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Intended Learning Outcomes

At the end of the session the delegate will:

● Have a critical awareness of learning outcomes associated with partnerships, exchanges, study abroad and the need for equivalence.

● Understand the tools in use that illustrate equivalence and learning outcomes.

● Be able to evaluate the Learning Outcomes, Learning Activities and Learning Assessment across the breadth of global education in all its forms.
Essential elements

- Academic accumulation – need for recognition.
- Global Learning – where it sits.
- Learner Centred Approach – why?
- Stakeholder involvement and satisfaction.
- Tools available – focus on Tuning and Frameworks.
- Evidence – research in progress.
- SIO involvement/engagement and leadership (note SIO Academy focus).
Out with academic tourism and in with academic accumulation

- High cost (time, money, effort) = high demands (expectations, comparisons, consumer satisfaction) = required accumulation (not lost time but recognition of learning)
- Demand is by all stakeholders (students, advisors, faculty and administration)
- How can equivalent accumulation be assured?
Equivalence

“the state or fact of being exactly the same in number, amount, status, or quality “

- Related Words comparability, compatibility, correlation, correspondence; alikeness, community, likeness, parallelism, resemblance, similarity, similitude; exchangeability, interchangeability; identicalness, identity

Source: Merriam-Websters.com (12 January 2015)
“exactly” – do not like

“comparability” – do like

WHY?
- Flexibility and adaptability
- Autonomy and independence
- Mutual respect of diversity and co-operation
- Mission compatible
BUT - tools are available

Tools that show:
- Details of a system
- Structure of a degree
- Curriculum content
- Learning outcomes
- Student achievement
- Credits

Information allows for dialogue and movement.
“Ideally the integration of global learning must intersect with a shared agenda focused on student learning so that all related campus initiatives are integrated into and across missions, strategies, policies, peoples, practices, meanings, teaching and learning.”

Hilary E Kahn
Global Learning & Teaching Institute
3/1/2013 AIEA Regional Forum
What do employers think?

Global Connections: 70% of employers said their company:
- Has operations or employees in locations outside the United States (41 percent)
- Has suppliers outside the United States (49 percent)
- Has competitors based outside the United States (49 percent)
- Has clients outside the United States (54 percent)

96 % agree: Regardless of a student’s chosen field of study, all students should “have experiences that teach them how to solve problems with people whose views are different from their own.”

Emphasised in all aspects:

- Competencies – shifts to CBE etc.
- Credits that recognise achievement of LOs, student workload (to allocate credits), levels, etc.
The Degree Qualifications Profile (DQP)
### Tuning and the DQP

**INPUTS**

- Higher Ed Institutions
- Faculty
- Students
- Employers
- Higher Ed Organizations
- Employers
- EU
- Lumina Foundation

**Process**

Departments Engage in Tuning Process:
- Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a discipline
- Institutions engage in the DQP
  - Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a degree across disciplines
  - Students are the primary reference point – not institutions

**OUTCOMES**

**Short Term**
- Faculty reflect on intentional teaching and learning
- Student learning is better assessed
- Students know what they should know and be able to do in their discipline and degree

**Long Term**
- More engaged and better prepared students.
- Students pursue a coherent meaningful educational path
- Increased access into and across segments
- Increased production of credentials
- Employers understand what students know and are able to do.
Why Tuning?

Developed by and for academics and students

➢ Develop one language understood worldwide by all stakeholders: competencies and learning outcomes
➢ Stress the importance of general academic competencies and skills for society
➢ Involve stakeholders in the process of curriculum design and enhancement
➢ Develop shared (inter)national reference points at disciplinary / subject area level
➢ Give academics a key role in the process of reforming Higher Education structures and its degree programs and qualifications
➢ Focus on diversity by promoting flexibility
➢ Facilitate (inter)national mobility and recognition of studies
The Tuning contribution for the innovation of academic programs worldwide:

- Linking the concepts of competencies, learning outcomes, student-centered and active learning and teaching and profiling at all levels as the basis for reform: Undergraduate and Graduate Studies

- Making the modernization of higher education a global process

- Developing and bridging competencies / LO frameworks for all qualifications (DQP / EQF), sectors and subject areas / disciplines
Student centered learning:
An approach or system that supports the design of learning programs which focus on learners’ achievements, accommodate different learners’ priorities and are consistent with reasonable students’ workload (i.e. workload that is feasible within the duration of the learning program). It’s accommodates for learners’ greater involvement in the choice of content, mode, pace and place of learning.

