



EMA

Erasmus Mundus Students and Alumni Association

MONABIP-Molecular Nano- and Biophotonics

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 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 7 |
| 3.1.3 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 8 |
| 3.1.4 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 9 |
| 3.2 | Support received during the orientation program | 9 |
| 3.2.1 | Consortia | 9 |
| 3.2.2 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 11 |
| 3.2.3 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 12 |
| 3.2.4 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 13 |
| 3.3 | Helpfulness of units and people | 13 |
| 3.3.1 | Consortia | 13 |
| 3.3.2 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 15 |
| 3.3.3 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 16 |
| 3.3.4 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 17 |
| 3.4 | Support received on various issues | 17 |
| 3.4.1 | Consortia | 17 |
| 3.4.2 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 18 |
| 3.4.3 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 19 |
| 3.4.4 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 20 |
| 4 | Assessment and feedback | 21 |
| 4.1 | Module assessment | 21 |
| 4.1.1 | Consortia | 21 |
| 4.1.2 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 23 |
| 4.1.3 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 24 |
| 4.1.4 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 25 |



| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 5 | Teaching/learning and supervision | 26 |
| 5.1 | First supervisor. | 26 |
| 5.2 | Second supervisor. | 26 |
| 5.3 | Teaching/learning | 27 |
| 5.3.1 | Complutense University of Madrid, Spain | 27 |
| 5.3.2 | Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France | 28 |
| 5.3.3 | Wrocław University of Technology, Poland | 29 |
| 6 | Internship/field experience and personal development | 30 |
| 6.1 | Personal development. | 30 |
| 7 | Acknowledgments | 31 |



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 31 students of your program. They represent 14 countries and collectively they have spent more than 60 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 | 31 | 3.48 | 3.19 | 2.54 - 3.06 | 3.07 - 3.23 | 3.24 - 3.40 | 3.41 - 3.70 |
| Enrolling in classes | 31 | 3.77 | 3.42 | 2.57 - 3.25 | 3.26 - 3.45 | 3.46 - 3.62 | 3.63 - 3.92 |
| Evaluation methods | 31 | 3.32 | 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 | 31 | 3.48 | 3.19 | 2.54 - 3.06 | 3.07 - 3.23 | 3.24 - 3.40 | 3.41 - 3.70 |
| Enrolling in classes | 31 | 3.77 | 3.42 | 2.57 - 3.25 | 3.26 - 3.45 | 3.46 - 3.62 | 3.63 - 3.92 |
| Evaluation methods | 31 | 3.32 | 3.03 | 2.23 - 2.88 | 2.88 - 3.06 | 3.07 - 3.21 | 3.22 - 3.76 |
| Information about fieldwork | 31 | 3.34 | 2.95 | 2.00 - 2.80 | 2.81 - 3.00 | 3.01 - 3.19 | 3.20 - 3.57 |
| Standards of behavior | 31 | 3.73 | 3.44 | 2.77 - 3.29 | 3.30 - 3.42 | 3.43 - 3.63 | 3.64 - 3.90 |
| Timetable | 31 | 3.55 | 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 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 15)




3.1.3 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 39)



3.1.4 Wroclaw University of Technology, Poland




3.2 Support received during the orientation program

3.2.1 Consortia

Question:B.1.3






| | n | Mean | EM mean | 0% - 25% | 25% - 50% | 50% - 75% | 75% - 100% |
|------------------------------|----|------|---------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| Academic staff | 31 | 3.81 | 3.44 | 2.40 - 3.29 | 3.30 - 3.47 | 3.48 - 3.63 | 3.64 - 3.92 |
| Administrative staff | 31 | 3.48 | 3.39 | 2.30 - 3.20 | 3.21 - 3.43 | 3.44 - 3.62 | 3.63 - 3.93 |
| Buddy or tutor system | 31 | 3.13 | 2.96 | 2.00 - 2.88 | 2.89 - 3.06 | 3.07 - 3.20 | 3.21 - 3.64 |
| International Student Office | 31 | 3.13 | 3.24 | 2.47 - 3.04 | 3.05 - 3.27 | 3.28 - 3.48 | 3.49 - 3.90 |
| Library | 31 | 3.50 | 3.37 | 2.50 - 3.20 | 3.21 - 3.35 | 3.36 - 3.58 | 3.59 - 3.91 |
| Other students | 31 | 3.52 | 3.33 | 2.36 - 3.18 | 3.19 - 3.36 | 3.37 - 3.47 | 3.48 - 3.86 |
| Student associations | 31 | 3.29 | 2.99 | 1.92 - 2.76 | 2.77 - 3.02 | 3.03 - 3.22 | 3.23 - 3.62 |
| University facilities | 31 | 3.48 | 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 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain



