



EMA

Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association

GEM-Master of Science course in Geo-Information Science and Earth Observation for Environmental Modelling and Management

Course Quality Advisory Board of the Erasmus Mundus Student and Alumni Association

Report was generated on 17 Dec 2015

Contents


1	Executive summary (?)	4
2	Introduction	4
2.1	Course Quality Advisory Board	4
2.2	Introduction to the CQSS survey	4
2.3	Structure of current report	5
3	Supporting services	6
3.1	Support received before the start of the Erasmus Mundus course	6
3.1.1	Consortia	6
3.1.2	Lund University, Sweden	7
3.1.3	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	8
3.1.4	University of Twente, Netherlands	9
3.1.5	University of Warsaw, Poland	10
3.2	Support received during the orientaion program	10
3.2.1	Consortia	10
3.2.2	Lund University, Sweden	12
3.2.3	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	13
3.2.4	University of Twente, Netherlands	14
3.2.5	University of Warsaw, Poland	15
3.3	Helpfulness of units and people	15
3.3.1	Consortia	15
3.3.2	Lund University, Sweden	17
3.3.3	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	18
3.3.4	University of Twente, Netherlands	19
3.3.5	University of Warsaw, Poland	20
3.4	Support received on various issues	20
3.4.1	Consortia	20
3.4.2	Lund University, Sweden	21
3.4.3	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	22
3.4.4	University of Twente, Netherlands	23
3.4.5	University of Warsaw, Poland	24



4	Assessment and feedback	25
4.1	Module assessment	25
4.1.1	Consortia	25
4.1.2	Lund University, Sweden	27
4.1.3	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	28
4.1.4	University of Twente, Netherlands	29
4.1.5	University of Warsaw, Poland	30
5	Teaching/learning and supervision	31
5.1	First supervisor.	31
5.2	Second supervisor.	31
5.3	Teaching/learning	32
5.3.1	Lund University, Sweden	32
5.3.2	University of Southampton, United Kingdom	33
5.3.3	University of Twente, Netherlands	34
5.3.4	University of Warsaw, Poland	35
6	Internship/field experience and personal development	36
6.1	Personal development.	36
7	Acknowledgments	37



1 Executive summary (?)



2 Introduction

2.1 Course Quality Advisory Board

CQAB is an independent advisory body that operates on a voluntary basis, and its members have not and do not receive financial benefits from their CQAB related activity. Membership to CQAB is assured through a competitive recruitment process among EMA members. Internally, CQAB has three main separate structures:

1. Programme Representative Network (PRnet), aimed at coordinating the relation between Erasmus Mundus courses and EMA.
2. Management of the em.feedback@em-a.eu, that assists students with pressing quality issues.
3. Survey Team, tasked with conducting the CQSS survey.

CQAB was created as a result of the pressing and constant concerns of EMA members about the quality of the student experiences as part of an Erasmus Mundus (EM) course. Internally, CQAB has a variety of tools to capture student concerns and to interact with student representatives from various programmes, but the CQSS survey represents its most comprehensive and systematic initiative focused on quality assurance. The inception and design of CQSS is enrooted in the complexity of the EMJMD student experience and driven by two distinct factors: the perceived systemic issues around quality across courses, and the general underrepresentation of students in evaluating the EMJMD programme.

For any concerns, questions or feedback on this report, please contact us at chair.cqab@em-a.eu.

2.2 Introduction to the CQSS survey

Our survey was filled in by 44 students of your program. They represent 30 countries and collectively they have spent more than 101 hours thinking and answering questions of our survey.

We hope that their feedback will help you make your Erasmus Mundus program even more brilliant and unique!



2.3 Structure of current report

The report focuses on providing your course with customized information received from students. The information in this report follows the structure of the CQSS survey. As such, information on how students attending the course evaluated their overall course experience, and also how various universities in the consortia were experienced by students. Only indicators with 10 or more responses are included in the report.

The largest section of the report focuses on providing information about the supporting services available to students before the start of the EMJMD programme, during orientation, the general helpfulness of various units and individuals, as well as the support received on specific student issues. The following section focuses on indicators capturing the assessment and feedback processes. In section four, the responses of students to questions pertaining to teaching, learning and supervision are highlighted. Before concluding, section five touches on the internship, field experience and personal development aspects evaluated as part of the CQSS survey.

Graph plots the responses from students, while table provides information about how other courses did on that question. Example of a table below:

	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Course content	44	3.34	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	44	3.64	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	44	3.37	3.03	2.23 - 2.88	2.88 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.76

Each row represents a dimension of the question. It contains information about the mean that question received from students of your program.

