be an item on the agenda for the MCS full day for teachers on June 14.

I haven't received any negative comments regarding learning expectations. All answers varied from "good" to "very good". As expected, Actor-Network theory was the most challenging concept, but some students underlined that this part of the course was the most exciting for them.
Similarly, learning activities received a median grade 4,5. The seminars were well-appreciated by the students (median grade 5,2), the literature received a median grade of 5,7, and the assignments got a median grade 5,3.
The Canvas site has room for improvement, with median grade 3,5.
The course has given the opportunity to take responsibility of their own learning (median grade 5,8).
There were some split opinions in the evaluation: while some students enjoyed the seminars about conspiracy theories and anti-gender movements, one student was unhappy about the latter. The majority of students seems satisfied with the course.

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

Summary of the teacher's views/Results: (The comments on the course's implementation and the results based on an assessment of the students' actual learning outcomes in relation to the intended learning outcomes, are summarised here. Both success factors and problems are identified.

The course structure and schedule were inherited from previous year.

As indicated above, the course was well appreciated by the students. Even though the reading activities are intense in the first weeks of the course, weekly activities seem to be helpful. The course is designed in a such a way to minimize procrastination and encourage peer interaction. The downside of this approach is its optimisation for the first submission opportunity – if some students decide to submit later, they may not be able to provide peer feedback to others, and hence would miss some points.
Our second year MCS students are familiar with Canvas – but other students may find this platform a bit confusing.
The students felt that they took responsibility of their own learning (all responses ranged from large-to very large extent).
My recommendation for the next course responsible: the students appreciated my facilitation of the peer review arrangement. The students can thereby start working on their peer reviews shortly upon submission of their weekly assignment. Otherwise, it would take much longer time to self-organise.

Analysis and action plan **(To be completed by the course coordinator)**

Analysis: (The course coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the analysis is based on a summary of the students' individual course evaluations, views from relevant teachers and course administrators, knowledge development in the field of research and that this analysis is done in collaboration with the teaching team.)

Like other elective courses, the group of students attending the course is heterogenous. The teacher is familiar with the curriculum covered on previous MCS courses and this course is thematically connected to previous syllabi. However, some students might not be accustomed to approaches and methods belonging to various branches of Critical Theory, that this course builds upon. For example, it is assumed that students possess basic knowledge about STS (Science and Technology Studies) before accessing its variant ANT (Actor-Network theory). Likewise, the students should have some knowledge about Feminist Studies before doing seminar on anti-gender movements.

Action plan: (The changes planned to be made in the short and long term are stated here, as well as the timetable for when the actions are planned be carried out and who is responsible for the implementation. If identified problems are left without action, this should be justified. The follow- up of proposed measures according to the previous course report(s) is presented here.)

Since the course was well appreciated by the students, I would not advise big changes to the format. However, there is room for improvement and my suggestions are listed below:

Short term changes:

- *I suggest extending the introductory lecture for another hour. The second hour can be used for dialogue between teachers and the students. It is important to learn about students' respective educational backgrounds and adapt preparatory lectures accordingly.*
- *I would advise adding at least two Q&A sessions.*

Long term changes:

- *Some students appreciated the regularity of weekly assignments, while others found them too limiting. I will review options for getting peer review points if some students cannot commit to the original schedule.*
- *Berndt will limit obligatory reading to several chapters from Bruno Latour's book.*
- *I suggest using more recent articles published by Castells. We could also consider using Van Dijck's book ''The Platform Society'' that was published in 2018.*

Publishing and archiving **(To be handled by the course administrator)**

☒ The course report is published, and the students have been informed about the publication,

☒ The course report is archived according to the university's archiving rules,

☒ The course report is shared with the programme coordinator (if applicable),

☒ The course report is saved according to any additional requests on behalf of the department.