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Foreword

As part of its quality assurance and strategic development, the University of Helsinki regularly conducts evaluations of its education and research. The previous evaluation of education was quite broad, covering all teaching and degree programs at the University of Helsinki. It was carried out between 2001 and 2002. Among many other recommendations, a suggestion for the evaluation of the management of education was introduced.

When planning a new evaluation of education, the Vice Deans for academic affairs as well as the Committee of Academic Affairs made the initiative to focus on the leadership and management of education in the next evaluation. It was seen as a topical issue connected to the reform of University law that will change universities’ legal status and management in Finland. In connection with the reform, the University of Helsinki will reorganise its management and operation systems, including decision-making procedures.

When the evaluation project was planned, it was not known how quickly the upcoming university reform in Finland would be launched. Now, this report is being published in the middle of the university reform. The report offers the University recommendations for strategic planning at an opportune moment and enables the University to benefit from outside expert views in the upcoming process of change.

The selected focus of the present evaluation is the management of education, investigated from the viewpoint of both leadership and management. This approach to university-level teaching can be deemed to be novel also on the international level.

Self-evaluations in the faculties and departments were implemented in the form of cooperative learning processes. Enhancement-led evaluation has always been the governing principle at the University of Helsinki, and it was implemented also in this evaluation as the University community assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the leadership and management of education. The faculty-specific evaluations were produced on the basis of departmental self-evaluations.

The external evaluation was conducted by an international panel consisting of 12 experts. The panel was chaired by Professor, Vice-Rector Eva Åkesson from Lund University, who was responsible for the panel’s performance, the practical division of labour within the panel and the relevance and high quality of the evaluation results. The panel had at its disposal self-evaluation reports by the University and its faculties, including the Language Centre and the Swedish School of Social Sciences. The panel was also provided with strategies and documents steering the
University's operations and additional materials requested by the panel, as well as interviews of over 400 members of the academic community.

The University requires a critical viewpoint on its leadership and management of education. The strengths, good practices and development proposals presented in the evaluation report offer both a detailed analysis of the present state of affairs and recommendations for future development. The good practices and recommendations that emerged in the evaluation will be used in the University’s strategic planning. It will be necessary to follow up on the implementation of the panel’s recommendations in the coming years.

The University of Helsinki wishes to express its deepest gratitude to the international evaluation panel for their thorough analysis, felicitous conclusions and recommendations reaching far into the future.

Many thanks are due to the entire University community for participating in the production of the self-evaluation reports, interviews and reviews of the evaluation materials.

The contribution of the Faculty coordinators of the evaluation has been excellent and greatly appreciated, as are the efforts of the Evaluation Steering Group in supervising the evaluation policy and procedures.

Special thanks are due to the Academic Affairs Unit, which has been responsible for all the practical preparations of the evaluation. Ms Minna Frimodig, Advisor in the Academic Affairs Unit, has been responsible for the entire project from the very beginning to the very end. Senior Advisor, Dr Seppo Saari’s expertise has been contributing to the project since August 2008. Many thanks to both experts. Your excellent work is greatly appreciated.

Hannele Niemi
Vice-Rector
Chair of the Evaluation Steering Group
Evaluation panel

Chairperson of the panel
Eva Åkesson, Professor, Vice-Rector of Lund University

Vice-Chair of the panel
Patric Dillon, Emeritus Professor, University of Exeter

Members of the sub-groups
Sub-group 1:
Deans/vice-deans in charge of academic affairs, Faculty of Biosciences, Faculty of Medicine, Faculty of Science and Faculty of Pharmacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position and Institution</th>
<th>Areas of expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Erik De Corte</strong></td>
<td>Emeritus Professor of Educational Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Leuven, Belgium</td>
<td>Learning and instruction, design of learning environments, assessment of learning, problem solving, quality assessment in higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Alan Lyles</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Public, Private and Nonprofit Partnerships, Division of Government and Public Administration, University of Baltimore, United States</td>
<td>Managing pharmaceutical supply, docent of Pharmaceutical Policy and Pharmacoeconomics, member of several evaluation boards/panels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pasi Sahlberg, chair of the sub-group 1</strong></td>
<td>Adjunct Professor of Behavioural Sciences (University of Helsinki), Lead Education Specialist, European Training Foundation, Italy</td>
<td>Pedagogical leadership, teaching methods, educational change, learning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eva Åkesson</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Chemical Physics, Vice-Rector of Lund University, Faculty of Science, Lund University, Sweden</td>
<td>Chemistry, physical chemistry, educational management and development, quality assurance and enhancement, accreditation of master degree, Bologna expert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-group 2:
Support of pedagogic development and staff development, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, Faculty of Law, Faculty of Social Sciences, Swedish School of Social Sciences and Faculty of Veterinary Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Areas of expertise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Suvi Eriksson</strong></td>
<td>Student of International Business Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Humanities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Oulu, Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Areas of expertise:</strong> Secretary for Academic Affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004-2007 (Student Union, University of Oulu), student involvement in QA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aalt Willem Heringa</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Comparative Constitutional and Administrative Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dean of the Law Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Faculty of Law</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Maastricht University, Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Areas of expertise:</strong> (Comparative) constitutional law, human rights, (higher) education management (dean; board of trustees of large school board; management team Maastricht University)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Kirsten Hofgaard Lycke</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Institute for Educational Research University of Oslo, Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Areas of expertise:</strong> Educational change, quality assurance and development, problem-based learning, enhancing learning environments, medical education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>John Taylor, chair of the sub-group 2</strong></td>
<td>Professor of Higher Education Management and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Director of the Centre for Higher Education Management and Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southampton, United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Areas of expertise:</strong> Management of higher education; e.g. strategic planning, quality and evaluation, human resource management, resource allocation models</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sub-group 3:
Management of the academic affairs, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, Faculty of Arts, Language Centre and Faculty of Theology

| **Patrick Dillon** | **Areas of expertise:** 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor of Educational Sciences&lt;br&gt; School of Education and Lifelong Learning&lt;br&gt; University of Exeter, United Kingdom</td>
<td>Education, e-learning and multimedia in education, design education, cultural ecology, heritage education and environmental education, docent and visiting professor (University of Joensuu, Finland)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Elisabeth Dumoulin, chair of the sub-group 3** | **Areas of expertise:** 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Food Sciences&lt;br&gt; AgroParisTech&lt;br&gt; Paris Institute for Life, Food and Environmental Sciences, France</td>
<td>Food Science and technology, exchanges of students, international relations, teaching methods</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Theo P.W.M. van der Krogt** | **Areas of expertise:** 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Associate-Professor of Public Management&lt;br&gt; EAPAA Secretary-General&lt;br&gt; European Association for Public Administration Accreditation&lt;br&gt; University of Twente, Netherlands</td>
<td>Public administration, public management, higher education organization, higher education evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Krista Varantola** | **Areas of expertise:** 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professor of Translation and Interpretation of English&lt;br&gt; Rector of University of Tampere&lt;br&gt; Faculty of Humanities&lt;br&gt; University of Tampere, Finland</td>
<td>Chairperson of the Finnish Council of University Rectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1 Introduction
Introduction


The University of Helsinki is Finland’s oldest, largest and most diverse institution of higher education conducting research and providing education based on research. The University of Helsinki consists of 11 Faculties, representing all academic disciplines with the exception of technology and business, and it operates on four campuses. The University community comprises 38,800 degree students (of whom 22,500 are FTEs) and 7,700 staff. The annual intake of new students is over 4,000; only one-fifth of the applicants pass the demanding entrance exams. The University offers instruction in some 300 subjects or degree programmes. The University of Helsinki is a member of the League of European Research Universities (LERU). LERU was founded in 2002 as an association of twelve research-intensive universities sharing the values of high-quality teaching within an environment of internationally competitive research. Currently, LERU includes 20 European universities.

The strategic aim of the University of Helsinki is to reinforce its position among leading European universities both in research and teaching. To achieve this aim, the University regularly carries out international evaluations of its research and education. The evaluations are a part of the University’s quality assurance system. The previous evaluation of education was conducted in 2001–2002; this evaluation focused on all the fields of education represented at the University, language and communication studies, and subject teacher education.

1.2 Aims and focus of evaluation

The present evaluation of education 2007–2008 focused on the management and leadership of education on various levels, including the University as a whole, Faculties, departments and the Language Centre.

The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The all-embracing goal is to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. The purpose of the management and the leadership of education is to support the attainment of objectives in the development of teaching and teaching methods, and in the improvement of the quality of learning. The management of education enhances the student’s profound mastery of and expertise in his or her field.
The evaluation did not include doctoral studies, which will be reviewed in connection with the international evaluation of research scheduled for 2011. The aim of the evaluation was to enhance the management and leadership of education by evaluating its present state from a critical perspective, recognising strengths and areas in need of development, and by receiving international feedback on the quality of operations.¹

1.3 Organisation

The University Senate has made a decision on evaluations to be conducted at regular intervals as part of the implementation of the University’s strategic plan. For the 2007–2008 evaluation project, on 23 January 2007 the Rector of the University of Helsinki appointed a steering group consisting of representatives of the various campuses and expert groups. The members of the steering group were as follows:

- Professor Hannele Niemi, Vice-Rector in charge of academic affairs (chair)
- Ms Johanna Ahola, student representative (Faculty of Arts)
- Dr Nina Katajavuori, Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy (Faculty of Pharmacy, until April 2008)
- Professor Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Head of the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education (Faculty of Behavioural Sciences)
- Professor Arto Mustajoki, Head of the Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures (Faculty of Arts)
- Professor Jukka Paakki, Dean of the Faculty of Science
- Ms Päivi Pakkanen, Director of Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs Unit
- Dr Mirja Ruohoniemi, Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy (Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, since May 2008)
- Ms Minna Frimodig, Coordinator, Academic Affairs Unit (secretary)
- Dr Seppo Saari, Senior Advisor in Evaluation, since September 2008, Academic Affairs Unit

The evaluation process was operationally coordinated by the Academic Affairs Unit. The Unit coordinated the evaluation by collecting and producing materials, providing instructions and other support, organising the panel visit, collecting the evaluation results for the final reports, and being responsible for communications.

¹ Constructive alignment, or consistency in teaching, is defined in the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009 as follows: “In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of consistency, teaching is based on four important stages: determination of learning objectives, determination of the subject and content of teaching, determination of assessment methods, and determination of teaching methods. In curriculum design, these four stages must be mutually consistent. When the different stages support each other, teaching has a unified and consistent effect on the learner” (p.22).
1.4 Evaluation method – enhancement-led evaluation

The evaluation of the management of education was conducted in accordance with the principle of enhancement-led evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation was to obtain information that the University and its Faculties and departments can use in the development of their operations. At its best, the evaluation was a shared learning process, which enhanced a common understanding of the target of evaluation. In accordance with the principles of learning organisations, the evaluation was drawn on previously acquired evaluation data. Enhancement-led evaluation is generally not based on ready-made standards or predetermined criteria.

The emphasis of the evaluation project was on providing opportunities for the academic community to participate in and affect the planning of the evaluation, its methods and aims as well as its impacts. The general aims and the target of the evaluation were drafted by the University’s Academic Affairs Committee, the members of which include teachers, students and experts from various fields represented at the University. The implementation and the theme of the evaluation were debated and commented on by the University’s various cooperation networks, such as the meetings between vice-deans and the meetings between heads of academic affairs. Furthermore, information and discussion meetings open to all members of the academic community were organised. The University community participated in the evaluation through self-evaluations and interviews by the external panel of experts.

1.5 Consequences of the evaluation

The areas in need of development that emerged from this evaluation will receive funding reserved for the development of teaching. The University will possibly award some performance-based funding to the Faculties based on the strengths and good practices identified by the evaluation panel. Moreover, the results of the evaluation and the feedback obtained will be exploited in the drafting of new strategic documents, such as the University of Helsinki Strategic Plan and the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies for the period 2010–2012. Finally, use will be made of the evaluation results in the planning of support services for the management and leadership of education, such as in-house training.
2 Evaluation process
Background material for the panel
1. Collection of the self-evaluation reports
2. Guidelines for the evaluation panel
3. Education and degree system of the University of Helsinki
4. Strategic Plan of the University of Helsinki 2007-2009
5. Programme for the development of teaching and studies 2007-2009
6. Teaching Evaluation Matrix
7. Final report of the evaluation of the quality of education and the degree programmes in the University of Helsinki 2001-2002
8. Facts 2007. Statistics about the Faculty funding (budget, external, own assets), staff (teaching staff, administration), students (student/teacher ratio, and degrees (BA, MA, PhD). (Completed version 3.11.08)
9. International mobility 2007 (Completed version 30.10.08)
10. Composition of curricula (Completed version 3.11.08)
13. Some examples of the self-evaluation reports at the department level: Department of Chemistry, the Christina Institute, Department of Economics and Management, Department of Economics, Department of Forest Ecology, Department of German, the Haartman Institute, Department of History, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Department of Practical Theology, Department of Private Law, Department of Psychology, Department of Sociology and the Faculty target programmes and Action plans for the development of teaching and studies.
14. Faculty target programmes and Action plans for the development and teaching and studies in Finnish. (For the Finnish Panel members)
Evaluation process

2.1 Self-evaluation

The starting point of the enhancement-led evaluation was the self-evaluation conducted by University units. In the self-evaluation, the Faculties and departments described and discussed the strengths and challenges of the management and leadership of their education. The purpose of the identification of strengths and areas in need of development was to aid the units and their leadership to steer the development of teaching and monitor the effects of the measures that were taken.

The self-evaluation was based on unit-specific descriptions of the management and leadership of education and on a questionnaire on self-evaluation that the Faculties and departments completed in accordance with instructions (see Appendix 1, page 471). The self-evaluation reports by the Faculties were written on the basis of departmental self-evaluations and reflections within each Faculty. Based on these preparations, each Faculty formed a perspective on its evaluation and determined the strengths and areas in need of development in its management and leadership of education.

2.2 External evaluation

The external evaluation complemented the perspective formed on the basis of the self-evaluations of the management of education. During the site visits to the University (3–7 November 2008), the evaluation panel had the opportunity to form their opinions based on the self-evaluation reports, other background material and interviews. The site visits were planned in cooperation between the Academic Affairs Unit and the evaluation panel in their preparatory meeting on 7 October 2008. The site visit included a number of interviews with staff involved in management and leadership, teachers and students. The panel was divided into three sub-groups having their sub-chairs.

The programme was organised in such a manner that at the end of each day, the panellists were able to discuss and write down their observations. Each subgroup had a secretary to transcribe all the discussions. The services of the Academic Affairs Unit (e.g., information, facilities, extra materials or revisions of the site visit programme) were available to the panel members throughout the visits to assist the panel in carrying out their expert assignment. During and after the site visit the writing and editing of the report were done on WIKI sites accessible for the Panel.
2.2.1 The role of the evaluation panel

In the appointment of the external evaluation panel, consideration was given to an equal representation of various disciplines and versatile expertise in the management and development of education. The panel also included two Finnish academics and a student representative.

The panel was expected to:

- Familiarise themselves with the assignment and the evaluation task with the help of the background material provided by the Evaluation Office in the Academic Affairs Unit.
- Familiarise themselves with the University of Helsinki with the help of the background material provided by the Evaluation Office (Academic Affairs Unit).
- Study the University’s self-evaluation materials (University-level, Faculty-specific and the Language Centre and Swedish School of Social Sciences self-evaluation reports).
- With the help of the self-evaluation materials, define the issues that will be considered during the site visits.
- Organise the internal division of labour of the panel during the visit and make specifications to the programme of the visit.
- Make a site visit to the University of Helsinki.
- Form an opinion on the basis of the self-evaluation materials and the site visit of the quality of the management and leadership of education at the University as a whole and in its Faculties, departments and the Language Centre.
- Give recommendations for the improvement of the quality of the management and leadership of education and provide written feedback on the evaluation. The recommendations and the feedback are to be submitted separately to each unit under evaluation.
- Participate in the closing seminar of the evaluation visit, where the Faculties and departments will have an opportunity to obtain instant feedback from the panellists and hear the most salient results of the evaluation.

Each panel member was expected to participate as an active and equal member in the panel’s work. The panel was requested to be objective and fair towards all units under evaluation. The special duty of the chair of the evaluation panel was to act as the chair during the panel’s site visit, in the panel meetings and in the writing process as well after the site visit. The chair was expected to promote a good collegial spirit and be responsible for the evaluation assignment and for the equal treatment of the units under evaluation. Three members from among the members were elected to the sub-chairs for the sub-groups.
2.2.2 Preparations for the site visits

The panel’s work began with studying the self-evaluation reports and the background materials. During this first stage, each panellist made his or her own preliminary observations on the basis of these materials and noted down both general and unit-specific questions. In the preparatory meeting of the panel, the implementation of the site visit and the division of labour were discussed. The panellist’s preliminary questions were pulled together, and they served as a basis for the issues to be dealt with during the visit and the relevant interviews. The questions were also grouped in accordance with the panellists’ specialty areas. In the preparatory meetings it was discussed that the questions to be presented in the interviews should be in line with the self-evaluation questions, and specifications to the questions can be made during the visit. During the site visits, the Chair of the panel, the sub-chairs and other panellists made sure that essential and previously selected viewpoints were considered.

The various aspects of the management and leadership of education that were discussed in the self-evaluation reports were considered from the following points of view:

- The problems and development needs of the management and leadership of education
- Sections that identified a specific area to be an area of strength, but no detailed reasons were given for this
- Sections in the self-evaluation reports that left the responsibilities and processes of the management and leadership of education unclear

2.2.3 Evaluation feedback

The evaluation panel was expected to form an opinion of the management and leadership of education in the Faculties and make evaluative conclusions, as well as to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in the management of education. The evaluative conclusions were made against the strategic objectives of the University of Helsinki.

In its Teaching Evaluation Matrix, the University of Helsinki presents in a concrete manner the objectives of its Strategic Plan and its Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies (see Appendix 4, page 515). The matrix is used in the University’s internal quality assurance processes, for example, to support the development of teaching in the Faculties and departments, in continuous self-evaluations and in the selection of the University’s Centres of Excellence in teaching.
The introduction of the Teaching Evaluation Matrix crystallises the strategic objectives related to the quality of teaching at the University of Helsinki, the University’s enduring values. These enduring strategic values include the following:

- Research-based teaching
- Focus on learning (the principle of student-centredness)
- Goal-oriented long-term development of teaching
- Esteem and support for the teaching profession

The members of the evaluation panel were requested to consider these strategic objectives throughout the evaluation: how do these strategic aims permeate the management and leadership of education in the light of each of the self-evaluation questions.

The panel’s evaluation was based on the consensus between the panel members. The panel was asked to point out the strengths and good practices of the units under evaluation and to give recommendations for improvement in accordance with the template provided. The template was provided to the panellists in electronic form. In addition to their written feedback, the panellists were provided instant feedback about their observations and the most salient results of the evaluation at the closing seminar of their visit. The panel discussed the issues that were raised in the seminar. The panellists shared the responsibility for the provision of feedback. The division of labour was organised in three sub-groups, and the preliminary results were presented by the sub-group members. During the panel visit, time was reserved at the end of each day for a panel meeting and for noting down feedback.

The feedback was based on the self-evaluation reports and on information gathered and observations made during the evaluation visit about the management and leadership of education. The following principles \(^2\) were observed in the production of the written feedback:

1. Providing evidence and documentation
2. Maintaining a connection between the evaluation and the evaluation materials
3. Writing in the active voice
4. Writing on a concrete level

---

\(^2\) 1. Providing evidence and documentation. The text should mention the source of a description of a practice or evaluation: a self-evaluation report, discussions during the site visit/interviews, the panel’s own recommendations.
2. Maintaining a connection between the evaluation and the evaluation materials. The feedback should make references to the self-evaluation process and indicate areas in need of development or present development ideas. The evaluation panel is also expected to draw its own conclusions.
3. Writing in the active voice. The feedback should be written in the active voice, e.g., meaning that the panel should express exactly who should improve their operations.
4. Writing on a concrete level. The panel should give concrete examples and express its ideas in specific terms.
2.3 Communications, discussions and analysis

The panel interviewed over 400 representatives of the University. The time schedule with each group was restricted, most often for 40 minutes. It was clear that such a short time affects the character of the discussions and puts pressure on the interviewers as well as the interviewees. It is good to be aware that the larger picture of the process and entity under discussion can be seen only by the panellists. This does not, however, mean that the object was unclear or reached at random by the panel. On the contrary, a combination of the self-evaluation report, the questions prepared beforehand and other informative material was the basis of the discussion steered by the panel, and these contributed to building a broad and deep understanding about the management and leadership on different levels at the University.

2.3.1 Some observations by the Faculties and by the steering group

The feedback from the Faculties was mainly positive, covering the process and evaluation results as well. Self evaluation was seen as communal learning process and very useful as itself. Faculties had many crucial discussions about the topic itself and about its significance for the development of studies and teaching.

The deans in charge of academic affairs shared their experiences about the usefulness of the evaluation after checking the draft of the report. The comments by the deans were as follows:

- One actual question is now how to change the strategy in the light of the evaluation results.
- The recommendations will help to rebuild the structures. The evaluation was felicitous, although some of the recommendations came as a surprise.
- The evaluation confirmed the direction in which to go. The description in itself was very accurate.
- The tone and style of the writing was empathic and constructive.
- The recommendations will be taken seriously, and they came at the right time.
- No additional remarks to add to the report.
- A fruitful way to execute the evaluation; the self-evaluation was experienced in itself as very useful.
- The report is critical enough, and the timing is punctual.
- The recommendations were considered important and very useful.
- The evaluation itself was felt to be positive.
- The first reaction was disappointment, but the next day the observations and recommendations were understood to be an excellent tool for development.
The Faculty coordinators of the evaluation had an essential role in the cooperation with the Academic Affairs Unit and the Faculties. The feedback by the Faculty coordinators on the evaluation was received both in the final meeting and are verbatim as follows:

- The guidelines were always clear.
- The time schedule to react and respond was realistic, giving time to prepare well in advance.
- The WIKI was found to be an excellent tool where the entire common database was available at the same website.
- The coordinators’ network gave peer support throughout the process.

According to the teachers’ feedback, the process itself was experienced as light enough:

- The atmosphere in the interviews was positive.
- The evaluation contributed to good discussion throughout the Faculty.
- The panel came across as experts.
- The time schedule was too tight in the interviews.

The steering group also made some observations about the evaluation in general and the aims and process of the evaluation. As a whole the evaluation process was seen as a good learning process for the university community, and it produced very relevant and useable information for development work.

The object of the evaluation

The object of the evaluation – the management and leadership of education – in itself was a quite new and challenging theme for the university. The steering group devoted much time to discussing and defining the meaning of the topic. This explication and the definition of the subject were very useful when establishing the instructions to the Faculties, which substantially helped the self-evaluation process.

Organising the evaluation

Early on it was decided that this evaluation process should be lighter and more limited in scope than the previous evaluation. The focus was limited, and much evaluation material was produced centrally. The support offered by the Academic Affairs Unit worked well. The organisation of all the practical matters by the Academic Affairs Unit moderated the burden on the Faculties and departments. The time schedule was carefully planned, and it remained attainable. Also, all the instructions were very well designed and feasible. One of the most important decisions was to offer the Faculties consultation as well as financial help for their self-evaluations. The cooperation between the Academic Affairs Unit and the Faculty coordinators was also remarkable. This evaluation process also cultivated the know-how of how to carry out an evaluation process at the University, and it is
important that these kinds of professional methods for evaluation procedures will also be carried out in the future at the University.

External Evaluation
The steering group was very impressed with the positive and quick answers of the invited evaluation experts. The panel was considered very committed to the project, and the panel’s expertise was seen as high quality. The panel was chaired well and was well organised. The good atmosphere in the discussions was highly commended by the Faculties. It is easy to rely on the panellists’ expertise. The interviewers were also well prepared, and the strategy in the division of labour between the panellists worked well.

The support offered by the Academic Affairs Unit to the panel was also remarkable. The panel was supported with clear and specific guidelines. The introduction to the evaluation task (including e.g. the panel’s “homework” and interview exercises) in both pre-meetings (Frankfurt 17.10.08, Helsinki 2.11.08) was seen as essential to the success of the panel’s work. Much planning and preliminary work was also done in several meetings during the spring and autumn of 2008 with the chair of the panel, Rector Eva Åkesson. The role of Eva Åkesson as a chairperson and her exceptional commitment to her duty were praised as being extremely important to the success of the entire external evaluation process.

Closing Seminar
The concept of the closing seminar was new in the University’s evaluation process. The idea was to offer the University community the opportunity to obtain instant feedback from the panellists and to hear the preliminary results of the evaluation. For the panellists it was a very challenging situation; they had to compress their main observations into a very short time and had to comment on issues that were not yet thoroughly digested. In any case the closing seminar was seen as a good ending to the evaluation week, and it raised expectations for and interest in the final report. The closing seminar also made it possible to see how all the panellists worked together and in this way increased trust in the panel’s operation. More time would have been needed for the discussion in the seminar.

Final Report
The evaluation feedback by the panellists covers the topic broadly enough and is detailed and concrete. The value added by it is quite obvious. The report is analytic, keen and gives a broad view of the topic under evaluation. The report introduces relevant recommendations. Special surveys made beforehand may have contributed material necessary or useful to the interviews.

For the future
In their final meeting, the Steering Group thoroughly discussed the evaluation method used. It was known beforehand that by this method it is not possible to get a detailed picture about leadership practices at the grass roots. For that
the panellists should spend a minimum of one day in each department. In the future the university will have a smaller number of departments, but nevertheless, grasping everyday life practices at the department level may be an attainable goal using this kind of evaluation method.

For planning and conducting further assessments, the Steering Group has expressed some ideas to be considered:

1. It may be reasonable to change the actual focus of the assessment every time.
2. The University of Helsinki and its Faculties and departments might benefit more from an assessment if it is conducted by using some kind of benchmarking procedure. Possible candidates for comparison could be other LERU universities.
3. The assessment could include a survey on teachers’ and students’ opinions, attitudes and wishes. This material might serve as a starting point for the panel to work with or instead of a self-evaluation.
4. To be more comparable with the research assessment exercise, one should think about the possibility to use rewards on the basis of the assessment.
2.3.2 The panellists’ observations of the evaluation process

The Evaluation Panel made a couple of remarks about the evaluation process.

First of all, eliciting such an evaluation was a good and brave endeavour of the University, which deserves due recognition. However, it was also extremely time consuming and very expensive. The instrument should be used sparsely and wisely. Furthermore, the evaluation process was well designed, and the support for the evaluation panel was first class. The pre-meeting of the Evaluation Panel was very useful for becoming acquainted with each other and for organising the work before the site visit. It was an intensive learning experience for all involved. The Evaluation Panel members were all very grateful for being invited to the University of Helsinki: we all learned a lot during the course of action. All the panellists made a great effort to ensure the success of the evaluation; during the site visit, we had an intensive week, interviewing during the days and writing during the nights.

Secondly, this evaluation process was directed at the management and leadership of the educational process in the University of Helsinki. Although this is a clearly identifiable aspect of university life, the Evaluation Panel lacked information on the context in which this educational process takes place, such as the research (strategies), some (numerical and content) details about majors, minors and independent Master’s programmes and their students, and information on the human resources policy/policies. Another element that was missing was information on the actual teaching performance of the Faculties. Information on the plans for the reduction of the number of departments was also missing. The above information would have been needed because management, and especially leadership, cannot be evaluated apart from the content and its context. To focus on the process and not also on the output and outcome is a drawback.

A third point is related to the development process of the University management and leadership. This evaluation process was not the first, but information on what the results of former evaluations were and what has been done with the results of these was only partially available. The same observation can be made for the Faculty level. The meetings the panel had with the different ‘stakeholders’ at the University and Faculty level were very helpful. The sub-panels of 4 persons were very workable. However, to interview 10 persons in 40 minutes was not an optimal situation; smaller groups would be preferred.

A bit more time for the management level was available in the ‘second’ interview, to raise a couple of issues that resulted from the other meetings. This aspect was partly taken care of in an extra meeting with all deans/vice-deans in charge of education after the Faculty visits were completed. Another aspect, taking into account the procedure of the evaluation as it was set up (short interviews and no separate contacts with all the Departments), it was not evident that separate comments on the Departments were expected in this exercise.
All the panellists had academic integrity and gave their honest view. The panel offered good advice as critical friends and really hopes it will be useful to the University so that the aim of the evaluation, to enhance the management and leadership of education, can be fulfilled. However, there is one severe drawback. In the evaluation, the panel has been given the mission to find both strengths and good practices. It was easy to find numerous examples of good practice. Nevertheless, the panel must emphasise strongly that there are most certainly other strengths and good practices in the Faculties and Departments that the panellists did not discover during the short visit to the University.

Finally, the members of the Evaluation Panel want to express their gratitude to Minna Frimodig and Seppo Saari for their fantastic service and support.
2.3.3 Realisation of the aims of the evaluation

The aim of the evaluation was to enhance the management and leadership of education by evaluating its present state from a critical perspective, recognising strengths and areas in need of development, and receiving feedback on the quality of operations. The aims of the evaluation were set beforehand by the University itself. The emphasis of the evaluation project was on providing opportunities for the academic community to participate in and affect the planning of the evaluation, its methods and aims as well as its impacts. The self-evaluation phase was designed to be a learning process. According to the feedback received from the Faculties, this aim was well reached. The financial and consultation support provided by the Academic Affairs Unit were seen as helpful in fulfilling this aim.

The external evaluation consisted of, in addition to all the documents provided, a large sample of representatives from all levels of the institution, who introduced understanding of the management and leadership in education. The phenomenon itself became better understood in the University, and the process increased the common understanding about the importance of management and leadership procedures, responsibilities, duties and organs such as committees, leaders, managers and the staff involved in these procedures.

The Panel was expected to identify the problems and development needs of the management and leadership of education, and to identify areas of strength and sections in the self-evaluation reports that left the responsibilities and processes of the management and leadership of education unclear. The Panel was requested to consider the strategic objectives throughout the evaluation and how the strategic aims permeate the management and leadership of education in the light of each of the self-evaluation questions. The Panel provided the evaluation observations based on evidence connected to the evaluation documents and discussions. The active voice and concrete recommendations that specify the actors responsible are presented in the report.

The Panel prepared the questions in order to raise relevant dialogue and discussion, and to avoid the experience of grilling the interviewees. The strict time schedule was implemented not by the Panel but by the University's decision to schedule one week for the site visit. That had some negative consequences, but the optimum ratio between the time allotted for the Panel and all the interviews and the costs was an optimised combination of many factors. The discussions in the interviews are always a checkpoint, clarifying some aspects, trying to pinpoint insubstantialities and looking for the essential aspects. The panel does not build a discussion which attempts to present an entity to the audience in the interviews, but is piecing together a puzzle and trying to present a complete picture in the report after all the interviews. The better the self-evaluations and other documents are, the better analysis the panel can provide in the report. All in all, the tone and the style of the report are correct. The enhancement-led approach in evaluation was
implemented in an ideal way. The approach was present in the interviews and can be recognised in the report text as well.

