

## **Course evaluation: Tourism Copenhagen, Spring Semester 2023**

The evaluation form was distributed to 66 students and was completed or partially completed by 23 students (35% of the students), while 3 students partially completed the evaluation form. 12 of the students attended the Urban Tourism course whereas 15 of the students participated in the Rural- and Nature-based Tourism course. 40 students did not answer the questionnaire.

### **In general:**

In general, the comments are positive however there are some negative comments about this semester and lack of active participation from the students themselves (maybe well reflected in the lack of respondents of this very same evaluation form).

### **Innovation in Tourism**

22 students answered the questions about this course. Of these, 18 know the learning objectives and the standards were clearly formulated and communicated, and 4 students know them more or less. Overall, the course material supported their learning process. Moreover, 12 students had spent 7-9 or more hours per week on the course, while 8 had spent 4-6 hours and 3 less than 3 hours a week to prepare for the course. The level of the course was considered appropriate for most of the students. While 6 students thought it was too high and 1 student that it was too low. The extent was considered appropriate by 16 students whereas 5 students thought it was too large and 1 student that it was too small. The majority considered that the course material and the presentation of the material supported their learning process whereas 1 student disagrees.

The comments on this course are positive and negative. The variation in students' previous experiences with innovation is often challenging in this course and give way to positive as well as negative comments. The positive respondents thought that the course was rewarding and relevant. They also appreciated the cases and discussions whereas the amount of reading resulted in negative comments.

### **Tourism Policy and Destination Governance**

24 students responded to questions about this course. The vast majority of students know the learning objectives of the course and considered them to be well communicated. While there is again variation in the number of hours spent on the course, 12 students spent more than 7 hours on preparing the readings while 11 students spent 4-6 hours per week and 1 student spent less than 3 hours. The level of the course was considered appropriate for the majority of the students (19), while 3 students thought it was too low and 2 students considered the level too high. 18 students completely and agree that the extent of the course and the learning objectives and standards of assignments and exams were clearly formulated and communicated. Whereas two students disagree and 4 students neither agree or disagree. The vast majority of the students completely agree that the course gave a good learning outcome in proportion to the learning objective as well as the course material and presentation of the material supported their learning.

The comments are in general positive and satisfied with the content, and discussions in class, however also negative comments about lack of fellow students preparation for class.

### **Rural and Nature-based Tourism**

14 students responded to the questionnaire. The vast majority of the students state that they know the learning objectives of the course. 6 students spent more than 7 hours on the course material and readings while 7 students spent 4 to 6 hours on the course materials per week. All students agreed on that the level was appropriate, and the extent as well. 12 students agreed or completely agreed that the learning objectives and standards of the assignments and exams were clearly formulated. The majority of the students agreed that the course gave good learning outcome in proportion to the learning objectives and that the presentation of the material supported the learning. Some critique of the lecturers, however it is important to stress that only 14 responded to the questionnaire in this course.

### **Urban Tourism**

12 students responded to the questionnaire. The vast majority of the students state that they know the learning objectives of the course. 8 students spent more than 7 hours on the course material and readings while 3 students spent 4 to 6 hours on the course materials per week. And 1 student spent less than 3 hours per week. 9 students agreed on that the level was appropriate, and the extent as well while 2 students considered the level far too low and the extent far too small. 8 students agreed or completely agreed that the learning objectives and standards of the assignments and exams were clearly formulated. Whereas 1 student completely disagreed. 7 students agreed that the course gave good learning outcome in proportion to the learning objectives and that the presentation of the material supported the learning while 4 students neither agree or disagree and 1 student completely disagree. 8 students agree that the presentation of the material supported their learning while 2 students disagree and completely disagree. Some students critique the lecturers and the cross campi lecturers, yet it is necessary to consider that less than half of the students responded to the evaluation form.

### **Digital Methods in Tourism**

13 students responded that they knew the learning objectives of the course and 3 students more or less while 1 student did not know. Again, there is a variation in the number of hours spent on the course, 8 said they spent more than 7 hours per week on the course, while 5 students spent 4-6 hours per week and 4 students spent 1 - 3 hours. The level of the course was considered appropriate for the majority of the students. While 13 students thought it was appropriate, 4 thought it was too low, whereas 9 thought it was far too high. Almost all students except for one student state that the level was appropriate as well as the extent was appropriate. 12 students thought that the learning objectives and assignments were clearly stated and that the learning objectives and standards of assignments were clearly formulated. 13 students agree or completely agree that the material and presentation supported their learning.

In general, the comments the students learning outcomes are very good and considered the course very rewarding