3.2.3 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France



3.2.4 Wroclaw University of Technology, 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 | 31 | 3.74 | 3.45 | 2.50 - 3.30 | 3.31 - 3.46 | 3.47 - 3.62 | 3.63 - 4.00 |
| Administrative staff | 31 | 3.57 | 3.35 | 2.10 - 3.18 | 3.19 - 3.45 | 3.46 - 3.61 | 3.62 - 4.00 |
| Buddy or tutor system | 31 | 3.24 | 3.03 | 2.20 - 2.90 | 2.91 - 3.06 | 3.07 - 3.20 | 3.21 - 3.73 |
| International Student Office | 31 | 3.10 | 3.25 | 2.45 - 3.09 | 3.10 - 3.27 | 3.28 - 3.50 | 3.51 - 3.71 |
| Library | 31 | 3.57 | 3.42 | 2.80 - 3.20 | 3.21 - 3.44 | 3.45 - 3.60 | 3.61 - 3.93 |
| Other students | 31 | 3.55 | 3.40 | 2.45 - 3.21 | 3.22 - 3.39 | 3.40 - 3.55 | 3.56 - 3.85 |
| Student associations | 31 | 3.25 | 3.04 | 2.10 - 2.92 | 2.93 - 3.08 | 3.09 - 3.24 | 3.25 - 3.68 |
| University facilities | 31 | 3.48 | 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 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people at this university (n = 15)




3.3.3 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people at this university (n = 39)




3.3.4 Wroclaw University of Technology, 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 | 31 | 3.61 | 3.34 | 2.50 - 3.19 | 3.20 - 3.40 | 3.41 - 3.57 | 3.58 - 3.90 |
| Health insurance | 31 | 3.43 | 3.36 | 2.54 - 3.25 | 3.26 - 3.38 | 3.39 - 3.56 | 3.57 - 3.84 |

Table 4: Summary statistics




3.4.2 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain



3.4.3 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France

3.4.4 Wroclaw University of Technology, 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 | 31 | 3.77 | 3.28 | 2.10 - 3.12 | 3.13 - 3.33 | 3.34 - 3.49 | 3.50 - 3.90 |
| Clarity of evaluation criteria across universities | 31 | 3.19 | 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 | 31 | 3.32 | 2.81 | 1.89 - 2.58 | 2.59 - 2.79 | 2.80 - 3.01 | 3.02 - 3.50 |
| Feedback on evaluation results and grades | 31 | 3.30 | 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 | 31 | 3.22 | 2.91 | 1.75 - 2.73 | 2.74 - 2.97 | 2.98 - 3.19 | 3.20 - 3.55 |
| Grade conversion across universities | 31 | 3.40 | 2.85 | 2.17 - 2.71 | 2.72 - 2.83 | 2.84 - 3.00 | 3.01 - 3.56 |
| Information provided about provision of certificates and transcripts | 31 | 3.55 | 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 | 31 | 3.40 | 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 | 31 | 3.74 | 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 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain

Rate the following items (n = 15)




4.1.3 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France

Rate the following items (n = 39)



4.1.4 Wrocław University of Technology, Poland

Rate the following items (n = 24)




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 | 31 | 3.65 | 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 | 31 | 3.77 | 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 | 31 | 3.75 | 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 | 31 | 3.76 | 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 | 31 | 3.76 | 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 Complutense University of Madrid, Spain


Please rate the following items (n = 15)



5.3.2 Ecole Normale Supérieure de Cachan, France



5.3.3 Wroclaw University of Technology, Poland




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 feel my Erasmus Mundus course prepared me for my career | 31 | 3.58 | 3.35 | 2.64 - 3.28 | 3.29 - 3.33 | 3.34 - 3.54 | 3.55 - 3.88 |
| My soft skills were improved by my course | 31 | 3.69 | 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 | 31 | 3.37 | 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 | 31 | 3.73 | 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