One of the aims of the evaluation was to document the findings on the Faculty and departmental levels in addition to the University level. In practice, this was not possible, as the Chair of the Panel states in this report. The Panel met only some members that could be recognised as representing the departments. For this reason, the departmental level is not covered in the report. The departmental level feedback received by some of the Faculties can be considered added value. It also proves that the Panel acted moderately and was realistic about what is possible to observe and conclude. The evaluative conclusions were expected to be in line with the strategic objectives of the University of Helsinki. Comments on these are presented in many cases in the report. The Panel’s observations are based on an analytical view of the whole data. The findings are also reasoned and credible.

On the university level, the report includes 16 recommendations, and common areas in need of development 27 recommendations. On the Faculty level 67 recommendations are presented. The Panel recognised 20 University level and 104 Faculty level strengths and good practices. The report will best serve the University after the outcomes are carefully analysed and implemented step by step. Each recommendation will be prioritised according to major versus minor and urgent versus long-term recommendations. The evaluation can be implemented by taking the outcomes of the evaluation into account and integrating them into all the documents and procedures to which they are relevant. The Academic Affairs Unit as its developmental role will continue to follow the implementation of the evaluation also in the long term.
3 Management of education at the University level
3.1 Self-evaluation report at the University level
A  Introduction

The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The all-embracing goal is to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of constructive alignment, teaching is based on four important stages: determination of learning objectives, determination of the subject and content of teaching, determination of assessment methods, and determination of teaching methods. The purpose of the management of education is to support the attainment of objectives in the development of teaching and teaching methods and in the improvement of the quality of learning. The management of education enhances the student’s profound mastery of and expertise in his or her field. To a great extent, the management of education at the University means collective responsibility for the development of teaching and the enhancement of learning. The expertise of the teaching staff, students and various academic administrators in the faculties and departments is not only called upon in collegial decision-making, but also in daily academic activities and their development. The overall responsibility for the development and objectives of field-specific education rests with academic leaders, i.e., deans, vice-deans and heads of department. The special characteristics of the University’s general management system are clearly visible in the daily management of education, which includes both the management of operations and the leadership of people. The University’s operations manual defines leadership and management as practical actions that enable the work community and its members to be able to fulfil their core duties. Through his or her activity, the manager promotes the achievement of programme goals and provides the prerequisites for the activities of the work community and its members.

The self-evaluation of the management of education at the University level was conducted as a last, summarising stage after the faculty-level self-evaluations. Once the faculties had submitted their self-evaluation reports, a three-hour workshop was arranged on 18 April 2008 to draw overall conclusions of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education at the University level. An invitation to this workshop was sent to the rector and the vice-rectors, members of the University Senate, deans and vice-deans in charge of academic affairs, as well as heads of academic affairs, planning officers and experts from the Administration Office. The number of invitees was 55, of whom 33 participated in the workshop. The participants discussed four themes from section
B of the faculty self-evaluation reports under the leadership of a consultant, and on the basis of this discussion, a planning officer from the Department of Strategic Planning and Development and a project employee compiled this University-level self-evaluation report. The descriptions in this report draw from the operations manuals of the University of Helsinki and its faculties, the duties and responsibilities defined in the Universities Act and the University’s internal regulations, and from materials and texts available on the University’s website and intranet.

B A description of the management of education at the university level and its pivotal strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development

Setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures

The University’s operations management process

At the University of Helsinki, setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures takes place through its operations management process. Operations management ensures that the University operates in accordance with its strategic plan, and it applies to all University activities and resources. The University’s operations management and quality assurance systems are closely related.

The salient stages of operations management include:

- Devising a strategy in order to determine objectives and areas in need of development
- Formulating action and target programmes to determine concrete measures, responsibilities and available resources
- Implementing the strategy and following up on its success in target negotiations and target and performance seminars
Operations management can be divided into the following primary processes and sub-processes:

**Operations management process chart**
- **primary and subprocesses**

- Follow-up and evaluation of the strategy
- Strategy and development programmes
- Implementation of the strategy
- Dissemination of the strategy

- unit-specific annual follow-up report
- project reporting
- follow-up of the strategy and development programmes
- closing of the accounts
- annual report
- expertise databases
- annual statistics
- agreement on annual targets
- distribution of funding
- projects and unforeseeable needs
- service agreements
- writing/updating of the strategy and development programmes
- agreement on the objectives of the three-year period
- principles of the allocation of funding and the allocation model
- drafting of unit-specific target programmes

The University administers its activities according to a three-year strategic plan. The strategic plan defines, on the basis of the University’s values, duties and future prospects, strategic goals for the University’s core duties (i.e., research, teaching and societal interaction relevant to research and teaching) and for the development of its operational preconditions. It also defines key areas of development which need to be addressed to achieve the set strategic goals.

The University implements its strategy through various policy programmes which present the concrete measures to be taken, objectives, responsibilities and resources. From the point of view of the management of education, the most important of these policy programmes is the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. Since 1992, this programme has encompassed the objectives and focus areas of the development of teaching and learning. The programme is devised in the form of a team effort including the entire university community, i.e., students, teachers and academic administration. A significant part of the process is a one-day seminar, which brings together the expertise of a large and versatile group of participants to define focus areas and priorities. After the seminar, the draft programme is circulated widely for comments before it is finalised by the Academic Affairs Committee and the University Senate. The Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies plays a significant role in the allocation of three-year project funding for the development of teaching, which is distributed on the basis of applications from the faculties.
The faculties, independent institutes and the Administration Office draw up their own target programmes on the basis of the University’s Strategic Plan and policy programmes.

The organisation of the target programme’s content is identical for all faculties. The independent institutes and the Administration Office devise their own target programmes and apply the set organisation of the programme as appropriate. The target programmes define concrete objectives which need monitoring and set out a general plan for their implementation. The target programmes also take into account the performance agreement between the University and the Ministry of Education. In addition to listing unit-specific aims, the target programmes include commonly agreed objectives concerning the entire University which have been defined in meetings between deans, directors of independent institutes and the rector. Unit-specific targets are agreed upon in the unit’s performance negotiations. Tables containing information on the resources of the strategy period’s first year, targets and key figures as well as a three-year service agreement are enclosed with the target programmes.

Most faculties draft action plans on the basis of their target and policy programmes, such as three-year action plans for the development of teaching. Among other things, the action plans prioritise the development challenges identified in the target programmes and distribute responsibilities for the implementation and follow-up of measures to be taken. Guidelines for the development of teaching are prepared collegially, drawing from the work of joint development seminars and various committees and networks. Students actively participate in the preparation and decision-making processes. The faculty-level target programmes and action plans are translated into concrete measures through departmental strategic plans and guidelines for the development of teaching.

The implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan and policy programmes, and the target programmes of the faculties, the independent institutes and the Administration Office, are evaluated in connection with performance negotiations with the rector and in target and performance seminars related to operations management. The faculties, independent institutes and the Administration Office report annually on their activities especially with regard to the implementation of their target programmes and provide analyses of the reasons for and consequences of their performance. The rector provides written feedback on these reports and focuses in particular on the implementation of target programmes. In connection with the reports and the rector’s feedback, target and performance seminars are arranged for the deans to discuss, on the basis of reports and key figures, the previous year’s activities and the implementation of the relevant policy and target programmes, and to anticipate the success of the current year’s objectives.
Strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development

The various methods and instruments used in connection with the University's operations management process are a great benefit, for, on the one hand, they facilitate the devising of the University's Strategic Plan, and on the other hand, they provide useful tools for planning and management after the strategy has been written. An example is the dialogue questionnaire used in the devising of the Strategic Plan 2007–2009, which involved gathering evaluations of the implementation of the previous strategy through an online discussion. The instruments related to the planning and management of operations include the University, faculty and departmental operations manuals and process descriptions, and the University's Teaching Quality Evaluation Matrix, which facilitate the orientation of new employees and enable also older employees to perceive concretely the University's operations. The multitude of methods and instruments also has its downside: due to lack of time and energy, they all cannot be used.

The short strategy period is the most obvious weakness of the operations management process. The present three-year period is too short, for the planning of the next strategy period is launched at the same time that the implementation of the current strategy period is beginning. Not much information has accumulated about the implementation of the previous strategy period, so the planning of the following period begins from scratch, when, in fact, the planning should be based on the experiences and systematic analyses of the previous strategy period. Implementing changes and detecting the effects of reforms in educational structures are slow processes: completing the basic degree takes five years, and in order to witness all the effects of a reform we should wait for the graduation of the class of students affected by the changes. If reforms are carried out too quickly, there is not enough time to analyse their effects. A clear development challenge is to devise separate strategies for short and long terms: although the demand for three-year strategy periods comes from outside the University, i.e., from the Ministry of Education, it does not prevent the University from drawing up its own strategic guidelines for five or ten years.

Further strengths include the fact that the present Strategic Plan has fewer key areas of development than the previous ones; in other words, the University has been able to select its objectives skilfully. However, the fact that the faculties and departments are not always able or do not dare to implement the set priorities to the full is a weakness. Differences between the faculties and departments should be taken into account when devising strategies and programmes of various levels, thus providing them with opportunities to apply on an individual basis the key areas of development defined at the University level. The University's large size is also both a strength and a weakness: the great variety in the type of units and levels of administration generates versatile good practices, but at the same time, presents a great challenge for management at the University level. Also, because of its large size, the University has not succeeded in involving all members of the University
community in its strategic objectives, and not all members of the University are aware of its salient objectives. The University should continue to clearly highlight the core issues and main objectives, which should be familiar to every member of the University community and to which they all should be committed.

The fact that knowledge obtained in practical operations is not adequately exploited in the drafting and implementation of the strategy is a weakness. Daily work generates a vast amount of experience and observation which are not collected in any form. Experience-based knowledge is thus an unused resource. Yet another weakness is that problems are not properly identified and announced in the negotiations connected to operations management processes. Numerous issues of great importance are noted down as areas in need of development in strategic plans, but no real action is always taken.

The support provided by numeric and qualitative follow-up data for the management of education

Numeric follow-up data

Numeric data is obtained from a variety of sources. In addition to electronic information systems (such as Oodi and Ilmi), data is collected by various officials by using various questionnaires, for example. Numeric follow-up data is used, among other things, in the ETAPPI study progress checkpoint system, and the most important data are gathered together annually on all levels of administration.

Key performance indicators

The faculties and the independent institutes are responsible for monitoring their activities using key performance indicators and other information, some of which are common across the University. The key performance indicators are specified in target programmes. Key figures related to education include the number of applicants/admitted students, student/teacher ratio, the number of completed degrees, degree completion times and the employment of graduates in positions corresponding to their academic qualifications. The key performance indicators are examined in target and performance negotiations to assess how well the unit has progressed towards attaining the agreed objectives. Electronic information systems are used in the collection of the relevant figures. Resources are examined from the point of view of the implementation of agreed objectives. Key performance indicators are used to describe operations and changes in operations over several years. In addition, deficiencies in activities and needs for improvement can be detected with the help of performance indicators. At the University level, key performance indicators are collected for reports submitted to the Ministry of Education and Statistics Finland.
The Student Register
The services of the University’s Student Register are based on the Oodi academic information system. The Oodi system contains data on students, degree requirements, teaching programmes, and completed credits and degrees. The system offers various tools for the use of students, teachers and academic administrators for purposes such as the devising of reports. Teachers may administer their own courses through WebOodi. WebOodi also contains a course feedback application, tools for the planning and guidance of studies, and course catalogues. The Oodi data store is a separate database developed for reporting and statistical purposes.

Study progress checkpoint system (Etappi)
In connection with the implementation of the two-tier degree system on 1 August 2005, the University of Helsinki introduced a system of checkpoints (ETAPPI-järjestelmä in Finnish) to support the smooth progress of studies and, consequently, a faster completion of degrees. In this system of checkpoints, study progress is monitored by assessing the accumulation of credits. The faculties determine the minimum number of credits required at each checkpoint. Study progress is supported through the personal study plan and intensive supervision and tutoring. The University coordinates the system and produces faculty-specific screenings of students and the relevant reports. At the University level, the results can be used in the evaluation of study progress, faculty-specific objectives and the implementation of the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies.

Career Services
The University follows up on the employment and career progress of its graduates through questionnaires directed at recent graduates and subsequent follow-up surveys. Data on the employment of recent graduates has been collected since 2004, and reports on the results are published annually. The faculties and departments also conduct their own follow-up surveys. National data on the employment situation of graduates is monitored through Statistics Finland’s data service, and the University reports the data in, for example, its annual reports.

University of Helsinki Ilmi data store
The Ilmi system is a reporting service designed for providing reports from the University of Helsinki databases. Data from various systems is collected into the data store for efficient information search and reporting. As the data are collected from various sources to one place, it is possible to combine data from the different systems. It is also possible to conduct searches in the system, obtain ready-made reports and produce custom-made reports through queries in the system. The reports and queries can be done for department or faculty-level data or for a field of education.
Qualitative follow-up data

Regular and continuously used quality assurance procedures of central importance include the following:

- Quality assurance procedures applied in the international academic community that are of relevance to the University’s core duties (e.g., refereed publications, peer reviews)
- Quality assurance through recruitment (researchers, teachers, students)
- Documentation of the quality assurance system, including definitions for quality policies, operations, actors and responsibilities (primarily in the operations manual)
- Evaluation of research, education and societal interaction, as well as of administration and support services
- Self-evaluation (including the Teaching Evaluation Matrix and relevant reporting)
- Collection of feedback from students, the labour market, interest groups and the staff; evaluation and consequent measures to be taken
- Auditing of the quality assurance system

Operations manuals

The University of Helsinki Operations Manual is a quality assurance tool which documents the practices through which the University attempts to attain its objectives. It describes procedures and common ground rules for operations, evaluation and development. The Operations Manual is a document summarising the University’s quality assurance system; it focuses on the starting points of operations, management, core duties, resources, support services and the University’s activities as a whole from the point of view of continuous quality improvement.

The faculties and independent institutes use the University’s Operations Manual as a basis for devising their own operations manuals to suit their own needs. The departments in the faculties may also write their own operations manuals.

Teaching Evaluation Matrix

The Teaching Evaluation Matrix is a quality assurance tool which enables teaching quality to be examined in a comprehensive way. The academic community’s conception of the quality of teaching is presented in the matrix in a distilled form. Teachers, students and experts in higher education and academic administration all contributed to its making. The definitions of quality contained in the matrix are based on the University’s Strategic Plan and the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, and they give concrete form to pedagogical planning, implementation and evaluation.
The faculties and departments have utilised the Teaching Evaluation Matrix as a tool for strategic planning and for self-evaluating their own teaching activities. The evaluation matrix enables units to describe and evaluate their own activities in relation to the common goals and development needs of the wider academic community. The use of the evaluation matrix as part of reporting and quality assurance is documented in the Programme for Development of Teaching and Studies approved by the University Senate.

**Centres of excellence in teaching**
Since 1995, the Ministry of Education has selected national centres of excellence in education. The University of Helsinki, for its part, has been rewarding its own units on the basis of the quality of their teaching since 2003. The assessment of teaching quality helps to put the focus on the quality of university-level teaching, to encourage units to assess the quality of their teaching and further develop their operations in a comprehensive manner, and to promote the dissemination of good practices and new innovations at the University. The internal performance evaluation conducted at the University every three years focuses on the central aspects of planning, implementation, evaluation and postgraduate studies. The assessment criteria consist of the criteria compiled in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix, which specifies in concrete terms the University's strategic aims and development challenges. The performance reports submitted by the faculties and departments are assessed by an assessment group appointed by the University's Academic Affairs Committee, and the rector makes the final decision on the nominations. All the departments that submit a proposal for performance-based funding will receive feedback as part of the evaluation process.

**Experiences of Teaching and Learning Questionnaire**
The questionnaire on teaching and learning (ETLQ, *OPPI* in Finnish) belongs to a research project coordinated by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, which aims to provide information about teaching and studies in different disciplines. The questionnaire was sent to first-, third- and fifth-year students in ten faculties at the University of Helsinki in 2006 and 2008. Some faculties have included the questionnaire in the process of devising the student's personal study plan, in which case the questionnaire is used systematically and students respond to it every two years. The aim is that all faculties will include the questionnaire in some part of the studies, for example, in the process of devising the personal study plan.

The Experiences of Teaching and Learning Questionnaire has several objectives. While being an instrument in the development of high-quality learning and teaching, it is also a scientific research project on learning experiences and student perceptions of their learning environment, and a tool for the enhancement of learning and learning skills within the supervision of the personal study plan.
The survey reveals information on how student approaches to learning and perceptions of their learning environment change over the course of their studies. Also, information is obtained on how learning and perceptions of learning environments differ between students in different academic fields. The purpose is not to make comparisons between different fields but to examine the relationship between students’ learning and their perceptions of their learning environment. The results are used as an aid in quality assurance on all levels of university administration.

**Strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development**

The support provided by follow-up data is a definite asset for the University's overall evaluations, of which the University has long-term experience. Relevant to the follow-up data are the University-, faculty- and departmental-level operations manuals and process descriptions and the Teaching Evaluation Matrix, which were already cited as the strong areas of the University’s operations management system in previous chapters. Even though versatile statistics and the great amount of available follow-up data are an undisputable advantage, we may ask how useful the statistics really are and whether they contain the most relevant information. Reviewing the basic principles of compiling statistics is an important area in need of development. Other strengths include the University's solid research basis, the available versatile pedagogical training and research, and the knowledge acquired through research.

Among the most notable weaknesses related to follow-up data is the poor exploitation of the accumulated data, especially with regard to feedback obtained from employers and students. Feedback from students and employers on the quality of degrees is collected and examined in ample amounts, but it is not used in the best possible way. As it is safe to say that qualitative feedback takes precedence over numerical follow-up data in the development of operations, qualitative feedback should be given greater consideration in decision-making. There is room for improvement in the manner in which the departments, the faculties and the University receive the results of feedback, and students should have a clearer idea of how and where their feedback may have an effect. As the flow of information from the top down, or from the bottom up, is not optimal, the University faces the challenge of setting up a system where feedback is raised from the level of heads of department through various levels to the top of the central administration. A great deal of progress has been made in the exploitation of feedback in recent years, and ample attention has been paid to it in unit-specific self-evaluations, but continuous efforts are still needed to make the exploitation of feedback more systematic and explicitly managed. Also, in order to improve communications, all units should specify more explicitly what kind of information they need. Reviewing the collection and exploitation of follow-up data is one possible area in need of development.
The collection and exploitation of follow-up data is part of the University’s operations management system. The University’s involvement with its strategy is a strength which also provides a solid basis for the collection of follow-up data. But the limited duration of the strategy period that was mentioned in connection with the operations management process and the consequent follow-up phase of similar limited duration are also weaknesses plaguing the collection and exploitation of follow-up data.

The distribution of responsibilities and labour in the management of education at the University of Helsinki

Duties and responsibilities of the management of education

The University’s management system is divided, on the one hand, in accordance with the structure of the University into three organisational levels, and on the other hand, into three sectors, one being academic leadership and the other two the management of administrative and support services. The three organisational levels are 1) the University, 2) faculties and independent institutes, and 3) units under the faculties and independent institutes (such as departments). Each organisational level has academic leaders and decision-making bodies (such as the rector, deans, heads of department and multi-member decision-making bodies prescribed by the new Universities Act with representation by the professoriate, non-academic staff and students), as well as an administration and administrative managers with the authority to make decisions (such as the University of Helsinki Administration Office, faculty office, departmental office and their directors and heads). Decisions are made by the decision-making organs or by leaders, and they are prepared through cooperation between the academic leadership, preparatory organs and administrative and support services.

A number of the duties and responsibilities bestowed upon academic leaders, decision-making bodies and academic administration are directly prescribed by the Universities Act and internal regulations. These duties are further defined in various rules of procedure and in the operations manuals of the University, faculties and departments. Different cooperation networks play a significant role in the management of education. Below is a brief presentation of the most important University-level academic and administrative leaders, and section after that presents the internal networks of academic administration. A more detailed description can be found in the document “Management of education at the University of Helsinki” (enclosed with the evaluation material; “Guidelines for the evaluation panel”), which also contains a description of faculty- and departmental-level leaders and managers, and their responsibilities.

Management of education at the University level

According to the division of responsibilities pertaining to quality assurance, the University is responsible for the overall quality and resourcing of education.
**Academic leadership**

The **Senate** is the highest decision-making body at the University. Duties of central importance related to education include the approval of the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, decisions on the general principles of student admissions and on the number of admitted students, the approval of general guidelines for the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, and the appointment of the University's Academic Affairs Committee, among other things.

The **rector** heads the University’s operations and deals with and resolves issues pertaining to the general management of the University. The rector is responsible for the University's internal operations management system. The rector’s decisions related to academic affairs are prepared extensively through consultations with various experts and committees. On the basis of extensive preparations, the rector decides on various awards for teaching achievements, on centres of excellence in teaching and on the grants awarded to these centres. The rector submits a proposal to the University’s Electoral Collegium for the appointment and duties of vice-rectors.

The **first vice-rector**, i.e. the **vice-rector in charge of academic affairs**, is responsible for the strategic management of education, setting guidelines for operations and for chairing several committees related to the development of teaching. The most important of these committees is the University of Helsinki Academic Affairs Committee. The vice-rector visits faculties together with the administrators responsible for the preparation of decisions every one or two years to discuss current issues pertaining to the development of teaching.

The **Academic Affairs Committee** is a strategic support group for the development of education at the University and a preparatory organ for decisions taken by the Senate and the rector. The Committee’s duty is to deal with fundamental issues pertaining to university-level teaching, studies, learning and learning environments, to prepare a draft for the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, to prepare the distribution of awards for teaching achievements and nominations for centres of excellence in teaching, to determine the procedures for the evaluation of the quality of teaching, and to develop international operations within the education sector and the classroom use of information and communication technology. The Academic Affairs Committee is entitled to appoint sub-committees to operate under its supervision.

**Other committees** whose duties are related to the development of teaching and the management of operations include the **Svenska verksamhetsnämnden** (committee for Swedish-language operations), appointed to develop and harmonise teaching provided in the Swedish language, and the Library and Information Services Committee, which makes strategic plans for library operations at the University level. To ensure the legal protection of students, the University has a Board of Examination Appeals, which deals with appeals regarding the grading of examinations, Licentiate theses and doctoral dissertations.
Administrative units and services

The University of Helsinki Administration Office is responsible for preparing and implementing decisions taken by the University Senate and the rector. The preparations are conducted in cooperation with faculties and other University units. Matters pertaining to education and the development of teaching are prepared by the Academic Affairs Office of the Department for Strategic Planning and Development in the Administration Office.

The Academic Affairs Unit is in charge of preparing and implementing strategic decision-making concerning academic affairs and operations management, as well as of providing certain centralised services at the University. The Unit promotes the development of teaching and the exploitation of the results of quality assurance and evaluations in teaching and learning. The Unit is responsible for enhancing the use of ICT in teaching. Furthermore, the Academic Affairs Unit is in charge of the Student Register, its internal development and enhancement of the production of data for academic purposes.

Student Services offers expert information and student-oriented services to prospective students and enrolled students. The unit also supports the University leadership, faculties, departments and other cooperation partners in the development and organisation of student services.

The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education operating under the auspices of the Department of Education is a both a research unit and a service unit. The Centre furthers research on university pedagogy and expertise on university-level teaching and learning in the entire University. It is also responsible for providing courses in university pedagogy in the form of in-house training at the University.

Networks related to the management of education

Networks within the sphere of academic affairs

A central characteristic of the preparation of decisions and proposals concerning the management of education is that the matters under preparation are dealt with and discussed in meetings held by various networks. Some of these networks are permanent and meet regularly, some operate only for a fixed term. The issues dealt with are of current interest, such as educational policies and guidelines or proposals under preparation. The purpose of the networks is to disseminate experiences and good practices throughout the University. Each network has an appointed coordinator to relay issues that have been raised in the network to the vice-rector in charge of academic affairs, the Academic Affairs Committee and academic administrators in the Administration Office and faculty offices.
The network of vice-deans gathers the vice-deans and deans in charge of academic affairs in the faculties once or twice per term to discuss topical issues related to university education under the chairmanship of the vice-rector. This network functions as an informal discussion forum for the leadership of the university and the faculties.

The network of heads of academic affairs convenes once a month and is also attended by officers, coordinators and other administrators from the faculties, the Language Centre and the central administration. The meeting functions as a cooperation forum for administrators on issues ranging from student exchanges to the degree reform and student services, and from the preparation of statements to performance negotiations and service agreements from the point of view of academic affairs. In the meetings, experiences are exchanged about faculty-specific practices, and matters concerning the entire university community are prepared.

The network of academic advisors gathers together faculty academic affairs advisors and academic affairs secretaries as well as various academic affairs administrators from the Department for Strategic Planning and Development. The participants in the meetings discuss and exchange information about current academic affairs, such as student selection practices and student services.

The network of planning officers for international affairs meets once a month. This network includes planning officers from the faculties and from the various units of the Administration Office who deal with international affairs.

The network of senior lecturers in university pedagogy is a multidisciplinary network of experts, whose know-how is at the disposal of the entire University community. The meetings, which take place once a month, are coordinated by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.

The network of specialists in web-based education functions as a cooperation network and medium for the distribution of information and the sharing of experiences between the specialists, the Educational Centre for ICT and other interested parties.

The University of Helsinki Student Union is a significant cooperation partner for the University in the development of education and teaching. All preparative committees and working groups have a representative from the Student Union. The Student Union not only serves as a link between its members, but also as their lobbyist vis-à-vis the University and society at large. All students pursuing an undergraduate degree at the University of Helsinki belong to the Student Union.

Faculty and subject-specific student organisations are formed by students to bring together students in the same field, lobby for their interests and organise various kinds of activities. These organisations actively participate in the planning
of study-related issues and in the development of teaching in the faculties and departments.

**Leadership networks as well as national and international networks**

The academic leaders and top-level management of the University meet regularly to ensure the flow of information in both directions in topical matters and participation in the preparation and execution of decisions. Examples of leadership networks include the University’s management group consisting of the rector, vice-rectors and the head of administration.

The University is engaged in national and international education-related cooperation networks with universities, polytechnics and other educational organisations both in Finland and abroad. National cooperation forums include the national seminar on academic administration, the development seminar for international affairs in universities, the national network of heads of academic affairs in universities, the PedaForum network on university-level pedagogy, the IT-Peda network, the Oodi Consortium and the Finnish Virtual University. The Bologna Process is the main forum of European cooperation within the field of higher education, the aim of which is the creation of a European area of higher education by 2010. Other international cooperation forums include The League of European Research Universities (LERU), the UNICA Network and the Utrecht Network, in addition to which the University has concluded bilateral partnerships with 80 universities. Detailed information about the national and international networks can be found in the document.

**Strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development**

The most salient strengths of the distribution of responsibilities relevant to the management of education are the horizontal management networks and support services. The networks formed by vice-deans, heads of academic affairs, senior lecturers in university pedagogy and other groups, as well as working groups appointed by various committees, all contribute significantly to the successful management of education. Furthermore, the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education provides valuable support for the management of education in the form of pedagogical research and training. However, there is a need for more field-specific research and awareness: what is learning like in the natural sciences and in the humanities, and how does learning differ in these two fields? Increased research and training in field-specific learning is clearly an area in need of development.

A serious weakness in the management of education is the problematic distribution of labour between academic and administrative leadership and between the different levels of administration. The distribution of duties between academic
leaders and administrative management is perceived as unclear, and there are differing opinions as to the functionality of the distribution of labour. Professors are not management professionals, and they do not always have adequate administrative competence, a conception of leadership and knowledge of the University’s practices. Also, as they often lack adequate immediate administrative support, they feel that they are overburdened by excessive administrative work. In the distribution of labour between the different administrative levels, the line of command “university-faculty-department” is, to some extent, perceived as reactionary and unpredictable, and there is room for improvement in the controlled implementation of long-term processes. The unpredictability can partly be explained by the fact that most guidelines are issued by the Ministry of Education, and sometimes the University is forced to harmonise its own, original guidelines in accordance with those of the Ministry. Nevertheless, the University should make efforts to improve the predictability of its long-term operations.

The high degree of commitment among the leadership, their solid expertise and their extensive experience of academic administration can be counted among the strengths of the distribution of responsibilities in the management of education. The academic leaders and administrative managers share a common policy line through the strategies and development programmes, be it that at times there are problems with commitment. The sometimes evident poor transparency and inefficiency of the academic administration must be counted among its weaknesses. Not everyone is aware of who is responsible for what and who should be contacted in a given situation. Also, the administrative work done by teachers could be transferred to the administrative professionals. The teachers’ significant autonomy with regard to the content of their teaching is definitely a challenge for the management of education.

When considering the distribution of responsibilities in the management of education, a number of possible development challenges emerge, especially with regard to clarifying responsibilities, the status of professors as leaders and improved communication. The distribution of responsibilities should be clarified in large-scale policies in particular. A step in the right direction would be to document responsibilities and job descriptions in operations manuals and to turn all deanships into full-time positions, which would highlight the leadership status of the dean and allow other administrators to concentrate on their duties. The awareness of professors of their leadership role should be raised either through leadership training or feedback on leadership. Communications could be enhanced by improving the orientation of new staff members to the University – also professors could be better oriented into their duties – in addition to which access to information related to administration and the distribution of responsibilities could be generally enhanced.
Service management within the sphere of academic administration

Services within the sphere of academic administration

At the University of Helsinki, administrative services and support services are organised in two ways, either by the central administration or on the campuses. Certain services are provided by the campus service centres to ensure easy access to the users. The services to be offered on the campuses are agreed upon in service agreements between the University’s Administration Office and the faculties operating on the campuses. Such services include services related to international research funding, salaries, the administration of IT user accounts and general academic advice for students. In the central administration, the Academic Affairs Unit and the Student Services Unit of the Department for Strategic Planning and Development are in charge of centralised academic affairs services. Specialised service units provide services in their respective areas of speciality.

Academic Affairs
The Academic Administration Team is in charge of the preparation and implementation of strategic decision-making and the operations management processes concerning academic affairs, and of presenting academic affairs matters to decision-making bodies. The services offered by the Academic Administration Team include the coordination of internal networks responsible for the development of academic affairs, the promotion of academic affairs administration and of the development of teaching and internationalisation, expert assignments in quality
assessment and consultation, the provision of legal advice for the academic affairs sector, and other expert assignments. The Academic Administration Team is also in charge of developing the University’s teacher and researcher exchanges and related services.

