

**FACULTY OF NURSING AND MIDWIFERY**  
**STUDENT RESEARCH EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE (SREQ)**  
**POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS**  
**ANALYSIS OF OPEN RESPONSE COMMENTS: 2005**

**CONTENTS**

<b>1</b>	<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>ARRANGEMENT.....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF THE COMMENTS: TAXONOMY AND PROCESS .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS REFERRING TO THE BEST ASPECTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>ANALYSIS OF COMMENTS SUGGESTING IMPROVEMENTS .....</b>	<b>3</b>

## **1 Introduction**

The Student Research Experience Questionnaire (SREQ), which evaluates the quality of research higher degree students' experiences, was introduced in 2002. As part of the questionnaire postgraduate research students are asked to provide comments on the following:

- What are the best aspects of your research higher degree experience?
- What aspects are most in need of improvement?

Based on the responses to these questions, this document seeks to provide an analysis of the areas of best practice, and opportunities for improvement, in the experiences of postgraduate research students in the Faculty of Nursing and Midwifery in 2005.

In 2005 4 / 11 students who responded to the SREQ provided comments on the best aspects of their degree experience, and on those that were considered to be in need of improvement.

## **2 Arrangement**

1. Analysis of comments referring to best aspects of the degree course
2. Analysis of comments referring to aspects that could be improved

Responses are ranked according to the number of times an aspect occurs in the comments received. Due to the low number of responses received, and to maintain student confidentiality, no comments are provided. It is statistically invalid to convert this low number into percentages. Therefore results are expressed as raw numbers

## **3 Analysis of the comments: taxonomy and process**

The manual analysis and evaluation method used by the University is based on an in-house taxonomy which allows for standardisation of reporting across the university and ease of comparison with the SREQ quantitative analysis reports. Within the taxonomy, categories used for the SREQ are identical to the SREQ factor scales, with the addition of Administration and organisation, Ethics Administration, Academic Board policies, International Office, and other administrative areas and support services. This taxonomy is under constant revision as the need to sub-divide categories and create new ones becomes apparent.

Each comment received is analysed according to the SREQ Taxonomy, with those including more than one aspect being counted in each aspect mentioned.

It should be noted, however, that the absence of favourable comments on a particular aspect of learning and teaching does not reflect that this is not an area of best practice. Rather that the students are happy with their experiences, and prefer to focus on commenting on areas in need of improvement.

*Rachel Symons  
Office of Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Learning and Teaching)*

*June 2006*

**4 Analysis of comments referring to the best aspects<sup>1</sup>**

	<i>2005</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2002</i>
Quality of supervision: supervisor	3	5	3	5
Quality of infrastructure: research resources: library	2	1	2	
Overall satisfaction: satisfaction with research	1	5	5	4
Research climate: supportive work environment	1		1	
Quality of supervision: flexibility of program	1			
Research climate: support of other research students	1			
Research climate: part of research community: faculty	1			

**5 Analysis of comments suggesting improvements<sup>2</sup>**

	<i>2005</i>	<i>2004</i>	<i>2003</i>	<i>2002</i>
Quality of supervision: supervisor	2	3		3
Quality of infrastructure: research resources: library	1		1	
Quality of infrastructure: physical facilities: workspace, buildings, office etc	1	1	2	
Research climate: interaction with other research students (study related)	2	2		2
Research climate: seminars/ workshops	1		2	2
Research climate: student support: part-time students	1			
Overall satisfaction: general comments	1			
Overall satisfaction: quality of degree	1			

---

<sup>1</sup> Number of comment received: 2005: 4; 2004: 11; 2003: 13; 2002: 12

<sup>2</sup> Number of comment received: 2005: 4; 2004: 11; 2003: 13; 2002: 12