



College ESLG

Review of the study program Management of Real Estate and Infrastructure (MA) from students' perspective 2019-2020

College ESLG conducted a program evaluation and distributed the program evaluation form to all existing master students in writing. The same evaluation form is also available in the Electronic Grading System but it is not mandatory. The College ESLG will make the program evaluation form mandatory to all students before and they must fill it immediately upon the login.

The survey is composed of five sections. Sections of the survey are as follows:

1. Program Content – composed of five questions with Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied);
2. Teaching and Assessment - composed of fourteen questions with Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied);
3. Treatment of students and learning support – composed of six questions with Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied);
4. Overall evaluation of outcomes – composed of six questions with Likert Scale from 1 to 5 (very dissatisfied to very satisfied);
5. Written comments with three text boxes composed of best feature of the program, the drawback of the program and the part what would you improve in the overall quality of the program;

The present study of program evaluation of students shall focus on each section separately and draw recommendations for each of them, which will be further incorporated in the end in the strategic plan document of the study program. Apart from descriptive statistics, also the multiple regression will be run to see which of the independent variables influences mostly the dependent variable.



College ESLG

PROGRAM CONTENT

For each section the descriptive statistics was run in order to superficially find out which of the aspects of program content influenced mostly the students' satisfaction (those students that were subject to program evaluation). The descriptive statistics analysis was run in SPSS. The statistical analysis has been presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics for program content

Descriptive Statistics of program content						
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Contents and quality of mandatory courses	34	2	5	4.35	.832	.692
Contents and quality of elective courses	34	1	5	4.13	1.058	1.119
Choice of elective courses	34	1	5	3.96	1.147	1.316
Coherence and progression of contents	34	2	5	4.04	.928	.862
Fulfillment of your expectations by program	34	1	5	3.87	1.217	1.482
Valid N (listwise)	34					

Source: SPSS

From 79 respondents (existing students of the master program) who responded in the invitation to fill program evaluation forms only 34 responded effectively, especially those who are currently in the second year of studies in the study program Management of Real Estate and Infrastructure (MA). Questions of the questionnaire were with Likert Scale 1 (very dissatisfied), 2 (dissatisfied), 3 (somewhat satisfied), 4 (satisfied) and 5 (very satisfied). From the responses, the present report finds out that the contents and quality of mandatory courses has the highest mean of 4.35 with the lowest standard deviation of 0.832 and variance of 0.692, whereas the fulfillment of your expectations by the program has the lowest mean of 3.87 and the highest standard deviation of 1.217 and highest variance of 1.482. Students are also satisfied with the contents and quality of elective courses with the mean of 4.13 and slightly higher standard deviation of 1.058 and variance of 1.119. The coherence and progression of contents comes next with the mean of 4.04 and standard deviation of 0.928 and variance of 0.862. The choice of elective courses has the mean of 3.96 and standard deviation of 1.147 and variance of 1.316.



College ESLG

To identify which of these independent variables has the highest effect on students' satisfaction with the program content, we run multiple regression analysis whereby the dependent variable is the program content satisfaction and the other above described variables are independent variables.

Below we show the multiple regression analysis in Table 2

Table 2. Multiple regression for program content

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.415	.645		2.195	.042
	Contents and quality of mandatory courses	.040	.340	.042	.116	.909
	Contents and quality of elective courses	.255	.252	.340	1.013	.325
	Choice of elective courses	-.185	.157	-.268	-1.178	.255
	Coherence and progression of contents	.383	.267	.449	1.438	.169
	Fulfillment of your expectations by program	.163	.176	.250	.925	.368

a. Dependent Variable: Program content

From the multiple regression analysis run in SPSS, we find that coherence and progression of contents has the highest beta > 0.1 which is 0.383 and t > 1.0 which is 1.438, followed by contents and quality of elective courses with B = 0.255 and t = 1.013, followed next by fulfillment of your expectations by the program with B = 0.163 and t = 0.925. Thus, the study finds that coherence and progression of contents has the biggest causal effect on the satisfaction of students with the program content, followed by the contents and quality of elective courses, and fulfillment of your expectations by the program. On the other hand choice of elective courses has a negative impact on the program content satisfaction.



