Evaluations Report, Tourism. Copenhagen, Spring 2014

Programme evaluation

8 students replied. Overall satisfaction, everything is either completely agree or agree, with one exception (/person): 13 % (1 person) thought that the coherence and progression between modules and courses were less clear and 13% neither greed nor disagreed in their ability to formulate a problem. That same person (I guess?) also did not think s/he was able to organize long work processes and found university career counselling poor.

Course evaluations, 8th semester

44 students (dropping to 20) from 8th semester (roughly ½ as last year). 21 took Tourism Studies (and hence 23 the specialisation - which is not listed under courses – this needs to be added). 57% of the students attended quantitative methodology.

Use of time and division between classes

69% evaluate that their total work effort was satisfactory or very satisfactory. 55% spent 20 hours or more, 45 less than that. So a clear mismatch between our expectations and theirs. Overall satisfactory - and many - comments – some confusion, but more things ‘coming together’ after 7th semester. Still comments about examination in Change Management. Most of the students thought that the level of the course was appropriate (100%, 91%, 75% respectively – rest: ‘too high’ or ‘far too high’). Many students are unaware of the learning objectives of the course (only between 38 and 56% claim to know them). Under all courses, students have added substantial comments.

Generally, Tourism Policy has again received positive feedback (although some believed the course to be too demanding). Some confusion about the exam and the course book, which only become available later in the semester. Some other critique entailed the late exam (I agree). This situation was predominantly due to innovation camp, Woofie, Easter etc. making it impossible to get exams over and done with before the project. If this is also the case next year, we will begin projects earlier on and have both things running at the same time (as we are doing in this semester also to ensure exams right after classes end). Students have clearly gained an understanding the dynamic nature and complexity of tourism (and policies).

In Tourism Experiences and Market communication, students also worry about the late exam and ‘forgetting’ from late February to mid-June. Students highlight new insight on the role of online etc. communication, social media platforms and brand narratives and strategies in tourism. General statement: Too much literature, too few lectures. Reflects a compact semester, as also stated in comments from other courses.

The comments regarding Change Management were mixed: while some liked the cases and the ‘no laptop policy’, many consider the ‘show up=pass’ (as they see it) as a ‘joke’. To amend this, we are considering to link passing the class with participation in the Innovation camp and also strengthen the ties between these two modules. Only 38% thought their learning objectives were met and 19% spend 1-3 hours (43% spend 4-6).
The ‘course’ **Innovation in Tourism** is **not a course** and should not be evaluated as such, as pointed out by students. Some confusion about whether the questions concern the *project* or the *camp*. Students highlight the camp, especially that one in Morocco. We need to discuss if the two ‘directions’ need to have/can have separate Camps. Generally, confusion and concern of what ‘others’ did, limited time, lack of reading material but also some stating that they really enjoyed it. **NOT easy to please everyone!**

**Sustainable development** (filled out by 18). More people know about the leaning objectives (72%) – perhaps because they have to actively choose SD? Very satisfied students – they point to learning about power relations, North/South issues, sustainability issues, becoming more critical. Some concern about the short time for the exam. This has been discussed amongst colleagues. Teacher needs to stress that even though page numbers are the same for the 4-day exam elsewhere, requirements are lower – so not comparable.

**Project evaluation**
18 filled out the questionnaire (ca. ¼, last year: 1/3). It clearly shows an overall satisfaction with supervisors. A few students complain about the inability of getting the supervisor(s) they requested (on spring usually Helene or Szilvia). This unfortunately happened with a few of Anders Sørensens students. Perhaps we need to write in the supervisor request that students need to list at least 4 or 5 names?

**A note to the questionnaire format:** It needs to be more clearly stated that Innovation is not a course, but a camp. This confuses students.