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88 students (response rate of 46%) filled out the questionnaire. 58 from 7th semester and 30 from 9th. This is an improvement in response rate from the year before, but some precautions must be taken in terms on conclusions drawn from responses from just under half the students.

A majority (73%) of the responding students is spending between 30-40 or 40 hours or more on their studies, and a total of 82% of the respondents evaluate their own work efforts to be satisfactory. There is a slight decrease in the percentages of students at this high rate of study activity as well as in students' own satisfaction, and this is a constant focal point for the Study Board.

Respondents generally state to be well-informed of coherence between study activities in the semester (63%), to acquaint themselves with the Study Order (94%), and find that the academic outcome of attending the programme has been 'big' or 'very big' (41% combined) or 'average' (55%). Only two students describe their benefit as small, and no students as very small. Although the big/very big assessment is relatively high, the fairly high percentage finding the benefit of their studies to be average is still a concern for the Study Board.

The qualitative responses indicate that the students are generally happy with the programme, but there are also some comments on experiencing difficulties mostly related to being in a new programme, and particularly being in a Danish university for the first time, navigating information flows, language issues, programme structure etc. A lot of times this also revolves around difficulties in understanding project work and expectations. There are a few comments on practical challenges, e.g. with changes in the schedule or other. These are however only done when necessary, which means that changes are extremely difficult to avoid altogether, and communication of changes are always a priority that we continue to follow up on.

A majority of the respondents took part in group work while writing projects (98%). The response to the group formation and team work in general is well assessed, although some comments related to issues of this taking place too late in the semester. This is adressed in the subsequent semester by moving group formation forward in the semester. A few students comment upon problems that can arise when students have different commitments to project work. They also state that this challenge became part of their learning experience. It is noted that only 10% of the projects were conducted in collaboration with external partners, which is a decrease from the year before, but also something that is focused upon in various activities during the subsequent semester.
Among the students doing internships 50% assess the outcome as very big and 38% as big. 13% find it to be average. No students find it small or very small, so all respondents must be assumed to have gained some outcomes from their internships. Qualitative comments are few, but very positive, particularly referring to the learning experience of the respondents.

Among the students doing mobility stays (7 respondents), only one respondent states to have had a ‘very small’ academic profit from it. The rest of the respondents state to have had ‘big’ or ‘very big’ academic profit. However, all respondents indicate to recommend the study abroad option to others.