
**CCG course evaluations**
Of a total possible 105 evaluations from students who received the evaluation form, only 30 (29%) of the population chose to respond, which means the evaluations must be considered far from representative, especially with regard to certain courses evaluated by as few as three respondents, albeit the registered attendance was four or five times that number.

As regards to two core courses, ‘Media Consumption, Culture Globalization and Ethnic Relations’ and ‘Challenges and Future of Communication in Global Contexts’, students seem generally happy with the actual teaching, learning materials and communication of goals. However, comments offered suggest that students on one stream in particular, Consumption and Market Communication, find the core courses not to address issues of relevance to them. This is a critique which has been voiced in evaluations before, and one that the Study Board must, once again, seek to address. Another recurring, and probably related problem is that 38-39% of respondents report spending less than 3 hours per week on these courses (including lessons and course preparation).

With regard to all stream and optional courses a large majority are satisfied. Respondents declare themselves to know the learning objectives of the specific courses, the level is considered appropriate and the presentation and materials considered to support the set goals and student learning well. Worth notice is the fact the four stream-specific courses in applied methods, which were not always well received, but which were recently over-hauled, are positively evaluated by respondents.

**Project supervision evaluations**
44 students filled in the CCG supervision evaluation, which is an increase from previous evaluations, approaching representativeness. The general picture is a very positive one, with almost all respondents ‘completely agreeing’ or ‘agreeing’ with the three statements: that project supervision provided valuable support with regard to: Methodology, academic work and theoretical basis, and work process. In a few instances, students’ comments are less positive about the accessibility of the supervisor. In one case, the supervision process was reported to have gone very poorly. The programme coordinator will take the critique *ad notam* and communicate it to the supervisor in question to avoid future such instances.

**Programme evaluations / Uddannelsesevalueringer**
A total of 199 students received the evaluation form and 73 chose to respond. This makes for response rate of 37%, meaning the evaluations can be considered only indicative, not representative. The respondents list teamwork skills, hands-on experience, academic analysis and methodological skills among the three “most important and useful qualifications” acquired during their CCG studies. 67% find there was clear or very clear “coherence and progression between the modules/courses” of the programme, whereas 29% found coherence and progression less clear. These are not surprising figures for a programme which encompasses no less than four different stream specialisations, and the negative responses are mirrored in course evaluations in which a recurring issue is the perceived lack of relevance of, particularly core, course to one or two of the streams.
83% found that problem-based and project-organized learning was conducive to the development of their academic competencies and their ability to identify and formulate problems (13% were indifferent); 92% found that problem-based and project-organized learning was conducive to the development of their ability to approach and work with problems and their ability to organize a long work process and achieve set goals on time, while only 25% rate the university's information about business and career opportunities as ‘good’ (46% find it to be ‘medium’, another 25% tick ‘poor’). As regards the latter, here is clearly room for improvement.