Enhancing Quality of Technology-Enhanced Learning at Jordanian Universities
eQTel
544491-TEMPUS-1-2013-1-ES-TEMPUS-SMGR
Turku University
Turku, Finland
Study Visit
24-30 August 2015

List of Participants

No.	Name	Institution	Position
1	Hani Dmour	Ministry of Higher Education	Secretary General
2	Bashir Al-Zu'bi	HEAC	President
3	Mashhour Al-Refaie	PSUT	President
4	Mohammad Zboun	Ministry of Higher Education	Team Member
5	Hasan Al-Shalabi	Al-Hussein bin Talal University	Contact Person
6	Maha Audat	Al-Hussein bin Talal University	Team Member
7	Yazan Abu Yaghi	PSUT	Finance
8	Jarir Nsour	PSUT	Lecturer
9	Abdallah Al-Zoubi	PSUT	Project Manager
10	Mamoun Dmour	University of Jordan	Webmaster
11	Ahmad Khasawneh	Hashemite University	Contact Person
12	Bashar Hammad	Hashemite University	Team Member
13	Khalil Karasneh	Yarmouk University	Team Member
14	Laia Canals	FUOC	Team Member
15	Timo Halttunen	Turku University	Contact Person
16	Satu Hakanurmi	Turku University	Team Member
17	Ari Koski	Turku University	Team Member
18	Tero Keva	Turku University	Team Member
19	Päivi Hakala	Turku University	Team Member

1. Participants were welcomed by mr. Timo Halttunen, Head of Unit at University of Tuku Brahea Centre.

2. Based on our meeting in Turku on Tuesday, August 25th 2015, we are summarizing the points we made after hearing the progress of the design of the three pilot courses. These are the recommendations we have put together to improve the design of the courses so that learning outcomes are in line with course objectives, planned learning outcomes, and online-modes of delivering education.

- We strongly suggest adding activities at certain points during each unit of the course to foster collaborative learning amongst peers: they could be paired activities, group activities where the students have to collaborate in solving a problem or working on a formula, or divide them into groups to do presentations on sections of the course or subtopics and share those presentations for the other groups to comment and discuss.
- We recommend the use of facilitators/counselors/tutors to help the faculty members run the course: some aspects, communication spaces. These could be alumni, students who took the course in previous semesters, volunteer to answer the questions they can. If we can find a way of offer them some compensation for their dedication, providing them with some free courses.
- We suggest the use of more structure communicative spaces in Moodle in order to organize certain discussions and so that it facilitates the discussion between the peers themselves at the classroom level. The instructor of the course should make sure that they follow group-

dynamics methods to answer students' queries instead of falling into the trap of teaching many one-on-one private lessons. The Facebook group in the Renewable Energies course, could still serve to hold office hours or to do announcements of important deadlines, etc.

- Make sure you taking into account the possible copyright issues that stem from using copyrighted materials in the course. Jordanian and international copyright laws should be consulted. We suggest to seek aid from the head of library or expert librarians in the home universities because they tend to have an understanding of those issues.
- While designing the pilots, it is a good idea to come up with a plan to assess how the pilot went. There are different ways of assessing it (surveys, focus groups, interviews) and different aspects should be examined: the learning outcomes, the students' feedback on several issues (time devoted to each of the units and activities, the different tasks or learning activities, the quality of the materials, the usability of the platform and the different tools and communication spaces, willingness to sign up for another online class, etc), instructor's reflections, etc.
- Learning materials may vary and consist of online study-guide with a clear timeline, expected learning outcomes, learning activities and assignments. Materials may represent different media like short text, podcasts, videos and captured lectures. The purpose of natural reader in Renewable Energies course remained a bit unclear. Why the teacher or hired actor was not used? This is one aspect to include to student feedback if you plan to use natural reader also in the future.
- Remote labs are a good example how to share resources as a university network. At the moment it is not clear are they meant to be an online course, part of blended learning or integrated to face-to-face learning? In order to be an online course an overall structure with timeline, learning outcomes and study guide including student activities and assignments needs some course design resources. As a separate thing remote labs are now more like an open educational resource.
- At the moment LMS doesn't work properly so the infrastructure and administration of the Moodle-server need responsible persons. Students use LMS throughout the day and also after office hours. To have a subcontractor as administrator might be one solution if it is difficult for universities to organise this.
- We recommend to use course-design teams when producing pilot courses and also afterwards when designing new courses. There are several roles needed in online course design: content expert, pedagogical expert/course-designer, technical and media experts and instructors/tutors. It is seldom a single person handles all these areas of expertise. And usually the courses are better when there are several opinions available.

