

## **Report on course and supervision evaluations: Tourism Aalborg, Autumn Semester 2020**

The evaluation form was distributed to 27 students, and was completed or partially completed by 19 students, which gives a response rate of 70%.

All respondents had attended the Market Communication in Tourism, Problem Based Projects and Research Methodologies and Tourism Destination Analysis. All but one had attended Key Issues in Tourism Consumption, and two had also attended the Arctic Studies Specialisation course.

### **Market Communication in Tourism**

Of the 17 students who answered questions about this course, 7 said that they had spent 4-6 hours per week on it, 4 spent 7-9 hours and 3 spent 10 or more hours. Three claimed to spend 1-3 hours. The majority (75%) thought that the level and extent of the course was appropriate, although one student thought that it was far too high and one that it was far too low. The respondents were very satisfied with the communication of the learning objectives and assignments and 77% said that the course gave them a good learning outcome. Although 71% agreed or completely agreed that the course material supported their learning, there was less agreement on the presentation of the material, with 41% neither agreeing nor disagreeing that it had supported their learning.

The comments suggest that the reason for this was that the teacher had so much material and good examples that he often ran out of time in the lectures. However, the respondents also praised the teacher's energy, enthusiasm and use of real-world examples. Other areas for improvement were using more group work and discussions so the structure of the classes varied more.

### **Tourism Destination Analysis**

Seventeen students answered the questions about this course. Of these, ten had spent 7-9 or 10+ hours per week on the course, while six had spent 4-6 hours and one had only spent 1-3 hours. All but one student agreed or completely agreed that the learning objectives and standards were clearly formulated and communicated, that the course gave them a good learning outcome in proportion to the learning objectives. Overall, 65% completely agreed and 29% agreed that the course material supported their learning process and 71% completely agreed that the presentation supported their learning.

The comments on this course are very positive. The respondents thought that the course was interesting and well-organised. They also appreciated the group work, cases and discussions. The use of digital learning tools, especially Padlet, was also seen as a positive

aspect of this course. One area for improvement is increasing the amount of case work in the beginning of the course and ensuring that there are breaks during group work.

### **Key Issues in Tourism Consumption**

Sixteen students answered the questions about this course. Of these, nine said they had spent 7-9 or 10+ hours per week on the course; five had spent 4-6 hours and two claimed to have spent only 1-3 hours. The vast majority agreed that the level and extent of the course were appropriate. Overall, the respondents were very satisfied with the course. 44% completely agreed, and 31% agreed, that it gave a good learning outcome in proportion to the learning objectives. 82% either agreed or completely agreed that the course material and their learning process.

The comments on this course are generally positive. Particularly good aspects of the course that respondents mentioned were the mini-project, range of topics, and use of case studies. One area for improvement is to make more use of the preparatory reading during the teaching sessions. We have discussed the links between reading and lectures in the teacher group, and how to ensure a good balance between making references to the reading without simply going through the same material.

### **Problem Based Methodology and Project Writing**

Seventeen students responded to questions about this course. While there is again variation in the number of hours spent on the course, nine said they spent 4-6 hours per week on it, while three spent 7-9 hours and three spent over 10 hours per week. There is some difference in opinion regarding the level of the course this year. While nine students thought it was appropriate, three thought it was too high, and five thought it was far too low. The variation in students' previous experience with research methods is always a challenge with this course, but this year the evaluations may also have been affected by the unusually large number of exchange students in their 9<sup>th</sup> semester (due to the pandemic), who have already studied PBL & methodology. At the same time, the vast majority thought that the extent of the course was appropriate, and 88% agreed or completely agreed that the course gave a good learning outcome, and that the material and presentation supported their learning.

The comments indicate that the respondents liked the practical sessions and applying specific methods in group work exercises but would like to have more examples to help them understand the issues around Philosophy of Science. One concrete suggestion for improvement is to work more with previous students' projects.

### **General Comments**

There are some comments that give feedback on the teaching in general over the semester and, in particular focus on the impact of the pandemic. There are several comments praising

the teachers' adaptation to teaching on Zoom. The respondents say it has been a 'good experience', 'the lecturers did a great job with Zoom, all things considered', and 'there were some technical problems here and there, but at the end of the day, I don't think this has affected the quality of the education'. The students also note that their attendance has been better because they could join the classes online (and the teachers have also noticed higher attendance). There are some helpful suggestions for practical improvements, such as ensuring that there are a minimum of three students in breakout rooms, so the discussions are livelier. The teaching group has discussed the use of different Zoom tools and what worked well and less well during the semester in terms of the digital platforms.

There are not many comments about the broader impact of the pandemic – most are about the content and structure of the courses, as usual. One respondent has commented on the difficulties of getting to know fellow students. We have discussed general well-being and how to stay motivated and support each other during the lock-down several times with the students and will continue to do this.

### **Project Supervision Evaluations**

Nine students have submitted evaluations of project supervision. The evaluations are all positive, with no negative evaluations of support in relation to methodology, theory, or work process. All supervisors were either very accessible or always very accessible.