Calculation of means is based on Likert-scale. Each option corresponds to a numeric value in a following way:

1. "Very unsatisfied" or "Disagree" = 1.
2. "Unsatisfied" or "Somewhat disagree" = 2.
3. "Satisfied" or "Somewhat agree" = 3.
4. "Very satisfied" or "Agree" = 4.

Therefore, average score for any given dimension in a table ranges from a minimum of 1 to a maximum of 4, with 4 being a perfect score for each dimension.

Following that is the mean for all respondents of the survey. Finally, table provides information about distribution of means in all other courses. Distribution is represented by quantiles. This means that 25% of courses will lie in each of the columns. This enables easy comparison of any given program with its peers. The column with the score of your program is highlighted.



3 Supporting services


We will have some text here.

3.1 Support received before the start of the Erasmus Mundus course

3.1.1 Consortia

Question:B.1.1

Rate the information and support received before the start of Erasmus Mundus master course on the following aspects




	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Course content	44	3.34	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	44	3.64	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	44	3.37	3.03	2.23 - 2.88	2.88 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.76
Information about fieldwork	44	3.02	2.95	2.00 - 2.80	2.81 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.57
Standards of behavior	44	3.65	3.44	2.77 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.42	3.43 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.90
Timetable	44	3.28	3.13	1.94 - 2.96	2.97 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.33	3.34 - 3.80

Table 1: Summary statistics




3.1.2 Lund University, Sweden

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 38)




3.1.3 University of Southampton, United Kingdom

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 24)




3.1.4 University of Twente, Netherlands

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 35)



3.1.5 University of Warsaw, Poland




3.2 Support received during the orientaion program

3.2.1 Consortia

Question:B.1.3






	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Academic staff	44	3.73	3.44	2.40 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.92
Administrative staff	44	3.57	3.39	2.30 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.43	3.44 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.93
Buddy or tutor system	44	2.94	2.96	2.00 - 2.88	2.89 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.64
International Student Office	44	3.40	3.24	2.47 - 3.04	3.05 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.48	3.49 - 3.90
Library	44	3.73	3.37	2.50 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.35	3.36 - 3.58	3.59 - 3.91
Other students	44	3.49	3.33	2.36 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.36	3.37 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.86
Student associations	44	3.23	2.99	1.92 - 2.76	2.77 - 3.02	3.03 - 3.22	3.23 - 3.62
University facilities	44	3.82	3.40	2.40 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.39	3.40 - 3.57	3.58 - 3.92


Table 2: Summary statistics




3.2.2 Lund University, Sweden




3.2.3 University of Southampton, United Kingdom



3.2.4 University of Twente, Netherlands



3.2.5 University of Warsaw, Poland




3.3 Helpfulness of units and people

3.3.1 Consortia

Question:B.2.1






	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Academic staff	44	3.77	3.45	2.50 - 3.30	3.31 - 3.46	3.47 - 3.62	3.63 - 4.00
Administrative staff	44	3.45	3.35	2.10 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.61	3.62 - 4.00
Buddy or tutor system	44	3.06	3.03	2.20 - 2.90	2.91 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.73
International Student Office	44	3.42	3.25	2.45 - 3.09	3.10 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.50	3.51 - 3.71
Library	44	3.77	3.42	2.80 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.44	3.45 - 3.60	3.61 - 3.93
Other students	44	3.53	3.40	2.45 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.39	3.40 - 3.55	3.56 - 3.85
Student associations	44	3.17	3.04	2.10 - 2.92	2.93 - 3.08	3.09 - 3.24	3.25 - 3.68
University facilities	44	3.70	3.42	2.71 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.48	3.49 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.86


Table 3: Summary statistics



3.3.2 Lund University, Sweden




3.3.3 University of Southampton, United Kingdom




3.3.4 University of Twente, Netherlands

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people at this university (n = 35)




3.3.5 University of Warsaw, Poland



3.4 Support received on various issues

3.4.1 Consortia

Question: B.2.2




	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Financial issues	44	2.82	3.34	2.50 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.57	3.58 - 3.90
Health insurance	44	3.05	3.36	2.54 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.38	3.39 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.84
Inappropriate conduct or sexual harassment issues	44	3.50	3.54	3.22 - 3.50	3.51 - 3.60	3.61 - 3.72	3.73 - 3.76


Table 4: Summary statistics

3.4.2 Lund University, Sweden


Rate the following items for first university (n = 38)




3.4.3 University of Southampton, United Kingdom



3.4.4 University of Twente, Netherlands



3.4.5 University of Warsaw, Poland




4 Assessment and feedback

We will have some text here.