Pedagogical principles that fit very well also to online courses you can watch on YouTube: Teaching   Teaching   &   Understanding   Understanding https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iMZA80XpP6Y

Monday, 24 August 2015
 (Minutes of the Study Visit and presentations), Curriculum Development and Quality
(joint presentation by Head of Department Erkki Härkönen, Specialist, Minna Vuorio-Lehti and Vice Rector Riitta Pyykkö).
Presentation started by introducing the context of the Higher Education in Finland. In Finland they have two sectors of HE: research universities (1640- ; 14 institutions) and universities of applied sciences (UAS)/polytechnics (1990s- ; 24 institutions). Several reforms has been conducted or are going on in both sectors: legal status, number of institutions, organizational structures, funding system, degree structures, curricula etc.
Three-cycle degree system is used in Finland (Bachelor + Master + Doctorate; 3+2+4 years);
Research universities, such as University of Turku, offer all three cycles and UASs 1st and 2nd.
One specific speciality in Finland is that there is restricted but equal access for all; Universities and UAS have different access criteria for entry, usually results of matriculation exams and entrance tests.

Universities and UAS in Finland have full autonomy in academic issues. Also one character for Finnish universities is the active staff and student participation in management of universities. This means that the level of hierarchy is low and there are strong national student organisations in local and national level.

Government steering is mostly done in Finland by information and funding system. 2/3 of funding comes from the state which is based on the performance.

What influences the development of education in Finland? At European level following processes are the most significant: European Higher Education Area ("Bologna Process", Finland member-country 1999-), three-cycle system, credit system (ECTS), grading system (1-5) and policies and practices: competence-based curricula, recognition of prior learning, student-centred approach etc.   etc.

At national level there are three process: Universities Act & Government Decree on University Degrees (educational responsibilities, which means right to offer degree education in certain fields and Degree structure, aims of the degrees, extent of studies leading to a degree etc.). Also Ministry of Education and Culture has launched "Education and Research" Development Plan which is one of the strategical guidelines for developing the universities. There are also some other national strategies & programmes which guide the development of education Finland.

At Institutional level universities have full autonomy which is guaranteed by the Constitution of Finland. Universities are responsible for the quality of degrees.

After the introduction of the Finnish Education system in HEI´s the presentation focused on the process of curriculum design in the University of Turku. The process is in short as follows:

- ✓ The council of teaching and learning has made decision in 2013 that curriculum is composed for two year periods in every faculty
- ✓ The council of teaching and learning has also decided that curriculum is constructed by the European ideas of learning outcomes
- ✓ And very important cornerstone is that teaching in our university is always based on research and theoretical thinking
- ✓ Every faculty accepts its curriculum
- ✓ The process of curriculum starts every second year in autumn semester. Vice rector who is responsible for the development of education and educational structures, will send the so called curriculum letter to faculties. In this letter she will give orders and guidelines what the units in this precise time should have to take into account.
- ✓ After vice rector´s letter, units will start their own curriculum designing process in institutional teams/groups they have just for this purpose and where teachers, researchers and students are as members.
- ✓ Units works with their curriculums about 2-4 months and when they are ready the department´s council will deal and accept it.
- ✓ Curriculum will published in university´s webpage.

In university of Turku the pedagogic perspective to academic curricula is:

- It is a guidance system in academic studies and learning affairs
- It is a student's map in a strange terrain
- It concretizes the ideas of current teaching philosophy in University and Unit level
  - ○ What is the teaching philosophy of the university/faculty/department?
  - ○ What are the basic values in teaching and researching?
- It is a part of university's/faculty's/department's management system
- It is a tool to develop teaching and learning in different units at the university
- It gives information about the quality system of University

In University of Turku the central administration have a unit for Educational development and counselling services. This unit will support the curriculum work in faculties and departments (e.g. intranet pages, seminars, meetings, personal support when needed). Also the unit for Student and admission services support the curriculum process by providing electric programmes and

platforms where the ready curricula are published. They will also give support to administrative staff who are responsible for coding the curriculum data into the system

Tuesday, 25 August 2015
(Minutes of the Study Visit and Presentations)
Quality Management and Measures (presentation made by Vice-Rector Riitta Pyykkö and Quality Manager Anu Mäkelä)
In their presentation Vice-Rector Riitta Pyykkö and Quality Manager Anu Mäkelä told about the quality system of University of Turku and what international and national guidelines and processes influence to this. In international the European framework of Quality Management (EFQM) is the most important. This process is part of the European Higher Education Area, also known as ""Bologna process", (2015: 48 member countries). The process can be said to be started at Berlin Communiqué 2003. Where it was decided that "By 2005 national quality assurance systems should include:

- A definition of the responsibilities of the bodies and institutions involved
- Evaluation of programmes or institutions, including internal assessment, external review, participation of students and the publication of results
- A system of accreditation, certification or comparable procedures
- International participation, co-operation and networking

In the national framework for quality assurance is decided that HEIs are autonomous and responsible for the quality of education and research in their own universities; they shall by law take part in external evaluation of their activities and QA systems on a regular basis and publish the findings. Ministry of Education and Culture prepares legislation and other regulations; deploys performance-based funding, informed by data from national databases. Finnish Education Evaluation Centre (FINEEC) organizes external evaluations and produces qualitative information which the educational institutions can use in developing their operations

From 1 May 2014: one government organisation combining the evaluations carried out by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Centre, the Finnish Education Evaluation Council and the Finnish National Board of Education

The objective of all evaluations is to produce information that the HEIs can use in developing their own operations. Evaluation is based on mutual trust; no financial or operational sanctions are made after the evaluation. HEIs have the ultimate responsibility to utilise and implement the information and recommendations provided in evaluations (cf. no school inspectors either!). Another objective is to exchange and disseminate the good practices identified in evaluations among other HEIs in Finland. There is also constant dialogue between different stakeholders: HEIs and other stakeholders also participate in the development of evaluation methods, targets and criteria.