College ESLG

TEACHING AND ASSESMENT

Descriptive statistics of satisfaction teaching and assesment is in Table 3.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Teaching and Assessment

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Useful of lectures for grasping contents	34	1	5	4.04	1.065	1.134
Usefulness and quality of study materials	34	2	5	3.70	1.185	1.403
Course/workload distribution during the week	34	2	5	3.91	.793	.628
Involving students in staff's research projects	34	1	5	3.70	1.460	2.130
Opportunities for international cooperation	34	1	5	3.35	1.335	1.783
Clearly defined outcomes	34	2	5	3.96	.928	.862
Clearly defined assessment criteria	34	2	5	4.13	.869	.755
Coherence of assessment criteria	34	2	5	4.26	.864	.747
Continuous assessment	34	1	5	4.17	1.029	1.059
Regular feedback on successfulness in learning	34	2	5	4.22	.902	.814
Schedule of exam periods and other forms of assessment	34	2	5	4.17	.834	.696
Number of exam periods	34	1	5	4.30	1.020	1.040
Methods of assessment (exam implementation)	34	2	5	4.35	.935	.874
Overall satisfaction with implementation	34	2	5	4.17	.937	.877
Valid N (listwise)	34					



College ESLG

From the descriptive statistics of teaching and assessment, the methods of assessment have the highest mean of 4.35 and standard deviation of 0.935 and variance of 0.874, followed by number of exam periods with the mean of 4.30 and standard deviation of 1.020 and variance of 1.040. Next variable that has the highest mean is coherence of assessment criteria with the mean of 4.26, standard deviation of 0.864 and variance of 0.747. Regular feedback on successfulness in learning has the mean of 4.22 and standard deviation of 0.902 and variance 0.814. Both schedule of exam periods and overall quality of implementation have the means of 4.17 but the schedule of exam periods has the lower standard deviation of 0.834 compared to that of overall quality of implementation of 0.937 .

Usefulness and grasping of lectures has the mean of higher than 4, which is 4.06 with standard deviation of 1.065. Next variable that has the high mean of 3.96 is the clearly defined learning outcomes. Course/workload distribution during the week has a mean of 3.91 Students are less satisfied with involving students in staff's research projects with the mean of 3.70 and standard deviation of 1.460. Usefulness and quality of study materials if 3.70. The variable with the lowest mean is opportunities for international cooperation with the mean of lower than the set standard of 3.5, which is 3.35 and standard deviation of 1.335.

Next, we run multiple regression to see which of the independent variables has the highest positive and negative effect on the satisfaction of students with the teaching and assessment.

Table 4: Multiple regression for teaching and assessment

		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.	
1	(Constant)	.995	.492		2.022	.078	
	Useful of lectures for grasping contents	.023	.112	.028	.202	.845	
	Usefulness and quality of study materials	-.009	.119	-.012	-.075	.942	



College ESLG

Course/workload distribution during the week	-.305	.158	-.276	-1.930	.090
Involving students in staff's research projects	.002	.111	.004	.022	.983
Opportunities for international cooperation	.006	.058	.009	.099	.923
Clearly defined outcomes	-.089	.194	-.095	-.459	.659
Clearly defined assessment criteria	.611	.223	.606	2.736	.026
Coherence of assessment criteria	-.192	.148	-.190	-1.297	.231
Continuous assessment	.326	.219	.384	1.493	.174
Regular feedback on successfulness in learning	-.071	.128	-.073	-.553	.595
Schedule of exam periods and other forms of assessment	.015	.167	.014	.087	.933
Number of exam periods	.001	.143	.001	.006	.995
Methods of assessment (exam implementation)	.146	.142	.156	1.032	.332
Overall satisfaction with implementation	.312	.149	.334	2.092	.070

a. Dependent Variable: Teaching and assessment

From the multiple regression run in SPSS, the clearly defined assessment criteria has the highest effect on the satisfaction of students with Teaching and Assessment with $b=0.611$ and $t=2.736$, followed by overall satisfaction with the implementation of the program with $b=0.312$ and $t=2.092$. According to Nunally (1979) for an independent variable to have an effect on dependent variable the $b>0.1$ and $t>1.96$. Next variable that has the highest effect on the satisfaction of students for teaching and assessment is continuous assessment with $b=0.326$ and $t=1.493$ and methods of assessment with $b=0.146$ and $t=1.032$. From Table 4, we can notice that involving students in staff's research projects has a very low beta= 0.002 and $t=0.022$ and opportunities for international cooperation with beta of 0.005 and $t=0.099$.

