EMA
Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association

EUROCULTURE-Europe in the Wider World

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

Report was generated on 17 Dec 2015

Contents

1 Executive summary (?)

Overall satisfaction

| Response | Very unsatisfied | Somewhat unsatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied |

	Very unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Overall academic satisfaction	4%	16%	48%	32%
Overall satisfaction	4%	4%	60%	32%
University of Strasbourg, France	8%	25%	33%	33%

0 · 25 · 50 · 75 · 100

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 25 students of your program. They represent 18 countries and collectively they have spent more than 22 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 idicators 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 aon 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	25	2.92	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	25	2.96	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	25	2.88	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	25	2.92	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	25	2.96	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	25	2.88	3.03	2.23 - 2.88	2.88 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.76
Information about fieldwork	25	2.42	2.95	2.00 - 2.80	2.81 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.57
Standards of behavior	25	3.18	3.44	2.77 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.42	3.43 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.90
Timetable	25	2.80	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   University of Strasbourg, France

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received
before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 13)

| Response | Very unsatisfied | Somewhat unsatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied |

Accommodation — 18% | 9% | 36% | 36%

Estimation of living expenses — 10% | 10% | 30% | 50%

Local transportation — 18% | 18% | 64%

(Scale: 0, 25, 50, 75, 100)

3.2   Support received during the orientaion program

3.2.1   Consortia

Question:B.1.3

Rate the introduction process to the following units or people as part of the
orientation program

Response	Very unsatisfied Somewhat unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied Very satisfied

	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Academic staff	25	3.20	3.44	2.40 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.92
Administrative staff	25	3.04	3.39	2.30 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.43	3.44 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.93
Buddy or tutor system	25	2.56	2.96	2.00 - 2.88	2.89 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.64
International Student Office	25	3.12	3.24	2.47 - 3.04	3.05 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.48	3.49 - 3.90
Library	25	3.00	3.37	2.50 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.35	3.36 - 3.58	3.59 - 3.91
Other students	25	3.40	3.33	2.36 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.36	3.37 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.86
Student associations	25	3.00	2.99	1.92 - 2.76	2.77 - 3.02	3.03 - 3.22	3.23 - 3.62
University facilities	25	3.24	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 University of Strasbourg, France

Rate the introduction process to the following units or people as part of the orientation program at this university (n = 13)

3.3 Helpfulness of units and people

3.3.1 Consortia

Question:B.2.1

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people

	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Academic staff	25	3.36	3.45	2.50 - 3.30	3.31 - 3.46	3.47 - 3.62	3.63 - 4.00
Administrative staff	25	3.20	3.35	2.10 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.61	3.62 - 4.00
Buddy or tutor system	25	2.50	3.03	2.20 - 2.90	2.91 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.73
International Student Office	25	3.13	3.25	2.45 - 3.09	3.10 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.50	3.51 - 3.71
Library	25	3.04	3.42	2.80 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.44	3.45 - 3.60	3.61 - 3.93
Other students	25	3.61	3.40	2.45 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.39	3.40 - 3.55	3.56 - 3.85
Student associations	25	3.05	3.04	2.10 - 2.92	2.93 - 3.08	3.09 - 3.24	3.25 - 3.68
University facilities	25	3.36	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 University of Strasbourg, France

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people at this university (n = 13)

3.4 Support received on various issues

3.4.1 Consortia

Question:B.2.2

Rate the support received on the following issues

|	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
Financial issues	25	3.32	3.34	2.50 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.57	3.58 - 3.90
Health insurance	25	3.38	3.36	2.54 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.38	3.39 - 3.56	3.57 - 3.84

Table 4: Summary statistics

4 Assessment and feedback

We will have some text here.

4.1 Module assessment

4.1.1 Consortia

Question:C.1

Rate the following items

| Response | Very unsatisfied | Somewhat unsatisfied | Somewhat satisfied | Very satisfied |

Item	Very unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Very satisfied
Availability of course coordinator to discuss questions or problems related to my studies and mobility experience	4%	20%	28%	48%
Clarity of evaluation criteria across universities	4%	28%	60%	8%
Consistency of moduleÃ s assessment across universities	12%	36%	44%	8%
Feedback on evaluation results and grades	8%	16%	56%	20%
Formalised system by university consortium for students to share opinions and feedback on course	12%	28%	40%	20%
Grade conversion across universities	8%	20%	52%	20%
Implementation of recommendations given by students to improve EM course experience	18%	27%	45%	9%
Information provided about provision of certificates and transcripts	12%	12%	48%	28%
Information provided about the type of degree s to be awarded	12%	8%	54%	25%
The willingness and ability of the course coordinator to follow up on unresolved issues addressed	8%	12%	29%	50%

	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	25	3.20	3.28	2.10 - 3.12	3.13 - 3.33	3.34 - 3.49	3.50 - 3.90
Clarity of evaluation criteria across universities	25	2.72	2.77	1.90 - 2.55	2.56 - 2.79	2.80 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.60
Consistency of moduleÃ s assessment across universities	25	2.48	2.81	1.89 - 2.58	2.59 - 2.79	2.80 - 3.01	3.02 - 3.50
Feedback on evaluation results and grades	25	2.88	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	25	2.68	2.91	1.75 - 2.73	2.74 - 2.97	2.98 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.55
Grade conversion across universities	25	2.84	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	25	2.45	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	25	2.92	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	25	2.92	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	25	3.21	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   University of Strasbourg, France

Rate the following items (n = 13)

5   Teaching/learning and supervision

We will have some text here.

5.1   First supervisor.

Question:L.4

Please rate the following statements on first thesis supervisor

	n	Mean	EM mean	0% - 25%	25% - 50%	50% - 75%	75% - 100%
My supervisor provided valuable advice during my thesis work	25	3.29	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	25	3.40	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

Please rate the following statements on second thesis supervisor

	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	25	3.22	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	25	3.33	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	25	3.21	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 University of Strasbourg, France

Please rate the following items (n = 13)

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	25	3.64	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	25	3.62	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	25	3.29	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	25	3.79	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	25	3.36	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	25	3.36	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	25	3.05	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