Types of national evaluations of education in Finland (just a short example):
- Audits of quality assurance/management systems
- First round 2005-2011; second round going on
- Subject/field-specific evaluations
- E.g. Evaluation of Teacher Education; Evaluation of Civil Engineering Education
- Thematic evaluations
- E.g. Evaluation of the implementation of the Bologna process
- Accreditation type of evaluations
- Mostly conducted by international QA agencies (AMBA, EQUIS etc.)
- In Finland: Accreditation of UAS applications 1996-1999; currently EUR-ACE for engineering
- Selection of centres of excellence in education (1998-2012 - ?)
- E.g. UTU Faculty of Medicine 2010-2012

In short, following list is audited by the FINEEC:

- The objective of all evaluations is to produce information that the HEIs can use in developing their own operations
- Evaluation based on mutual trust; no financial or operational sanctions
- HEIs have the ultimate responsibility to utilise and implement the information and recommendations provided in evaluations (cf. no school inspectors either!)
- Another objective is to exchange and disseminate the good practices identified in evaluations among other HEIs
- Constant dialogue with stakeholders: HEIs and other stakeholders also participate in the development of evaluation methods, targets and criteria

What is not evaluated?
- The mission of the HEI
- Strategy
- Results
- Quality of education, research, societal interaction or support services as such

Stages of the audit process:
1. HEI and FINEEC make an **Audit contract for a audit**
2. FINEEC sets up an **audit team**
3. HEI submits its **audit material**
4. FINEEC conducts **training** for audit team
5. The team reads the audit material and prepares **questions**
6. The team conducts a 3-5 days **site-visit**
7. The team writes an **audit report**
8. The team proposes either a **pass** or a **re-audit** for the HEI
9. FINEEC Council makes the **final decision**
10. The report is **printed, published online** and a **seminar** is held
11. HEI and audit team give **feedback**
12. National **follow-up** seminar around three years after audit

Three cornerstones of UTU quality work

- **Strategy** work covering the entire University
  - Strategy 2016-2020 under preparing, inc. Action plans
  - Based on all-aroud information:
    - evaluation information and continuous monitoring
    - discussions in the Extended Management Group and in the Board
    - The rectors' visits to all departments of the University
    - A report "The University of the Future" (by Finland Futures Research Centre)
    - Students' view on future needs (produced by the Student Union)

- **Procedures, methods, operational culture**
  - Acts & decrees > rules of procedure, decisions, guidelines etc.
  - Operational culture, quality culture

- **Steering**
  - Principles of steering (decided by the University Board)
  - Indicators for strategic goals
  - Annual planning, follow-up & feedback
    - covers all the sectors defined in the strategy: target dimensions (research, education, societal interaction) and requirement factors (staff and networks, finances, infrastructures, smoother operations)
    - encompasses all the units

Turun yliopisto
University of Turku

Milestones in the development of UTU quality system

2008	First Audits: UTU and Turku School of Economics passed separately
2010	Change in the legal status of universities and the merger of UTU and TSE
2010-12	Reforms in the management system and development of steering of the new UTU's operations
2010 -	Long-term and systematic personnel policy
	• *E.g. HR Excellence in research logo by the European Commission*
2012 -	New intranet > new ways for quality documentation
2012 -	A more strategic approach to the development of infrastructures
2013-15	Trimming down the administrative and support services
2013 -	More systematic collection and utilisation of student feedback
2014-15	Second Audit, a re-audit will be needed (QM of societal interaction & making the QM system more visible)
2014-16	Comprehensive evaluation of research
2017	A partial re-audit

Turun yliopisto
University of Turku

COLLECTING STUDENT FEEDBACK AT THE UNIVERSITY OF TURKU

form of feedback	Stage of study						
	1. year	2. year	3. year	4. year	5. year	n. year	after graduation
course feedback	████ = evaluation of teaching and guidance (spanning 1.–n. year)						
survey at the beginning of the studies	▭						
national student feedback survey				▭ (after the completion of the Bachelor's degree)			
follow-up on placement in the labour market							▭ Approx. 1 year after the completion of the Master's degree
career and employment survey							▭ 5 years after graduation

▭ = evaluation of teaching and guidance
▭ = evaluation of entities that are larger than separate courses

Student feedback system

Effects on the curriculum and on individual courses

Effects on how the faculty aligns and profiles its education and on how education is developed

Effects on UTU's policy lines on education and on the priorities in its development

COURSES: utilising feedback and communicating about it incl. UTU's general questions → **DISCIPLINES / PROGRAMMES:** utilising feedback and communicating about it → **DEPARTMENTS AND/OR FACULTIES:** utilising summary and analysis of collected feedback and of its effects → **UTU:** utilising the results of yearly report at university level

Turun yliopisto
University of Turku