Report on the basis of evaluations tourism Copenhagen Spring 2017

- Out of 51 students on Tourism 31 responded or partially responded a 61% response rate.
- Out of 24 students on Global Tourism Development 15 responded or partially responded, a 63% response rate.

Note: evaluation on the Global Tourism Development course was not sent out in the

Change Management
26% defined the learning outcome as low or far too low. The rest saw it as appropriate (nb: only 16 filled out the reply). 36% or completely disagree to having obtained good learning outcomes. Some critique about the intensity of the course (over 4-5 weeks). 38% of students only spend 1-6 hours per week. Thankfully this course has now run for the last time.

Policy
41% of students only spend 1-6 hours per week (10% 1-3, 31%-4-6), which is not satisfactory. General satisfaction, although the presentation of materials was not deemed useful by many (21% neither agree or disagree, 21% don’t agree). A particular ‘blog exam’ developed by the teacher caused much frustration, also mirrored in the comments. Students felt that there was too much focus on form rather than content. However, a note here – the students did very well at their final exam (both teachers and internal examiner have stated that). Students asked for more cases and theory. I have discussed this with the teacher.

Market Communication
60% of students only spend 1-6 hours per week (23% 1-3, 37%-4-6). Very little! 24% defined the learning outcome as low (17%) or far too low (7%). A similar pattern is also found in the extent and outcomes of the course. Also the presentation of the material was judged unsatisfactory by some (34% neither agree nor disagree, 7% don’t agree, 7% completely disagree).

The (very experienced) teacher of the course came back very shortly after a sick leave, which could explain some unusually poor evaluations. However, a general ‘upgrade’ could be in need, which I will discuss with the teacher.

Digital methods
19 students followed this course in spite of the fact that there is no curriculum and no ECTS. Great satisfaction about the teacher and the relevancy. Although this course is not compulsory, it links very well with the new 9th semester course in Social analytics and is highly relevant for the labour market, which is why I recommend to keep this course running also next year.

Innovation
Very ‘distributed’ use of time (from a lot to very little). As always (!) it confuses the students that it is called ‘a course’, as they either think it is the innovation camp (which I guess it is) and the project. This will change by next year. Students LOVED Cuba (also in terms of learning😊) and also Halsnæs. Again, students appreciate the ‘hands-on’ experience.
**Sustainable Development (GTD)**
Came out in a later link. We really need to get GTD courses included as students take it quite badly. General satisfaction, the students also here praise the trip to Cuba.

**Projects**
General satisfaction, nothing stands out as concerning.

**The survey**
A student last year commented on the form that ‘comments’, good comments’, ‘bad comments’ etc. is too tedious. It would be great to really rethink our surveys once the new curriculum is approved. Do we know who is in charge of changing the evaluation to the new curriculum?