PARADIGM SHIFT REQUIRED
From Staff Centered to Student Centered Learning!
Tuning approach based on 6 consistent features for degree programs:

- an identified and agreed need
- a well described profile
- corresponding learning outcomes phrased in terms of generic and subject specific competence (lines 1 and 2)
- the correct allocation of ECTS credits to units (line 3)
- appropriate approaches to learning, teaching and assessment (line 4)
- methodology for quality enhancement (line 5)

TUNING focuses on:

<< fitness of purpose >> (meets expectations) and
<< fitness for purpose >> (meets aims)

Large scale consultations among stakeholders (academics, employers, graduates and students) to identify most relevant competencies and levels of achievement (LO) in degree programs:

Global Relevance !!
Tuning:

- Europe
- United States
- Latin-America
- Russia
- Africa
- Central Asian Republics
- Middle East and North Africa
- Feasibility studies: Australia, Canada, most recently India

Making it a global process..
THE COMPETENCIES FRAMEWORK PYRAMID

- DQP/EQF descriptors
- TUNING Sectoral Competencies Frameworks
- TUNING Subject specific Competencies Frameworks
Developing Frameworks and Reference Points for the Design and Delivery of Degree Programs in …

➢ Standard setting
➢ Non-prescriptive

Process:
• Establish group of 12-15 international experts
• Describe Academic Field
• Define list of 30 General Competencies
• Define list of Subject Specific Competencies
• Map typical degrees
• Map potential employability field
Profiles can be based on two types of dimensions: the Learning Process and the Subject Area. Examples:

Legend: Bachelor, Master, Doctorate
gathers the essence of what is - “should be” - the degree holder.

detects the occupations and tasks which can be carried out by the graduate.

focuses on the environment in which the graduate is able to function successfully.

defines the main expected learning outcomes in terms of competencies – general and specific.
Developing and Bridging Frameworks /Profiles

DQP / EQF and Sectoral and Subject area based Profiles / Frameworks crucial tools for Global Education:

To identify:
• Suitable partners
• Added value of study abroad / exchanges

To evaluate:
• Equivalence of learning based on real evidence: (Intended and Achieved) Learning Outcomes, Learning Activities and Learning Assessment

Facilitates fair planning and recognition of studies abroad:
• Appropriate content (knowledge, skills and wider competencies) and level
Developing and Bridging Frameworks /Profiles

The impact: Evidence versus Theory

Outcomes of the Tuning US-EU Study
Tuning and the DQP: Measuring Impact and Outcomes

**INPUTS**

- Higher Ed Institutions
- Faculty
- Students
- Employers
- Higher Ed Organizations
- EU
- Lumina Foundation

**Process**

Departments Engage in Tuning Process:
- Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a discipline

Institutions engage in the DQP
- Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a degree across disciplines

Students are the primary reference point – not institutions

**OUTCOMES**

**Short Term**

- Faculty reflect on intentional teaching and learning
- Student learning is better assessed
- Students know what they should know and be able to do in their discipline and degree

**Long Term**

- More engaged and better prepared students.
- Students pursue a coherent meaningful educational path
- Increased access into and across segments
- Increased production of credentials
- Employers understand what students know and are able to do.
What is Tuning?

Please indicate to what extent you believe each of these terms represents the Tuning approach.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Very Much (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat (2)</th>
<th>Not at all (1)</th>
<th>Country Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes</td>
<td>83.74%</td>
<td>11.82%</td>
<td>4.43%</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competences</td>
<td>75.50%</td>
<td>20.50%</td>
<td>4.00%</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessment of student performance*</td>
<td>64.32%</td>
<td>29.15%</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td><strong>2.29</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student learning process</td>
<td>53.77%</td>
<td>39.70%</td>
<td>6.53%</td>
<td>2.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree outcomes</td>
<td>50.25%</td>
<td>42.13%</td>
<td>7.61%</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum development</td>
<td>49.01%</td>
<td>40.59%</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline/Subject-specific</td>
<td>44.67%</td>
<td>44.16%</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td>2.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>38.89%</td>
<td>46.46%</td>
<td>14.65%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardisation</td>
<td>31.50%</td>
<td>47.00%</td>
<td>21.50%</td>
<td>1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative teaching</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td>48.99%</td>
<td>21.21%</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexible pathways</td>
<td>28.28%</td>
<td>54.04%</td>
<td>17.68%</td>
<td>2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy/Academic freedom</td>
<td>21.32%</td>
<td>50.76%</td>
<td>27.92%</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = < 5% (two-tailed test)
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## Significant differences for those who know Tuning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Have you heard of the term &quot;Tuning?&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My course learning outcomes are consistent with degree program learning outcomes.*</td>
<td>Yes       2.94  No       2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty discussions involve student learning, degree outcomes, and competencies.*</td>
<td>Yes       2.88  No       2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course catalog reflects the learning outcomes for the degree.*</td>
<td>Yes       2.71  No       2.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have broadened my perspective of the entire curriculum by tailoring my specialization to the needs of the degree program.*</td>
<td>Yes       2.53  No       1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make adjustments throughout the term in my teaching when I see the students are not achieving the learning outcomes.*</td>
<td>Yes       2.41  No       1.60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = < 10%
Significant differences for those who know Tuning

<table>
<thead>
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<tr>
<td>The course catalog reflects the learning outcomes for the</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>degree.*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have broadened my perspective of the entire curriculum by</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailoring my specialization to the needs of the degree program.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I make adjustments throughout the term in my teaching when I</td>
<td>2.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>see the students are not achieving the learning outcomes.*</td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>what are we learning? process</th>
<th>percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>i know which learning outcomes are provided in each of my courses</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>there has been a change in vocabulary in the department – more about competence, degree outcomes, and student learning</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i have broadened by perspective of the entire curriculum by tailoring my specialization to the needs of the degree program</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my syllabus states learning outcomes/competences</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Tuning and the DQP: Measuring Impact and Outcomes