The services provided by the Student Register pertain to the use, maintenance and development of the Oodi academic information system, follow-up of the correctness of the data, administration of use and user IDs, user training and supervision, and other support services. The Student Register is also responsible for the compatibility of the Oodi system with other information systems, mass delivery of student data, production of student statistics and reports, and maintenance of the University’s centralised registers.

The Educational Centre for ICT provides the University’s teaching staff with services, support and training related to the use of educational technology. The Centre’s experts offer consultation on the use of ICT in teaching, the development of learning environments and materials, and web-based teaching. The Centre follows up on and enhances the pedagogic use of the newest technological innovations.

Student Services
Admissions Services is responsible for marketing the educational opportunities offered by the University and for providing general advice to applicants and support services to the faculties and departments during application and student selection periods.

Academic Guidance and Financial Aid Services provides general information and advice to students, attends to the University’s duties as a public authority in matters relating to student financial aid, coordinates the study progress monitoring system and offers special services to disabled students and international degree students. The Academic Guidance and Financial Aid Services has offices on the City Centre and Viikki Campuses that provide general guidance, advice on student financial aid and student register services.

International Mobility Services is responsible for the coordination of international student exchanges and for providing practical advice (e.g., on housing) to exchange students and support services for the Nordplus Nordic exchange programme. International Mobility Services is also in charge of the overall coordination of the Erasmus exchange programme at the University.

Career Services provides expert support services to the faculties and departments for the development of professional orientation studies, produces services for employers that promote graduate employment as well as surveys on graduate employment, coordinates traineeships and offers general services in support of employment prospects.
Service management

The service entities of Academic Affairs and Student Services are overseen by directors of services. The duty of a director of services is to supervise and develop the operations of the service entity, draft operational and financial plans, monitor the attainment of objectives and oversee the preparation and implementation of relevant decisions, and devise service descriptions.

The service entities are divided into service units, which are run by heads of services. The head of services is responsible for ensuring that services are produced appropriately, efficiently and in compliance with high-quality standards. Furthermore, the campus service centres have service coordinators, who supervise the cooperation between the heads of services and the negotiations for service agreements.

The Director of Strategic Planning and Development and the directors of development form a management group which is responsible for general planning and promotion of issues under preparation. The Department for Strategic Planning and Development supports the production and development of campus services with a view towards establishing uniform and equal services on each campus.

The operations of the Department are steered and affected by various interest groups inside and outside the University; these groups are also the Department’s customers. The Department works in close cooperation with the faculties, departments and campus units, relevant committees, and other departments of the Administration Office. The quality of the services is monitored, and services are improved with the help of a feedback system, regular customer satisfaction surveys and service agreements.

The organisation of pedagogic in-house training follows the organisation pattern of other support services, in other words, it is provided both in a centralised and decentralised (on the campuses and in the faculties) manner. The University finances the pedagogical training provided in the form of a centralised service by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, located in the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. The Centre’s centralised duties also include providing support for the work of senior lecturers in university pedagogy and the coordination of their network. The centralised services offered by the Centre are agreed upon in a service agreement between the rector and the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. The Centre is run by a professor of university pedagogy.

The University provides funding for the lectureships in university pedagogy (a total of 15 posts) in all its faculties. The administration of the posts and the relevant resources have been transferred into faculty-specific basic allocations; however, the University is entitled to withdraw the funding for the post if the faculty allocates the posts to other duties than pedagogical research, study and development.
Strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development

The strengths of the University's service management include, above all, common information systems and the ability to recognise, create and develop strategic objectives as well as services supporting teaching. The processes of building up information systems for common use generate common practices and enable the production of versatile services. Services promoting the University's strategic objectives are provided by the Educational Centre for ICT, Career Services and the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.

The most important weaknesses centre around the lack of a customer-oriented attitude in the production and development of services and the fact that the entity of services is not easily perceivable to students. The management of services should lend an ear to the needs expressed in the field so that operations can be arranged appropriately within the available resources. As to the entity of services, it is clear that all services in a university the size of the University of Helsinki cannot be concentrated in one service point, but the students should at least have an idea of which services are available at which service point. An essential development challenge for service management is to take into consideration the different target groups in the dissemination of information on the available services.

A third weakness that can be raised is the lack of planning and overall vision in service management. At the moment, the University has no general conception of its service organisation, nor the will to prioritise different wishes and needs, and consequently, it is rather unclear which development projects will eventually be launched and which will not. What is needed is increased target orientation and coordination in the development of services so that the same issues are not dealt with simultaneously in several units and so that not too many development measures are driven forward simultaneously, which the faculties and departments cannot accommodate in practice. The entity of services available to the University community should be made more visible, but at the same time, consideration should be given to tailor-made services directed at specific target groups. Tailored services should be possible and easily put into practice if only to ensure that services and service providers do not limit the opportunities of the different academic fields. An area in need of development in service management is the devising of a clear strategy for service production.

Finally, it must be noted that the whole concept of services and service management has been discussed a great deal. The issues under debate have included the relationship between the service provider and user: when speaking of customer-oriented services, can teachers and students be regarded as customers, or should they, as active participants of the university community, be called, e.g., cooperative members? On the other hand, services often mean extra work for the staff as they perform extra tasks such as feeding data into information systems; this makes customers also service providers. When developing new services, what must be
considered is whether the services are something the “customer” must accept or whether the services are something that the customer can develop further into a useful personal tool.

**Strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development raised in the workshop**

The number of asterisks at the end of the strong or weak points indicate how much the workshop on the management of education at the University of Helsinki held on 18 April 2008 wished to emphasise the particular point (*=little, ***=much).

**Setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses and areas in need of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operations manuals and process descriptions(***)</td>
<td>• The faculties and departments are not able or do not dare to prioritise according to the strategic key areas (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prioritisation of strategic key areas (***)</td>
<td>• Tools exist, but there is not enough time and energy to use them (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tools created for the University, such as the Teaching Evaluation Matrix and dialogue survey (**)</td>
<td>• Tools exist, but there is not enough time and energy to use them (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University’s large size and diversity (*)</td>
<td>• Management of the decentralised entity of the University is a challenge at the University level (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Conflicts are possible between departments and disciplines(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Identification and expression of problems (****)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategy periods are too short: the next strategy should be based on a systematic analysis of the previous strategy (****)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Separate short- and long-term strategies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Knowledge obtained in practical operations is poorly exploited in the drafting and implementation of the strategies (***)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## The support provided by numeric and qualitative follow-up data for the management of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses and areas in need of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The University’s overall evaluations and development programmes (***)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A solid research basis (**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical training and research (**)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Versatile and extensive statistics (**)</td>
<td>• The statistics are not always applicable (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Review of the principles of devising statistics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic thinking provides a solid basis (**)</td>
<td>• Strategy periods unsuitable (**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Commitment to the strategy insufficient; the strategy lacks core issues which everyone can commit to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Employer and student feedback is poorly exploited (***))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
|                                               | • The flow of information from the bottom up and from the top down is not optimal (***
The distribution of responsibilities and labour in the management of education at the University of Helsinki

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses and areas in need of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Networks and working groups within academic administration (***)</td>
<td>• The reactionary and unpredictable nature of the line of command “university-faculty-department” (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaders’ commitment to the strategic objectives (*)</td>
<td>• Shortage of field-specific research and knowledge on learning (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedagogical research and training (Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education)</td>
<td>• Opaquenes and inefficiency of academic administration (teachers do administrative work) (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid expertise and extensive experience of academic administration (*)</td>
<td>• Improvement of access to information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvement of orientation of new staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The distribution of duties between academic leaders and administrative management is unclear (*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved exploitation of operations manuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Full-time deanships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Professors are not management professionals and they do not always have adequate administrative competence or a conception of leadership (**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Leadership training for professors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback on leadership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Service management within the sphere of academic administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses and areas in need of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good information systems in common use</td>
<td>• Lack of a customer-oriented attitude in the production and development of services (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University boasts the expertise to develop new services that promote its strategic objectives (*)</td>
<td>• Hearing needs from the field</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The entity of services offered is unintelligible to the students (***)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improvement of the dissemination of information on services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Lack of planning and an overall vision in service management (**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved prioritisation of projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Coordination of the production of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Development of tailor-made services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategy for service production</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C Summary

The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of high quality. The salient strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development in four focal areas of the management of education were defined in a workshop belonging to the process of self-evaluation at the University. The participants in the workshop included representatives of the academic leadership and academic administration (including services).

At the University of Helsinki, setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures takes place through its operations management process. Definite strengths of this process are the tools created for the drafting, planning and management of the strategy, such as operations manuals, process descriptions and the Teaching Evaluation Matrix. Also, a current strength is the improved prioritisation of the strategic key areas. The short strategy period is the most obvious weakness of the operations management process: not much information has yet accumulated about the implementation of the current strategy period at the time that the planning of the following period begins, when, in fact, the planning should be based on the experiences and systematic analyses of the current strategy period. A clear development challenge is to devise separate strategies for short and long terms. The other weaknesses of the process include the poor identification and expression of problems and the poor exploitation of knowledge obtained in practical operations in the drafting and implementation of the strategy.

The University collects a multitude of both numeric and qualitative follow-up data which can be used to support the management of education. Relevant strengths encompass the University’s overall evaluations and development programmes, versatile statistics, available pedagogical training and research, and solid research basis. The most striking weaknesses that emerge in this respect are the poor communications between the different levels of administration and the poor exploitation of the feedback on the quality of degrees. Feedback is collected from students and employers, and even though many resources are put into this collection, the results obtained are not used as a clear guideline in the development of operations. Development challenges thus include the improvement of the collection of feedback and its systematic exploitation, and the decisive incorporation of qualitative follow-up data and feedback in decision-making.

The University’s management system is divided in accordance with the structure of the University into three organisational levels and into three sectors, one
being academic leadership and the other two the management of administrative and support services. Duties and responsibilities are defined in the Universities Act, internal regulations, various rules of procedure and operations manuals of various levels. The horizontal management networks and support services, such as the networks of vice-deans, heads of academic affairs, senior lecturers in university pedagogy, various working groups subordinate to committees and the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, emerge as the most notable strengths in the distribution of responsibilities. The most notable weaknesses are the reactionary and unpredictable nature of the line of command “university-faculty-department” and the unclear distribution of labour between the academic leadership and the administrative management. Relevant to this is the development challenge of recognising the position of professors as leaders: they are not management professionals, and they do not always have adequate administrative competence, a conception of leadership and knowledge of the University’s practices. The leadership of professors must be supported through leadership training, by offering them administrative support and by enhancing the functionality of the division of labour in administration.

At the University of Helsinki, administrative services and support services are organised either by the central administration or on the campuses, and the academic administration also offers various services for both staff and students. The strengths of the academic administration’s service management include common information systems and the ability to recognise, create and develop strategic objectives as well as services supporting teaching. The most important weaknesses centre around the lack of a customer-oriented attitude in the production and development of services and the fact that the entity of services is not easily perceivable to the students. Areas in need of development involve the dissemination of information about the available services and the lack of planning and overall vision in service management, which could be solved by devising a strategy for service production.
3.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The University of Helsinki is a research-intensive university with a leading position in Finland. In the University Strategy it is stated that “the University of Helsinki will establish its position among the leading multidisciplinary research intensive universities in Europe”. The present evaluation focuses on the management of the leadership of education on various levels in the University. We all know universities are not easy to manage. The strength of a university originates from the relative freedom and autonomy of its academic staff to generate a unique creative environment within the university. The challenge for the University’s leadership is to implement strategies needed to face the future challenges and, at the same time, still support the creative initiatives from within the academy in a delicate balance and a fruitful meeting of top-down and bottom-up approaches.

3.2.1 Setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures

The University Board, the University Senate, is the highest decision-making body of the University. The Rector is chair of the Senate and heads the University’s operations. One of the four Vice-Rectors, the first Vice-Rector, is responsible for strategic leadership and management of education, and is chair of the Academic Affairs Committee. At the Faculty level, a similar organisation is presented with a Dean as head of the Faculty and chair of the Faculty Council. The Dean or Vice-Dean is in charge of academic affairs and also leads the Committee for Development of Teaching. At the Departmental level, the organisational structure is repeated, with a Head of Department as chair of a Steering Group and a Group for the Development of Teaching. From the scheme of organisation set out in the self-evaluation report, a structure for organisation of the leadership and management of teaching is put forward, with a line of command from the top level to the Departmental level.

The self-evaluation report describes the three-year Strategic Plan as constituting the principal policy document governing the University and defining key areas of development for the period under consideration. Several other policy documents exist at the University level: the most important in this context is the Programme for Development of Teaching and Studies, prepared by the Academic Affairs Committee and approved by the Senate. The Faculties and Departments are expected to develop their own plans and targets, both in relation to the Strategic Plan and to the Programme for Development of Teaching.
The Strategic Plan spans a three-year time period, which we consider too short. It is essential to create a long-term view; strategy formation is not a year-to-year function. It would be beneficial for the University as a whole to articulate a sustainable long-term vision over longer planning periods. Clearly, in the fast moving world that is higher education today, flexibility and speed of response are key features, but that should not be at the expense of long-term vision. Similarly, it is important that the University takes responsibility for its own destiny. We heard many cases where we were told that “we must wait for the Government to decide”; clearly, the University will work closely with Government, but it is also essential that the University looks to shape its own future and priorities. We strongly emphasise making this change in the near term in anticipation of the coming national reforms, which will place larger demands on the strategic leadership of the entire University. Although the Government is extending its planning cycle to four years, we believe that a five to six year strategic horizon, at least, is required for strategies, with a rolling review in the interim. The long-term Strategic Plan should be underpinned by a series of detailed operational plans.

The University has many plans, tools and manuals, but the full potential of these methods is currently under-realised. In this respect, “less is more” and better focus is more likely to produce successful outcomes. We recommend that the University initiate a full and detailed review of its overall structure for strategy and planning, including implementation and monitoring. This should aim to develop a fully integrated structure covering the University, Faculties, Departments and the Administration, with clear lines of responsibility and accountability. This review should also seek to provide focus and direction; at present, there are too many, vague targets, rather than a concentration on a smaller number of key objectives. The interpretation and application of strategy is commonly left to Departments, to highly committed individuals or to the Administration. Whilst such local initiative is welcome, in broad institutional terms the result can be a lack of coordination and fragmentation. We encourage the leadership of the University to work together with the Faculties in formulating a vision and strategies for the future of the whole University. When the vision and strategies are formulated, the next steps that are needed are prioritisation and empowerment of the Faculties and staff, as well as the University, with leadership and tools to translate these ideas and proposals into concrete measures. For example, implementation will require that funding and resource allocation be more closely linked with strategy.

The University’s operational management process is described in the self-evaluation report as a four-step cycle: strategy and developing programmes, dissemination, implementation and follow-up, and evaluation of the strategy. A key part of the dissemination and implementation process is the arrangements for funding and the resource allocation model. Today, the overall vision for the University is poorly articulated and issues of implementation and subsequent monitoring are not fully developed. There is also a disconnection between planning and resource allocation; if targets are set, it is crucial that resources are available to deliver such objectives.
This can be done either by the allocation of new resources or by the redeployment of existing resources. Planning is not only about doing new things or doing old things better; it may also involve difficult decisions about relative priorities or to discontinue certain activities. We heard examples of new initiatives that had been supported with earmarked funds and had succeeded; we also heard examples where Faculties and Departments were expected to make changes without the necessary funding. Unfortunately, when targets are set without regard to necessary funding, staff can rapidly become disillusioned with the planning process, causing the erosion of credibility in the decision-making structure.

We recommend a further extension of the leadership development programme for senior leaders and managers at University, Faculty and Departmental levels, and for the Administration. Areas to be covered might include change management, financial management, human resource management, strategy and higher education marketing. Such training is best undertaken immediately before these leaders and managers take up their positions in order to ensure smooth transitions and minimal disruption in day-to-day management. This will help to equip the University for the challenges that lie ahead, being well-prepared through proactive training of leaders and effective succession planning before the reform is in place. In view of the forthcoming reform, a management with a more strategic leadership and entrepreneurial skills will be required throughout the University. Such training is best undertaken at the University level, mixing leaders and managers from across the University and from the central Administration, thereby gaining a better mutual understanding of issues across the institution.

It was positive to observe that a majority of the Vice-Deans in charge of academic affairs have participated in pedagogical as well as leadership training. They set a good example for all staff. Although participation is voluntary, there is an increasing number (> 1,100 since 1994) of staff who have participated in courses on university pedagogy.

Finally, it was clear that the Rector’s feedback is appreciated by the Faculties, giving them a structure within which to execute their management and leadership roles.

**Conclusions**

**Strengths**

- The University of Helsinki is a comprehensive, research-based University that aspires to excellence in all fields. The breadth of expertise in the University is both a strength and a real opportunity for future development.
- The University of Helsinki is a very strong University, with very impressive staff and students.
The University of Helsinki has a distinct organisation, with an overarching Strategic Plan to which Faculties are expected to align their strategic plans. This provides an integrated structure and offers a good basis for future developments.

**Good practices**

- The University acted upon the recommendation from a previous evaluation by establishing and funding University lecturers in pedagogy and encouraging the development of the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.
- The written feedback from the Rector on the reports and the implementation of the target programme and the following performance seminars for the Deans.
- The work with dialogue processes using different tools such as seminars and dialogue questionnaires online.

**Recommendations**

- We recommend a longer time span for the Strategic Plan; at least a five to six year strategic horizon is required.
- We recommend that the University initiate a review of its overall structure for strategy and planning, including implementation and monitoring. This should aim to develop a fully integrated structure covering the University, Faculties, Departments and the Administration, with clear lines of responsibility and accountability. This review should also seek to provide focus and direction; at present, there are too many, vague targets, rather than a concentration on a smaller number of key objectives. This review should involve reference to external expertise.
- We recommend that the strategies and planning be more closely aligned with resource allocation, either by the allocation of new resources or by the redeployment of existing resources.
- We recommend that consideration be given to extending the University’s leadership development programme.

**3.2.2 The support provided by follow-up data (numeric and qualitative) for the management of education**

The University follows the performance of the Faculties and the Institutes through a range of key performance indicators specified in their target programmes. However, it is not clear from the self-evaluation if and how the key performance indicators are correlated with resource allocation; the self-evaluation states that resources are examined from the point of view of the implementation of agreed objectives.
The University has several common electronic systems for numeric follow-up data, such as the Oodi, Etappi and Ilmi data stores. The careers services do alumni follow-up studies; data has been collected since 2004 and annual reports have been produced, but there are no examples of how the results have been used by the University in the self-evaluation. The University has an Operational Manual which is a quality assurance tool and from which departments write their own manuals. From the text in the self-evaluation, it is not obvious if and how the results from Quality Assurance are fed into quality improvement in a systematic manner. Another quality assurance tool is the Teaching Evaluation Matrix. An appealing initiative is the use of criteria in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix as a basis to reward staff for high quality teaching. Another constructive element is the feedback given to all the departments who submitted proposals for performance-based funding. The experiences of the teaching and learning questionnaire, ETLQ, is an also an interesting project, combining development with learning and teaching in a scientific research project.

From the discussion with the heads of academic affairs, we learned that, although much data is collected, these are not yet connected to each other. Also, according to the Rector and Vice-Rectors, the data are not yet used optimally or systematically in the strategic process. The decision-making bodies at different levels do not seem to make much use of statistical information in their planning processes. The central Academic Affairs Committee did not seem to have any common notion of the value of information systems and feedback information. However, some Faculties are using the management data. Furthermore, the Government is developing new ‘rules’ for data, and the software for the data collection and analysis is outdated. A national-level project RAKETTI is expected to help remedy the situation. However, there is no reason to wait for the Ministry of Education to determine performance indicators for the funding model; in practice, all indicators are already known. A more systematic use of available data can be achieved, although the data system might not yet be ideal.

Formulation of internal key-performance indicators in relation to the strategy of the University is essential. Systematic collection of quantitative and qualitative curriculum evaluation data is necessary. We heard of several cases where information was not available or was not shared, or where different figures were used for the same piece of information at different places in the organisation. An example was the widely differing methods used for calculating student/staff ratios between and even within Faculties. Within any successful planning structure, it is essential that all leaders and managers are working from the same sources of information, and that information is shared openly within the University. We also urge the more systematic use of key performance indicators in order to measure progress in meeting strategic targets. The use of other management tools (such as the Balanced Scorecard or “traffic light” systems) might also be explored. We therefore recommend that a full review be undertaken of the University’s strategy for the provision of management information to ensure that the real needs of the
University, Faculties, Departments and the Central Administration are met in an effective and timely fashion.

To summarise, the University is encouraged to address the present arrangements for the collection and use of management information at all levels. Much data is collected, but its use is often imprecise; some information is collected but not used. The use of a small series of key performance indicators specific for particular actions is recommended.

The University should benchmark its activities at all levels against the best universities in Europe to a much larger extent than is currently undertaken. This will help to increase the wider appreciation of the position of the University relative to its international partners and competitors.

Conclusions

- Data are collected, but not used in a cyclical, systematic strategic process.
- Evaluation data on courses are used, but the data on curriculum evaluation is incomplete.

Strengths

- The Teaching Evaluation Matrix
- ETLQ, the experiences of teaching and learning questionnaire
- The checkpoint system is working well.

Good practice

- Use of data from the checkpoint system

Recommendations

- We recommend that the University review the present arrangements for the collection and use of management information at all levels. Much data is collected, but its use is often imprecise; some information is collected but not used. The use of a small series of key performance indicators specific for particular actions is recommended. A more systematic use of available data and formulation of internal key-performance indicators in relation to the strategy of the University are essential. We recommend that the University reviews its strategy for the provision and use of management information to ensure that the needs of Faculties, Departments and the Central Administration are fully satisfied.
- We recommend that the University seek to exploit the full potential of the quality assurance data that are routinely collected. It must be made available at the level of the individual Faculty and Department in addition to the current aggregations.
• We also recommend that the University looks to benchmark its activities at all levels against the best universities in Europe. This will help to increase a wider appreciation of the position of the University relative to its international partners and competitors.

3.2.3 The distribution of responsibilities and labour in the management of education at the University of Helsinki

The structure of the University’s management system is described within the University’s self-evaluation as comprising three organisation levels (University, Faculties and Institutes, and Departments) and three sectors (academic leadership, management of administration, and support systems). Decisions are made either by decision-making bodies or by leaders. The basis for decision making is developed through cooperation between the academic leadership and administrative and support services, but the interplay between these actors and the distribution of duties is not well elaborated in the report.

Several horizontal networks exist within the academic administration, both permanent and with a more temporary character. These networks are rated as a strength in the self-evaluation. However, many tasks for universities today need the engagement of several different competences in order to address new challenges in a creative and efficient way. Thus, the use of small ad hoc teams drawn from a range of skills and competencies in order to resolve particular issues is also commended; such groups might complete a task and then be dissolved.

In the management of education, the Academic Affairs Committee occupies a central position within the University. The Academic Affairs Committee is charged with developing a pedagogic plan, but the interviews gave us the impression that actual implementation occurs predominantly at the level of the Vice-Deans for Academic Affairs and in their network. We recognise that the Committee has made several specific achievements in recent years. However, we do not believe that the Committee is offering overall leadership and vision for teaching and learning across the University. It was suggested to us that the Committee was a “discussion group”. Whilst a forum for the sharing of ideas is helpful, we believe that, in the increasingly competitive environment within which the University is now operating, it is important that the Committee takes active responsibility for the leadership and delivery of teaching and learning across the University. This will include the development of a clear long-term vision for education and, in particular, the development, leadership and oversight of institutional policies (e.g. for internationalisation of education, curriculum development and interdisciplinary study), and should include the active oversight of the work of Faculties and Departments. Faculty ownership would be increased if they were more fully involved in the development of the plan.
Deans and Vice-Deans have a crucial role within the University structure. It was suggested to us that in recent years they have increasingly become involved with determining central University policy. This is an important development. Increasingly, Deans must “face both ways”, helping to shape and implement University strategy but also representing their Faculties and being responsible for the delivery of teaching and learning within their Faculties. It is important that Deans and Vice-Deans (we have quite deliberately emphasised the responsibility of BOTH Deans and Vice-Deans) recognise this dual role and are equipped to exercise these responsibilities (staff development, responsibility for discretionary resource management).

It is important that all staff feel a sense of involvement and have an opportunity to contribute to decision making. However, the present structure comprises too many committees and groups, often with uncertain or overlapping remits and no clear lines of responsibilities or powers; we heard many examples of issues being debated many times with no decisive conclusions. This is an inefficient and ineffective method of decision making. Flatter decision-making structures with more devolved responsibilities (subject to appropriate accountability) should be considered. A review of the University’s decision-making structures at all levels is needed.

The University encourages high levels of professional autonomy with strong local “ownership” of education and degree programmes. This is a strength in securing high levels of commitment from academic staff. However, it can also lead to a lack of accountability within the University and a sense of detachment from overall University or Faculty policies and strategic objectives. A balance must be struck. In our view, the present balance may tip too much towards departmental autonomy, creating difficulties in ensuring overall quality assurance (at either Faculty or University levels) and in achieving overall strategic objectives such as internationalisation and the development of multidisciplinary teaching.

Such autonomy has advantages and can encourage local initiative and ownership. However, it can also weaken coordination and may tolerate noncompliance. Another consequence can be uncertainties about the meaning of key concepts. For example, the University advocates a student-centred approach to learning and also promotes the development of research-based teaching. However, it was immediately apparent that the meaning and understanding of these terms varied widely within the University. It is important to stimulate further discussions of these issues throughout the University.

We were very impressed with the work of the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and of the University Senior Lecturers in University Pedagogy throughout the University. The staff are highly committed and enthusiastic, and we have also received clear evidence from Faculties regarding the significant impact that these staff are making. We hope that the University will be able to provide the long-term stability that will enable these staff and the Centre to extend their
role. The University is highly commended for its foresight in taking forward these developments.

The University has a very strong research profile. However, it is important that teaching quality is equally valued within the University. It is important when making staff appointments that teaching potential as well as research records are considered. Good practice and innovative teaching need to be more widely celebrated within the University. Similarly, bad teaching cannot be tolerated. We were horrified on one occasion to hear of bad teaching that was recognised by the Head of Department, colleagues and students, only to be told that nothing could be done until the person concerned reached retirement. The University has many outstanding teachers and should build on this base to promote excellence across the board.

Similarly, we noted that teaching loads often varied widely within Faculties and within Departments. Some Heads of Department were active in the management of teaching loads, but others were unwilling to intervene. Some variations between departments and staff are inevitable. The use of transparent workload management systems should be considered further.

The University of Helsinki is a very strong university with very impressive staff and students. However, we feel that it is not fulfilling its potential. There is no reason why Helsinki should not be performing as one of the world’s leading universities. We feel that there is some level of institutional complacency and in some cases a lack of ambition within the organisation. The reforms in higher education in Finland will compel a new approach to leadership and management at all levels; a new, competitive approach is inevitable (although this may be uncomfortable for some staff). This will require a clear vision, decisive leadership at all levels and a greater willingness to prioritise (what to do and, more difficult to achieve, what not to do).

**Conclusions**

**Strengths**

- The University has a strong tradition of democratic and participative governance that is to be commended. There is a strong sense of needing to involve all staff in the development of policy.
- The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and the University Senior Lecturers in University Pedagogy, working throughout the University
- The University Strategy focuses on the learner-centred approach. This principle has been translated into the Teaching Evaluation Matrix, which is available university-wide.
- An increasing number of academic staff have pedagogic training, although participation is voluntary.
Good practices

- We wish to commend the University’s intention to secure high levels of involvement and participation in teaching and learning within the academic community.
- The decision to locate Senior Lecturers in University Pedagogy in the Faculties is an excellent example of good practice at the University level.

Recommendations

- We recommend a detailed review of the University’s decision-making structures at all levels.
- We recommend that the Faculties provide stronger incentives for all academic staff to complete pedagogic training.
- We recommend that the Faculties should define and elaborate more explicitly what a learner-centred approach means in their disciplines.
- We recommend that the University develop university-wide aspects and criteria to be functional in the recruitment of personnel in order to have a better balance between pedagogical and research qualifications.

3.2.4 Service management within the sphere of academic administration

The Department for Strategic Planning and Development in the central administration has three units: Academic Affairs, Student Services and Research and Innovation Services.

The administrative services and support are organised either by the central administration or on the campuses. The campus-based services are regulated by a service agreement between Faculties and the University’s Administration office. However, these agreements do not appear to be related to service standards or to funding. The Academic Affairs team has central tasks for supporting pedagogical management in Faculties and Departments, and the implementation of strategic decision making. The team also coordinates various University networks, some in quality assessment and some in the field of internationalisation.

The staff in this group are managing day-to-day administrative matters with students and degrees. They have to deal with the tensions arising between strategy devised in senior groups within the University and the autonomy of Faculties and Departments. In other words, they are handling the practicalities of implementing strategy. The autonomy of the Faculties and Departments is very high, and it is sometimes problematic to get the strategic decisions implemented at these levels. This is done on both an ad hoc basis, through informally agreed processes, and through formally devised procedures. In some cases, the group is also mediating between Ministry policies, University strategy and Faculty and Departmental autonomy.
There is a need for quality control of the student checkpoint system. Although the system is administratively useful, it is not well implemented in some departments. Also, the potential of the information is not fully utilised at the moment for managing student recruitment and progression. The reasons why implementation has not been successful in some departments should be identified and appropriate action taken, and the system should be refined to maximise its potential.

The heads of academic affairs indicated to us that students very much like the possibility of being able to have all kinds of combinations of majors and minors. However, this requires significant counselling and advice. Adequate resources should be available for this work.

The importance of student support services within universities is now widely recognised. Effective, efficient support services, including administrative services (e.g. registration, progression, assessment), learning support (e.g. study skills, time management, generic skills) and welfare services (e.g. counselling, disability) are vital in creating an environment within which students can succeed. The University has a duty of care to help and support its students. Within the University, there are many caring and dedicated staff, and we wish to commend their work. However, we believe that services might be developed further and that coordination might be improved. A review of student support services is needed both to ensure that the range of services provided is adequate and that funding levels are appropriate, and to clarify lines of responsibility between Faculties, Departments and central services. This review should also cover the role of academic staff in supporting their students and help them to identify issues and respond to student needs; in particular, the need to prevent difficulties before they arise must be stressed. In recent years, the University has been required to respond to the new degree structures required as a result of the Bologna process. This has necessitated very considerable effort on the part of staff throughout the University. We have been impressed with the response of the University. Many staff commented on the need for a period of stability following such deep changes.