College ESLG
Annex of Innovation Campus
Street Ibrahim Rugova p.n Lipjan
Tel: 038 602 405
M: 045 456 666
E-mail: info@eukos.org



TREATMENT OF STUDENTS AND LEARNING SUPPORT

Next, the study elaborates upon the student satisfaction with the treatment and learning support component. The descriptive statistics has been presented in Table 5.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of Treatment of Students and Learning Support

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Showing understanding for students' problems	34	1	5	3.87	1.180	1.391
Encouraging students' self confidence	34	1	5	3.91	1.125	1.265
Access to teaching staff	34	2	5	4.22	.951	.905
Access to additional mentors	34	3	5	4.30	.703	.494
Consultations with teaching staff	34	3	5	4.26	.915	.838
Student career (employment guidance)	34	1	5	3.70	1.063	1.130
Valid N (listwise)	34					

From Table 5, access to additional mentors has the highest mean of 4.30 and standard deviation of 0.703, followed by consultations with teaching staff with mean of 4.26 and standard deviation of 0.915 and variance of 0.838. Next variable with the mean higher than 4.0 is access to teaching staff with the mean of 4.22 and standard deviation of 0.951 and variance of 0.905. Encouraging students' self-confidence has the mean of 3.91 and standard deviation of 1.125 and showing understanding for students' problems is valued with the mean of 3.87 and standard deviation of 1.180. Students had the least satisfaction with the student career and employment guidance with the mean of 3.70 and standard deviation of 1.063 and 1.130.

Next, we run multiple regression to see which of these independent variables has the highest effect on the satisfaction of students for treatment and learning support.



College ESLG

Table 6: Multiple regression for Treatment and Learning Support Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Coefficients Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.411	.445		-.923	.370
	Showing understanding for students' problems	.132	.075	.158	1.753	.099
	Encouraging students' self confidence	.268	.103	.306	2.590	.020
	Access to teaching staff	.393	.157	.380	2.507	.023
	Access to additional mentors	-.004	.180	-.003	-.024	.981
	Consultations with teaching staff	.288	.100	.268	2.870	.011
	Student career (employment guidance)	.043	.097	.047	.444	.663

a. Dependent Variable: Treatment of students and support

From multiple regression analysis, we can notice that consultations with teaching staff has the highest effect on satisfaction of students with treatment and learning support with $b=0.288$ and $t=2.870$, followed by encouraging students' self-confidence with $b=0.268$ and $t=2.590$, and $b=0.393$ and $t=2.507$. Also showing understanding for students' problems meets partially the requirement of Nunnally (1979) for $b>0.1$ and $t>1.96$ with $b=0.132$ and $t=1.753$.

OVERALL EVALUATION OF THE PROGRAM

Next, the report evaluates the finding of students responses to the overall evaluation of the program. The descriptive statistics has been presented in Table 7.



College ESLG

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of overall evaluation of the program

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
Fulfillment of your initial expectations	345	1	5	3.61	1.373	1.885
Study program prepared you for your work	34	1	5	3.87	1.180	1.391
How much study program prepared you for continuing education in the same field	34	1	5	3.83	.937	.877
Satisfaction with graduates employment	34	1	5	3.43	1.273	1.621
How demanding was the program	34	1	5	4.09	1.041	1.083
Harmonization of ECTS with real workload in various courses	34	1	5	3.96	1.022	1.043
Valid N (listwise)	34					

The part of how demanding the program has the highest mean of 4.09 and standard deviation of 1.041 followed by harmonization of ECTS with the real workload in various courses with the mean of 3.96 and standard deviation of 1.022 and variance of 1.043. The preparation of the study program for work has the next highest mean of 3.87 and standard deviation of 1.180 and variance of 1.391 followed by the preparation of the program for education in the same field with the mean of 3.83 and standard deviation of 0.937. Satisfaction with the graduates employment has the lowest mean of 3.43 and standard deviation of 1.273.



