



# PERCCOM-PERvasive Computing and COMmunications for sustainable development

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

*Report was generated on 17 Dec 2015*

# Contents


<b>1</b>	<b>Executive summary (?)</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>4</b>
2.1	Course Quality Advisory Board . . . . .	4
2.2	Introduction to the CQSS survey . . . . .	4
2.3	Structure of current report . . . . .	5
<b>3</b>	<b>Supporting services</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Support received before the start of the Erasmus Mundus course . . . . .	6
3.1.1	Consortia . . . . .	6
3.1.2	ITMO, Russia . . . . .	7
3.1.3	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	8
3.1.4	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	9
3.2	Support received during the orientaion program . . . . .	9
3.2.1	Consortia . . . . .	9
3.2.2	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	11
3.2.3	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	12
3.3	Helpfulness of units and people . . . . .	12
3.3.1	Consortia . . . . .	12
3.3.2	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	14
3.3.3	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	15
3.4	Support received on various issues . . . . .	15
3.4.1	Consortia . . . . .	15
3.4.2	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	16
3.4.3	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	17
<b>4</b>	<b>Assessment and feedback</b>	<b>18</b>
4.1	Module assessment . . . . .	18
4.1.1	Consortia . . . . .	18
4.1.2	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	20
4.1.3	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	21
<b>5</b>	<b>Teaching/learning and supervision</b>	<b>22</b>
5.1	First supervisor. . . . .	22
5.2	Teaching/learning . . . . .	23
5.2.1	ITMO, Russia . . . . .	23
5.2.2	Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland . . . . .	24
5.2.3	University of Lorraine, France . . . . .	25



<b>6</b>	<b>Internship/field experience and personal development</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>7</b>	<b>Acknowledgments</b>	<b>27</b>



# 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](mailto: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](mailto:chair.cqab@em-a.eu).

### 2.2 Introduction to the CQSS survey

Our survey was filled in by 19 students of your program. They represent 15 countries and collectively they have spent more than 129 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	19	2.95	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	19	3.42	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	19	2.83	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	19	2.95	3.19	2.54 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.23	3.24 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.70
Enrolling in classes	19	3.42	3.42	2.57 - 3.25	3.26 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.92
Evaluation methods	19	2.83	3.03	2.23 - 2.88	2.88 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.76
Information about fieldwork	19	2.85	2.95	2.00 - 2.80	2.81 - 3.00	3.01 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.57
Standards of behavior	19	3.47	3.44	2.77 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.42	3.43 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.90
Timetable	19	3.05	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 ITMO, Russia

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




### 3.1.3 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland

Rate the following items regarding the logistic information and support received before the beginning of studies in this university (n = 20)





### 3.1.4 University of Lorraine, France




## 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	19	3.47	3.44	2.40 - 3.29	3.30 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.63	3.64 - 3.92
Administrative staff	19	2.68	3.39	2.30 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.43	3.44 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.93
Buddy or tutor system	19	3.06	2.96	2.00 - 2.88	2.89 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.64
International Student Office	19	3.12	3.24	2.47 - 3.04	3.05 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.48	3.49 - 3.90
Library	19	3.28	3.37	2.50 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.35	3.36 - 3.58	3.59 - 3.91
Other students	19	3.22	3.33	2.36 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.36	3.37 - 3.47	3.48 - 3.86
Student associations	19	3.11	2.99	1.92 - 2.76	2.77 - 3.02	3.03 - 3.22	3.23 - 3.62
University facilities	19	3.26	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 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland



### 3.2.3 University of Lorraine, France




## 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	19	3.39	3.45	2.50 - 3.30	3.31 - 3.46	3.47 - 3.62	3.63 - 4.00
Administrative staff	19	2.61	3.35	2.10 - 3.18	3.19 - 3.45	3.46 - 3.61	3.62 - 4.00
Buddy or tutor system	19	3.12	3.03	2.20 - 2.90	2.91 - 3.06	3.07 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.73
International Student Office	19	3.29	3.25	2.45 - 3.09	3.10 - 3.27	3.28 - 3.50	3.51 - 3.71
Library	19	3.50	3.42	2.80 - 3.20	3.21 - 3.44	3.45 - 3.60	3.61 - 3.93
Other students	19	3.58	3.40	2.45 - 3.21	3.22 - 3.39	3.40 - 3.55	3.56 - 3.85
Student associations	19	3.22	3.04	2.10 - 2.92	2.93 - 3.08	3.09 - 3.24	3.25 - 3.68
University facilities	19	3.44	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 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland

Rate the helpfulness of the following units of people at this university (n = 20)




### 3.3.3 University of Lorraine, France



## 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	19	3.00	3.34	2.50 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.40	3.41 - 3.57	3.58 - 3.90
Health insurance	19	2.71	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 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland





### 3.4.3 University of Lorraine, France




## 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	19	2.84	3.28	2.10 - 3.12	3.13 - 3.33	3.34 - 3.49	3.50 - 3.90
Clarity of evaluation criteria across universities	19	2.47	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	19	2.63	2.81	1.89 - 2.58	2.59 - 2.79	2.80 - 3.01	3.02 - 3.50
Feedback on evaluation results and grades	19	2.56	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	19	2.62	2.91	1.75 - 2.73	2.74 - 2.97	2.98 - 3.19	3.20 - 3.55
Grade conversion across universities	19	2.82	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	19	2.71	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	19	2.94	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	19	2.84	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	19	2.94	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 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland

Rate the following items (n = 20)



## 4.1.3 University of Lorraine, France




## 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	19	3.60	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	19	3.60	3.54	2.79 - 3.46	3.47 - 3.62	3.63 - 3.80	3.81 - 4.00


Table 6: Summary statistics




## 5.2 Teaching/learning

### 5.2.1 ITMO, Russia

Please rate the following items (n = 13)




## 5.2.2 Lappeenranta University of Technology, Finland





## 5.2.3 University of Lorraine, France



## 6 Internship/field experience and personal development

We will have some text here.



## 7 Acknowledgments

Some concluding remarks