We understand that academic affairs are not discussed in the informal networks that exist in the University e.g. between the Rectors and the Deans. The discussions between Rectors and Deans tend to concentrate on policy issues and research infrastructure. This is a weakness and should be addressed. The relationship between the lecturers in pedagogy and the administrative personnel responsible for academic affairs is unclear and depends on how the lecturers perceive their role (research-orientation versus development orientation). This needs to be clarified in the work plans of these lecturers.
Conclusions

Strengths

- We were impressed by the very high level of professional commitment and expertise among staff at all levels in the University.
- The University has responded positively to the demands of the Bologna process.

Good practices

- Quality control at student checkpoints. There are five times during students’ studies when information can be transferred to the department for action. The system seems to be administratively useful.
- In recent years, many important changes have been realised in a relatively short time, such as the implementation of the Bologna structure and the checkpoint system. The introduction of the university-wide grading scale system and the ECTS system is seen as very valuable.

Recommendations

- We recommend quality control of the student checkpoint system. Although the system is administratively useful, the system is not well implemented in some departments. Also, the potential of the information is not fully utilised at the moment for managing student recruitment and progression. The reasons why implementation has not been successful in some departments should be identified and appropriate action taken, and the system should be refined to maximise its potential.
- We recommend the University undertake a review of its student support services. This should include consideration of the resources available for counselling and advice.
- We recommend that academic affairs be discussed in the informal networks in the University e.g. between the Rectors and the Deans.
- We recommend that the relationship between the University lecturers in pedagogy and the administrative personnel responsible for academic affairs be clarified in the work plans of these lecturers.
- We recommend that arrangements for funding the University’s central administration be reviewed. This should involve an examination of various alternative models, the use of service agreements and the arrangements for effective scrutiny of central services.
4 Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry
4.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry
A Introduction

The international evaluation of education 2007–2008 was implemented in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry in cooperation between departmental contact persons and Faculty officials, using the guidelines, instructions and resources of the University of Helsinki.

The Faculty management group appointed Leena Suominen, a senior lecturer of university pedagogy, to coordinate the evaluation. The Faculty also designated its Committee for the Development of Teaching to function as the evaluation steering group under the leadership of Marketta Sipi, vice-dean in charge of academic affairs. The students were represented in the steering group by the student members of the Committee for the Development of Teaching.

The Faculty established a separate intranet workgroup for communications purposes and invited departmental contact persons, the members of the Committee for the Development of Teaching, the dean, the vice-deans and the heads of departments as members of this workgroup. In addition, the evaluation coordinator created a separate wiki area for Faculty documents, including final reports which were made available to all before a deadline that the Faculty had set.

Each departmental steering group appointed a contact person to draw up the department’s independent self-evaluation report. This contact person was in charge of compiling the departmental self-evaluation report and coordinating the evaluation process at the department, as well as for distributing information to other evaluation contact persons and the Faculty steering group. The Faculty-level self-evaluation report was produced by a group consisting of the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the head of academic affairs and the senior lecturer of university pedagogy. The lecturer also uploaded the final documents to the Faculty’s wiki site.

The diversity that characterises the Faculty was reflected in the various methods used to implement the self-evaluation. The departments compiled their self-evaluation documents in different ways, depending on each department’s size and other characteristics. Some departments used existing documents for the self-evaluation. One department carried out an electronic self-evaluation survey aimed at its staff (about 160 persons) and the student members (15 persons) of both its steering group and its discussion and development group for academic affairs. Small departments were able to carry out a SWOT analysis in conjunction with department meetings, teacher meetings or other get-togethers. The Faculty senior lecturer of university pedagogy was available for advice and guidance throughout the process.
The departmental contact persons and the evaluation steering group met a total of four times during the self-evaluation. These meetings included the distribution of information, status reports and discussion on issues that had arisen. The last meeting was a workshop for the self-evaluation contact persons, the heads of departments, the teachers, the students and other staff. They were to examine the self-evaluation reports so as to formulate a joint view of the strengths and development needs in the management of education. This workshop was led by Dr Maaret Wager. The workshop participants totalled 20 people, including not only departmental contact persons, but also members of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching. Students were also invited to this workshop via their organisations’ mailing list, but no student representative participated.

The feedback on the workshop indicates that it was particularly useful for raising awareness of common problems associated with the management of education. On the other hand, the participants also discovered that the departmental structures vary so much that no single solution can be offered for all the problems. The feedback also suggests that the participants believe in the departments’ independent efforts to improve their operations on the basis of existing good practices.

After the workshop, the Faculty senior lecturer of university pedagogy prepared a draft of the final report and, following comments from the steering group, put the finishing touches on the Faculty’s self-evaluation report.

B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry as an operational environment

The Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry is a multidisciplinary faculty with nine departments. It has close ties to Finnish society, which is reflected in the orientation of its disciplines and research towards applied sciences: agriculture, forestry, economics, and food and environmental sciences. The Faculty’s undergraduate degrees are the Bachelor and Master of Science (Agriculture and Forestry) and the Bachelor and Master of Food Sciences. The Faculty has some 3,200 students, of whom about 500 are pursuing a postgraduate degree. According to statistics for the
academic year 2006–2007, the Faculty has 122 teachers, of whom about the same number are professors and university lecturers. The Faculty offers education in 18 major subjects and has five English-language Master’s programmes. Each year, the Faculty admits about 400 new students, while some 220 students graduate with a Master’s degree and about 30 students graduate with a doctoral degree from the Faculty. The Faculty units supporting education (the Hyytiälä Forestry Field Station, the Värriö Subarctic Research Station, the Suitia and Viikki Research Farms and the Muddusjärvi Research Station) are situated in various locations across Finland.

One of the Faculty’s strengths is its multidisciplinarity. In some fields, the Faculty is the only institution in Finland to provide university-level instruction. The Faculty’s operations are based not only on University of Helsinki guidelines for research and education, but also on societal needs and feedback.

Education is managed at the Faculty level by the dean together with the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs and with the Faculty Council. But because of differences between the disciplines, departmental bodies or individual teachers handle degree design, teaching and operations management for the most part.

Strategic starting points and objectives for education

The vision of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry is to be an internationally renowned scientific expert organisation and an attractive cooperation partner, as well as being a leading multidisciplinary research and education institution in Europe. The Faculty’s values include human well-being, the appreciation of nature and the environment and sound ethical actions. The Faculty degrees are based on research in its disciplines and on the latest knowledge gained through such research. The Faculty also applies the University’s principle whereby all teachers conduct research and all researchers teach.

The Faculty’s focus areas and activities in the development of teaching and studies are founded on the University of Helsinki Strategic Plan, its Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, the feedback received in the previous international evaluation and the Faculty’s target and action programmes. The feedback obtained from associates and employers (advisory boards) plays an important role in degree design.

It is vitally important for the Faculty’s operations that degree targets are met by increasing the number of both Master’s degrees and doctorates. The focus areas and main guidelines for teaching during the current operating period are recorded in the Faculty’s action plan for the development of teaching and studies 2007–2009. This plan includes information about quantitative and qualitative targets, the measures necessary to achieve them, persons in charge, follow-up procedures and resources.
The core content of the action plan was created in a cooperative workshop by the teaching staff and the Faculty officials. The following emerged as the key development objectives for the current three-year period:

- Student recruitment
- Commitment through guidance and supervision
- An international frame of reference
- Definition of degree targets and development of the content and quality of degrees
- Multidisciplinarity

These development areas comply with the University of Helsinki Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009.

Departmental targets and measures related to education are specified in each department’s own operational and financial plan, strategic plan, action programme and similar documents.

The targets, action plans and responsibilities determined collectively and through joint decision-making and described in the above documents provide guidelines for practical measures that both the departments and the teaching staff implement in a self-directed manner.

**Evaluation and development of education**

The evaluation, indicators and development of education in the Faculty are based on the University’s Strategic Plan and the target and policy programmes founded on the Strategic Plan, as well as on various internal and external evaluations and feedback schemes. Feedback from employers and discussions with associates also play a role in the further development of education, both in degree design and in the assessment of degree quality.

The University conducted an international evaluation of the quality of education and the degree programmes from 2001 to 2002. The results of this evaluation were published in the book Kasvaen kestävään laatuun ("sustainable quality through growth"; Levander and Mikkola, 2003), in which the prospects and development needs of undergraduate education are listed as follows: the development of degrees in the new two-tier degree structure (the implementation of the Bologna process), the development of teaching, a student-centred approach, advice and guidance, the problems of student recruitment and the management of education.

The Faculty addressed the above development needs during the previous strategic period by reforming the structure of its major subjects in conjunction with the
transition to the two-tier degree structure. In addition, the Faculty has increased the emphasis given to teaching skills and pedagogical qualifications in teacher recruitment, has introduced student-centred teaching methods founded on problem-oriented and inquiry-based learning, and has allocated a lectureship of university pedagogy to the development of a guidance and supervision scheme spanning the entire degree. In the current operating period, the Faculty has focused especially on a reform of student recruitment and admissions with project funds.

As of the beginning of 2008, the Faculty has been using a course feedback scheme which obligates each department not only to collect feedback, but also to process it in departmental or discipline-specific bodies and to report annually on this processing and on reciprocal feedback to the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching.

One concrete development measure that the Faculty Council took to clarify the management of education was to appoint a vice-dean in charge of academic affairs as of the strategic period 2004–2006.

Management of education in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry

Strategic decisions concerning education in the Faculty are made by the Faculty Council under the leadership of the dean. The Faculty Council decides on degree requirements and the standing orders on degrees, makes a proposal for the annual intake of students and decides on admission criteria in accordance with the general principles of student admission confirmed by the University Senate. The Faculty Council also approves Master’s theses, which are part of advanced studies requirements. The dean leads and supervises the Faculty’s operations. To confirm and monitor the Faculty’s target and policy programme, the dean visits the departments each year and compiles monitoring surveys every six months. The dean is assisted in the Faculty by a management group consisting of the vice-deans, the head of academic affairs, the postgraduate and international affairs officers, the financial planning officer, the head of administration, the information officer and the senior engineer of the Faculty’s equipment centre.

The Faculty’s Strategic Planning Group assists the Faculty leadership in the preparation of strategically important issues and also functions as a Faculty-level cooperative body. This Group includes representatives of the Faculty’s various staff groups. The members of the Faculty’s management group participate in the Group’s work depending on the issue discussed. The Group also includes student members.

1 See also appendix 1, page 104: Structure of the management of education.
The societal interaction of the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry is based on the societal relevance of its scientific research and its teaching founded on such research, as well as on the specialist services produced by the Faculty researchers and teachers. The Faculty advisory boards promote the exchange of information and cooperation between the Faculty and key societal associates representing the various Faculty disciplines in order to develop the Faculty’s research and teaching and to increase their societal impact. For these purposes, the advisory boards make assessments of quantitative and qualitative degree targets, comment on the structure and content of the Faculty degrees, and monitor and promote the employment of Faculty graduates.

The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs is responsible for the preparation and implementation of educational tasks set for the Faculty, and for the compilation of the action plan for the development of teaching and studies. The vice-dean also chairs the Committee for the Development of Teaching and the Admissions Board.

The Committee for the Development of Teaching supports the Faculty projects for the development of teaching and prepares decisions relating to them. The Committee also completes other tasks that it considers to be associated with the development of teaching in the Faculty. The dean appoints the Committee for the Development of Teaching for three years at a time. The Committee includes a representative and his or her deputy from each department, and two student representatives. In addition, expert members from the Faculty’s academic affairs and support services for teaching participate in the Committee operations. Matters presented to the Faculty Council are usually first submitted to the departmental steering committees and subject-specific student organisations for additional comments and statements. The Committee meets once a month. It plays a major role in the planning and guiding of Faculty teaching and in the distribution of information about studies and teaching between the departments, the Faculty and the student organisations.

The Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills assesses the teaching qualifications and skills of applicants for various Faculty teaching posts based on the applicants’ test lectures and academic portfolios. The Committee’s tasks include attending test lectures, assessing applicants’ teaching skills based on the lectures, conducting feedback discussions with applicants in conjunction with the lectures and submitting authoritative statements on teaching qualifications to the Faculty’s Appointment Committee. The Committee’s tasks are described in more detail in the section Management of education under Teacher recruitment.

The Admissions Board is responsible for student admissions and related communications and decision-making. The Board participates in the development of admissions. The Admissions Board also functions as the steering group of the Faculty’s student recruitment project. The Faculty Council appoints the Board
for three years at a time, and the Board is chaired by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs.

The Faculty’s support and development services for teaching include academic affairs services, which are led by the head of academic affairs, pedagogical support services, which are supervised by the senior lecturer of university pedagogy, and support services for web-based education, which are led by the Faculty’s planning officer for web-based education.

The main tasks of the Faculty’s academic affairs officials include the administration of studies and degrees, the preparation, presentation and implementation of decisions on academic affairs, student admissions, student advice, the compilation of degree requirements and course catalogues, international academic affairs and the coordination of University-level operations and guidelines at the departmental level. The Faculty senior lecturer of university pedagogy provides pedagogical support for the development of teaching in the Faculty and is an expert member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching, the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills and the Research and Postgraduate Division. The senior lecturer of university pedagogy supports teaching and learning by training teachers and postgraduate students in university pedagogy, teaching undergraduate students about learning skills and tutoring, consulting teachers on the development of courses, teaching methods and teaching materials, and developing job-market training. The lecturer is also responsible for research, surveys, monitoring and reporting related to the quality of teaching. A key objective for the current operating period is to develop the Faculty’s guidance and supervision scheme and to produce related instructions and feedback systems. The Faculty officials providing guidance and supervision and the senior lecturer of university pedagogy coordinate peer tutoring together with the secretary of the Faculty’s tutoring project. The Faculty’s specialist in web-based education offers training, support and assistance in the planning of web-based education and the use of web-based tools in teaching.

At the departments, the departmental steering committee is in charge of the management of education. Working under the supervision of the head of department, this group assesses and develops education in the departmental disciplines, submits a proposal for degree requirements to the Faculty Council, issues a statement on the standing orders on degrees and decides on the departmental teaching programme. The departmental steering committee also makes a proposal to the Faculty Council on the annual intake of new students and objectives for completed degrees.

The persons in charge of education at the departments are the head or deputy head of department and the professors in charge of disciplines together with the departmental steering committee. The departmental steering committee is responsible for the quality of teaching and completed studies, and it also decides on these matters.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire Faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

The support services for teaching in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry are provided by the Faculty Office. The core duties of the academic affairs officials include producing high-quality administrative and support services, which enable top-level teaching, research and societal interaction. The Faculty Office complies with existing regulations and statutes as well as the principles of good administration.

The Faculty support services for teaching relate to the following:

- Academic administration
- Student admissions
- Student advice
- Formulation and coordination of degree requirements and the curriculum
- Management of education: strategic planning, the issuance of instructions, teacher recruitment
- Support and development of teaching: pedagogical support, web-based support, teacher training and advice

The Faculty officials responsible for the above duties work primarily in a self-directed way and in teams according to the objectives of the Faculty action plan. Each employee has been assigned an immediate superior with whom the employee conducts annual review discussions to assess achievements and determine future goals and activities.
Academic administration

The duties associated with academic administration in the Faculty include the preparation of financial and operating plans as well as target negotiations. The head of academic affairs is responsible for regulations on degrees and the preparation of related practices, the distribution of information about academic affairs, the receipt of applications for diplomas, the assembly and preparation of degrees, the protection of legal rights, the preparation of decisions on academic affairs, the presentation of matters for the Faculty Council’s decision and the implementation of the Faculty Council’s decisions, student admissions, student advice, the compilation of degree requirements and the editing of course catalogues, international academic affairs, the coordination of postgraduate studies, and the coordination of University-level operations and guidelines at the departmental level. The Faculty has decided collectively to be one of the first faculties to start using the Oodi student information system in course administration and to participate in the development of this system by testing the OpasOodi service.

Student admissions have been defined as a particular area of development in the current operating period. The student recruitment materials were revised in 2007, and various marketing channels have since been tested. Based on an analysis of the Faculty’s student admissions, a new admissions scheme will be developed for the main admissions process in the summer of 2009. The objective is to reach out to
more applicants interested in the Faculty disciplines and to use the new admissions scheme for selecting highly motivated students with the knowledge and skills needed to study successfully and thus to succeed in their careers as well.

**Formulation and coordination of degree requirements and the curriculum; coordination of the course catalogue process**

*Requirements related to the degree reform*

The Faculty’s major-subject reform in 2005 and the Bologna degree reform require that the content, quality and objectives of degrees be given particular attention and that they be continuously assessed, developed and specified. The content of teaching must also take into account the needs of society and employers.

Strong links between Faculty disciplines and various sectors of industry and commerce as well as society have a great impact on the content of the Faculty degrees. This is reflected in the diversity and multidisciplinarity of degrees and courses. The objective of curriculum design is to offer high-quality, research-based degrees which provide students with profound knowledge and skills in a specific field.

*Instructions and departmental duties related to degree requirements*

The Faculty’s academic affairs officials prepare instructions to the departments for study planning and the formulation of degree requirements. These instructions describe the degree structure and related regulations. They also provide information about the teaching periods in the academic years in question and explain the terminology related to degree requirements and the teaching programme. They also include instructions for the OpasOodi course descriptions and give the names and contact details of the support persons for curriculum design and the development of teaching.

The departments are responsible for planning degree requirements and courses, providing courses and ensuring their quality. Each departmental steering committee decides (decision of the Faculty Council on 13 December 2007) the departmental teaching programme. The Faculty Council determines degree requirements at the proposal of the departmental steering committees.

**Curriculum design as a process**

The Faculty is developing its curriculum design process. For the academic years 2008–2010, the Faculty Office has formulated an annual cycle for curriculum design (see Figure 1, page 83) and various process charts. The objective is to develop curriculum design into a clearer and more logical process. After the degree requirements have been approved and the course catalogue has been published, the Faculty’s academic affairs officials will analyse the process and discuss how to develop it further. The person in charge of this further development will be
the head of academic affairs, and the other participants will include the Faculty’s student advisors and the planning officers working in development projects on fixed-term contracts under the supervision of the head of academic affairs.

Management of education

Education and its management mostly take place at the departments. The Faculty also has workgroups and bodies which can collect departmental views, promote interdepartmental cooperation and define joint practices. These are important for education and can thus be said to manage education at the Faculty level.

**Formulation of the action plan for the development of teaching and studies**

The action plan for the development of teaching and studies is the most important document for defining concrete targets and measures and thus for managing education in the Faculty. Its preparation process reflects the Faculty’s leadership, which is generally characterised by collegial agreement and strategic planning.

The preparation of the present action plan began in May 2006 when an open seminar was organised for all the Faculty staff and students so as to collect ideas, thoughts and concrete proposals for the development of the Faculty’s teaching and studies. The seminar material was then further processed at two open meetings at which focus areas and other development areas were defined for the development of teaching and studies. The Faculty defined targets and measures that were as concrete as possible for the development areas. In addition to using the seminar material, the Faculty used a statement submitted by the Finnish League of Agricultural and Forestry Students Associations. The draft of the action plan was then discussed and further processed in the Committee for the Development of Teaching and the Strategic Planning Group. All preparatory materials were posted on the intranet.

The Faculty asked its nine departments and the League of Agricultural and Forestry Students Associations to submit a statement on the draft plan. These statements were discussed in the Committee for the Development of Teaching, and the action plan was revised accordingly. The action plan for the development of teaching and studies was finally approved by the Faculty Council in November 2006.

The action plan complies with the University of Helsinki Strategic Plan for 2007–2009 and the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies which supports the Strategic Plan. Education in the Faculty will be further developed according to the action plan in the strategic period 2007–2009.

**Teacher recruitment**

The Faculty has established a Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills to assess the teaching qualifications (teaching skills) of applicants for teaching posts
(professors, docents, university lecturers, postdoctoral assistants) and to submit a statement on such qualifications to the Faculty’s Appointment Committee. This statement is based on the applicant’s teaching ability, as assessed on the basis of his or her test lecture, and on the applicant’s other teaching qualifications, as specified in his or her academic portfolio. The Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills assesses applicants’ teaching skills on the basis of their test lectures and conducts a feedback discussion with the applicants for docentships, university lectureships and postdoctoral assistantships. The Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills also compares the teaching qualifications of potential appointees if several people have applied for the same teaching post.

The assessment of teaching qualifications (teaching skills) is based on the revised instructions on teaching qualifications (teaching skills), approved by the Faculty Council on 7 June 2007, and on the assessment criteria for teaching qualifications and test lectures, approved by the Faculty Council on 10 June 2004.

The dean appoints the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills for three years at a time. The Committee is led by a professor from one of the Faculty departments, as defined in a decree and the criteria set by the Faculty Council. The Committee consists of the chair, three members and the members’ deputies. In addition, the Committee includes three persons named by the steering committee of the department at which the teaching and research post in question is located, one of whom is a member of teaching staff and two are students.

The permanent members of the Committee are appointed from among members of the departmental and discipline staff who have put themselves forward for appointment. Before its term of office begins, the new Committee agrees on its practices, procedures and main guidelines according to Faculty instructions. The senior lecturer of university pedagogy is involved in the Committee’s work as an expert member and provides basic information about the assessment of teaching skills.

Instructions
The Faculty instructions for the development of teaching and studies are prepared by the Faculty’s academic affairs officials or the staff providing support and development services for teaching. The instructions are also discussed in the Committee for the Development of Teaching, which includes representatives from all the departments and the League of Agricultural and Forestry Students Associations. If necessary, the departments and the League are asked to submit statements which the Committee then discusses before revising the instructions. Afterwards, the instructions are submitted for decision to the Faculty’s management group or the Faculty Council. The instructions are then communicated to the departmental steering committees and posted on the Faculty’s intranet site.
The initiative for compiling new instructions can come from the departments or the students. The development areas presented in the action plan for the development of teaching and studies can also serve as starting points.

One example of instructions prepared at the initiative of teachers is the matrix tool describing the evaluation criteria for Bachelor’s theses. This tool has been used since the beginning of the academic year 2007–2008. The new degree structure created the need to explain and harmonise the evaluation criteria for Bachelor’s theses. With support from the senior lecturer of university pedagogy, teachers established a workgroup to prepare and complete a matrix in which the learning objectives for various areas of a thesis (logic and coherence, structure, language, information and its processing, and style) were determined on a scale from 1 to 5. At the same time, the Faculty also decided that the Bachelor’s thesis evaluation would focus not only on scientific issues, but also on linguistic matters. As a result, the language revision of the maturity test at the Bachelor’s level was linked with the completion of studies in the student’s native language. Equivalent criteria for Master’s theses were defined as early as 2004.

Another example are the instructions currently being formulated for integrating the supervision of personal study plans and the monitoring of student progress (the University’s checkpoint scheme). These instructions will be based on the guidelines of the University of Helsinki HOPS (personal study plan) workgroup concerning the format of personal study plans, existing departmental practices for such plans, student feedback collected by the Faculty on the supervision of personal study plans and the needs for supervision and documentation created by the checkpoint scheme. The objectives are to define the responsibilities of the Faculty, the departments and the students and to integrate the operations of the scheme into a clear-cut and well-defined whole. The systematic guidance and supervision of both undergraduate and postgraduate students ease the pressure applying to specific time periods (because of, for example, the checkpoint scheme and the scheme for the flexible right to study) and harmonise the documentation used in the Faculty. Responsibility for the instructions has been delegated to the lecturer, whose five-year pool post includes the task of developing the guidance and supervision system.

Draft instructions will be discussed and approved by the Committee for the Development of Teaching, after which they will be submitted for the Faculty Council’s or the dean’s decision.

**Support and development of teaching**

*Persons in charge and others involved*

The support and development of teaching are coordinated and implemented in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs,
the Committee for the Development of Teaching, which consists of representatives from all the Faculty departments and of student representatives, the head of academic affairs, the senior lecturer of university pedagogy (pool post for 2006–2011, to be made permanent in 2010) and the specialist in web-based education. In addition, four planning officers are employed in fixed-term projects that relate to the development of teaching, postgraduate studies, guidance and supervision, and student recruitment and marketing. These officials’ superior is either the dean, the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the vice-dean in charge of research or the head of academic affairs.

The head of academic affairs, the planning officers and the senior lecturer of university pedagogy prepare any development measures presented in the action plan or proposed by the teaching staff. Such measures are then submitted for decision to the Committee for the Development of Teaching. If necessary, the head of academic affairs further presents the proposals to the Faculty Council for approval, or the teachers can start implementing the measures at the departments with assistance from the providers of support and development services for teaching.

The support services for teaching include not only the services offered by the academic administration, but also pedagogical services and the support services for web-based education. Pedagogical support services include teacher consultation and advice, training in university pedagogy, the development of guidance and the support for guidance, and the development of the quality of teaching. The purpose of quality assurance is to increase teachers’ understanding of the principles and implementation methods applying to the constructive alignment of teaching, alongside the teachers’ excellent content knowledge and skills. This has been attempted in practice, for example, in the teacher café Viklo, operated cooperatively by the senior lecturers of university pedagogy on the campus. The assessment of learning as part of the constructive alignment of teaching has been the topic of several training sessions in Viklo.

As part of its support services for teaching, the Faculty has established its own teacher café to improve the communal spirit and well-being of its teaching staff and others interested in teaching and guidance. The key objectives of the café are to address the issues and needs that arise in teachers’ daily work, to offer a space for sharing good practices and to promote the distribution of information among teachers and other Faculty staff. The Faculty senior lecturer of university pedagogy is responsible for the café operations.

The officials providing support services for teaching are also responsible for the Faculty’s tutoring activities, which have been actively developed for close to a decade now. Tutoring is part of the Faculty’s guidance and supervision system and its quality assurance. In practice, this means that an annual cycle of feedback and planning has been integrated into the Faculty’s operations, using tutor reports and
feedback reports from new students. Tutor activities are the responsibility of the senior lecturer of university pedagogy who cooperates with the secretary of the tutoring project, the Faculty’s student advisors, the students and the departmental contact persons.

The development of teaching focuses on the targets recorded in the Faculty’s action plan. Such targets in the current strategic period include commitment, the development of student guidance and the guidance system and the reform of student admissions. As practical measures, the Faculty has hired two fixed-term planning officers to plan the development of the Faculty’s student recruitment. One of these planning officers is to develop marketing and communications, while the other is to develop student admissions by the time a new entrance examination is introduced in 2009. The projects started in summer 2007. In addition, the planning officers developing the system of personal study plans (“HOPS”) and study progress checkpoints (“Etappi”) as well as postgraduate supervision will work in the Faculty until the end of the current operating period. The senior lecturer of university pedagogy is responsible for the development of a guidance system that spans the studies as a whole. This task is strongly linked with several targets in the action plan. Successful guidance and supervision require teacher involvement, the better achievement of degree targets, the reduction of the duration of studies, interactivity and a well-functioning student feedback scheme. The same requirements also apply to the guidance and supervision of postgraduate students. As of 2008 the Faculty grants an annual “Distinguished teacher” award based on student proposals.

The senior lecturer of university pedagogy decides on and implements pedagogical training, its content and its methods together with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and the senior lecturer of university pedagogy in other faculties on the Viikki Campus. The needs and requests of the teaching staff serve as starting points for other training that supports teaching. Training is given according to the principle of shared expertise, which means that good practices are shared under the leadership of the senior lecturer of university pedagogy.

Training in web-based education and its content are coordinated by the network of specialists in web-based education, and this training also takes into account the needs of teachers.

Continuous development is an integral part of all Faculty-level training. All participants in training are asked for feedback, which is taken promptly into account. Interactivity is a prerequisite for the continuity and appropriateness of training.
Strengths and areas in need of development in operational methods and their management

- The Faculty has solid structures for its support services for teaching and has defined clear targets and action plans.

- The planning of degrees and teaching is based on a strong employment perspective. Since some departments do not, however, monitor their graduates’ employment or collect feedback systematically, this monitoring should be done also at the Faculty level. Increasing alumni cooperation and targeting feedback surveys to former undergraduate and postgraduate students who have graduated three years earlier would provide appropriate information for degree planning and curriculum design. Systematicity can be achieved, for example, by integrating the processing of feedback and the planning of degrees into the Faculty's three-year operational periods and the preparation of action plans at the Faculty level, and by using the University of Helsinki system for monitoring graduate employment.

- The operations and representativeness (members from each department) of the Committee for the Development of Teaching are appreciated in the Faculty, as are the well-established operations of the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills. Teaching skills should, however, be given greater weight in the recruitment of teachers. The development of teaching is unsystematic at the departments; it takes place only randomly or as necessary. The danger is that teachers’ informal, mutual communication does not systematically cover all the areas of teaching, in which case the content of teaching may have gaps or omissions. Changing teacher meetings from sporadic to regular, systematic get-togethers might be one solution.

- According to the principle of the Faculty's action plan process, everyone can participate in operations planning, which increases the teachers’ commitment. Jointly created documents guide operations. It is nevertheless difficult to motivate the staff to participate in operations planning because the staff members are overburdened with work and have different objectives and levels of commitment. This makes decision-making less systematic. Problems associated with the distribution of information also hinder the implementation and development of jointly agreed activities in dialogue between the Faculty and its departments. A partial solution would involve using the intranet more efficiently and developing the teachers’ site into a communications channel.
• The Faculty’s instructions are appropriate, and its advice service functions well. The staff of the Faculty Office is professional and has a positive attitude. Clearly defined, joint operations models are, however, still needed. Common guidelines are necessary for clarifying the distribution of duties between the Faculty, its departments and the students. One concrete suggestion for raising the profile of common guidelines is to present instructions in a clear, concise format (e.g., as PPT documents) which the departments can easily distribute to their teachers and students.

• The current pedagogical support services and the support services for web-based teaching are considered successful and appropriate. The profile of pedagogical support should be raised, and the availability and scope of training should be increased. Support services should be brought closer to the departments and the teachers. Training in guidance and supervision is seen as particularly inadequate.

• The organisation and management of support services must be clarified to raise their profile and to streamline the distribution of duties between academic affairs officials and the providers of support and development services for teaching.

• The University must ensure that the management of education is scheduled from the central administration via the Faculty to the departments in a clearer and timelier way. High-quality implementation and operations at the departments require various arrangements and thus more time than the schedule currently allows. The instructions that the Faculty has already forwarded to the departments have occasionally been changed in the central administration, which has caused confusion and additional work for the Faculty and its departments.

**How does the unit agree on the content, methods and development of teaching?**

The departments and their disciplines are responsible for the detailed planning of modules, course content and teaching methods. There is great freedom within the educational programmes and departments, which means that the main responsibility for the methods and development of teaching lies with the relevant professor or an individual teacher.

Each teacher shares the responsibility for the syllabus design of his or her courses together with the discipline coordinator by deciding on the content and methods of teaching.
Planning of the content and methods of teaching

In connection with the reform of major subject studies included in the degree reform, the entire Faculty conducted a core content analysis of its modules. In practice, the content of all courses was systematically reviewed and its connections to the basic sciences were re-examined. In the development of new major subjects, modules were revised and combined within the disciplines in an appropriate manner.