College ESLG

Table 8: Multiple regression for overall quality of the program

		Coefficients ^a		Standardized		
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Coefficients	t	Sig.
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.468	.473		.989	.337
	Fulfillment of your initial expectations	-.200	.207	-.284	-.968	.347
	Study program prepared you for your work	.088	.206	.108	.429	.673
	How much study program prepared you for continuing education in the same field	.212	.318	.205	.665	.515
	Satisfaction with graduates employment	.470	.211	.618	2.224	.041
	How demanding was the program	-.296	.227	-.318	-1.303	.211
	Harmonization of ECTS with real workload in various courses	.648	.318	.684	2.041	.058

a. Dependent Variable: Overall evaluation of outcomes

From multiple regression we can see that satisfaction with graduates employment has the highest $b=0.470$ and $b=2.224$ having the highest effect on the satisfaction of students with the overall quality of the program followed by harmonization of ECTS with the real workload with $b=0.648$ and $t=2.041$.



College ESLG

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS BASED ON WRITTEN COMMENTS

The table of respondents with the written comments on best feature of the program, the biggest drawback of the program and how would they improve the overall quality of the program has been presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Responses of students

Respondent	Best feature of the program	Drawback of the program	What would you improve in the overall quality
R1	Research work, practical work, group discussions	Part time staff with many engagements resulting less commitment	Cooperation of ESLG with private sector
R2	Sustainability component	Location in the second year	Better outreach with private sector in the field of energy efficiency
R3	No comment	Travel -location	No comment
R4	Negotiation of agreements course	Sustainable urban design	Improve the financial analysis of real estate investments course
R5	Project work	No drawback	More practical and field work
R6		No drawback	More practical work
R7	Real estate appraisal	No drawback	More practical

College ESLG
 Annex of Innovation Campus
 Street Ibrahim Rugova p.n Lipjan
 Tel: 038 602 405
 M: 045 456 666
 E-mail: info@eukos.org



College ESLG

			work and exercise hours
R8	Sustainability, negotiation of agreements	No drawback	Adding more efficiency and sustainability component
R9	Access to additional mentors	Less professors	No comment
R10	Real estate appraisal	Schedule of lectures inconvenient	Increase the staff diversity
R11	No comment	No comment	No comment
R12	Preparing to write essays	No comment	No comment
R13	Content of materials offered, research work	Previous building was a negative example of energy efficiency	More site visits and researches
R14	Class discussions and responsiveness of professors to students queries	Difficulties in employment in public institutions	No comment
R15	All the program makes me better prepared for the job	Old lecturing style in one of the courses	I would like to improve that every professor should be like Dr. Visar Hoxha

College European School of Law and Governance
 Nazim Gafurri 33 10000 Prishtina Kosovo

Tel: 038 602 405

M: 045 456 666

E-mail: info@eukos.org



College ESLG

R16	Facility management and maintenance	The regulatory part needs to be completed to support this profession	Increase practical part
R17	Case studies, exercises, and project work	Practical work	Include practical obligation
R18	Several unique courses, project work, research	Less exercises and field visits	More field visits and exercise hours
R19	Exercise work and research	Lack of practical work	Add practical obligation and site visits in the field
R20	Project work and career guidance by Professor Islam Hasani	Lack of support by management	Field visits and better cooperation between staff and students
R21	Class interaction with professor	Ex catedra teaching by some professors	More practical work and better cooperation with public institutions
R22	Uniqueness of the program	No comment	Smaller project groups, and visit to buildings with sustainable materials,

College ESLG
 Annex of Innovation Campus
 Street Ibrahim Rugova p.n Lipjan
 Tel: 038 602 405
 M: 045 456 666
 E-mail: info@cukos.org



College ESLG

14 students did not respond in qualitative interview. From the qualitative analysis some of the issues are recurring in most of the responses of the students such as project work and research-based teaching, sustainability component, real estate appraisal course, and negotiation of agreements. As the best features of the program. Amongst the drawbacks of the program students identified lack of site visits and practical work as most relevant issued that must be addressed. On the other hand, it is the predominant opinion of the respondents that better outreach to private sector, increase of site visits, and practical work are some of the quality issues of the program that must be improved.

