

## Course report Faculty of Technology and Society

This course report is based on student feedback and submitted course evaluations, exam results and the teacher's idea for further development. The course report is published on the course website and Canvas-site.

<b>Course name</b>	Specialised Research Practice
<b>Course code</b>	ME660E
<b>Semester</b>	Ht22
<b>Number of registered students</b>	7
<b>Course coordinator</b>	Sven Packmohr

<input type="checkbox"/>	Course report is published on Canvas-site
<input type="checkbox"/>	Course report is published on course webpage

### Compulsory course evaluation

Number of responses to the compulsory course evaluation	5
---	---

The compulsory course evaluation has been conducted through:

<input type="checkbox"/>	Standard template via SSR (Sunet Survey and Report)
<input type="checkbox"/>	Extended standard template with <i>own questions</i> via SSR
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Own evaluation method by the course coordinator
If own evaluation method was conducted, describe how: Via Google.Forms (positive / negative, resources, learning success)	

### Additional evaluations that were conducted during the course

<input type="checkbox"/>	Separate survey
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral evaluation in class
<input type="checkbox"/>	Oral evaluation in smaller groups
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other evaluation method
If other evaluation method was conducted, describe how: Weekly contact with the students	

### Comments on the course evaluations

The course contained two streams: One, working with the book by W. Belcher “Writing your Journal Article in 12 weeks” to develop an own research proposal. Two, co-authoring an article with two researchers (Henning Brink and Sven Packmohr) using data collected by them.

Positive:

- Useful combination of reflection, writing and co-authoring
- Useful book with stepwise structure and weekly seminars

Negative:

- Issues with integration between Zotero and Google.Doc
- too similar to Researching Media Technology course
- Unclear structure between book and co-authoring (clearer assignment descriptions)
- topic was not self-chosen, might impact engagement

Learning success:

- Pleasant time in achieving the outcomes
- Got better at doing research and writing academic texts

### Examination results

X	Examination results are as expected
	Examination results are not as expected
Results were mixed between A until D grades.	

### Recommendations and priorities for the course development

Generally, the course design, which used data collected by researchers, ensured the connection to the learning outcomes. Another success factor is the book by W. Belcher. In total, three articles were co-authored. In the aftermath of the course, two were sent to different conferences. By the time this report was written, one was accepted for <https://www.esociety-conf.org>. The other is still under review for <https://headconf.org>. Also, this indicates the success of the course.

Regularly, students claim the need for more precise instructions. At the same time, we met twice weekly, giving us enough time for clarifications. Students must develop a more active way of interpreting and understanding instructions. Even an accurate instruction description requires students to interpret what is portrayed.

In one part of the course, students worked with the process by the book on their own topics. Thus, there was freedom to choose and engage more with a topic. The second part is based on data already collected. Thus, the area was pre-determined. Still, the specific topic was framed by all the co-authors.

As the course is non-compulsory, students should be informed more about possible choices. A revised course structure is underway. This course might be substituted with a more open project course, giving students a choice to frame a cooperation and/or research project.