Some departments used needs analyses in the planning of the content of teaching; for example, the discipline of forest products marketing has used the method of needs analysis in cooperation with the Finnish Forest Research Institute already since the 1970s. The teaching, courses and course content in forest products marketing were thoroughly reviewed in 1997, and were again renewed in 2005 in connection with the implementation of the two-tier degree system.

On the departmental level, strategies and guidelines concerning the content, methods and development of teaching are agreed upon in various organs, such as teachers’ meetings, major subject committees, department meetings, informal discussions, seminars organised by the department or in the departmental steering committee. Meetings between teachers are organised at some departments according to need, while the larger departments have adopted more systematic practices to facilitate the coordination of teaching in their various major subjects. Examples of such practices include the teachers’ meetings of the Department of Food Technology, the weekly department meetings of the Department of Forest Economics, the monthly group meetings of the Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology, and the major subject committee of the Department of Applied Biology, which all regularly deal with issues related to teaching and agree on the common goals of the independent major subjects of the department.

In some cases, the academic advisor plays a significant role in the coordination of courses within the department and between departments.

As far as individual courses are concerned, the teacher responsible for a course is fairly free to make decisions about his or her teaching, but is also responsible for it. The teachers’ meetings may provide guidelines for the planning of teaching. As to the details about course content and teaching methods to be used, each teacher is free to make his or her own decisions. This applies to part-time teachers as well. The teacher is responsible that the objectives specified in degree requirements are attained in the course.

Development of teaching

In the development of their teaching, departments take into account the feedback obtained from their interest groups and the labour market, as well as surveys on
the employment situation of graduates. Research is integrated into teaching as fully and tightly as possible. Researchers contribute to the development of teaching and courses especially by participating in teaching in laboratory courses.

The departmental units discuss the development of teaching in various kinds of departmental meetings and get-togethers. Regularly conducted meetings include the teachers’ meeting of the Department of Food Technology and the group meeting of the Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology; in both meetings, students contribute to departmental development by participating in the planning of teaching and making initiatives.

Course-specific student and teacher feedback is exploited in the development of courses. In some units students also provide discipline-specific feedback in connection with annual development seminars or student get-togethers.

**Strengths and areas in need of development**

- Each study programme may in its curriculum design build up its own profile emphasising its areas of expertise and strengths. On the other hand, independence in the design of the content and implementation of courses has led to overlaps with other programmes, due to insufficient communication between teachers.

- The advantage of self-directed team work and teacher-controlled teaching is that heavy administration can be avoided. On the other hand, unsystematic approaches and the lack of management in the planning of teaching offered over faculty, department and discipline-specific boundaries causes problems in communications and in the coordination of timetables.

- The idea of student-centredness is implemented successfully in the planning of teaching, and feedback is collected extensively. The feedback system adopted by the Faculty directs feedback for efficient processing and improved exploitation in curriculum design.

- The connections of individual departments with the business sector are strong, and the opinions of interest groups are taken into account in the planning of the content of teaching.

- Apart from the course feedback system, no system exists for the follow-up of the functionality of the degree reform. The teaching programme that was renewed in the degree reform is still in its developmental stages.
• The existing, systematically working committees and working groups for the development of teaching are perceived as useful. The lack of time and uncommittedness to the activities of these groups, and the fact that some departments have no regular meetings between teachers, complicates the practical implementation and the development of curricula. There are no management structures that would meet the development needs arising from among the teaching staff.

• The visibility of management and leadership and a clear distribution of responsibilities are important areas in need of development in the Faculty.

How does the unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?

Distribution of responsibilities

The departments are responsible for the planning of degree requirements and courses, the implementation of the courses and the quality of learning. The departmental steering committee shall decide on the teaching programme (Faculty Council Decision dated 13 December 2007). The Faculty Council decides on the degree requirements at the proposal of the departmental steering committee.

Preparation of degree requirements

The objectives of teaching are defined in departmental strategic plans and action plans. The content of courses is revised at the same time as the degree requirements. At present, the degree requirements and course offerings are approved for a period of two years in connection with the devising of the course catalogue.

In the first place, degree requirements are prepared by discipline-specific or departmental teachers’ meetings, major subject committees or equivalent organs. For example, at the Department of Agrotechnology, the head of department and the professors in charge of their discipline prepare the degree requirements, which are then discussed by the departmental steering committee, which makes the final decision on them. The department’s docents and interest groups are heard to ensure that the degree meets the requirements of the labour market in the best way. The competence profiles of graduates are examined together with students, employers and representatives of professional unions, and the results are linked with the definition of degree requirements.

The power of decision with regard to proposals to be submitted to the steering committee rests with the professor in charge of the discipline in question. The decision-making is supported by discussions conducted in the various organs, and consideration is given to the wishes expressed by other departments, divisions and disciplines about the content and timing of courses. The professor in charge of
a discipline decides on the recognition of studies completed elsewhere and also consults other teachers on the matter, if necessary.

Students are actively involved in the revision of degree requirements. During the transition to the two-tier degree system, the departments engaged in discussions about degree requirements both at departmental and division-level working groups with active participation by students. At the moment, students are participating in the planning of teaching through memberships in planning groups, steering committees and feedback seminars, as well as through course feedback.

The degree requirements of the Helsinki Region Biotechnology Education Programme (HEBIOT), that crosses over faculty boundaries, are discussed in the HEBIOT steering group, which has representation from the University of Helsinki campuses, the Helsinki University of Technology and the Helsinki School of Economics.

**Strengths and areas in need of development**

- Regular meetings between teachers are a resource when decision-making is collegial. Efforts must be made to increase systematic and regular meeting practices throughout the Faculty.

- There is a need for increased flexibility at the departments with regard to degree requirements, international degrees and minor subject modules, which raises the profile of academic advisors as coordinators of the content of degrees. On the one hand, this increases opportunities to plan individual study paths, but on the other hand, it increases administrative work and demands clear-cut instructions from educational management on studies that can be accepted into degrees. The flow of information between the Faculty’s academic administration and the departmental organs and officials responsible for degrees must be improved, and a clear, systematic and functional division of responsibilities must be established before flexibility can be increased.

- The design of degrees is heavily influenced by research in the field and feedback from the labour market and the Faculty’s interest groups. Students have ample opportunities to participate in the planning of degrees. The departments, as well as the Faculty, should collect feedback from the labour market more systematically.
How does the unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

Grounds for the distribution of workloads

The background factors determining the distribution of teaching duties include the field and emphasis of the post, and the teacher's expertise and special competencies. Certain courses are allocated to holders of certain teaching posts, and they are passed on to the successors in these posts. Some departments observe the principle that all teachers are able to teach any course. However, in highly specialised applied sciences rotating courses between different teachers is not possible. Very often teaching is dependent on individuals, their expertise and personal resources.

Agreeing on the distribution of workloads

The teaching timetables for the academic year are agreed upon between the teachers of the discipline (professor, university lecturer, researchers who teach and teachers from outside the department) and in the annual review discussions between superiors and employees. The agreements are documented in the annual workload plans. The head of department or professor in charge of a discipline prepares a proposal for the distribution of workloads, which is discussed at the teachers' meeting, or more informally, between teachers and in major subject committees. Efforts are made to take into consideration the differences in the time spent on the preparation of teaching for different courses in the distribution of teaching duties. The head of department supervises the monitoring of the appropriate distribution of workloads and addresses relevant problems. The teachers' meetings may also address injustice in the distribution of workloads and other possible problems.

Examples from the departments

The Department of Agrotechnology arranges teaching according to teaching periods. In addition to the teaching staff, research directors and researchers provide instruction. Plans for who shall be responsible for specific courses are made in teachers' meetings and informal discussions. The course coordinators are responsible for courses in their field and, when necessary, ask for help from their colleagues among the department's teaching staff or researchers, or from outside lecturers. The department amanuensis and assistant attend to the support services of teaching (course catalogue, room bookings, examination vigilations) in accordance with their job descriptions.

The Department of Applied Biology has implemented a system of monitoring teaching hours. The major subject committee coordinates the distribution of teaching duties and agrees annually on the rotating duty of the supervision of personal study plans so that this responsibility is evenly distributed among the teachers. The completed working hours for each course are documented on a
form available on the intranet, and the course coordinator forwards these forms to the amanuensis in charge of administrative matters. The course coordinators are agreed upon annually within the department’s programmes. Efforts are made to take into consideration the teachers’ areas of expertise in the distribution of teaching duties. Researchers too are expected to contribute five per cent of their total working hours to teaching. The leaders of research groups ensure that their researchers participate in teaching and that this duty is evenly distributed. The appropriate distribution of teaching duties and especially its monitoring are definitely areas in need of development at the Department of Applied Biology.

Strengths and areas in need of development

- Instruction is organised into teaching periods. The leadership of the department should take the initiative to make better use of the teaching periods when agreeing on the distribution of teaching duties.

- The general opinion is that the workloads of the teaching staff are too heavy. Rotating teaching duties and making good use of the system of teaching periods is not always possible. Research leaves cannot be granted because the supervision of theses does not follow the period system, or the teachers have such a heavy load of teaching duties that they have to teach during each teaching period.

- Pruning overlaps in the content of teaching within the Faculty and on the campus may lead towards more evenly distributed teaching duties.

- The departments need to establish the practice of regular meetings and to clarify the role of the head of department in order to better implement the distribution of teaching duties and development ideas. Planning and monitoring must be made systematic.

- Student activity and open discussion channels facilitate the supervision of studies and theses. There is the risk that popular supervisors will be overburdened. The supervisory system and ground rules for teaching must be developed to promote the appropriate and even distribution of supervision duties.

- Teaching provided by docents is, to a great extent, an unused resource. By increasing teaching provided by docents, the teaching load of the teaching staff can be lightened, and the teaching programme will diversify.
How does the unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?

The Faculty recruits its teaching personnel on the basis of academic portfolios and gives special consideration for research and teaching qualifications. The starting point is that at the departments, all teachers do research and all researchers teach. Teachers are expected in their teaching to deal with the research conducted in the Faculty and thus raise the students’ interest in the topic under discussion. The teaching staff is scientifically highly competent, and the teachers are teaching their specialities. In the distribution of teaching and administrative duties, efforts are made to ensure that enough time is reserved for scientific research, for it serves as a basis for teaching of a high quality.

Research opportunities

The duties of teachers include the maintenance of scientific qualifications and awareness of current literature, but active research work requires funding from outside the University or working closely with a research institute outside the University. The Faculty’s departments promote as far as possible the research activities of their teaching and research staff by placing up-to-date facilities and equipment, as well as qualified support personnel at their disposal. The Instrument Centre operating under the Faculty Office is responsible for the Faculty’s common services related to research, teaching, acquisitions, maintenance and servicing. Such services include, for example, the operations of the isotope division and the research stations, and the maintenance of the Faculty’s instrument register. As the Viikki Campus boasts a significant concentration of research in the biosciences, the Faculty’s research resources are of a high international standard. Some departments employ technical staff, which frees teachers to focus more to mere teaching and research.

The teaching staff has the possibility to conduct research as an integral part of their duties, and they may participate in training in their field as well as in international conferences according to their own interests (and funding granted for research or travel expenses). Thanks to the system of period teaching, it is possible to allocate time for either research or teaching in the annual work plan. Furthermore, some courses are offered only every two years to allow the teachers to concentrate on research.

Pedagogical training

A positive attitude towards the development of teaching and teaching cooperation prevails in the Faculty. Although the departments lack a human resources policy
as regards the development of the teaching staff’s pedagogic skills, normally participation in training is not restricted in any way as long as teaching duties are taken care of.

A significant proportion of teachers in the departments have participated in some level of training in pedagogy and the use of information and communication technologies in teaching. Some members of the teaching staff attended the pedagogic training arranged by the Faculty in the early 2000s. Since then, teachers have taken advantage of the training opportunities offered by the Faculty (project focusing on the development of teaching on the Viikki Campus, 2002-2006), the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences and the Centre for Development of Higher Education. In 2006 the Faculty organised the course *Teaching through English* for those teachers who felt a need for further training and practical advice in teaching courses in English (e.g., in English-language Master’s programmes).

The departments encourage their teachers to acquaint themselves with teaching experiments and to apply these in practice. However, the responsibility for maintaining professional competence rests with the individual teacher. In practice, teachers have found it problematic to find the necessary time for completing pedagogic qualifications because the shortage of personnel in the departments limits opportunities to participate in training. The high turnover of the personnel and long spans between training increase the need for continuous pedagogic training.

**Recruitment of teachers**

In the recruitment of teachers, the standard of the applicants’ academic and pedagogic qualifications are assessed on the basis of their academic portfolios. The appointment committee set up for the filling of the post evaluates the applicants’ academic competence on the basis of the research qualifications documented in their portfolios as well as on basis of the statement by the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills, and places the applicants in ranking order. Even though pedagogic qualifications are given increasing attention in the recruitment of teachers, academic (research) qualifications continue to be emphasised in recruitment decisions.

**Strengths and areas in need of development**

The problems and development challenges that emerged in the departmental self-evaluation reports and in the Faculty’s evaluation workshop, are, to a great extent, solvable by systematic management and leadership. In the teaching profession, which is plagued by overloads and lack of time, the self-directedness of the staff is not enough to guarantee interest in research work that would maintain professional competence or to encourage voluntary pedagogic training. A proposal for the
establishment of the post of head of teaching at the departmental level was put forth as a solution for decreasing practical problems. This head would have the power of decision, vision and responsibility for the entirety of the management of education, and with the help of a fair human resources policy could promote the versatile development of professional competence among the teaching staff.

- Innovative teaching methods may be used in a dynamic operating environment with close links to research activities.

- The system of teaching periods provides opportunities for research work, but their organisation and coordination require collegial planning.

- A positive attitude towards pedagogical training prevails in all departments of the Faculty. However, time for this training cannot be arranged/is not arranged in the annual work plans of individual teachers or in discipline-specific teaching plans.

- Although pedagogic skills are taken into account and valued in recruitment, pedagogic skills and the expertise of the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills should be given heavier emphasis in recruitment decisions.

- The management of time is a genuine problem for many teachers. The amount of administrative work in their duties is great.

**Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the entire Faculty**

**Strengths and weaknesses**

- Multidisciplinarity is a resource for the Faculty. The Faculty is characterised by an operational culture emphasising self-directedness and initiative; the Faculty also strives for democratic and collegial decision-making processes and operations based on team-work.
• The Faculty has organs and structures for decision-making and the conclusion of agreements, but the appropriateness of their functionality varies. Some departments lack persons responsible for certain matters or the division of responsibilities is unclear (partly due to the high turnover of personnel).

• Communications do not permeate the entire Faculty organisation, and willingness for cooperation between the Faculty and departmental levels is not, in every case, on the same level. The means to address problems in the cooperation between the Faculty and its departments are few.

• Because of the great variety of existing practices and operational cultures, it is difficult to devise universally applicable instructions and guidelines for the management of education. Thus, it is challenging to achieve uniform operational models and objectives. As guidelines are of a general nature, problems in their interpretation may arise. Harmonisation is not regarded as an appropriate objective, which leads to a situation where individual support and development measures consume a great deal of resources.

• Structures and resources exist for the high-quality recruitment of teachers. The use of the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills in the recruitment of teaching personnel is an established practice and applies to all teaching positions. The higher esteem enjoyed by research vis-à-vis teaching is, however, still manifested in the filling of posts. The status of teaching must be raised, and the pedagogical competence of the staff responsible for the management of education must be enhanced.

• Student activity is high, and their opportunities to participate in the planning and decision-making concerning teaching are good. All administrative organs of the Faculty have student representation, and students are also heard through the feedback system developed for the entire Faculty. The exploitation of the feedback obtained and the provision of feedback on feedback must, however, be developed further and rendered systematic.

• The planning of degrees and teaching is based on a strongly professional perspective. Nevertheless, as some departments do not monitor their graduates’ employment or collect feedback systematically, the Faculty should conduct or coordinate this follow-up. Intensified alumni cooperation and targeting feedback surveys to graduates (both under- and postgraduates) e.g. from three years ago would provide appropriate information for degree planning and curriculum design.

• The Faculty community recognises the usefulness of support services for pedagogic development and web-based teaching. Support services for
teaching as well as pedagogic support and training will be enhanced as the Faculty will obtain a lectureship in university-level teaching and learning in 2010. At the moment, teachers do not have adequate training services (university pedagogy, supervision, time management, assessment in accordance with constructive alignment, etc.) at their disposal. Instructions and guidelines are not easily accessible on the Faculty’s website or on the Alma intranet.

Development challenges

• An organ consisting of teachers and students should be established in every department for collegial agreement, coordination of teaching and improvement of communications. This organ should meet regularly, deal systematically with practical matters, be responsible for communications between the departments and the Faculty, cooperate closely with the departmental committee for the development of teaching and the steering committee, and be in charge of the management and coordination of education at the department. This organ could be chaired by the department’s deputy head, for example. Such an organ would guarantee equal opportunities for all teachers to deal with matters related to teaching and feedback, and would participate in the planning of teaching and collegial decision-making and agreements.

• The systematic use of the feedback obtained from the labour market and recent graduates can be enhanced by connecting the processing of feedback and the planning of degrees with the three-year planning periods of the University and the preparation of the Faculty’s action plan, and by exploiting the University’s follow-up system for the employment situation of graduates. The existing practices of the Faculty’s Strategic Planning Group and its role as an instrument in the management of education could be enforced in the follow-up of practices relevant for teaching and degrees. The reports that the group submits every six months could be accompanied by surveys on labour market connections and feedback, which would contribute to systematic follow-up practices in the departments and disciplines.

• Ground rules that define teaching policies clarify practices to be observed between teachers and students and principles of operation and divisions of responsibilities between departments and the Faculty. The scope of such rules may expand to cover practices between faculties with regard to, for example, degree requirements. The careful preparation of the ground rules and collegially decided objectives and content contribute to the commitment of the teacher and student communities.
• The support services for teaching need a clearer organisation and operations management to improve their visibility and to clarify the distribution of labour and roles of academic administration and the support and development services teams. The support and development services for teaching need improved visibility on the net. The rotating lectureship in university pedagogy will be made permanent in 2010, which will enable the organisation of long-term development of teaching in the Faculty. Visibility can also be increased by establishing a well-defined team or a unit for the development of teaching, which would have close ties to the Faculty’s academic administration and the departments and the departmental organs dealing with, (or to be established to deal with, academic matters).

• Monitoring of the degree reform must be launched during the next strategic period. The Faculty and its departments should cooperate in evaluating the effects of the new degrees on the employment prospects of graduates and their relevance for professional life, as well as in relation to the functionality of modules and the success of the feedback system implemented in early 2008.
4.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry includes 9 Departments with different structures and disciplines, in different locations. It represents in 2007: 2678 students pursuing Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees and 132 teaching staff including 55 professors. In 2007, 393 new students entered the Faculty. The 9 Departments have different sizes, with different numbers of students, and some include PhD studies. In 2010 the number of Departments might be reduced to 4.

The Faculty contains 18 major subjects, and 5 independent Master’s programme courses are taught in English (and include foreign students). In these MSc programmes students can choose among from several majors. Some courses are common to several MSc programmes. Some distinction is made between research and education - and societal needs. Emphasis is put on the relations between society, employment needs, and feedback from employers. The objectives of education are oriented to various employments: not only to create researchers or teachers but also towards jobs outside the university, in industry and in government.

The self-evaluation was conducted with a very good organisation at all levels, with the participation of all actors, including students.

Management and leadership in education

Observations on the Faculty level
The Faculty has working groups and bodies to collect departmental views, to promote inter-departmental cooperation and to define joint practices. They organise an annual cycle for curriculum design.

A committee (Advisory Board) with external people meets 4 times a year. It plays an important role in degree design and in the assessment of degree quality. Each degree includes an internship (1 - 3 months); more and more MSc theses are done outside the university.

The Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy is responsible for the development of a guidance system; she decides on and implements pedagogical training. To succeed in this important role, understanding the needs of teachers, this position is occupied by a teacher with a background in the faculty disciplines. In the last years the objectives were to interest more and more teachers in pedagogy
by giving them good examples that may come from teachers themselves and by training. Some minimal training should be obligatory. In the recruitment of teachers the criteria must be adjusted to take pedagogical qualities more into account.

The number of students recruited is high (because of the topics taught), but too many students are just waiting to transfer later to medicine or veterinary studies. It would be better to have motivated students from the beginning who continue their degree. In each discipline an orientation course (including different topics) was put into place at the beginning of studies to motivate and keep students. The Faculty could take measures to remedy the situation by better targeted entrance exams and thorough study guidance.

Multidisciplinarity in education is linked to the acquisition of a wide range of skills for the student and to learning outcomes. It needs good, detailed information. Several examples in teaching were given, based on individual initiatives, combining bases with more specific products and application at the society level. For example, in MSc there is a large choice of topics with different specialisations; in Bioenergy several faculties are participating in teaching; a course on the food chain brings students into the context of practice; module baskets with thematic focus and various angles of approach are used. The introductory courses are planned by different disciplines.

**Additional observations**

- One comment was that it is not possible to do full studies in Swedish at the University, even if teachers are able to teach in Swedish in every Department.
- Some teachers are using a variety of teaching competences and assessment practices, but more development needs to be undertaken within the Faculty.

**Observations at the departmental level**

Education and its management mostly take place in the Departments. Degree design, teaching, and management of teaching are done by Departmental bodies and units (e.g. the Steering Committee, Meetings, seminars, informal discussions, Departmental Units, Interest Groups). For example, in the Forestry Teacher group meetings are organised monthly with all teachers and some students. Big and small Departments have different strategies.

The teacher responsible for a course is responsible for teaching and for developing new activities, and is fairly free to make decisions on how to reach the degree requirements. The use of versatile assessment methods and practices is good.

With the reform the core content of all courses was systematically reviewed, and the connections to the basic sciences re-examined. The total number of courses
was decreased, and some synergy between faculties was established. However, the workload of teachers is very high, and the time available for research is not enough. The balance between teaching and research represents a challenge. Even if some period of the year is dedicated to research, the working load in teaching is high. Flexibility in teaching is in practice. Some courses could be given by docents. Research is used in teaching.

Learning is one of the University focuses. It was mentioned in the specific core competences defined for each course. The learners may be very different, and learning methods may be influenced by assessment methods. The workload of students seems normal. Most of the students are working alongside their studies. Different forms of studies (attending courses or working at home) exist according to the subjects. Students see themselves as students who need to contribute to their learning and not as customers who need to be filled with facts.

The pedagogical skills of teachers are not uniform, but all teachers are open to questions. The forms of teaching are various, classical and problem based, with some group work, according to specialities and teachers. Field work, case studies and problem-based learning are valued by students as educational experiences. More generally, the students feel that they are a “good community”.

Feedback on courses is not compulsory for students but is developing more and more. In 2008 the course feedback scheme obliges teachers to collect feedback, and Departments to report annually on the processing.

The study plan helps to structure the studies. Study coordinators in the Departments help to guide the students.

About 30% of students have a period (about 3 months) abroad, which can be more or less included in their studies.

There is participation by foreign students in courses held in English (MSc). There are some wishes to have more international students at MSc and PhD levels. The mobility of teachers is possible, varying by Department and individual (the need for substitutes, money, family). A sabbatical year system could be put in place (for all staff!). The Faculty receives many external lecturers, people who are practitioners, and this is considered to be positive for teaching and for students.

Additional observations
- Pedagogy within the disciplines is less developed in some Departments.
- The disciplines concerned with the transmission of information may be also focused on learning.
- The tradition of multidisciplinary research in the Faculty must be more developed for education.
• The need to integrate information systems (Oodi, Etappi, feedback) and make continuous and sophisticated use of available information for monitoring university-, Faculty- and Department-level progress and comparing it with set targets.
• The need to improve the use and monitoring of personal study plans.
• The need to consider how to make the leadership/managerial role more attractive at Departmental levels.

Conclusions

Strengths
• Good organisation at Faculty and Departmental levels.
• Good employment opportunities. Alumni/student feedback survey, contact with the working world.
• Good systems of communication between students and faculty.
• Active student organisations, students well integrated in decision making.

Good practices
• An advisory board consisting of external stakeholders discussing the adequacy of degrees and their contents.
• Contacts with the working world through practice in the field, in companies for the Master’s thesis, etc.
• Organisation at the department level for planning teaching.

Recommendations
• In the longer term, the recruitment policy should ensure the appointment of staff with both subject and pedagogical expertise.
• Try to think of ways in which to satisfy the linguistic needs of Swedish-speaking students.
• Continue to develop contacts with the working world.
• Find ways to attract new, motivated students (the exchange of experiences at national, European and other levels).
• Priority should be given to ensuring that all staff involved in teaching have the minimum pedagogical training.
5  Faculty of Arts
5.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Arts
A Introduction

The Faculty of Arts is not only Finland’s largest and oldest institution for teaching and research in the humanities, but also a significant international community fostering research, education and cultural interaction. The Faculty is a multifaceted combination of traditional humanistic scholarship and new multidisciplinary fields. The Faculty engages in multidisciplinary, state-of-the-art research and teaching of an internal standard, produces under- and postgraduate degrees, offers minor subject studies to students from other faculties, and promotes the University’s general cultural mission.

A total of 7,000 students are pursuing their Bachelor’s and Master’s level degrees in the Faculty’s 16 departments and two institutions. The number of disciplines offered totals approximately 80, of which 50 can be chosen as a major subject. The Faculty of Arts has the national responsibility for 13 disciplines, in other words, in Finland, these 13 disciplines can be studied only at the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki.

A distinctive feature of the Faculty of Arts is its internationality. Degree-oriented education in foreign languages and cultures is provided in the language departments of the Faculty, as well as in the Institute for Asian and African Studies and the Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies. The Department of Finnish, for its part, offers teaching in Finnish language and culture to international students. In almost every discipline, courses are also given in English. The Faculty’s international activities are promoted by visiting and tenured teachers from all over the world.

The Faculty’s large size and versatility with respect to fields of research and teaching also provide a solid basis for new ideas and viewpoints in the management of education. The departments, disciplines and units of various sizes generate differing and versatile practices that can be exploited and disseminated throughout the Faculty. Our strength and challenge is the achievement of flexibility which promotes creativity and structural consistency and maintains unity in research, teaching and management in a research-intensive, multidisciplinary and large Faculty.

Education in the humanities has traditionally had a very wide scope, and the Faculty promotes an all-round education by offering students the opportunity to shape their degrees as far as possible according to their own interests. Such flexibility and individually structured degrees are a significant challenge for the management of education and teaching, the planning of studies, and academic advising. Graduates from the Faculty find employment in both the private and public sectors, and the Faculty also plays a significant role in the education of subject teachers for primary and secondary education.
The self-evaluation of the management of education at the Faculty of Arts was carried out in accordance with the instructions provided by the Department for Strategic Planning and Development of the University of Helsinki. The head of academic affairs, who was appointed as the Faculty’s evaluation coordinator, participated in the training sessions organised by the Department for Strategic Planning and Development and informed the Faculty of the project’s aims and instructions for its implementation. To start, the head of academic affairs disseminated information about the evaluation and the membership of the international evaluation panel on 4 December at the meeting between heads of department, at which was also discussed the timetable and the guidelines for the evaluation. The head of academic affairs sent instructions for the writing of the departmental self-evaluation reports to the departmental steering groups on 18 December. The deadline for submitting these reports to the Faculty Office was 15 February. Then a project employee saved the departmental self-evaluation reports on the evaluation wiki platform and compiled a summary of the reports to be used at the Faculty’s evaluation workshop. To provide answers for the self-evaluation questions, the head of academic affairs wrote a synthesis on the basis of the Faculty’s operations manual, action programme and the Faculty Office rules of procedure. Before the workshop, the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee discussed the departmental self-evaluation reports and the summary based on them. The Faculty’s workshops took place on 7 and 14 March under the supervision of an outside consultant. The participants included the members of the Academic Affairs Committee (tripartite representation with the dean serving as chair), officials from the Faculty Office and the above-mentioned project employee. The workshop programme followed the instructions provided for the event. On the basis of the material generated at the workshop, the project employee and the head of academic affairs wrote the Faculty’s self-evaluation report and saved it on the Wiki platform for comments and editing by the members of the Academic Affairs Committee. The Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee discussed the report again in its meeting on 27 March 2008. The dean confirmed the report on 31 March 2008.
B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The University of Helsinki has determined the division of responsibility in education so that the faculties are responsible for the quality of their degrees, the attainment of agreed objectives and for the allocation and prioritising of resources distributed by the University. Departments are responsible for the quality of teaching and completed studies in their fields. More specifically, their responsibility encompasses curriculum design, setting learning objectives and monitoring learning results.

At the departmental level, basic education is the responsibility of the head of department, and study-related decisions are confirmed by the steering group, which has an appropriate representation of teachers, non-academic staff and students. Departments have employed administrative staff, such as amanuenses, for the practical organisation and planning of studies. The departments have great independence in their everyday operations and the application of decisions. The departments have established working groups, such as committees for the development of teaching, to support the management, development and planning of teaching. Furthermore, departments organise various kinds of seminars for the planning and development of teaching, and regularly collect feedback from students.

Decisions taken by departmental steering groups on basic education are forwarded to the Faculty's Academic Affairs Committee or to administrators, who prepare matters concerning basic degrees for the consideration of the Faculty Council or the dean. For example, the Academic Affairs Committee prepares matters pertaining to the development of teaching and supervision, the establishment of Master's programmes, and statements on basic degrees. The officials in the Faculty Office, such as the head of academic affairs, are responsible for the preparation and presentation of the Faculty Council's decisions, and for the planning and administration of operations.

The Faculty Council and the dean decide on matters pertaining to basic education upon presentation. The Faculty Council decides, among other things, on the requirements of basic degrees, the number of annual student admissions, admission criteria and the approval of Master's theses required for advanced studies. The responsibilities between the dean and the three vice-deans are distributed according to a clear administrative division, which accords basic education under

---

1 See also appendix 1, page 136: Structure of the management of education.
the power of decision of the dean or one of the vice-deans. During the period 2007-2009 the general management of basic education was the responsibility of the dean. A vice-dean is in charge of subject teacher education and education in translation studies.

A preparatory committee (including the dean, vice-deans and leading administrators) evaluates and develops the Faculty's strategic operations and guidelines and prepares the Faculty Council's meetings. The Faculty Office is divided into three internal sections responsible for research and postgraduate studies, basic education, and administration and support services. The head of academic affairs, who is the immediate superior for staff in Student Services, is responsible for the general management of basic education and for the coordination, cooperation and distribution of labour between the sections.

