

DH1609

Rob Comber, [rcomber@kth.se](mailto:rcomber@kth.se)

### 1. Description of the course evaluation process 1

The course is evaluated through two primary means: course analysis survey and discussion in the final seminar. Feedback from both sources is collated and discussed in a course analysis meeting with two colleagues. The Course Analysis survey allows for reflection on gender<sup>2</sup> and disability as factors influencing course delivery.

### 2. Description of meetings with students

The course is presented at two länkmöte and discussion is held in the final seminar reflecting on the course.

### 3. Course design

The course is delivered through parallel lectures and seminars. Seminars introduce core topics intended to fulfil basic learning requirements (vis a vis Bloom's taxonomy). The seminars are intended to allow for analysis, synthesis and creative exploration of the learning materials. The course is assessed through a review, an exam, and attendance at lectures and active participation in the seminars.

The course changes since the last rounds have responded to the challenges of delivery during the pandemic. Delivery of seminars over zoom has been beneficial for some students, providing both a more controlled environment within which to discuss topics and a greater variety of discussion groups.

### 4. Students' workload

Students report working between 3-5 hours a week on the course on average. Some students have higher workloads (6-11 hours), typically aligned with course reading. There is a perceived unevenness in the workload, commensurate with specific weeks reading tasks.

### 5. Students' results on the course

How have the students succeeded in the course? If there is a significant difference compared to previous course offerenings, what can be the reason?

There is no significant difference with previous years. Course results are well distributed.

### 6. Students' answers to open questions

What does students say in response to the open questions?

The students reflect on the heavy reading load for the course, scheduling of reading in relation to lectures, and for a greater diversity of teaching methods.

### 7. Summary of students' opinions

Students are generally happy with the course. There is a continued, from previous rounds, feeling that the reading load is high.

### 8. Overall impression

Overall, my perception is that the course is well received. Rather than introducing new aspects of media literacy, the course delivers a deeper and more nuanced language for engaging with media, information and communication. This reflects growing media literacy in society, to which students are especially attuned. There is a need for some more ways to engage with the learning material - particularly during the pandemic, the course content has predominantly been delivered in a traditional lecture format.

### 9. Analysis

The course could have more applied learning, particularly regarding critique of media messaging. Although this is already assessed, smaller and more frequent tasks could help to establish this as a skill. It may also be beneficial to provide explicit teaching on critical reading as a skill.

### 10. Prioritized course development

Greater diversity of learning materials. I will investigate pre-recorded material to provide concise definitions and concrete examples, and develop more interactive learning materials for lecture sessions. We will schedule the larger reading loads to give time for students to engage with it without a significant increase in workload per week.