4.1 Module assessment

4.1.1 Consortia

Question:C.1




	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Availability of course coordinator to discuss questions or problems related to my studies and mobility experience	44	3.45	3.28	2.10 - 3.12	3.13 - 3.33	3.34 - 3.49	3.50 - 3.90
Clarity of evaluation criteria across universities	44	3.14	2.77	1.90 - 2.55	2.56 - 2.79	2.80 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.60
Consistency of module's assessment across universities	44	3.05	2.81	1.89 - 2.58	2.59 - 2.79	2.80 - 3.01	3.02 - 3.50
Feedback on evaluation results and grades	44	3.23	2.77	1.70 - 2.57	2.58 - 2.83	2.84 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.60
Formalised system by university consortium for students to share opinions and feedback on course	44	2.95	2.91	1.75 - 2.73	2.74 - 2.97	2.98 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.55
Grade conversion across universities	44	2.91	2.85	2.17 - 2.71	2.72 - 2.83	2.84 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.56
Implementation of recommendations given by students to improve EM course experience	44	2.92	2.82	1.58 - 2.62	2.63 - 2.86	2.87 - 3.15	3.16 - 3.44
Information provided about provision of certificates and transcripts	44	3.14	3.02	1.96 - 2.85	2.86 - 3.07	3.08 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.67
Information provided about the type of degree s to be awarded	44	3.30	3.12	2.40 - 2.95	2.96 - 3.16	3.17 - 3.35	3.36 - 3.70
The willingness and ability of the course coordinator to follow up on unresolved issues addressed	44	3.45	3.23	1.80 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.32	3.33 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.92

Table 5: Summary statistics




4.1.2 Lund University, Sweden




4.1.3 University of Southampton, United Kingdom


Rate the following items (n = 24)



4.1.4 University of Twente, Netherlands



4.1.5 University of Warsaw, Poland




5 Teaching/learning and supervision

We will have some text here.

5.1 First supervisor.

Question:L.4




	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
My supervisor provided valuable advice during my thesis work	44	3.74	3.50	2.64 - 3.43	3.44 - 3.60	3.61 - 3.75	3.76 - 4.00
My supervisor was available for periodic meetings	44	3.71	3.54	2.79 - 3.46	3.47 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.80	3.81 - 4.00

Table 6: Summary statistics

5.2 Second supervisor.

Question:L.5




	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
My second supervisor was available for consultation if the lead supervisor was unavailable	44	3.59	3.38	2.36 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.65	3.66 - 3.91
My supervisor provided valuable advice during my thesis work	44	3.67	3.40	2.45 - 3.12	3.13 - 3.48	3.48 - 3.71	3.72 - 3.91
My supervisor was available for periodic meetings	44	3.63	3.37	2.50 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.50	3.51 - 3.70	3.71 - 3.91

Table 7: Summary statistics


5.3 Teaching/learning

5.3.1 Lund University, Sweden


Please rate the following items (n = 38)



5.3.2 University of Southampton, United Kingdom




5.3.3 University of Twente, Netherlands



5.3.4 University of Warsaw, Poland

Please rate the following items (n = 14)




6 Internship/field experience and personal development

We will have some text here.

6.1 Personal development.

Question:L.6

Rate the following statements regarding personal development during EM course



	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
I am satisfied with my current position	44	3.68	3.37	3.00 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.44	3.45 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.79
I believe my course helped me achieve my current position if employed or student	44	3.80	3.44	3.00 - 3.43	3.44 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.72	3.73 - 3.95
I feel my Erasmus Mundus course prepared me for my career	44	3.62	3.35	2.64 - 3.28	3.29 - 3.33	3.34 - 3.54	3.55 - 3.88
I feel satisfied now about my former experience as an Erasmus Mundus student	44	3.86	3.63	3.36 - 3.61	3.62 - 3.69	3.70 - 3.79	3.80 - 4.00
My soft skills were improved by my course	44	3.72	3.49	2.90 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.71	3.72 - 4.00
My transcripts and certificates were provided in a timely manner	44	3.52	3.17	2.36 - 2.93	2.94 - 3.36	3.37 - 3.62	3.63 - 4.00
The course has enabled academic and personal achievement beyond my initial expectations	44	3.67	3.28	2.46 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.37	3.38 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.91

Table 8: Summary statistics



7 Acknowledgments

Some concluding remarks