The Faculty has attempted to elect the most suitable and motivated people to serve as deans, heads of department and administrators. The orientation of superiors and heads has been given special consideration, and all holders of supervisory positions are encouraged to participate in the leadership training offered by the University. Moreover, the management and development of education is supported through monthly meetings between heads of department, in which is also discussed current issues concerning basic education under the leadership of the dean. The Faculty also arranges twice a term a meeting between academic affairs coordinators to discuss up-to-date developments or development needs in teaching. These meetings between heads of department and academic affairs coordinators ensure that information concerning basic education is efficiently disseminated and that reforms are swiftly applied in practice.

The Faculty has regularly arranged seminars on the development of teaching, for example in spring 2007, in connection with the reform of degree requirements. In the academic year 2007-2008, the emphasis has been on the supervision of theses and dissertations. During the past winter, a series of three seminars were held, and they will continue in the following academic year. The aim of these seminars was to devise ground rules for the supervision of theses and dissertations at the Faculty and to compare supervision practices between teachers and the departments. The seminars also support teachers who provide thesis supervision by offering them peer support and a forum for discussion. Furthermore, teachers are offered training in university pedagogy, ICT and current issues, such as supervising the writing of personal study plans. For example, 83 teachers have participated in the Faculty's own courses in university pedagogy since 2003.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

- How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire Faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

Distribution of labour in the management of teaching

The Faculty of Arts supports the implementation and development of teaching through a clear division of administrative responsibilities and duties. In the management of teaching, the management structures from the departments up to the Faculty level are consistent, and the various actors are aware of their responsibilities in the planning and implementation of teaching. The Faculty’s strength lies in its multidisciplinarity and large size, combined with a desire to harmonise the processes involved in the management and planning of education.

At the moment, there are great differences in the planning and management of education between the departments and discipline-specific units. To avoid major differences in the quality of the departments and to enhance the management of education, issues related to the management of education will be increasingly discussed in the meetings between heads of department and in the target and performance negotiations between the departments and the dean. This is closely connected to the survey on basic resources launched in spring 2008 at the Faculty. The survey will result in proposals for a structural reform of core functions, such as further development of the structure of posts and the internal allocation of resources in the Faculty. As far as academic affairs are concerned, new guidelines will be determined for future student recruitment (maximum numbers of students per discipline) and for divisions between disciplines.

To avoid great differences in the quality of the departments and to enhance the management of education, the division of labour between existing operations, organs and networks will be further developed. For example, so far the duties and responsibilities of heads and deputy heads of departments have not been divided,
defined or delegated. At present, the appointment of deputy heads is primarily a matter of filling in as a substitute, and the contributions of deputy heads have not been fully exploited as part of a democratic distribution of duties and responsibilities. The heads of department are thus responsible not only for the management of teaching, but also for the management of research and administration.

Connected to the structural development of the management of education is the Faculty’s decision to establish a unit for university pedagogy during the academic year 2008-2009 to support the planning and development of teaching. This unit will be created on the basis of present activities by concentrating and reorganising duties and responsibilities related to university-level teaching and learning into a structural unity. The unit’s primary duty will be to survey the planning, development and implementation of teaching in the Faculty and to support teachers in their work. The pedagogical unit will be responsible for the teaching staff’s professional continuing education by organising training, and planning and implementing regular teaching development seminars in the Faculty. Furthermore, the unit is expected to create a pedagogical network to provide support for teachers and develop teaching in the Faculty. The aim is strengthen and systematically improve collegial peer support among teachers, which, in addition to interaction, would greatly contribute to the uniformity of quality between the departments. The Faculty’s self-evaluation revealed a special need for job-specific peer support that crosses departmental borders. Examples of such jobs and duties include teachers, planners of teaching, academic affairs coordinators, heads of department, development groups and departmental steering groups. Holders of some of these jobs and positions already have established meetings, but organised support in issues related to the management and development of education should be provided for those groups that still lack the relevant support.

Support in the development and evaluation of teaching for the Faculty and its departments will be organised through the pedagogical unit, which will participate in topical projects, such as the preparation of the Faculty’s action programme, the reform of degree requirements, the development of the assessment of teaching qualifications in the filling of posts and the evaluation of education. Moreover, the pedagogical unit will be responsible for monitoring the activities of departmental working groups for the development of teaching and for promoting the regularisation of their activities. A central duty of the unit will also be the development of a student feedback system and the collection of feedback on degrees in the humanities using the OPPI survey developed for collecting information on student approaches to and experiences of their learning environment. Coordination of the OPPI survey will promote the management of education, once the Faculty can make systematic use of the interpretation of the results and proposals for measures to be taken. The regular implementation and commitment to the analysis of the results of the OPPI survey and other University-wide surveys and materials will provide tools for the follow-up of student feedback on degrees and for identifying needed changes.
Degree requirements are filed in the Faculty Office, but the departments are primarily responsible for publicising information on their teaching and for filing this information. The aim is that in future all such information will be saved in electronic format, for example, in the WebOodi student information system. Three of the areas in need of structural development within the management of education are the documentation of teaching, the development of teaching and the management of teaching both at the departmental and Faculty levels. At the moment, the Faculty lacks a uniform policy for the documentation or preservation of materials related to the planning and management of teaching. Documentation would facilitate the systematic monitoring of the planning of teaching and relevant decision-making, which, for its part, would enhance the management of education. Also, documentation would enable both the Faculty and its departments to form a better overall picture of their education. Well-documented material would also be of great use in the orientation of new employees.

**Combining and supporting teaching and research**

The close connection between teaching and research is a strength for the management of education at the Faculty of Arts. Teachers and postgraduate students have the opportunity to give lectures and teach in their own areas of expertise, which enhances the connection between teaching and research. Teachers have the possibility of taking a leave of absence for research, which also promotes the coupling of teaching and research. However, the Faculty recognises that equal support for the coupling of teaching and research and providing all departments with the same opportunities is an area in need of development. To reach the objective of equal support, the Faculty commits itself to the University's strategic guidelines according to which all teachers do research and all researchers teach.

Another important development challenge is the provision of support for training in university pedagogy offered to the teaching personnel and doctoral students. Doctoral students have increasingly been given teaching responsibilities, which has provided them with valuable teaching experience and added to the versatility of the teaching programme. Also, engaging doctoral students in the teaching activities of the departments is important from the point of view of future recruitment. The Faculty will launch a basic course in university pedagogy for doctoral students in cooperation between the Faculty of Arts and the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.

The teaching staff at the departments is offered versatile training provided by the Faculty in university pedagogy and, for example, in the use of ICT in teaching. After the reform of degree requirements, development seminars have been replaced by training in topical issues, such as the seminar series on the supervision of theses and dissertations organised in the academic year 2008-2009. The increased participation in pedagogical training among teachers has promoted openness, self-evaluation
and a cultural change in the development of teaching, which is manifested in the form of development projects and new initiatives. For example, study modules are being developed both structurally and content-wise in cooperation between teachers and the departments.

**Development of teaching**

The Faculty’s degree reform and the most recent updating of degree requirements can be considered the Faculty’s third area of strength. The reform of the degree system in 2005 and the updating of degree requirements in 2007 improved the planning of teaching and harmonised the Faculty’s processes for the management and planning of education. At the same time, the Faculty became seriously aware of the need to create uniform practices and overall policies. Furthermore, student feedback on the structure and requirements of degrees was taken into consideration in planning.

The objective of the degree reform was to facilitate the work of teachers and students through the means of planning, supervision and assessment. In particular, the simplification of the structure of degrees, reconsideration of the content of studies, core content analysis and constructive alignment as the starting point for the design of modules proved to be strengths in the management of education. The Faculty issued instructions for the planning of degree requirements by stressing certain guidelines and encouraged the departments to adopt changes in their operational culture as compared to the planning processes of previous years. The process of degree requirement planning in the departments was enhanced by the establishment of working groups for planning and development. The purpose of these groups in the long run is to develop and follow up on degrees and to harmonise degrees and teaching. A further purpose of the working groups is to support the departments in the design and devising of the annual teaching programme and in determining its areas of emphasis. Besides establishing planning and development working groups, the Faculty supported the departments by organising joint development seminars and by placing the expertise of the Faculty’s Student Services at their disposal. Essential for the success of the development work was a thorough understanding of the significance of the teaching programme and degree requirements, especially as tools for the supervision of teaching activities and learning. Since the degree reform, the Faculty’s degree requirements have been saved in the Oodi information system, which has allowed the Faculty to enhance and rationalise the publicising and registration of the requirements. The chart below illustrates the points of convergence for the management of education and the processes of studying and learning.
As a whole, the degree reform can be cited as an example of a recent development project, the successful results of which are evident both in studies and in study guidance and advice. Also, departmental planning and development working groups have since the degree reform been operating on a regular basis.

The following flow chart illustrates the planning and processing of degree requirements in the Faculty from the perspective of the management of education:
The above process also reveals areas in need of development. The approval of the degree requirements at the Faculty level contains challenges for the management of education. The salient guidelines for the development of teaching are translated into practice through the choices made at discipline and departmental levels and in the details of these choices. As the Faculty Council approves the degree requirements as one large entity, the possible deficiencies of the requirements have been left to be detected by the academic administration and the internal feedback systems of the departments. Amendments and specifications to the degree requirements are made by the dean after a decision by the Faculty Council.

Another development challenge related to the approval of degree requirements is the goal-orientedness and timing of the planning process. At the moment, degree requirements are confirmed every two years without any efforts to coincide this process with the timetables of the target- and performance periods of the Faculty and its departments. A pivotal development challenge is to renew the system of the confirmation of degree requirements to take place every three years so that it becomes an integral part of the administrative and operative management of the Faculty.

A further area in need of development is the exploitation of student feedback and the implementation of a “feedback route” for both individual courses and the entire degree. The Faculty is currently working on a joint policy and guidelines for the processing and exploitation of the feedback collected from students. Course feedback is collected at the departments in connection with teaching, and two years ago the University collected feedback material on degrees in the form of the above-mentioned OPPI survey. Yet another area in need of development is the development of interactive feedback so that students would commit themselves to the processing of the feedback received from teachers and that teachers would
experiment with various pedagogic approaches in the provision and receipt of interactive feedback. In sum, a multifaceted and consistent feedback route needs to be developed to render feedback an integral part of the planning of teaching. The feedback route could be implemented as above.

How do the departments agree on the content, methods and development of teaching?

According to the self-evaluation reports (N=18), the departments of the Faculty of Arts follow three kinds of practices in agreeing on the content, methods and development of teaching. In ten departments comprising several disciplines, matters pertaining to basic level teaching are first prepared among the representatives of a discipline and then agreed upon in discipline-specific meetings, teacher’s meetings, discipline-specific steering groups or other equivalent working groups. As far as departments comprising one or two disciplines are concerned, five departments prepare matters pertaining to basic level teaching in separate working groups, in a teaching committee, for example. In three departments, the planning is begun by working groups or individual teachers representing different fields or programmes, and their proposals are collected by a university lecturer appointed for the task. In some departments, course or module coordinators prepare proposals concerning the course or module for the consideration of the decision-making body of the discipline. Proposals presented to departmental steering groups are often prepared in working groups, but in some departments the proposals are first discussed in the working group for the development of teaching. Most often the departmental steering group, which is responsible for the management of basic education, its general guidelines and amendments to these guidelines, makes decisions on the basis of proposals prepared on the discipline level or by a working group. In some departments, decisions are made in a general academic meeting.

Think tanks on the content, methods and development of teaching take place in various working groups and seminars at the departments. About half of the Faculty’s departments have a working group for the development of teaching, which became an established organ in the course of the reform of the degree structure, and whose role differs from department to department. Also, many departments have separate development and planning committees for modules, programmes, course groups and degrees (e.g., a committee for the development of research and postgraduate education). Other possible working groups include a committee for the planning of teaching, a planning committee for new degree requirements, a committee for problem solving, an academic affairs committee and various think tanks. In addition to having a host of working groups, over half of the Faculty’s departments organise teaching planning and development seminars. The departmental self-evaluation reports underline the fact that these seminars are of great importance for the development of practical teaching work. The joint events provide an opportunity to gather all the experts and persons
responsible to discuss and plan the teaching programme as an entity. The self-evaluation reports reveal that the departments have a clear division of labour and responsibilities among their staff with regard to the planning and implementation of education. This enables the departments to foster flexibility in the organisation of instruction, the planning of research periods, peer support between colleagues and in the regular follow-up and development of teaching.

Regardless of the processes and practices used, a variety of issues that the departments raised in their reports must be taken into account when making decisions concerning teaching. The starting point for the drafting of the departmental teaching programme is primarily content relevant to a degree of a high quality. Over half of the reports also mention consideration for student wishes as a starting point, in addition to which some reports emphasise the department's obligation to organise compulsory courses, while other reports highlight the department's foci in various fields and new research trends. Also, the availability, acquisition and current relevance of literature and other learning materials is considered in the planning work. Projects for the development of teaching have been carried out systematically in the 2000s, and this development continues in almost every department.

The focus of development measures at the moment is on the student feedback system. The departments collect systematic feedback on teaching from students, so the focus is on the exploitation of the feedback, especially in developing and planning teaching. Other development projects have focused on the equivalence of course content and degree requirements, course registration practices, development of the range of courses on offer, English-language degree requirements, the individual study paths of students in different stages, teachers' pedagogical skills, the orientation of new teachers, and the transparency of assessment criteria. In recent years, the reform of the degree requirements constituted a development project that in many departments established the planning and development of teaching as a new practice in terms of both structure and content. Many departments mention in their self-evaluation reports that after the reform of the degree requirements, the development of the content and methods of teaching or the approval of degree requirements has been based on core content analysis.

Agreeing on the content, methods and development of teaching is connected to the issue of involving the entire department community in the process. In all departments, the planning of teaching, either in its initial or final stages, takes place in a group involving the three power groups of the department (professors, teachers and non-academic staff, students). This system ensures that all parties have the opportunity to participate and be heard in matters pertaining to teaching. Teaching is planned in cooperation with researchers and part-time teachers by requesting that they provide suggestions for next year's teaching. Students are fairly seldom asked to provide comments or suggestions for courses at the planning stage of the teaching programme. However, some departments mention
teaching development projects that have been launched on the basis of student initiatives. In fact, the self-evaluation reports raise increased student participation in decisions concerning the content and methods of teaching as an area in need of development. The departments hope that increased student participation will promote the accurate definition of learning objectives and the development of improved teaching practices.

Based on the departmental self-evaluation reports, student participation in the planning and preparation of teaching varies between the departments and mainly comes to fruition in organs that are organised in accordance with the principle of tripartite administrative power. In some departments students participate in all stages of planning and preparation, while in some students participate only in the final stage of decision-making in the departmental steering group. Efforts are made to hear the students in other ways than through the student representatives in the administrative organs. Over three-quarters of the departments mention the collection of student feedback on teaching and its impact on the development of teaching. The departments emphasise that the collection of student feedback is continuous, regular and systematic and of great consequence for teaching. For example, teaching methods, workloads and the content of courses are reviewed through the feedback received.

The departments of the Faculty of Arts ensure the methodicalness of the collection of student feedback by using departmental or major-subject feedback forms, and collecting these forms in cooperation with the student organisation or in connection with the supervision of personal study planning. Some departments not only collect course- and module-specific feedback, but also feedback on the teaching provided by the department as a whole, for example, in connection with the revision of degree requirements.

Furthermore, some departments make special efforts to involve their academic community in their operations. Two departments mention the practice of engaging course assistants, in other words, engaging students to assist the teacher with the course and thus to obtain supervised teaching experience. Some departments monitor the success of teaching through the teachers’ self-evaluations. One department collects feedback on its operations every three years from its alumni.

How do the departments prepare and decide on degree requirements?

The departmental self-evaluation reports reveal that departmental practice in the planning and decision-making concerning degree requirements are based on a clear division of labour and responsibilities in the units. The self-evaluation reports also underline the fact that the strength of the planning of the degree requirements lies in the opportunities offered to all employees to participate in
Regardless of the working methods applied, the operations of the departments focus on the priority given to compulsory studies in relation to other studies. In connection with reviewing and developing degree requirements, the departments weigh the options of the extra work caused by new courses and the need to prune old courses. The departments cited core content analysis as a starting point for planning. For example, the Department of Finnish Language and Literature based its core content analysis on recent research information, teacher and student feedback, as well as on feedback from the labour market. Also, consideration is given to the curricula and objectives of the relevant disciplines in other Finnish universities.

The departmental preparation and decision-making concerning degree requirements progresses along the same lines as the agreement on the content, methods and development of teaching. In departments hosting several disciplines, the primary responsibility lies on the level of the disciplines which initiate the planning process. Common studies for all students, if any, are planned in interdisciplinary working groups or under the leadership of the amanuensis, and the steering group approves the proposals. There are, however, department-specific variations to this process. In half of the departments with several disciplines, the working group for the development of teaching has a strong role in the planning process and submits proposals to the steering group. The preparation is a multi-phased and multi-faceted process. The planning of the degree requirements may be initiated in a development seminar, followed by a teachers’ meeting or a request for comments from the staff on the draft plan. If the review of the requirements concerns minor subject studies, the planning may be lead by a university lecturer, while a review of a larger scope often takes place in a working group especially established for the purpose.

In departments with one or two disciplines, the preparation of degree requirements is often begun in smaller working groups which are appointed for the purpose or are permanent discipline-specific or even course-specific teams. There may either be several parallel working groups, or the preparation may be initiated in several organs of varying levels. Again, there are differences in student participation in this process between the departments. The proposals by the working groups are often discussed in general meetings, teachers’ meetings or staff meetings, where the staff has the opportunity to propose amendments and alterations to the draft plans. Feedback from the staff is collected using various methods; the working group for the development of teaching may, for example, discuss the proposals by the working groups. The person bearing the main responsibility for the degree requirements, often the amanuensis, a planning officer or a university lecturer, compiles a final version of the degree requirements and submits it for the approval of the steering group.

On the whole, the numerous practices applied in the planning of degree requirements in the departments should be discussed on the Faculty level and
assessed to what extent these practices need to be harmonised and simplified. Relevant to the above is the wish expressed by the departments in their self-evaluation reports that the Faculty provide support for the promotion of the regular and appropriate operations of the departmental planning and development groups. On the other hand, the reports also proposed that inter-departmental meetings be arranged to provide opportunities for comparing the operations of the planning and development groups and for sharing good practices.

Below, an example of the preparation of degree requirements and management of education at the Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies:

The degree requirements have been prepared previously and are edited using the core content analysis method. The core content analysis is applied on the level of study programmes and disciplines in cooperation with the students, the amanuensis, and the working group for the development of teaching, and when reviews of a greater scope are being made, also in cooperation with the department meeting. The module coordinators lead the development work together with course coordinators. When degree requirements are drafted, the department’s research profile as well as the staff’s research interests are taken into consideration. The proposals for degree requirements drafted by the department’s study programmes are processed by the working group for the development of teaching, and after revisions and amendments, if any, approved by the steering group.

How do the departments ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

The departments follow varied practices in ensuring an appropriate distribution of workloads. The organisation of teaching is coordinated at the level of disciplines and in cooperation between disciplines, especially at those departments with several disciplines that provide common courses for their students. The most important official in all the various administrative models is the head of department or discipline, whom several departments name as the person responsible for ensuring an appropriate and fair distribution of teaching duties among the teaching staff. The head is also responsible for agreeing on teacher-specific work plans and for ensuring that they match the general job descriptions of posts and positions. The teacher and the head discuss the work plan in person when teaching is being planned. Some self-evaluation reports also emphasise the importance of the annual review meetings between the employees and the head of department, when the annual workload may be reviewed or the experiences of and course feedback for the previous term can be discussed. In some departments the monitoring of an appropriate division of labour and conducting of review discussions is, at least partly, the responsibility of other staff members than the head of department or discipline. Such staff members may include professors, university lecturers or teaching coordinators.
Management of education at the Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies (by Lotta Jalava)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STARTING POINTS</th>
<th>PREPARATION</th>
<th>DECISIONS</th>
<th>IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>FOLLOW-UP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty strategy</td>
<td>Faculty Academic Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Steering group</td>
<td>Faculty support services</td>
<td>Meetings between heads of department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental action plan</td>
<td>Research and cooperation</td>
<td>Committee for the development of teaching</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- professors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- centre group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- amassuas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Office = amassuas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Head of department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and supervision</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student organisations “Sisla” and “Ráide”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Committee for the development of teaching:
- professors
- centre group
- students
- amassuas

Steering group:
- professors
- centre group
- students

Office = amassuas
Head of department
Meetings between heads of department
Departmental meetings

Feedback mechanism

Disciplines:
- Finnic languages
  - professor
- Finno-Ugrian studies
  - professor
- Sami studies (B.A.)
  - lecturer and professor of Finno-Ugrian studies

- Estonian language and culture
  - visiting prof
- General programme
  - prof of Finno-Ugrian studies
- General programme
  - prof of Finno-Ugrian studies
- Hungarian language and culture
  - visiting prof
- Sami studies (B.A.)
  - prof of Finno-Ugrian studies

The drafting of the teachers’ work plans is considered to be the most important tool of the management and planning of education at the departments. As one self-evaluation report points out, the drafting of the work plan in itself requires that teachers consider the distribution of their workloads. Cooperation between teachers also plays an equally important role in the estimation of overall workloads and their distribution. In many departments, the distribution of teaching duties and the implementation and numbers of courses and possible parallel courses included in the degree requirements are planned in discipline-specific meetings or working groups formed by teachers. The permanent teaching staff may also draft their entire annual work plans in cooperation, which creates an understanding of individual and collective duties and of the distribution of working hours for each duty. The amanuensis or the administrative secretary in some departments plays a significant role in the coordination of the planning of teaching. They may be responsible for calculating the number of courses to be offered in relation to the number of students, after which the teaching responsibilities may be agreed upon on the discipline and programme levels.

In sum, the departmental self-evaluation reports indicate that the departments agree on the appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching in multiple ways. In its simplest form, the distribution of workloads is agreed upon informally between colleagues. On the other hand, this process and the relevant decision-making can proceed through multiple stages. To cite an example, the planning of the teaching programme may be launched in a teachers’ meeting or development seminar in January-February, when each teacher will submit a draft proposal for his or her teaching. Based on these proposals, the amanuensis will draft a proposal for the following year’s teaching programme. The proposal and student comments will then be discussed by a department meeting, and the final decision on the teaching programme will be made by the steering group.

There are several underlying principles behind the appropriate distribution of teaching duties, one being the principle of research-based teaching. Teaching duties are distributed within disciplines in accordance with the teachers’ expertise and research orientation, qualifications and interests. The permanent staff is primarily responsible for the teaching of compulsory courses. Docents and part-time teachers offer courses in their fields of specialisation. In the language departments, this principle can be seen in practice in the fact that native speakers are responsible for language skills courses and Finnish teachers for other courses. Many departments engage in cooperation with neighbouring fields by organising joint courses, which naturally is reflected in the distribution of teaching duties.

In order to ease the teaching staff’s workload, almost half of the Faculty’s departments hire postgraduate students or recent graduates as part-time teachers. By employing doctoral students, departments can ensure that the latest research results permeate the department’s teaching and diversify the teaching on offer. Docents make an up an important teaching resource, and many departments are,
in fact, making efforts to increase the teaching provided by their docents. Some departments make use of external experts in the distribution of teaching duties and engage international visiting teachers with funding from the Nordplus, Erasmus and Fulbright programmes and the Centre for International Mobility. Teaching is also arranged in cooperation with other disciplines, departments, national doctoral programmes and the national university network (in the form of online teaching), all of which impact the distribution of teaching duties.

A number of departments report that they are making efforts to distribute teaching duties so that students can be guaranteed a wide-ranging and versatile teaching programme. Some departments focus on the high quality and further development of basic teaching, while others make efforts to ensure that compulsory courses are adequately offered with consideration for student numbers. Practical arrangements have their effect on the drawing up of the teaching programme. For example, two self-evaluation reports emphasised the importance of planning study paths in such a way that unnecessary overlaps in teaching can be avoided. All departments should engage in such planning.

The appropriate distribution of workloads is considered also in connection with issues concerning the well-being and job satisfaction of the teaching staff. Many departments are greatly concerned about the even distribution of demanding courses and administrative duties among teachers. They also pay attention to the distribution of teaching and other duties so that the teachers’ daily and weekly timetables run smoothly and their workloads remain reasonable. Most departments are able to offer their teachers the opportunity to conduct research by, for example, taking time off for research or having teaching periods freed of teaching. One department makes an effort to guarantee its teachers one teaching-free day a week for preparation and for marking assignments. When teaching duties are distributed, account is taken of changing situations and personnel turnover. For example, when teachers retire, the department tries to plan in advance the distribution of duties so that their knowledge and skills based on experience can be passed on. The even distribution of duties can, to some extent, be furthered by teaching arrangements, such as applying examinations, portfolios, lecture diaries and exercises in the assessment of course work.

An often mentioned area in need of development in the departmental self-evaluation reports was the high turnover of the staff, partly due to leaves of absence, which presents a challenge for the implementation of the teaching programme. A central challenge for the departments is to ensure a multifaceted teaching programme of a wide scope and consistency in the content of courses regardless of who the teacher of the course is. A further challenge is the unforeseen additional duties piling up over the course of the academic year and their even distribution among the teaching staff. Some departments mentioned the promotion of the well-being of their staff as an area in need of development. No surveys on the working atmosphere among the Faculty’s teaching staff have been conducted. The
aim is that an inquiry into the Faculty’s atmosphere would benefit the Faculty and its departments as a tool in the development and management of education.

A few departments made the general comment in their self-evaluation reports that they wished that esteem for teaching would increase and that its status alongside research would be upgraded. This would, for its part, facilitate the appropriate distribution of workloads among the staff. Instead of opposing teaching and research with each other, their relationship should be seen as a supportive and necessary link, as is aptly expressed by the following citation from a self-evaluation report: *Without high-quality, versatile and inspiring teaching the department cannot maintain its glorious research tradition.*

**How do the departments promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (recruitment, pedagogical training, research opportunities)?**

The departmental self-evaluation reports emphasise professional skills based on competence in the field, practical teaching skills and other qualifications required for the positions in question. The departments promote the professional skills and expertise of their teaching staff especially by providing opportunities for research work and encouraging them to participate in pedagogical training. Also, of central importance is the exploitation of peer and student feedback. The departments regard professional development as a continuous, multifaceted long-term process, which focuses on peer support, an exchange of experiences and the creation of innovative teaching solutions. The departments believe that valuing one’s own work and equal and encouraging treatment towards all promotes motivation, high quality work, and job satisfaction and well-being at work. One department identifies the improvement of the work community’s atmosphere as an area in need of development, so that every one at the department will value their own work and feel part of the teaching and research community.

The teaching staff is offered research opportunities in a variety of ways. Most departments make efforts to arrange leaves of absences for research or teaching periods freed of teaching duties for their teachers, or by reserving time for research in their annual plans. Teachers are also encouraged to engage in research, establish research networks and participate in field work periods, and some departments provide opportunities for longer research leaves, conference trips and visits to foreign universities. The system of teaching periods allows for new and alternative solutions in arranging research leaves. Some departments are preparing teaching materials based on the department’s research profile, and one department reported that it supports the staff’s publishing activities. Furthermore, departments arrange informal meetings where the staff may discuss their research topics. All departments aim to combine the duties related to teaching and research in a fair and just manner for all teachers. The departmental reports reveal, however, that there is room for
improvement in this respect. Some departments plan to make improvements in their system of research leaves, opportunities to conduct research during terms or opportunities to take sabbatical leaves. However, the staff’s unequal opportunities to conduct research are not considered to be a problem in all departments. According to the self-evaluation reports, in one department the share of research in the duties of individual posts varies according to the duties which are agreed upon with the head of department in annual review discussions.

All departments have a positive attitude towards the teaching personnel’s pedagogical and other kinds of training. Some departments even require their teachers to complete at least basic level studies in university pedagogy, while others merely recognise the importance of encouraging teachers to participate more actively in courses on university pedagogy. The practical means of supporting the teaching staff’s training actually vary greatly between the departments. In some departments teachers actively participate in training; the most popular type of training is university pedagogy, but courses in information and communication technologies, supervision, portfolio drafting, educational technology, information searching and web-based teaching are highly popular as well. Teachers are also offered technical support as well as support for web-based teaching. Moreover, teachers are encouraged to seek rehabilitation geared to their occupational requirements to prevent burnout. Some departments have connected the assessment of student learning to the development of teachers’ professional skills and research-based teaching. The most active departments have also organised their own training and attempt to ensure that the teachers who have completed various courses pass on to their colleagues the knowledge obtained from the course. Of special importance in this respect is the propagation of pedagogical knowledge obtained in training. Many departments lay special emphasis on both supervised and spontaneous discussion on pedagogic issues among the teaching staff. For example, the Department of Finnish Language and Literature is planning to launch pedagogic coffee hours with a view to provide teachers an opportunity to exchange information, experiences and good practices.

On the basis of their self-evaluation reports, the departments consider the Faculty-level organisation of pedagogical training for postgraduate students and part-time teachers an area in need of development. On the other hand, it has been difficult to arrange training for the staff of the departments alongside their teaching duties. The self-evaluation reports do not report on any systematic follow-up on the pedagogical as well as other types of training completed by teachers, but the aim is to create a clear follow-up system in the years to come. Such a system is a development challenge on both the departmental and Faculty levels, the aim being to launch the documentation of the teaching staff’s professional skills and expertise and to enable the Faculty to form an overall picture of the situation. Form the point of view of the management of education, it is difficult to form an overall picture of the staff’s professional continuing education and development of their professional skills without any documentation on the matter.
Half of the departments identify teaching qualifications and pedagogical training as merits of increasing importance in the recruitment of teachers. Other aspects considered in recruitment include teaching experience, feedback received on teaching and the production of learning materials. On the whole, the self-evaluation reports reveal the recruitment practices of the departments to be rather eclectic. Teachers may be recruited according to need, with consideration for the key areas of the degree requirements and teaching, through a national or international invitation for applications, or especially in the case of part-time teachers, on the basis of research qualifications. Some departments reported that they are developing the professional skills of new teachers through thorough orientation. As the orientation of new teachers is the responsibility of the teaching staff holding either permanent or fixed-term positions (in addition to their teaching duties), the teaching experience, philosophy and materials will be transferred to the new staff member. Some departments also use their operations manual as an aid in the orientation of new employees. The Department of German provides mentors for new teachers. Some departments regard the orientation of new teachers as an important area in need of development. For example, the Department of Comparative Religion is in the process of devising a guidebook for the orientation of new teachers, which will contain information on practicalities concerning teaching at the University and present the teaching methods used at the Department.

In a few departments, the dire economic situation has complicated the recruitment of teachers and has left some teaching positions unfilled. The operations of the departments are thus hampered as the staff turnover does not take place evenly and according to need. Also, the know-how of retiring, experienced teachers is not transferred to the new teachers. The Faculty aims to devise guidelines for the management of education at the departmental level and thus harmonise recruitment practices between departments. The departments are hoping that the Faculty's survey on basic resources will solve the problems related to human resources.

