



RESULTS OF THE HONOURS PROGRAMME SURVEY

2022

Supervisors

**FRIEDRICH-SCHILLER-
UNIVERSITÄT
JENA**

Central Office for Teaching Evaluation (ULe)

+49 3641 9 45237

ule@uni-jena.de

www.ule.uni-jena.de

July 25, 2022

Contents

1	Methods	1
1.1	About this report	1
1.1.1	Tables with absolute (<i>N</i>) and percentage frequencies (%)	1
1.1.2	Tables with mean values and graphs	1
2	Results	3
2.1	Information for statistical purposes	3
2.1.1	Current position	3
2.2	Assessments	4
2.2.1	Summarizing statements	4
2.2.2	Organisation	4
2.3	Components of the Honours Programme.	6
2.3.1	Honours Workshops	6
2.3.2	Honours Mentoring	6
2.3.3	Honours Funds	9

1 Methods

1.1 About this report

This report uses different ways of presenting results. In the following sections, both tables with absolute and percentage frequencies, and tables with mean values and graphs are explained in more detail.

Not every person has fully answered all the questions. Due to omissions or choosing the option “no answer” (n.a.), the full sample size may not be reached for each question. Therefore, the frequencies of the answer alternatives do not add up to the total sample size in every case.

1.1.1 Tables with absolute (N) and percentage frequencies (%)

For some statements in the survey, people are given several alternative answers to choose from. These can be distinguished as single or multiple choice. For *single choice*, the respondent can only choose a single answer option, whereas for *multiple choice*, multiple answer options can be chosen by one person. The option of multiple choice is clearly labeled at the relevant points in this report.

The absolute frequency (N) results from the number of respondents who gave an answer to the corresponding item/aspect. In order to easily compare the frequencies between the individual groups, percentage frequencies (%) are also shown: For this purpose, the absolute frequency is set in relation to the number of people who responded to this statement. For single choice, the separate percentages add up to 100 %. In the case of multiple choices, on the other hand, the sum of the separate percentages may be higher than 100 % because a single person may have chosen more than one answer option.

When displaying results from *open-ended questions*, only the answers of the main group(s) are listed. Data from reference groups are excluded here for saving space. The answers to open-ended questions are reproduced in their original wording, whereby comments with the same wording are summarised and shown with their absolute frequency.

If an answer alternative was not chosen by any person ($N=0$) or if no data are available for it (marked by – in the tables), the corresponding values are displayed in grey for better readability.

1.1.2 Tables with mean values and graphs

The majority of this survey contains statements that are to be answered on a closed, mostly 7-point Likert scale. For such response formats, the *mean value* over all responses can be calculated. Thus, a statement about the central tendency can be drawn.

The *graphs* display the mean value for the respective item, the mean values of the reference groups and the distribution of the answers (in the main group). For each of the seven scale points (unless otherwise stated) a rectangle whose width indicates the percentage frequency (% value) is shown with a label showing the percentage. For reasons of readability, labels for values smaller than 5 % are omitted. The percentage frequencies in the graphs refer to the data of the main group (Main) of the report. The mean value of all responses of the main group for the respective item is shown with the symbol \bar{x} . The mean values of the reference groups are illustrated with the symbols \triangle_A , \triangle_B and \triangle_C .

For each item a *significance test* was calculated in order to see if there are statistically significant differences between the groups. A result is significant if the difference between two mean values did not occur by chance. First, each variable is tested for normal distribution with a Shapiro-Wilk test. If normal distribution is given, a t -test is calculated. If no normal distribution is given for the variable under consideration, the parameter-free Wilcoxon test checks the differences in mean values for statistical significance. Significant differences are marked with ² for reference group A, ³ for reference group B and ⁴ for reference group C. The significance tests are performed two-sided at a level of $\alpha = .05$.

Sample table: study satisfaction	Main		RA	RB	RC							
	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>M</i>	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1 I am satisfied with my studies.	100	4.2 ^{2,3}	2.5	5.5	4.5							

Legend: Main: Main group; RA \triangle : Reference group A; RB \triangle : Reference group B; RC \triangle : Reference group C

In the *example table* shown here, $N=100$ respondents of the example group Main (main group) answered the item “I am satisfied with my studies”. The corresponding mean value is $M=4.2$. Furthermore, the table contains mean values for the reference groups: The mean value for reference group A (RA) is $M_1=2.5$ and for reference group B (RB) the mean is $M_2=5.5$. The mean value of the example group Main (main group) ($M=4.2$) is marked with ² and ³, which indicates that the mean differs significantly from the means of the reference groups A and B. The lower part of the graph shows the percentage frequencies for each of the seven scale points. For example, 8 % of respondents answered 1=“I strongly disagree” and 10 % of respondents answered 4=“partly”.

The following statistical parameters are given depending on the respective question:

Symbols in tables

- N*** Number of respondents who gave an assessment of the question/statement; absolute response frequency
- M*** Mean value on the respective 7-point response scale
- %** Percentage; relative response frequency
- n.a.*** Number of respondents who marked “no answer”.
- Cells in tables for which no or insufficient data are available
- ² A mean value (*M*) marked with 2 is statistically significantly different from the mean value of the *second* group (reference group A).
- ³ A mean value (*M*) marked with 3 is statistically significantly different from the mean value of the *third* group (reference group B).
- ⁴ A mean value (*M*) marked with 4 is statistically significantly different from the mean value of the *fourth* group (reference group C).

