Report on the basis of evaluations tourism Aalborg Spring 2015

Course evaluations 8th semester
Out of around 30 active 8th semester students, 23 students have completed at least some parts of the questionnaire, so results might generalize across the student population.

As for the POLICY course, close to half the students have spent 4-6 hours a week on the course whereas 19% of students have spent respectively 1-3, 7-9 or 10+ hours. These numbers are somewhat lower than last year where half the students spent between 7 and 9 hours a week on the course. Between 50 and 80% of students agree/completely agree on the statements regarding learning objectives, learning outcome, learning process and presentation of material. The majority of students find the level and extent of the course appropriate – although the qualitative comments point to tourism policy being a complex and difficult topic, but also to the teacher doing a very good job teaching this complex and difficult topic.

As for the EXPERIENCES and COMMUNICATION course, 64% of the students spent 7+ hours a week on the course. The majority of students find level and extent appropriate. Between 65 and 79% of students agree/completely agree on the statements regarding learning objectives, learning outcome, learning process and presentation of material. The students furthermore gave a series of qualitative comments useful for the two teachers in this course.

As for the course CHANGE MANAGEMENT, students generally find extent and level appropriate – although students spent everywhere from 1-3 hours (13%) over 4-6 (38%) and 7-9 (31%) to 10+ (19%) hours a week on the course. This is more than last year where it seemed that active participation was sometimes perceived as ‘show up’ being adequate. Between 69 and 94% of students agree/completely agree on the statements regarding learning objectives, learning outcome, learning process and presentation of material and in the qualitative comments, the lecturer is praised for his teaching.

As previously, students have the opportunity to follow the APPLIED METHODOLOGY. This course was followed partially and only by a few students. Tourism students now have their ‘own’ methodology and project writing course on the 7th semester and this seems to have made this course less needed (students both pointing to the level of this course being lower than in the past and students pointing to not have time for this course/prioritizing other matters).

As for the non-course INNOVATION, 1/3 of the students spent 10+ hours a week on the course; 1/3 7-9 hours; 1/5 4-6 hours; and 13% 1-3 hours. The majority of students find level and extent appropriate and between 74 and 87 % of students agree/completely agree on the statements regarding learning objectives, learning outcome, learning process and presentation of. Apart from a few comments, the qualitative comments point to students liking that students delivered lectures on innovation (the negative relates to some students not having put enough resources into it), WOFIE (the negative relating to it not being tourism related enough) and the solution camp. The students rightfully point to the solution camp taking place too late in the semester. Finally, some students suggest that participation in WOFIE and the solution camp should be mandatory (they are, but students are not checked at present).

Evaluations of supervision, project work and programme evaluation (10th semester)

40 students (21 8th semester students and 19 10th semester students) started answered the questionnaire on the SEMESTER EVALUATION with the number dropping to 25 students during the questionnaire. 36% of respondents have spent 40 or more hours a week on their studies whereas 32% have spent less than 30 hours a week on their studies, while 79% of students find their work effort satisfactory. 89% of the students acquainted themselves with the study regulations. 55% of the students found the overall benefit of the semester ‘big’ or ‘very big’ whereas 41% found the benefit to be ‘average’. Furthermore, 87% agree that they were informed about practical issues whereas 11% neither agree, nor disagree.
As for the **PROJECT EVALUATIONS** there are two issues that perhaps should be discussed by the study board. A few students argue that ‘their’ supervisor had “too many groups, not having enough time for us” and the coordinator finds that it is imperative that students understand that they will *always* receive the supervision they are entitled to and that the study board will *never* assign more students to a supervisor than what that supervisor actually has time and resources for. Furthermore, the massive, and unfortunate, re-assigning of supervisors after thesis students had started working on the thesis was commented far less by students than anticipated.

As for the **10th SEMESTER (PROGRAM) EVALUATIONS**, 89% stated that there was a ‘clear’ or ‘very clear’ coherence and progression and 6% neither agree, nor disagree on PBL and project-teaching developed their academic competencies, ability to work with problems and to organize work (the rest either completely agree or agree on these statements. However, the portion of students that neither agree, nor disagree they have improved their ability to identify and formulate problems. Finally, AAUs information on career opportunities seems to be an issue that could be improved substantially.
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