Summary

Strengths

- Clear-cut administrative division in responsibilities and labour within the management of education
  - The Faculty's large size and versatility with respect to the fields represented by the departments provide a solid basis for new ideas and viewpoints in the management of education. Good practices invented by the departments can be dispersed and exploited throughout the Faculty.
  - The departmental planning and decision making related to degree requirements are based on a clear-cut division of responsibilities and duties between the relevant officials. All employees are offered the
opportunity to participate in the planning and preparation of the degree requirements.
  o In the departments, the various actors are aware of their responsibilities in the planning and implementation of the teaching programme. This opens up possibilities for flexibility, research periods, peer support and for the follow-up and development of teaching.

• Combining and supporting teaching and research
  o Teaching is strongly and genuinely linked with research.
  o Teachers have ample opportunities for professional continuing education. The training offered to teachers has promoted openness, self-evaluation and teaching development projects.
  o Doctoral students are offered opportunities to engage in teaching as well as to receive support in this teaching.

• Development of teaching
  o The reform of the degree system and the updating of degree requirements improved the planning of teaching and harmonised the Faculty's processes for the management and planning of education.
  o The departmental working groups for the development and planning of teaching have, in recent years, established themselves as tools in the management and planning of education.
  o The systematically collected student feedback on teaching is taken into account in the planning and development of teaching at the departments.
  o The departments are committed to the continuous development of teaching.

Development challenges
  • The uniformity of the quality of departmental planning and development of education
    o The Faculty should increase its support for the planning and development of education in the meetings between heads of departments and in the annual target and performance negotiations. Decisions taken on Faculty and departmental levels that have an impact on the management of education should be based on the Faculty's survey on basic resources.
    o The Faculty will establish a unit for university pedagogy during the academic year 2008-2009 to coordinate the planning, development and implementation of teaching in the Faculty and to support the departments and teachers in the planning and implementation of education.
    o The Faculty will agree on common practices to be adopted in the documentation of the planning and management of teaching and on how the documents should be preserved.
• Combining and supporting teaching and research
  o The Faculty should promote the development of peer support for teachers across departmental boundaries. In addition, support is needed for the promotion of the regular and appropriate operations of departmental working groups for the planning and development of teaching.
  o Training in university pedagogy must be provided for doctoral students and part-time teachers.
  o The Faculty must conduct a survey on its working atmosphere in order to promote well-being at work and to obtain a tool for the management of education.

• Development of teaching
  o The process and timetable of the decision-making related to the approval of degree requirements must be improved.
  o The Faculty must issue instructions for the collection of student feedback, in other words, for how the feedback obtained for teaching and degrees is to be processed and exploited at both departmental and Faculty levels.
  o In addition to collecting course-specific student feedback, the Faculty must collect collegial feedback and feedback involving the various levels of the degree (entire degree, parts of it, individual courses) as well as develop various methods for the collection of feedback both in the departments and in the Faculty.
  o Student participation in the planning and development of teaching must be ensured in the departments both at the preparatory and decision-making stages.

D Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the entire Faculty

The aim of the self-evaluation of the management of education has been to comprehensively describe and understand the management of education. On this basis, the Faculty recognises in the decision-making and planning of education the strategic development challenge of devising overall guidelines and developing the uniformity of the quality of the departments. This development challenge is
tackled by defining more clearly the distribution of labour within the management of education, for example, by elucidating the structures of existing operations, administrative organs and networks. The survey on basic resources launched in spring 2008 and the upcoming establishment of a unit for university pedagogy serve as examples of the measures the Faculty is taking to clarify the distribution of labour within the management of education.

The Faculty's strength in the management of education lies in the versatility of its departments and in its large size, combined with a desire to harmonise the processes involved in the management and planning of education. This is already evident in the clear division of responsibilities between different administrators from the departmental level up to the Faculty level. Another strength for the management of education lies in the close connection between teaching and research. Teachers and postgraduate students have the opportunity to give lectures and teach in their own areas of expertise, which enhances the connection between teaching and research. Various efforts are made to provide the teaching staff with opportunities for research leaves, which especially promotes the objective of teaching based on state-of-the-art research. The departmental self-evaluation reports reveal, however, that the departments expect further measures from the Faculty for the enhancement of an equal division of research and teaching duties and, at the same time, enhancement of the uniform quality of teaching and research at the departments. To reach the objective of equal support for teaching and research, the Faculty commits itself to the University's strategic guidelines, according to which all teachers do research and all researchers teach.

The self-evaluation reports indicate that a further important development challenge is the provision of support for training in university pedagogy for the teaching personnel and doctoral students. Generally speaking, opportunities have been provided for postgraduate students to take on teaching responsibilities, which will not only diversify the courses on offer, but will also provide the postgraduate students with valuable teaching experience. In the academic year 2008-2009, the Faculty will cooperate with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education in the organisation of training for doctoral students. To support the pedagogic skills and competencies of the teaching personnel and pedagogic cooperation in the Faculty, the Faculty arranges training in university pedagogy and other in-house training.

The degree reform of 2005 and the approval of new degree requirements in 2007 were clear turning points in the management of education in the Faculty of Arts. According to the self-evaluation reports, the success of these reforms proved to be the Faculty's strength. In particular, the clarification of the structure of studies, core content analysis and the documentation of learning objectives as the starting points of the planning of modules, as well as the thorough reconsideration of teaching methods have proved to be the strong points of the management of education. In addition, the departmental working groups for the development of
teaching and the establishment of their operations have been of great significance for the Faculty. As a whole, the degree reform can be cited as an example of a recent development project, the successful management and results of which are evident both in studies and in study guidance and advice. On the basis of the self-evaluation reports, relevant to the structure of the degree and degree requirements is the challenge to develop the processing and exploitation of student feedback as part of the management of education. The Faculty aims to implement a feedback route for student feedback for both individual courses and the entire degree.
5.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

By and large, the management of education in the Faculty of Arts is adequate, although not much information on the performance is available. The majority of decisions is taken on the departmental level. Because the faculty is large and diverse, there are large differences between departments. The main challenge for the faculty is the allocation of resources. The management signals three areas in need of development: the uniformity of the quality of departmental planning and development of education, combining and supporting teaching and research (so each gets fair attention), and the development of teaching. The responsibility for the many programmes of the faculty is not clear. The quality of teaching gets attention from all departments. Many teachers already have taken university pedagogy courses. There are course evaluations, but not all departments use this information structurally.

The site visit team has the impression that managerial strategies for disseminating good practice are not well articulated. It seems very difficult to agree on joint conceptions in Management & Leadership. Department leaders see themselves rather as academics without leadership and management duties.

Management and leadership in education

Observations on the faculty level

On the basis of its self-evaluation report, the management and leadership of education of the Faculty of Arts seems adequate. Although the faculty is rather large (7,000 students) and diversified (16 departments and 2 institutes), the management seems ‘in control’ of the educational management process, as far as might be expected. There is a clear (but rather vague) objective (to be a “significant international community fostering research, education and cultural interaction” by engaging in “multidisciplinary, state-of-the-art research and teaching of an international standard”). It is difficult to form a coherent picture of the aims and objectives at faculty level.

The self-evaluation report offers scarce information about the performance of the faculty, so it is not possible to see whether the management is successful with respect to this performance. From the discussions with the respective groups in the faculty, it became clear that the faculty is seen foremost as a support structure. Traditionally (and still) most decisions are made on the departmental level; this is
where the power is, although there is not so much leadership or management. On the departmental level the decisions on programmes, workload and quality issues are taken, however, not so much from a managerial perspective. Nonetheless, the majority of the departments agree upon the important coordinating and regulating role of the faculty (for quality for quality control, feedback system, degree structure). These form the structure within which the departments are operating. The role of the faculty in decisions upon the degree structure is seen as especially appropriate.

The policy preparation and implementation processes with respect to the management of education are clear and adequate. The management is executed in a clear and adequate structure. There is adequate influence for the teachers and students. The processes are being harmonised to a certain degree, but there is (will be) enough room for flexibility for the departments to arrange the processes inside the department as seems appropriate. The successful project of the degree restructuring is an example of the adequacy of the management structures and processes. Also the discussions on a common grading system (which took a lot of time) are seen as valuable. According to the responses of the departments to the questions concerning the management of education, there are no serious troubles in the management of education in this faculty, at least as the faculty limits itself to the kind of tasks it has done so far, and is not creating much more bureaucracy.

The main challenge for the faculty is the allocation of resources. This year a ‘survey on basic resources’ is launched that will result in proposals for a “structural reform of core functions”, and the further development of “the division of labour between existing operations, organs and networks”. It can be expected that the discussion about, and reaching agreements upon, these proposals will cause a much greater challenge to the management than the existing processes. As far as could be inferred from the discussion with the faculty and departmental leadership, there is no idea whatsoever about the criteria for distribution of the resources, apart from a ‘fair’ distribution.

The management, backed by the departmental leadership and most teachers, is serious in its goal to improve the quality of teaching. The faculty has decided to establish a Unit for University pedagogy, to “survey the planning, development and implementation of teaching in the Faculty and to support teachers in their work”. This unit will be “responsible for the teaching staff’s professional education”. This seems rather far going, because it will tamper with the responsibilities of the individual teachers and their direct superiors. Because in the self-evaluation there is no structural information on the human resource management, it is not clear whether the management of the faculty is aware of this inconsistency. However, from the responses to the question by the departments in the report, it seems there is no much human resource management, or at least there is much diversity between the departments. However, most departments report yearly ‘negotiations’ between teachers and their immediate supervisor about workload and performance.
The management signals three areas in need of development: the uniformity of the quality of departmental planning and development of education, combining and supporting teaching and research (so each gets fair attention), and the development of teaching. For each area there are more concrete actions planned. The uniformity of planning will be taken as one of the important elements in the announced proposals for the reduction of the number of departments. As can be expected, this issue is contested by some (bureaucracy; vehicle for the university to realise strategy; department heads distant of teaching), while others see advantages (more efficient; alignment of procedures). The majority seems to be in favour. It seems very important that the faculty management pays attention to the explanation of the objectives to all involved.

The departmental planning and development of education is supposed to benefit from the reduction of the number of departments and the accompanying alignment of planning processes. The challenge here will be to prevent too much bureaucracy. The development of education already is well underway and more or less ‘owned’ by the departments. Not all teachers are involved yet, but teachers and students signal a steady improvement of teaching skills. One suggestion could be to incorporate these skills a bit more in the context of the stimulation of learning by the students. The pedagogical support services and structures are seen as helpful but there is a fine balance between helpful and intrusive. Administrative processes to improve management and leadership processes are seen as a nuisance by a number of participants.

The faculty is aware of the necessity to ‘complete’ the evaluation process, by collecting feedback on the curriculum and by organising the use of course and curriculum feedback into the development and planning processes. At the departmental level this process is developed already, but there is no reporting yet at the faculty level. Because the element of feedback or input from the field of practice was missing in the self-evaluation report, the site visit team asked to be informed about this. It was reported that in many cases outside expertise was sought and involved in the preparation of the new degree structure most of the time through informal contacts. Furthermore, some degrees of this faculty (teaching degrees) are much more regulated by law. The feedback of alumni has been collected for many years already, and was taken into account as well.

The site visit team was struck by the enormous number of majors, minors and combinations between these, offered by the faculty. Even more astonishing was that no one from management nor teachers was challenging this fact. “Students like it”, as was confirmed by students. The faculty management and the students see this as the multidisciplinarity the university is looking for. Questions whether this is not too costly (and might result in an overload of teachers and lack of time for research), were neglected.
The students, although in favour of as many choices as possible, report that choosing an adequate major and minor is rather difficult, and advice or counselling is not always available. The study plan is valued by the students at the beginning of their study, but then becomes repetitious and bureaucratic. Future employment prospects are important to students. However, they feel that the contents of courses seldom address these concerns even when the connections can be easily made. The site visit team had the impression that not all programmes have obligatory internships or comparable practice training as a part of orientation to working life.

**Observations at the departmental level**

It is very difficult to say something in general about the departments of the Faculty of Arts, because they are so numerous and diverse (also in scale, and number of disciplines involved). However, the departments are in all cases the centre of the management of education. Up to now the planning processes and quality control take place at this level as well. By reducing the number of departments, the faculty wants to align these processes more. Some departments are afraid that this up-scaling will reduce the possibilities for advisors and counsellors to know the students, the programmes and the teachers well enough. The site visit team was somewhat disappointed by the reluctance of some of the department heads to take the self-evaluation seriously. Some department leaders see themselves rather as academics without leadership and management duties. It seems very difficult to agree on joint conceptions in Management & Leadership within the faculty.

The use of feedback from students is taken seriously by the departments, and most have developed a method to share the results of the feedback and to use it in the (re) design of courses. Some have also already developed a system of degree evaluation. However, there is little transparency in the process of acting on student feedback, i.e. students see little evidence of how their feedback is taken into account.

The responsibility for the many programmes of the faculty is not totally clear to the site visit team: no specific person is accountable for a specific degree, as such. However, for the faculty and department management and the teachers it is clear: a degree is agreed upon in the faculty, and consists of a major and a minor. Each of these is the responsibility of a department (the major takes care of the thesis as well). For the ‘independent’ master’s programmes (mostly interdisciplinary) there are steering committees (sometimes with external representatives), but one department is the leader in charge.

The quality of teaching gets attention from all departments. Many teachers have already taken university pedagogy courses. Also in some departments more informal groups are formed for teachers to learn from each other. Most teachers are aware of the necessity to upgrade their pedagogical skills, and do so. Students report that they see good improvements for most teachers. One point of critique is that there is not always feedback on written assignments. However, the recognition for teaching needs improvement, especially for young researchers.
The departments are also the level where the human resource management is realised. Yearly negotiations with teachers on their duties and opportunities take place. However a discrepancy between the reports by the teachers and by the department management became apparent. The former report there is almost no time for research, which is frustrating because most were selected upon their research skills, and is a waste of talent. The latter report that resources are scarce, but by spreading the teaching loads, they manage rather well and there still is some time for research.

The site visit team raised the issue of multidisciplinarity. The teachers of this faculty gave many excellent examples of multidisciplinary teaching. However, students seem not to recognise this. More attention has to be paid to this issue. Furthermore the participation remains fairly low in independent and multidisciplinary master’s programmes (e.g. 6 students in one programme). The whole concept is still unclear and under development.

Also the topic of research-based teaching such as was discussed. Here again there were good examples from some departments, involvement of students in departmental research, involving students in research networks, orienting theses to research, and the practice to devote some courses in a programme to actual research topics of teachers. However, other teachers complain about the time available for research a tragedy, not a strategy.

The site visit team has the impression that managerial strategies for disseminating good practice are poorly articulated. Staff with managerial responsibilities answer questions from the perspective of a teacher, not a manager. In such a way, good practices stay unnoticed, and the risk exists that other departments have to ‘invent the wheel again’.

**Conclusions**

**Strengths**

*Faculty level*

- Faculty structure and processes are functional, but no agreement on joint conceptions in Management & Leadership; the role of the faculty as a harmonizing body and quality control organ in a very heterogeneous faculty is clear and accepted.
- Much work done in improving teaching skills and ‘incorporated’ by many teachers.
- In-house pedagogical training is generally appreciated among teachers (not so much among department leaders).
Departments

- Departments played an active role in the degree restructuring process (core content analysis).
- Many good and motivated teachers with attention to pedagogical skills, teachers are easily reachable for advice.
- Variety in didactical methods used.
- There is attention for learning by students.
- Evaluation of courses is taken seriously by many (but not all) teachers.
- Students in general are happy with their programmes, teachers and exams.
- Students see themselves as learners and members of the university community, rather than as passive customers.

Good practices

- Courses in oral and written presentation for all students
- International visiting professors and possibilities for teachers to go abroad
- Some good examples of multidisciplinary teaching.
- The work of the senior-lecturer in university pedagogy

Recommendations

Faculty level

- Clarify managerial and leadership roles and responsibilities within the faculty.
- The faculty should prepare itself for negotiations over the distribution of resources.
- The faculty management should explain to all involved the objectives of the reduction in the number of departments plans.
- The faculty should, as planned, complete the evaluation process, by stimulating the collection of feedback on the curriculum and by stimulating the use of course and curriculum feedback into the development and planning processes.
- The feedback and input from the field of practice should get a more systematic place in the degree evaluation and adjustment processes.
- The numerous number of possible majors, minors and combinations between the two should be evaluated in the light of scarce resources, time for research and possibilities for more small group teaching.
- Attention should be paid to the counselling of students for their major and minor choices.
- Developing the personal study plan to allow cumulative reflection on learning and build up of sophisticated inventories of learning processes and learning styles. This should include a two way cross referencing between plan and content of learning.
• Internships (or comparable practice training) should be obligatory in all programmes.
• Improve recognition of teaching.

Departments
• Complete the evaluation process; use course and curriculum feedback in development and planning processes; use feedback and input from the field of practice more systematically. Stimulate the further development of evaluation of courses and degrees, but be careful not to harmonise too much (bureaucracy) because methods developed by the departments themselves are more lasting and probably more effective.
• More engagement of students with the concept of multidisciplinarity is needed. The development of multidisciplinary courses needs (financial) support.
• Learning by students needs further stimulation and support (development of tools).
• The recognition for teaching needs improvement, especially for young researchers.
• The strategic objective of research-based teaching should be made more operational; the departments could learn from each others good practices.
• Many teachers need (more) time for research, otherwise research-based teaching becomes difficult.
• More working life expertise and contacts with the outside world should be integrated in the curricula.
• More work on criteria and motivation for independent master’s programmes is needed.
Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
6.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
The self-evaluation of the management of education at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences was launched by appointing a steering group and departmental contact persons for the evaluation in January 2008. The international evaluation, focusing specifically on the management of education, concerns primarily the education leading to basic degrees at the Faculty and thus excludes the Faculty’s teacher training schools and libraries. The Faculty’s Teaching Committee was appointed to serve as the evaluation steering group, and each department appointed one or two evaluation contact persons. The practical implementation of the evaluation was supervised by an evaluation group consisting of the following persons: Seppo Tella, Vice-Dean in charge of academic affairs; Raija Lahdenperä, Head of Academic Affairs; Auli Toom, Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy; Mira Huusko, Planning Officer and the Faculty’s contact person for the international evaluation of education. Dean Patrik Scheinin also participated in the work of this supervisory group.

The departments wrote their self-evaluation reports in February and March 2008, and the Faculty’s self-evaluation report was compiled on the basis of these departmental reports in March 2008. This Faculty’s self-evaluation report also draws on the Faculty’s operations manual and process charts. The departments based their reports on existing documents and reports as well. The Faculty’s Teaching Committee commented in its meetings on the progress and various stages of the project.

The Faculty’s joint workshop was held on 12 March 2003, with participation by department heads and deputy heads, amanuenses, evaluation contact persons, members of the Teaching Committee, students and other Faculty members interested in the management of education. The total number of participants in the workshop was 27, and each department and the Faculty Office was represented. Prior to the workshop, the evaluation group had compiled a synthesis of the departmental self-evaluation reports for joint editing and discussion.

The ideas, proposals for editing, and the results of a SWOT analysis generated by the workshop were compiled together to serve as the basis for a final self-evaluation report written by the evaluation group. The final version was sent for comments to heads of department, evaluation contact persons, members of the Teaching Committee, the workshop participants, the deans and amanuenses. On the basis of their comments, final revisions and finishing touches were made to the report, which was then forwarded for translation.
B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences as an operational environment

The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences engages in research of a high national and international quality. The Faculty offers academic education based on research for the nation’s edification and for the purpose of directing and enhancing understanding about education, human growth, development, behaviour, learning and teaching. The Faculty generates new scientific knowledge to contribute to the development of civil society, to increase cultural and social capital, to protect nature and the environment, to improve life management, to prevent social exclusion and to promote the good living.

According to University of Helsinki statistics from 2006, the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences is the University’s fourth largest faculty based on student numbers. In 2007, the total number of basic degree graduates was 597, of whom 375 graduated with a Master’s degree. The Faculty offers the programme in education required of subject teachers for students from other faculties and a number of minor subject options for all students in the entire University. The Faculty comprises five departments, namely the Departments of Education, Home Economics and Craft Science, Psychology, Speech Sciences, and the Applied Sciences of Education. Each department has several programmes and major subjects, which means that student selection is a multifaceted process. In 2007, a total of 4,302 students applied for entry into the Faculty, of whom 553 were admitted, in other words, 13 per cent of the applicants. The Faculty's departments differ greatly from each other in terms of substance and areas of speciality. Furthermore, they differ in student and staff numbers, which adds its own challenge to the operations of the Faculty. In 2006, the staff’s total work contribution amounted to 450 person years, of which teaching and research accounted for 270 person years. These figures do not include the teacher training schools. Through its educational programmes, the Faculty offers versatile expertise to a number of significant sectors of society.

The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, operating under the auspices of the Department of Education, offers training in university pedagogy to the entire academic personnel of the University. The Department of Education also has programmes in education (general and adult education) in Swedish.
The Faculty hosts a number of international exchange students and visitors. Due to Finland’s success in the PISA survey, an increase in the flow of international expert visitors has been especially perceptible in the field of teacher education: in 2007, the Department of the Applied Sciences of Education received 58 groups, 556 persons in total, interested in teacher training, and the Viikki Teacher Training School received 290 international guests. The teaching staff is actively participating in teacher exchanges, and they are encouraged to teach courses in English.

Management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The structure of the management of education in the Faculty is illustrated in the chart in Appendix 1, (see page 171). The processes of the management of education are illustrated in the chart in Appendix 2, (see page 172).

The management of education at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences and its departments is based on the preparation and confirmation of degree requirements, the recruitment of the teaching staff, the assurance and development of the professional qualifications of teachers, assurance of the availability of support services, the monitoring and evaluation of the results and quality of learning, and the planning of activities of the basis of this monitoring and evaluation. Education and teaching is managed on departmental, faculty and University levels. Teaching is primarily managed by the departments, to whom the Faculty offers its support via various structures, committees and instructions.

The highest decision-making power in the Faculty rests with the Faculty Council and the dean. As a rule, an admissions board is in charge of student admissions. Academic affairs are presented by the head of academic affairs and academic affairs coordinators.

The Teaching Committee supports the departments by issuing various kinds of instructions and recommendations for the development of teaching and management of education and deals with development needs that emerge in the departments. The Teaching Committee is chaired by the first vice-dean, and the head of academic affairs acts as the secretary. The Faculty’s postgraduate education is the responsibility of the second vice-dean and the Faculty’s Research Committee (chaired by the second vice-dean) in cooperation with the first vice-dean and the Teaching Committee. The Research Committee’s secretary is the Faculty’s research officer.

In the departments, the management of education is the responsibility of the head or deputy head of department. Significant decisions on the management of education are made collectively by management groups directed by heads of department. The general responsibility for the operations of a department lie with
the head of department. Educational programmes, research centres and sectors have their own heads and deputy heads. Amanuenses or department secretaries and other administrators deal with the practical arrangements related to teaching. Departments have also various kinds of development groups and arrange annual development seminars for the development of teaching.

C Summary and analysis of the responses concerning the management of education and the related strengths and development challenges

How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

The Faculty’s response to this question follows the same structural model as the chart on the description of the management of education in the Faculty (Appendix 1, see page 171).

Management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences has well-defined structures for the management of education on the faculty and departmental levels. The departments are responsible for the implementation and development of high-quality instruction, and the Faculty supports them in these efforts via various structures, instructions and practices.

The highest decision-making body in the Faculty is the Faculty Council. The duty of the Faculty Council is to enhance the teaching and research conducted at the departments and to decide on degree requirements and standing regulations related to degrees on the basis of proposals submitted by the departments. The Faculty Council is responsible for the quality and comparability of degree requirements, degrees, and theses and dissertations. It is also the duty of the
Faculty Council to prepare a proposal on the annual intake of new students on the basis of proposals submitted by the departments and to decide on the admission criteria in accordance with the general guidelines confirmed by the University Senate. The 18-member Faculty Council meets currently once a month, and starting in the autumn of 2008 will meet every three weeks. The membership includes representatives from various personnel groups and the student body.

A week before the Faculty Council’s official meeting, interested members meet to prepare the matters to be discussed by the Faculty Council. This meeting also provides an opportunity to examine different viewpoints and, if necessary, brief the presenting officials with supplementary information or viewpoints that require changes in the agenda. This procedure ensures that matters are well prepared and thoroughly discussed collegially before decisions are made.

The Faculty Council has appointed the following committees and groups for the three-year period from 2007 to 2009: Teaching Committee, Research Committee, Committee for Societal Interaction, Management Group, Expert Group for the New Salary System, Human Resources Committee and Communications Committee. All these committees include representatives of departmental staff and the student body. The Admissions Board deals with matters related to student selection, makes decisions about the admission of undergraduate students and hears appeals against the results of student selection.

The dean has general authority in the Faculty. He or she supervises and monitors that the Faculty has functional systems for ensuring and enhancing the quality of degrees, teaching and support services. The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences has three vice-deans. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs is responsible for the faculty-level development and monitoring of teaching and studies together with the Teaching Committee and the academic affairs and international affairs staff in the Faculty Office. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs also collaborates with the committees for research and societal interaction.

The most important faculty-level committee from the point of view of the management of teaching is the Teaching Committee. The Committee devises a three-year action plan for the development of teaching and studies on the basis of the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies for the approval of the Faculty Council and then monitors its implementation at the faculty and departmental levels. The Committee also makes proposals concerning guidelines for teaching in the Faculty’s target programme. The Teaching Committee convenes once a month to issue instructions, recommendations and development proposals for teaching and studies. It also expresses faculty-level opinions on current issues concerning teaching, education and studies as well as on the challenges brought about by internationalisation. As representatives of the teaching staff and students from all the Faculty’s departments sit on the Committee, the views of the staff and students in the different departments are
taken into consideration before proposals concerning teaching are submitted for the decision of the Faculty Council and for implementation in the Faculty and its departments. A number of proposals and development ideas have sprung from the needs of the departments. The Teaching Committee is chaired by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, and the head of academic affairs acts as the secretary. The Faculty’s planning officer for international affairs also attends the meetings. The Teaching Committee arranges a seminar once a year for the Faculty’s teaching staff and students on current issues involving teaching and studies.

At the departments, the premier decision-making body is the departmental steering group under the leadership of the head of department. The overall responsibility for the management of teaching and research rests with the head of department. The leadership of departments have divided responsibility for the development of teaching and research, so that departments with several degree programmes have appointed a separate head and deputy head for each of the programmes. The largest departments have appointed deputy heads responsible for academic affairs to ensure a systematic and controlled management of education. Furthermore, departments have committees or programme-specific groups for curriculum design, whose duty it is to prepare degree requirements and course syllabi and to discuss the practical arrangements and development of teaching. Students are represented in all the departmental organs. Departmental administration assists the head and the leadership of the department. Matters related to teaching and education are also dealt with by statutory cooperative meetings and department meetings, where the staff has an opportunity to influence decisions about human resources, and subsequently, teaching resources. Departments hold annual planning seminars for the planning of teaching and studies. Discipline- or degree programme-specific groups, under the leadership of the relevant professor, are responsible for the research-based development of the discipline. Professors and individual teachers are responsible for the practical implementation of the courses they teach.

**Documents steering the management of education**

The management of education is steered by various documents devised by the University, the Faculty and the departments. The most important University-level documents include the University’s Strategic Plan, the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, and the plan for the development of teacher education written by the advisory board for teacher education at the University of Helsinki. The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences has devised a target programme for the years 2007-2009, which sets guidelines for the objectives of teaching and studies, Open University studies and continuing education, and support services for teaching and research, among other things. This target programme and the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007-2009 served as a basis for an action plan for the development of teaching and studies between 2007 and 2009.
Degree requirements define the structure of the degree and the titles, scope, learning objectives, previous studies, required literature and assessment methods of study modules and courses. Degree requirements are confirmed by the Faculty Council every three years on the basis of proposals by departmental steering groups. The degree requirements of Master’s programmes are confirmed every two years. The planning of degrees and teaching in the Faculty and departments is steered by standing regulations concerning basic degrees and studies. Admission criteria are determined on an annual basis.

The Teaching Committee has devised common instructions for the writing and assessment of Bachelor’s and Master’s theses, and the Faculty Council has approved them. The Faculty has common instructions for the consideration of teaching qualifications in the filling of posts; these instructions have been issued to fulfill departmental needs. Jointly agreed practices, agreements and instructions have been compiled into the Faculty’s operations manual and a guide for practices concerning undergraduate education to ensure that processes related to teaching are openly available to both staff and students. The Faculty’s human resources policy also sets guidelines for the management of teaching by determining the structure of the personnel, recruitment practices, the development of the structure of posts and the operation of leaders and the work community. Moreover, the Faculty’s Human Resources Committee has issued various recommendations with a view to support the management of teaching.

The departments draft their own target programmes and action plans on the basis of guidelines issued by the Faculty. The departments decide on their teaching programmes in accordance with degree requirements and devise their own operations manuals or human resources manuals according to need. The departments and their divisions write their own human resources policies and the teachers their own work plans. These documents are used in efforts to direct appropriate resources to teaching.

**Administrative services and systems that support the management of education**

The academic and international affairs administration staff in the Faculty Office provides support services for teaching and education under the supervision of a head of academic affairs. The duties of the staff in academic affairs administration have been defined to support the administration of academic affairs at the departmental level as appropriately as possible. For example, the Office has two student advisors who supplement the advice provided by departmental amanuenses. The Office also has a senior lecturer in university pedagogy who develops the Faculty’s teaching and cooperates with the Teaching and Research Committees as well as with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.
Each department has its own department office. The departmental amanuenses and other administrative staff are responsible for the practical arrangements and implementation relating teaching and academic administration, as well as for providing guidance and advice to students.

Various support systems, such as the Oodi and Etappi systems, are used as an aid in administration and follow-up. The Oodi information system was developed between 13 universities to aid in the administration of studies and teaching. The purpose of the Etappi system, which includes five checkpoints for the monitoring of the student’s study progress, is to identify students whose studies are delayed and to ensure that degrees are completed in accordance with the objectives set for universities.

The Faculty supports and encourages departments in the introduction and maintenance of a joint student feedback system. The Teaching Committee has devised for the use of the departments an electronic feedback form, which will facilitate the systematic exploitation of the feedback system. A feedback system in the Oodi platform is used in the development of education and the structure of studies. The Department of Education has been especially active in the piloting and development of the student feedback system and an electronic form for the students’ personal study plans.

The Teaching Committee has offered the departments support in the form of instructions for determining the scope of studies and a calculator for completed credits, which will facilitate the planning of studies and their timetables.