Symbols in graphs

- I** graphical representation of the mean value of the first group (main group)
- \triangle graphical representation of the mean value of the second group (reference group A)
- \triangle graphical representation of the mean value of the third group (reference group B; if present)
- \triangle graphical representation of the mean value of the fourth group (reference group C; if present)

2 Results

This report contains the following groups:

2022 Supervisors 2022 $N = 28$

2021 Supervisors 2021 $N = 35$

2020 Supervisors 2020 $N = 10$

2.1 Information for statistical purposes

2.1.1 Current position

Please provide the following information for statistical purposes.

I am ...	2022		2021		2020	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	28	100	34	100	10	100
a professor	14	50	20	59	9	90
a postdoctoral researcher	14	50	14	41	1	10

Legend: **2022**: Supervisors 2022; **2021**: Supervisors 2021; **2020**: Supervisors 2020

2.2 Assessments

2.2.1 Summarizing statements

Please start with an overall assessment.

Summarizing statements	2022		2021	2020					
	N	M	M	M	1	2	3	4	5
<i>1=I strongly disagree ... 3=partly ... 5=I strongly agree</i>									
1 The Honours Programme gives students a deeper insight into research processes.	28	4.7	4.7	4.5			7%	18%	75%
2 The Honours Programme gives students the chance to get in touch with the scientific community in their field of research.	28	4.5	4.4	4.3			7%	32%	61%
3 The Honours Programme is a useful preparation for their planned career after graduation.	28	4.6	4.7	4.4			7%	21%	71%
4 Overall, I am satisfied with the Honours Programme.	28	4.8	4.4	4.4				14%	82%

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021▲: Supervisors 2021; 2020▲: Supervisors 2020

2.2.2 Organisation

Please assess the organisation of the Honours Programme. If some aspects are not applicable for you or did not take place, please select „no answer“ (n.a.).

Assessment of the organisation	2022		2021	2020					
	N	M	M	M	1	2	3	4	5
<i>1=very bad ... 5=very good</i>									
1 Application process	27	4.6	4.7	4.4				30%	67%
2 Communication with the coordination office (answering questions, explaining and assisting with administrative procedures such as applications and statements)	22	4.7	4.8	4.4			5%	18%	77%
3 Comprehensibility and transparency of the programme's aims	28	4.3	4.6	4.1			7%	43%	46%
4 Structure of the programme and possibilities within the programme	28	4.4	4.3	4.1			7%	39%	50%
5 Possibility for the Honours students to actively refine the programme	21	4.4	4.1	4.0			10%	43%	48%

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021▲: Supervisors 2021; 2020▲: Supervisors 2020

Here you can write down further comments on the organisation of the Honours Programme.

Comments on the organisation	2022
<i>[Free texts]</i>	<i>N</i>
- Die Möglichkeit des Einsatzes der Geldmittel durch die Geförderten war sehr eingeschränkt und wurde teilweise widersprüchlich kommuniziert. Nachdem die ursprünglich gedachte Anschaffung gar nicht möglich war, konnte nicht einmal eine Software (nur als Jahres-Abo) angeschafft werden. Eine bessere Kommunikation, was angeschafft werden darf wäre sinnvoll (ursprüngliche mündliche Kommunikation: "alles ist möglich, kein bürokratischer Aufwand", dann, ebenfalls mündlich: "keine praktischen Mittel für das Forschungsprojekt", dann "keine Software-Lizenzen, wenn auch ein ein-Jahres-Abo vorhanden". Im Endeffekt wurden Bücher angeschafft, da leider auch keine sinnvolle Konferenz anstand.	1
- Gut, dass Antrag knapp gehalten werden kann (einseitiges Expose)	1
- I think it would be good if there was a small yearly conference, where the student can present their research as posters and with talks from selected supervisors	1
- Since the participant students are very interested in a research career, it would be great to have orientation concerning application for Stipendium, so that they may continue to a doctorate. Also, encourage the Honour students to stay for a doctorate in Jena, since the university has invested more into their education.	1

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022

2.3 Components of the Honours Programme.

Please assess the components of the Honours Programme in the following.

2.3.1 Honours Workshops

Do you want to receive more information about the offered workshops and events for the Honours students?

Information about workshops	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	33	100	10	100
Yes	15	58	24	73	8	80
No	11	42	9	27	2	20

Legend: **2022**: Supervisors 2022; **2021**: Supervisors 2021; **2020**: Supervisors 2020

Here you can write down comments, suggestions for improvement, ideas and wishes concerning the Honours Workshops:

Comments on the Honours workshops	2022
<i>[Free texts]</i>	N
- Einen Übersicht alle 3-6 Monate über das Workshop-Programm kann sinnvoll sein	1
- I have already given them in the previous step	1

Legend: **2022**: Supervisors 2022

2.3.2 Honours Mentoring

Are you also the reviewer of the student's thesis?

