Report on the basis of course evaluations: Tourism Aalborg, spring 2017

Course evaluations 8th semester

Out of 33 active 8th semester students, 17 students have completed at least some parts of the questionnaire, which gives a response rate of 52%. The number of responses varies from course to course. The vast majority of respondents expressed that they knew the learning objectives with a clear ‘yes’ or otherwise with ‘more or less’ in all courses. A majority of respondents found the level and extent of the course appropriate in all courses. Regarding learning objectives and outcomes, the vast majority found these relatively clear and considered good learning outcomes to come from all the courses. The majority also considered the course materials and presentation to be beneficial to the learning process in relation to all courses.

Tourism Policy & Destination Development. All respondents (100%) stated to have spent 4-6 hours or more per week on the course. The students gave many positive comments, e.g. on the relation between theory and practical usage. Minor critical comments relate mostly to various individual student’s preferences, e.g. in terms of more practical input and more interaction in class.

Change Management in Tourism Organisations. The majority of respondents (78%) stated to have spent 4-6 hours or more per week on the course, and there are only positive comments praising the teacher for his engaging teaching methods.

Tourist Experiences and Market Communication. The majority of respondents (85%) stated to have spent 4-6 hours or more per week on the course. Positive comments related to the interactive teaching style and the presentation of teaching materials. Criticism of student presentations was mentioned.

Applied methods: Market & Consumption. Tourism students are invited to follow this CCG course, but there are only seven respondents, which possibly reflects a relatively low percentage of tourism students attending the course. This could be explained by some comments on problems in attending another programme’s course, e.g. in terms of references to CCG that tourism students do not know about or overlaps in schedules, but also by a general idea that this has already been covered previously in their studies. However, some positive comments were also given to the teaching methods. In future, it is recommended that we reconsider the students’ involvement in this course, and how it can be further aligned with the tourism programme activities.

Innovation in Tourism. As this is not a regular course (no ECTS or exam), but merely an additional activity, it is not without problems to evaluate this on the same criteria as regular courses, and this is also reflected in the comments provided. For example, when respondents comment on the level and outcome, these are clearly reflecting what is usually expected to be provided in a regular course. However, there are also useful insights provided by respondents, e.g. in terms of being clearer in the communication of the purpose of activities like this. It should be mentioned though that this is turned into a course in the new curriculum, which means that it will to a greater extent resemble other course structures in the future.

Project Supervision. 22 evaluations were received, involving six different supervisors. The only slightly negative comments relate to the accessibility of supervisors, which in these particular cases has more to do with expectations and time management issues, for example, students wanting more time at the end of the project period. This is something we always address in various contexts, and we constantly work towards stronger alignment, in information materials, project writing workshop and supervision.

Overall conclusion:

The response rate is relatively high and results must therefore be considered generalizable across this year’s 8th sem. students. The vast majority of respondents gave positive ratings and comments in all courses and supervision, with only very few points of critique, which have been mentioned above and discussed among the teachers. The most critical comments were given to the innovation in tourism activity, which has been revised in the new curriculum implemented in sept. 2017. Some of the issues from the 7th sem. evaluations in the fall, e.g.
around the amount of readings, the level etc. seem to have disappeared, which may indicate that students have adjusted to the master’s level work load and expectations.