EVALUATION BY PROGRAM DIRECTOR AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The program director Assoc. Prof. Dr. Visar Hoxha after thorough examination of the findings from the students program evaluation, reaches the following conclusions:

PROGRAM CONTENT

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of greater than 4.0 with regards to program content in the following fields:

- Contents and quality of mandatory courses;
- Contents and quality of elective courses;
- Coherence and progression of contents:

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of lower than 4.0 with regards to program content in the following fields:

- Choice of elective courses;
- Fulfillment of initial expectations;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the highest effect on program content satisfaction of students:

- Coherence and progression of contents

From multiple regression analysis the following variable has the highest negative impact:

- Choice of elective courses



College ESLG

Recommendation:

- Strengthen the induction course at the admission to explain the students better their expectation within the program so there can be no discrepancy between what they expect and what is delivered;
- Strike a balance between the coverage of more than 50 % of ECTS by full time PhD staff with the hiring of more part time staff to increase the choice of elective courses within the program;

TEACHING AND ASSESMENT

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of greater than 4.0 with regards to teaching and assessment in the following fields:

- Methods of assessment;
- Number of exam periods;
- Coherence of assessment criteria;
- Regular feedback on successfulness in learning;
- Schedule of exam periods;
- Overall quality of implementation;
- Usefulness and grasping of lectures

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of lower than 4.0 with regards to teaching and assessment in the following fields:

- Clearly defined learning outcomes;
- Course and workload distribution;
- Involving students in staff's research;
- Usefulness and quality of study materials;
- Opportunities for international cooperation;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the highest effect on teaching and assessment satisfaction of students:

- Clearly defined assessment criteria
- Methods of assessment;
- Continuous assessment;

College ESLG
Annex of Innovation Campus
Street Ibrahim Rugova p.n Lipjan
Tel: 038 602 405
M: 045 456 666
E-mail: info@eukos.org



College ESLG

- Implementation of the program;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the lowest impact:

- Involving students in staff's research;
- Opportunities for international cooperation;

Recommendation:

- Increase the research publications of professors with students and make that mandatory in the contract;
- Increase the mobility of students;
- Professors should write university textbooks in the courses they teach under College ESLG umbrella peer reviewed by international professors to address the issue of usefulness and quality of study materials, which had the satisfaction of lower than 4.0;

TREATMENT AND LEARNING SUPPORT

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of greater than 4.0 with regards to treatment and learning support in the following fields:

- Access to additional mentors;
- Consultations with teaching staff;
- Access to teaching staff;

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of lower than 4.0 with regards to treatment and learning support in the following fields:

- Encouraging students' self-confidence;
- Showing understanding for students' problems;
- Student career and employment guidance;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the highest effect on treatment and learning support satisfaction of students:

- Consultations with teaching staff;
- Encouraging students' self-confidence
- Showing understanding for students' problems

College ESLG
Annex of Innovation Campus
Street Ibrahim Rugova p.n Lipjan
Tel: 038 602 405
M: 045 456 666
E-mail: info@eukos.org



College ESLG

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the lowest impact:

- Career and student employment guidance

Recommendation:

- Strengthen the Office of Career and Employment Guidance;

OVERALL QUALITY OF THE PROGRAM

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of greater than 4.0 with regards to overall quality of the program in the following fields:

- Demand of the program;
- Harmonization of ECTS with the real workload;

Students have the satisfaction with the mean of lower than 4.0 with regards to overall quality of the program in the following fields:

- The preparation of study program for work;
- Preparation for continuing education in the field;
- Graduates employment;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the highest effect on overall quality of the program satisfaction of students:

- Satisfaction with graduates employment;
- Harmonization of ECTS with real workload;

From multiple regression analysis the following variables have the least effect on overall quality of the program satisfaction of students:

- Fulfillment of your initial expectations;
- Preparation for work;
- Preparation for the continuing education;



College ESLG

Recommendation:

Induction course on explaining every detail of what is expected during the program;

Strengthen the continuing support during the studies to support students during their employment and furthering their education;

QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS BASED ON WRITTEN COMMENTS

From the qualitative analysis the recurring issues arise in most of the responses of respondents as best feature of the program:

- Project work;
- Research-based teaching;
- Sustainability component;
- Negotiation of agreements;

From the qualitative analysis the recurring issues arise in most of the responses of respondents as the drawback of the program:

- Lack of site visits;

From the qualitative analysis the recurring issues arise as the most relevant among students responses as what needs improvement in the program:

- Better outreach to private sector;
- Increase site visits;
- More practical programs;

RECOMMENDATION

- Increase the number of memoranda of cooperation with private sector firms and civil society organizations;
- Implement these memoranda of cooperation with more site visits and practical work of students;