Supervision of a final thesis	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	33	100	10	100
yes	19	73	28	85	9	90
no	5	19	4	12	1	10
still uncertain	2	8	1	3	0	0

Legend: **2022**: Supervisors 2022; **2021**: Supervisors 2021; **2020**: Supervisors 2020

How much time do you approximately spend on the Honours Mentoring (per student) per month?

Time spent	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	31	100	9	100
0-1 hour	1	4	1	3	1	11
1,5-2,5 hours	7	27	14	45	3	33
3-4 hours	7	27	9	29	4	44
more than 4 hours	11	42	7	23	1	11

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

Do you wish to receive more support in the mentoring process by the Graduate Academy

Request for support	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	33	100	10	100
Yes	1	4	3	9	0	0
No	25	96	30	91	10	100

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

What kind of support:

Type of support	2022	
<i>[Free texts]</i>	N	

There are no responses for this block.

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022

Do you think a half-day introductory workshop for supervisors in the Honours Programme would be useful to develop your skills as a mentor?

Introductory workshop	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	24	100	30	100	10	100
Yes	17	71	18	60	7	70
No	7	29	12	40	3	30

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

Did you think, the student was able to acquire competencies and skills and make progress in the following areas thanks to the mentoring.

Progress	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>[Multiple choices possible]</i>						
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	33	100	10	100
I do not see any progress	0	0	1	3	0	0
Professional knowledge in their discipline	24	92	25	76	4	40
Methodological knowledge in their discipline	23	88	24	73	5	50
Career orientation	12	46	12	36	3	30
Practical career planning	16	62	20	61	7	70
Self-assessment	19	73	24	73	8	80
Building a professional network	17	65	15	45	7	70
Other	1	4	0	0	0	0
- Verständnis für Machbarkeit und Limitationen	1	4				

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

Would you recommend colleagues to become involved in the Honours Programme as supervisors?

Recommendation to colleagues	2022		2021		2020	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
<i>Anzahl an Teilnehmern, die diese Frage beantwortet haben</i>	26	100	33	100	10	100
Yes	26	100	32	97	10	100
No	0	0	1	3	0	0

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

Overall satisfaction with Honours Mentoring	2022		2021	2020					
	N	M	M	M	1	2	3	4	5
<i>1=I strongly disagree ... 3=partly ... 5=I strongly agree</i>									
1 Overall, I am satisfied with the Honours Mentoring.	26	4.7	4.5	4.5				15%	81%

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022; 2021: Supervisors 2021; 2020: Supervisors 2020

Here you can write down comments, suggestions for improvement, ideas and wishes concerning the Honours Mentoring:

Comments on Honours Mentoring	2022
<i>[Free texts]</i>	<i>N</i>
- Das Programm hat keinen systematischen Auswahlmechanismus, um zu gewährleisten, dass die besten Studierenden unserer Universität aufgenommen werden. Es werden nur die Studierenden begutachtet, die sich bewerben und ich nehme an, dass sich nur ein Bruchteil der Studierenden bewirbt und ich weiß nicht, ob schon einmal kritisch hinterfragt wurde, ob dies die besten Studierenden der jeweiligen Studiengänge sind. Deshalb sind letztendlich wohl nicht die besten Studierenden im Programm und das Honours-Qualitätssiegel verfehlt seine Wirkung. Besser wäre es vielleicht, den Jahrgangsbesten der einzelnen Studiengänge, die Aufnahme ins Programm anzubieten bzw. diesen anzubieten, sich mit einem Motivationsschreiben zu bewerben. Ebenso sollte die Bewerbung der Studierenden unabhängig vom Betreuer erfolgen. Die besten Studierenden will sowieso jeder betreuen.	1
- Die Betreuung der Studierenden im Honours-Programm hat keine bessere Qualität als sie jeder andere Studierende in meiner Arbeitsgruppe ebenfalls erfährt und ich denke, dies gilt für unsere gesamte Fakultät. Anderenfalls würden wir unserem Lehr- und Betreuungsauftrag nicht gerecht.	1
- Gut, dass Formalitäten so knapp gehalten werden	1
- Ich finde die Idee eines Honours-Programms sehr gut. Aus der Perspektive eines Betreuenden finde ich aber die aktuelle Ausgestaltung des Programms nicht zielführend.	1
- Möglichkeit, der Nachwuchsgewinnung ist gut	1

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022

2.3.3 Honours Funds

Here you can write down comments, suggestions for improvement, ideas and wishes concerning the Honours Funds:

Comments on the Honours Funds	2022
<i>[Free texts]</i>	<i>N</i>
- It would be great if the use of funds would be made bureaucratically easier.	1
- Nicht ganz klar, was gemeint ist. Die 1000 Euro? Wir waren positiv überrascht, von der Verlängerungsmöglichkeit mit weiteren finanziellen Mitteln (und auch, dass keine Gutachten dafür nötig waren)	1
- Particularly in the natural sciences, sometimes the projects would require extra funds for consumables. A small extra grant (1

Legend: 2022: Supervisors 2022