**INPUTS**
- Higher Ed Institutions
- Faculty
- Students
- Employers
- Higher Ed Organizations
- Employers
- EU
- Lumina Foundation

**Process**
- Departments Engage in Tuning Process:
  - Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a discipline
- Institutions engage in the DQP
  - Establish common vocabulary, competencies, learning outcomes within a degree across disciplines
- Students are the primary reference point – not institutions

**OUTCOMES**

**Short Term**
- Faculty reflect on intentional teaching and learning
- Student learning is better assessed
- Students know what they should know and be able to do in their discipline and degree

**Long Term**
- More engaged and better prepared students.
- Students pursue a coherent meaningful educational path
- Increased access into and across segments
- Increased production of credentials
- Employers understand what students know and are able to do.
What are we learning?
Short-Term Faculty Outcomes

My concept of learning has changed as I understand the role of the course I teach as part of the degree program

| **It has changed how I assess student learning** | 56% |
| **Student engagement has improved** | 56% |
| **I discuss learning outcomes with students** | 42% |
## Faculty Impact in EU vs. US

### Implementing a Learning Outcomes/Competency(ies) Approach

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Yes (3)</th>
<th>Somewhat (2)</th>
<th>No (1)</th>
<th>Not Applicable (N/A)</th>
<th>Country Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I know which learning outcomes are provided in each of my course units.*</td>
<td>53.43%</td>
<td>23.53%</td>
<td>8.82%</td>
<td>14.22%</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My concept of teaching and learning has changed as I understand the role of</td>
<td>32.68%</td>
<td>31.22%</td>
<td>20.96%</td>
<td>15.12%</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the course unit(s) I teach as part of the degree program.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There has been a change in vocabulary in the department. It is more about</td>
<td>26.96%</td>
<td>33.82%</td>
<td>22.55%</td>
<td>16.67%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competence, degree outcomes and student learning.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pay more attention toward quality.*</td>
<td>26.60%</td>
<td>27.09%</td>
<td>29.56%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>2.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have broadened my perspective of the entire curriculum by tailoring my</td>
<td>22.82%</td>
<td>34.95%</td>
<td>25.73%</td>
<td>16.50%</td>
<td>2.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialization to the needs of the degree program.*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has changed how I assess student learning.*</td>
<td>19.51%</td>
<td>36.59%</td>
<td>29.27%</td>
<td>14.63%</td>
<td>2.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying the LO/competency(ies) approach in teaching and learning is</td>
<td>4.95%</td>
<td>17.82%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>27.23%</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recognised in the promotion/tenure process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student engagement has improved</td>
<td>4.46%</td>
<td>31.68%</td>
<td>39.60%</td>
<td>24.26%</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p = < 5%
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Student Outcomes</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a clear idea of what is expected of me</td>
<td>99%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand why I am required to take courses needed to earn my degree</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning and teaching approach stimulate active participation</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My discipline/degree program has a clear statement of expectations</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression routes to a degree are clearly stated and explained</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information materials state the learning outcomes for subject areas/disciplines and degrees</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I understand why I am required to take the course units needed to earn my degree *</td>
<td>69.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My discipline/degree programme has a clear statement of expectations *</td>
<td>60.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My workload is appropriate to achieve the learning outcomes of the course unit *</td>
<td>60.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My class assignments are based on learning outcomes *</td>
<td>55.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progression routes to a degree are clearly stated and explained *</td>
<td>55.05%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objectives are discussed in class *</td>
<td>53.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The learning and teaching approach stimulate active participation *</td>
<td>51.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course catalogue states the learning outcomes for each course unit</td>
<td>47.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advisors are able to provide a clear explanation of how course units fit into a bigger picture</td>
<td>46.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The course catalog states the learning outcomes for my major/degree</td>
<td>40.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning outcomes are discussed in class *</td>
<td>40.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is an opportunity for an end of course open dialogue to discuss the extent to which learning outcomes have been achieved</td>
<td>36.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I was advised on course unit selection there was a focus on the skills/competences I would gain</td>
<td>28.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Achieved Learning Outcomes

The delegate:

- Has a critical awareness of learning outcomes associated with partnerships, exchanges, study abroad and the need for equivalence.
- Understands the tools in use that illustrate equivalence and learning outcomes.
- Is able to evaluate the Learning Outcomes, Learning Activities and Learning Assessment across the breadth of global education in all its forms.
Contacts

TIM.BIRTWISTLE@HEDCONSULTANT.CO.UK

R.WAGENAAR@RUG.NL

SEE: TUNING USA
http://www.iebcnow.org/OurWork/Tuning.aspx
AND TUNING EDUCATIONAL STRUCTURES IN EUROPE
http://www.unideusto.org/tuningeu/
AND DQP http://degreeprofile.org/
http://www.luminafoundation.org/dqp-and-tuning