**Networks and student organisations that support development**

The Faculty and its departments are active in various networks that have been established to support the management and development of education. For example, the Office staff is engaged in a number of networks inside and outside the University. The various administrators have their official and unofficial networks, including the networks between deans, vice-deans, heads of department, heads of administration, financial planning officers, heads of academic affairs, the senior lecturers in university pedagogy, student advisors and planning officers for international affairs. The professors, teaching staff and researchers have their own networks as well.

The Faculty is also determined to foster internal networks that support the management of education. The head of planning convenes a monthly managerial meeting, chaired by the dean and attended by the heads of department, teacher training schools and libraries, to deal with long-term strategic planning and to discuss issues related to the operations of the Faculty and departments and of
relevance to the management of education. The head of administration also convenes the Human Resources Committee when necessary. The head of academic affairs once a month convenes a meeting of the departmental amanuenses and other administrative staff to offer support in their work with academic and international affairs. The head of academic affairs also meets with the student representatives of the Faculty Council in separate meetings. The meetings of the management group, amanuenses, students and the Human Resources Committee all ensure a smooth flow of information and an efficient dissemination of appropriate practices between departments.

There are 13 different subject-specific student organisations in the Faculty. These organisations belong to the Faculty’s student organisation Condus ry, and they all have a representative on the board of Condus. Condus ry is the official representative of students of the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences.

**Strengths**

- The Faculty and its departments have well-defined structures for the implementation and development of appropriate and high-quality teaching.
- Before each Faculty Council meeting, the agenda is extensively prepared by the departments, a preparatory organ and various committees. This has proved to be a great support for broad discussion of the issues to be decided on by the Faculty Council.
- The representation of departments and students in the committees and other working groups has been ensured in a number of ways.
- The Faculty’s student feedback system is used by all departments, which enables the Faculty to acquire consistent information about all study programmes. The Faculty has played an active role in the development of the student feedback system in order to ensure a joint and easily accessible system for the departments.

**Development challenges**

- Teaching personnel who are not members of committees or working groups must increasingly be provided with opportunities to participate in the development of teaching and the preparation of decisions.
- The information obtained through the student feedback system could be processed more systematically and exploited more effectively at the Faculty and departmental levels.
How do the Faculty and its departments agree on the content, methods and development of teaching?

Departments are responsible for agreeing on the content, methods and development of teaching, and they receive support for this from various instructions and the Faculty’s Teaching Committee. The content, methods and development of teaching are based on the following documents: the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009, the action plan for the implementation of the development of teaching and studies at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences (2007–2009), the Faculty’s target programme, degree requirements, and department-specific strategies, target programmes and action plans. Various instructions and evaluations by the advisory board for teacher education and the Ministry of Education also steer teacher education. The national coordination project for degree programme development in teacher training and the sciences of education (Vokke) also issued recommendations for the content of education in connection with the reform of university degrees between 2003 and 2006.

At the Faculty level, the most important organ in the development of teaching is the Teaching Committee, which has representation from all the departments of the Faculty. The Committee assists the departments in the development of their teaching according to current trends. The Committee has provided the departments with, for example, detailed instructions for the devising of degree requirements. These instructions are based on the University of Helsinki Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009.

The departments carry the primary responsibility for agreeing on the content, methods and development of teaching. Each department has a steering group, whose duty it is to evaluate and develop the teaching and research activities of the department and its divisions, submit to the Faculty Council a proposal for degree requirements and standing orders related to degrees, and decide on the department’s teaching programme. The steering groups also have student representation and are chaired by the head of the department. The management of academic affairs is usually designated to the deputy head of department.

The departments hold department meetings, meetings between the teaching staff, and discipline-, degree programme-, sector- or research centre-specific meetings to discuss the content, methods and development of teaching. The teachers may also form discipline-specific teams. The statutory cooperative meetings deal with issues concerning work plans and the planning and development of teaching. Some departments have working groups for curriculum design that plan and develop the next year’s teaching programme and degree requirements. The departments may also appoint working groups to support the development of educational sub-programmes, the composition of which is agreed on in the department meetings.
Each department has a department office, where the academic affairs personnel assist the teaching personnel in matters pertaining to the content, methods and development of teaching. The amanuenses, coordinators and secretaries are a central resource in this respect. The amanuenses have a perspective on the entire teaching programme and the practical arrangements related to teaching. The departments also provide support services for web-based teaching to ensure that versatile and up-to-date teaching methods are used.

The content and methods of the instruction provided by the departments are based on behavioural research. Besides the close connection to research, the teacher’s professional skills, enthusiasm and responsibility for the dissemination of the latest research information are of pivotal importance. The objectives and content have been documented on a general level in the degree requirements. Each course is assigned detailed objectives and content at the beginning of the course.

The departments continuously discuss the objectives, content and methods of teaching. Various kinds of pedagogic methods developed for university-level learners are applied in pedagogically justifiable ways. The teaching staff is willing to experiment with new innovations if their functionality is supported by research and they feel that these methods are suitable for their courses.

The aim of the development of teaching is that the choice of learning objectives, teaching and assessment methods, and content, as well as the acquisition of feedback and its exploitation all support each other in a consistent manner from the point of view of the learner and promote his or her learning. When degree requirements and course syllabi are drafted, attention is paid to the reconciliation of studies and work, for example, by implementing courses that focus on professional life, arranging versatile practical training periods and developing ties to the labour market. The balance between studies and work is given ample consideration; however, studies are considered to be of primary importance. The societal relevance of education is maintained by making use of the feedback obtained from working students, recent graduates and representatives of the field in the labour market and by following and conducting surveys among graduates from the Faculty. Graduates from all the Faculty’s degree programmes easily find employment.

The work culture in the departments encourages teaching experiments. This is proven not only by the informal daily discussions between colleagues, but also by the numerous planning and discussion sessions and other informal events focusing on teaching. The departments organise annual planning and teaching development seminars open to both teachers and students.

The development of teaching is an ever-ongoing process, where feedback acquired from various directions is exploited to enhance research-based teaching and where alterations are made in accordance with degree and teaching programme reforms. This process is a continuous dialogue with the various participants. Student feedback
plays a crucial role in the development of teaching. Feedback from students is collected in various forms: the course-specific feedback obtained through the WebOodi system is used by all the Faculty's departments. Teachers also acquire feedback in personal discussions with their students, and students give spontaneous feedback either orally or in writing. Such feedback is encouraged and is processed immediately. Annual and course-specific feedback is taken into consideration as far as possible in the implementation of the following year’s courses. Some feedback can be taken into consideration only in connection with the reforms of the degree requirements. The teaching staff discusses the implementation and development of teaching among themselves on various occasions, thus providing opportunities for peer support.

Strengths

- Thanks to the functional cooperation between the Faculty and its departments, and to the functional organisation and structure of the departments, education can be developed and managed systematically.
- The departments have well-defined principles for the content, methods and development of teaching.
- Teaching is based on state-of-the-art research information on teaching, studies and learning in the fields represented at the Faculty.
- The Teaching Committee expresses its opinion on current issues and relays the latest development trends to the departments both in its capacity as a Committee and through its individual members. The Teaching Committee receives development ideas from the departments through its members.
- The teaching staff is academically and pedagogically qualified, has solid experience in teaching, and is enthusiastic about experimenting with new methods, practices and pedagogic innovations in teaching.
- Student views on the content and methods of teaching are systematically taken into account via feedback from various working groups and student feedback.
- The students are informed and demand teaching of a high quality.

Development challenges

- The Faculty could put more effort into the development of multidisciplinary and interactive learning content.
- The Faculty should find ways to increasingly promote the balance between studies and work.
- The students’ role in the planning of teaching should be highlighted more.
- Student feedback could be used even more systematically in the development of teaching, and this exploitation should be documented. Students should be provided with feedback on their feedback, as well as on their studies and learning results.
• Feedback should be increasingly collected from outside the Faculty, so as to obtain valuable development ideas from external interest groups, and consequently, to keep the Faculty’s programmes abreast of societal changes. A wide variety of surveys have been conducted at the Faculty and departmental levels, but they have not properly been taken advantage of in the development of educational programmes.
• The Faculty could explore the possibilities of taking advantage of other departments’ teaching programmes with the aim of promoting the employment prospects of graduates.

How does the Faculty prepare and decide on degree requirements?

Degree requirements are prepared by the departments and confirmed by the Faculty Council. The University, the faculty and the departments have devised guidelines for and developed this process in various ways. However, of central importance is the preparatory work done by departmental groups and the steering group. The departmental amanuences also play a significant role in the practical implementation of this process.

Various guidelines and the Decrees on degrees steer the preparation of degree requirements and decisions made on them. At the University of Helsinki, the starting points and objectives of education are based on national legislation and education policies, including the Government Development Plan for Education and Research, the Strategic Plan of the University of Helsinki and the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. The University Senate decides on the most important guidelines for education. In recent years, a crucial role in educational policy has been played by the Bologna Process and its aims to enhance degrees in terms of both quality and structure. The purpose of this development work is to participate in the creation of a European educational area by increasing mobility and enhancing the transparency and comparability of degrees and studies.

The guidelines issued by the University have been specified to suit the needs and purposes of the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences in the Faculty’s target programme and its action plan for the development of teaching and studies. The quality assurance of degree-oriented education is based on degree-related regulations issued by the University of Helsinki and the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. However, the most important documents steering degree requirements include the national Decrees on University Degrees, which are amended about every ten years, most recently in 2005. The national coordination project for degree programme development in teacher training and the sciences of education (Vokke) was active in connection with the recent amendment of the Decree on University Degrees.
Degree requirements are planned at the departments by various working groups in the form of systematic sub-processes consisting of different levels and stages. The departmental steering groups submit a proposal to the Faculty Council for degree requirements. In the preparation of the requirements, core content analysis is used as an aid, and the workload of courses and modules are considered from the point of view of the students. The degree requirements contain information on the structure of the degree as well as the titles, scope, learning objectives, previous studies, required literature and assessment methods of modules and courses. The departmental research profiles and areas of emphasis, as well as the connection of teaching to the research areas, have an effect on the drafting of degree requirements. The degree requirements of teacher education are prepared in cooperation with the University’s teacher training schools.

The departments hold department meetings to launch the preparation of degree requirements. The preparation begins with an evaluation of the previous requirements and the processing of the feedback received. The various working groups draft proposals for the degree requirements. The student representatives in the departmental steering group agree on their representation in the department meeting. Teacher and student experiences of the previous degree requirements, developments in the field of education and in the teaching of education, the latest results of university level pedagogy, results of surveys conducted by the Faculty and its departments, feedback obtained through the teacher training schools and the network of field schools, as well as recommendations issued by the University and the Faculty are used in the preparation work. The administrative staff at departments compiles and edits the degree requirements on the basis of proposals by the various working groups, and forwards the draft proposal for the consideration of the departmental steering group, which submits its proposal to the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council confirms the degree requirements every three years, and departmental teaching programmes are confirmed once a year by departmental steering groups.

The literature contained in the degree requirements is kept up-to-date so that it is possible to make slight updates to the requirements on an annual basis. Every spring, proposals are collected from course coordinators who discuss possible development needs with the teachers, group supervisors and examiners of given courses. The WebOodi student feedback system plays an important role in this respect. The system also yields feedback on the appropriateness of course literature. Development ideas related to the literature often emerge only once the courses and teaching have ended. The dean confirms changes in the required literature once a year upon proposals by departmental steering groups.

- Illustration of the preparation of degree requirements at the Department of Education (Appendix 3, see page 173).
Strengths

- The distribution of labour between the Faculty, the departments and their divisions in the preparation of degree requirements is clear.
- The preparation of degree requirements at the departments is well supervised and organised, and highly competent.
- The preparation of degree requirements draws on the evaluation of previous requirements and the feedback received.
- International surveys conducted on education and research and assessments of the field are exploited in the preparation of degree structures and requirements.

Development challenges

- Cooperation and dialogue between programmes is often scarce in the preparation of degree requirements. Extensive exchanges would ensure the transfer of good practices and development ideas between programmes.
- Students should make better use of their opportunities to influence the preparation of degree requirements.

How do the Faculty and its departments ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

The appropriate distribution of teaching duties is the responsibility of departments and the heads of departments. The amanuenses are indispensable in the practicalities related to the planning of the distribution of teaching duties. This process of operative management is guided by various documents, such as the University's Strategic Plan and the Faculty's target programme. Other important documents include the University's Human Resources Policy, the Faculty's human resources policy, departmental human resources policies and the Faculty's guide for immediate superiors. The Faculty's Human Resources Committee issues guidelines for the distribution of teaching duties.

The abolition of joint regulations for teaching duties opened the way for flexibility in the appropriate distribution of teaching duties within the framework of collective agreements. In the case of teachers who conduct research, the distribution of teaching duties for the academic year is planned with consideration for an appropriate balance between teaching and research. Departments are in accordance with the recommendations of the University's and Faculty's human resources committees that each researcher will engage in teaching and each teacher in research. Departmental steering groups confirm the departmental teaching programme every year. The teaching programmes contain descriptions of
the methods of implementation and work, dates and times, and the names of the teachers responsible for the courses.

Teachers’ duties are reviewed in review discussions conducted with the head of department or with an immediate superior; practices regarding these discussions vary from department to department. Through these discussions the head of department ensures an even distribution of duties at the department. Prior to the review discussions, the teachers and contact persons for disciplines, subject groups, focus areas and sectors, if any, jointly agree on the coordination of each course. The starting point is that teaching duties should be evenly distributed in accordance with the teachers’ annual work plans. The immediate superior and the head of department approve the work plans. The head and deputy head of department are responsible for ensuring that the work plans are in accordance with agreed recommendations and that the plans are implemented as such. Teaching duties are primarily distributed in accordance with expertise acquired through research. The latest opportunity to gear teaching in accordance with work plans is when proposals are made for degree requirements and for the next year’s teaching programme. The aim is that enough time can be reserved for research.

The work plan for the academic year is devised in accordance with guidelines agreed upon in connection with the design of teaching programmes. The amanuenses negotiate with the teachers about the timing of their courses, the rhythm followed by the groups and course-specific demands as regards the teaching facilities. The aim is that the duties of the teaching personnel will be distributed as evenly as possible and that personal wishes, such as research-intensive periods, can be taken into consideration.

Departments have appointed a course coordinator for each course. This coordinator is responsible for ensuring that the course is implemented in an appropriate manner with respect to available resources and is using learning methods of the highest possible quality. Besides the classroom hours proper, attention is paid to the teacher’s workload for the course and the teacher’s experience in teaching the course in question. In this way, resources can be ensured for personal supervision in connection with research seminars and for the planning of a new course.

The Faculty’s Human Resources Committee recommends that from the autumn of 2008, researchers spend 10 per cent of their 1,600-hour annual workload on teaching. This recommendation applies to all researchers with the exception of Academy of Finland researchers, who follow the Academy’s recommendation according to which researchers spend 5 per cent of their total working hours on teaching or supervision. Postgraduate students with notable teaching qualifications may also be recruited as teachers.

The low number of teachers in relation to student numbers presents challenges for the appropriate distribution of teaching duties. The planning of teaching
is complicated by the high turnover of the teaching personnel, fixed-term appointments and the difficulty of finding qualified replacements.

**Strengths**

- Work plans are devised and discussed openly and publicly at the departments.
- The distribution of teaching duties is steered by well-defined guidelines.

**Development challenges**

- Postgraduate students should be utilised more extensively and systematically in teaching. They would thus gain valuable teaching experience and target-oriented initiation into the academic community.
- New methods could be developed for undergraduate students to participate in teaching. Such a practice would enhance student commitment to the department.
- The departments could develop a pool of qualified replacements, which would ensure them a supply of qualified teachers.

**How do the Faculty and its departments promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (recruitment, pedagogical training, research opportunities)?**

Various instructions and plans provide guidelines for the development of the teaching staffs’ professional skills and expertise in the Faculty and its departments. In matters related to human resources, the Faculty and its departments observe the Faculty’s and University’s human resources policies. The Faculty has a Human Resources Committee, which deals with issues concerning the development of human resources and well-being at work. The Faculty’s other committees also explore ways to develop the teaching staffs’ professional skills and expertise. In 2008 the committees held a joint meeting to discuss these issues. The Faculty has at its disposal adequate and reasonably appropriate facilities and telecommunication links, hardware and software, which all contribute to the qualifications and expertise of the staff. The most important work for the promotion of the staffs’ professional skills and expertise is, however, done at the departments under the leadership of the head of department.

**Recruitment of teachers**

The high standard of the teaching staffs’ professional skills is based on the recruitment of high-standard personnel. Recruitment takes place in accordance
with current regulations. The Faculty Council decides on appointments to professorships and university lectureships. The State Civil Servants’ Act and Decree, as well as instructions by the Ministry of Finance, provide for the filling of posts. Posts and positions are filled on the basis of comparisons between qualifications, or proposals by steering groups and the administrative principals of the teacher training schools, or upon decisions by the Faculty Council. The Faculty Council has confirmed instructions for the filling of posts from the point of view of taking into consideration both academic qualifications and teaching qualifications, as well as criteria for the filling of posts in the teacher training schools.

The Faculty Council has made the decision that special attention will be directed towards the assessment of teaching skills in the recruitment of new teachers and to the equal consideration of teaching skills and academic qualifications especially in the filling of university lectureships. The initiative for this policy came from the departments. In the filling of posts, attention is paid to teaching qualifications defined by decrees, including teaching experience and skills, pedagogical studies and the production of learning materials and textbooks. The Faculty has devised criteria for academic and teaching qualifications and instructions for their comparisons. Students are involved in the filling of all teaching posts. Teaching qualifications are also a significant factor in the assessment of teachers’ personal work performance.

The departmental research and teaching strategies are taken into account in the filling of posts so that qualified teachers are recruited to all of the department’s focus areas. A number of the holders of teaching positions at the Faculty also hold docentships. The departments have recruited scholars who are able to provide high quality education based on research in the field. The overall aim is to recruit personnel with solid teaching skills and an interest in the development of teaching.

When new employees start work, their orientation and introduction is carried out in accordance with the University’s and Faculty’s instructions and with consideration for the special features of the post in question. The Faculty’s operations manual and the University’s instructions on the intranet, department-specific operations manuals and personnel guides as well as special orientation folders all facilitate the orientation of a new employee.

In-house training and pedagogical training

The departments are responsible for their staffs’ participation in in-house and pedagogical training. The heads of department encourage their employees to engage in various kinds of training to ensure a high level of expertise in the department. The Faculty and the University support the departments in the development of human resources by offering training and organising development seminars. The
University's in-house training offers means to develop the management of education, among other things. The Faculty arranges training for immediate superiors. The departments organise department-, programme- or discipline-specific development seminars annually, and the Faculty organises a teaching development seminar, open to the entire personnel and student body, annually as well.

The training needs of every individual employee are discussed in the review meetings between the employee and the head of department or an immediate superior. The development needs of teachers’ professional skills or teaching arrangements are recognised in department meetings, discipline-specific meetings or other discussion forums. Once the development needs have been identified, action is taken within available resources with the help of various development seminars, for example.

The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education offers training in university pedagogy to the entire academic personnel of the University. The Faculty's teachers are encouraged to participate in training in university-level pedagogy, and a number of teachers have, in fact, completed the studies in education required of teachers or a programme in university pedagogy. The Department of Psychology has launched a tailored programme on university pedagogy, and in spring 2008 some 20 teachers and researchers participated in this programme. The participants felt that the studies were useful, collegial and contributed to the development of teaching.

The Faculty has a senior lecturer in university pedagogy, who cooperates with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education in the planning and organising of upcoming training in university pedagogy for the Faculty’s teaching personnel. This 60-credit training programme is scheduled to begin in August 2008 and will last three years.

**Research opportunities**

A prerequisite for the maintenance and development of professional skills is that teachers have time that they can devote to research. The possibility to engage in research is agreed upon with every teacher individually. The aim at the departments is that university lecturers should not use more than half of their 1,600-hour annual workload on teaching, and professors no more than 25 per cent. The departments providing teacher education fall short of this objective. Teaching periods offer the opportunity to concentrate on research during certain periods, which are agreed upon in meetings that take place every spring. However, such periods are not always possible due to the lack of qualified replacements and the shortage of permanent teaching staff. The Faculty’s Human Resources Committee has set the aim that an opportunity to conduct research will be guaranteed to all teachers and that all researchers will be guaranteed the opportunity to teach.
The Faculty has organised education designed for both researchers and postgraduate students. These courses and other events will be developed further according to need and available resources. The Faculty also organises seminars for the presentation of research results; these seminars are a joint forum for the Faculty’s researchers, students and the general public to discuss and debate current research.

The Faculty hosts a network entitled CICERO Learning, which arranges lectures and events related to learning research. The network, a joint venture between multidisciplinary research groups in Finnish universities, was established in 2005 and is coordinated by the University of Helsinki. Its aim is to establish active connections with business and industry.

The departments encourage their staff and postgraduate students to present their research in international seminars and conferences. Such activities will open the way for high quality research and international publishing, as well as networks with the national and international research communities in the field.

**Internationalisation**

The Faculty and its departments encourage teachers to engage in international exchanges that promote multiculturalism, multilingualism and other skills needed in the increasingly internationalised field of higher education. Personal exchanges enhance the possibilities to develop further teaching offered in English. An average of five work days spent in an international teacher exchange scheme will be accepted as part of the 1,600-hour annual workload.

In recent years, teachers at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences have been among the most active teachers at the University to take advantage of the available opportunities for teacher exchanges. In the academic year 2006-2007, a total of 65 teachers from the University of Helsinki took part in a teacher exchange scheme, of whom 31 came from the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. These exchanges were based on department- and discipline-specific bilateral agreements that the departments have concluded with 25 countries. According to collected feedback on these exchanges, the participating teachers regarded international connections, networking and cooperation as the most important benefits of the exchanges. Other important benefits include the development of research and teaching, obtaining new ideas and acquiring experience in teaching in a foreign language. The participating teachers’ own teaching is influenced by the new experiences and ideas. The visiting international teachers bring their own expertise to individual courses as well as to larger audiences through open lectures.

The English-language courses designed for both exchange students and the Faculty’s own degree students offer a multicultural meeting point for the students. International educational cooperation with its various projects promotes
intercultural interaction also through computer connections and distance learning.

**Strengths**

- The teaching staff at the departments is both academically and pedagogically qualified.

- The departments encourage their staff in various ways to develop their skills as academic teachers.

- The training designed for the Faculty’s researchers and postgraduate students provides opportunities for the entire staff to develop their competence as researchers.

- The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education within the Department of Education offers research results, training and development support in university pedagogy to the entire academic personnel of the University. The Centre is a significant resource for the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences.

**Development challenges**

- The orientation of new employees deserves greater attention in the future.

- The training in university pedagogy designed for the Faculty’s staff could be developed further and established in a form designed on the basis of feedback received from the first training.

- The Faculty should devise an overall policy for the development of human resources. The policy should take into account the development needs of the various personnel groups.
D Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and development challenges of the management of education

Strengths

• The Faculty has multifaceted expertise and the required organisation and structures for the systematic management and development of education.

• The research and teaching undertaken in the Faculty are reflected in the degree requirements.

• The Faculty boasts a qualified staff that has diverse pedagogical expertise and is ready to experiment and implement new pedagogical innovations and practices in teaching and support services.

• Heads and deputy heads of department (responsible for teaching) are committed to the management of education and carry out their duties with great expertise.

• Consistency in the planning, implementation and assessment of teaching is regarded to be of central importance in teaching.

• The Faculty has a relatively low hierarchy, which enables the various actors to engage in the interactive and transparent processes of decision-making.

• Before each Faculty Council meeting, the agenda is prepared by the departments, a preparatory organ and various committees. The representation of departments and students in the committees and other working groups has been ensured in a number of ways.

• Student views are taken into account in all stages of decision-making and planning and the development of teaching through working groups and student feedback.

• The student feedback system has been developed to cover the entire Faculty.
Weaknesses

- Differences in the sizes and internal cultures of the departments present challenges for the Faculty’s operations.

- The constant changes taking place at the University steal energy away from work. Both leaders and employees are burdened by these constant changes.

- The turnover of fixed-term employees is high, and there is not enough time for the orientation of new employees.

- The 1,600-hour annual workload is not enough for the successful completion of all duties. Very often the teaching and research personnel are burdened by the ever-increasing administrative duties to an unreasonable extent. Partly to blame is the administrative software introduced by the University in recent years for the use of all personnel groups; this software has often been technically unfinished.

Development challenges

- Leaders should be offered increasing opportunities to participate in leadership training.

- Heads of department should be guaranteed peace to concentrate on leadership and on the development of leadership.

- Work plans and rules of procedure should be developed so that all employees can cope with their duties within the annual workload or total number of working hours.

- Postgraduate students should be offered opportunities to teach as part of their studies in university pedagogy.

- Student feedback could be used more extensively in the development of teaching. Students should be systematically provided with feedback on their feedback and their study progress.

- Feedback should be increasingly collected from outside the Faculty, so as to obtain valuable development ideas from external interest groups and consequently, to maintain the Faculty’s programmes abreast of changes in the labour market and society at large.

- The student selection process should be simplified.
• In order to ensure research-based teaching, the Faculty’s teaching staff should be guaranteed a lighter teaching period during which they could concentrate on research.

• The new Universities Act provides opportunities for novel ways of thinking in the development of the management of education.

Appendices

• Appendix 1, page 171: Structure of the management of education at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences

• Appendix 2, page 172: Processes of the management education at the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences

• Appendix 3, page 173: Illustration of the preparation of degree requirements at the Department of Education
Appendix 1

Structure of the Management of Education
Faculty of Behavioural Sciences

Academic leadership and committee work

- Preparatory committee
- Faculty Council
- Dean
- Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board

Administrative services and systems

- Network of deans in charge of academic affairs
- Network of lecturers specialised in university pedagogy
- Lecturer specialised in university pedagogy
- Network of heads of academic affairs
- Help-qi pilot project
- Etappi study progress checkpoint system
- Network of academic advisors
- Meetings between office staff and student representatives
- Condus student organisation
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Action programme for teaching and studies
- Instructions for the writing and assessment of Bachelor’s and Master’s theses
- Human Resources Policy
- Admission criteria
- General assessment criteria for the Faculty’s disciplines, modules and courses
- Operations Manual
- Guide for common practices
- Oodi student information system
- Student feedback system
- Meetings between amanuenses
- Subject-specific student organisations
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Standing regulations concerning basic education and studies
- Instructions for the consideration of teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching posts
- Departmental target programmes
- Teaching programmes
- ICT strategy for teaching
- Human resources policies
- Work plans
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board
- Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board

Networks and student organisations

- Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education
- Network of deans in charge of academic affairs
- Teaching development seminars
- Network of lecturers specialised in university pedagogy
- Lecturer specialised in university pedagogy
- Network of heads of academic affairs
- Help-qi pilot project
- Etappi study progress checkpoint system
- Network of academic advisors
- Meetings between office staff and student representatives
- Condus student organisation
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Action programme for teaching and studies
- Instructions for the writing and assessment of Bachelor’s and Master’s theses
- Human Resources Policy
- Admission criteria
- General assessment criteria for the Faculty’s disciplines, modules and courses
- Operations Manual
- Guide for common practices
- Oodi student information system
- Student feedback system
- Meetings between amanuenses
- Subject-specific student organisations
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Standing regulations concerning basic education and studies
- Instructions for the consideration of teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching posts
- Departmental target programmes
- Teaching programmes
- ICT strategy for teaching
- Human resources policies
- Work plans
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board
- Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board

Documents steering the management of education

- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board
- Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs
- Network of deans in charge of academic affairs
- Network of lecturers specialised in university pedagogy
- Lecturer specialised in university pedagogy
- Network of heads of academic affairs
- Help-qi pilot project
- Etappi study progress checkpoint system
- Network of academic advisors
- Meetings between office staff and student representatives
- Condus student organisation
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Action programme for teaching and studies
- Instructions for the writing and assessment of Bachelor’s and Master’s theses
- Human Resources Policy
- Admission criteria
- General assessment criteria for the Faculty’s disciplines, modules and courses
- Operations Manual
- Guide for common practices
- Oodi student information system
- Student feedback system
- Meetings between amanuenses
- Subject-specific student organisations
- Faculty Target Programme
- Degree requirements
- Standing regulations concerning basic education and studies
- Instructions for the consideration of teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching posts
- Departmental target programmes
- Teaching programmes
- ICT strategy for teaching
- Human resources policies
- Work plans
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board
- Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs
- Faculty Office/Academic and international affairs
- Admission Board
Description of the planning of education at the Department of Education

Degree programmes, degree requirements and the curriculum
Amendments due to international, national, statutory or degree level requirements about every ten years

Programme-specific degree requirements confirmed by the Faculty Council for a term of three years

1. Evaluation of previous requirements, processing of feedback
2. Department meeting to launch planning
3. Subject-specific working groups devise proposals for degree requirements
4. The proposal for degree requirements is compiled and then discussed by the steering group, which submits a proposal to the Faculty Council
   • The degree requirements are updated annually at the proposal of the steering group and confirmed by the dean

The curriculum, which combines the degree requirements and the annual teaching programme, is devised annually and confirmed by the departmental steering group

1. TEACHING, collection of feedback and launching of planning
2. Planning of the distribution of teaching duties and booking of facilities
3. Planning of teaching and announcement of the teaching programme
4. Registrations, forming of groups, organising examinations, updating of the teaching information system, TEACHING

Appendix 3
6.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences is a relatively young Faculty, established at the beginning of 2004 when the Department of Psychology and the Department of Speech Sciences from the Faculty of Arts were integrated with the Faculty of Education. The main purpose of the merger was to seek academic and educational synergy by bringing behavioural sciences in the University under the same Faculty. The panel found a very open, lively Faculty, with a clear sense of mission, and saw evidence of a non-hierarchical, collegial atmosphere; both staff and students found it to be a good place to work and study.

The Faculty states that its mission is to engage in research and offer the highest standards of education in order to direct and increase understanding about human growth, development, behaviour, learning and activities. The Faculty also sees that the scientific knowledge produced by the Faculty adds to cultural and social capital, prevents social exclusion and helps manage and direct change. In order to achieve its goals, the Faculty is taking active steps to work together more intensively and effectively.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty of Behavioural Sciences is currently the fourth largest in the University (222 BA and 375 MA degrees awarded in 2007) and has five departments: the Department of Psychology, the Department of Education, the Department of Home Economics and Craft Science, the Department of Speech Sciences and the Department of Applied Sciences of Education. They offer university degrees in the fields of arts, cognitive science, craft science, educational sciences, home economics, speech sciences and psychology. This Faculty is responsible for the education of kindergarten teachers, primary school teachers, special education teachers, textile teachers and home economics teachers, and for the pedagogical studies of subject teacher education, as well as the education for teachers for adult education and multiple-subject studies for class teachers and subject teachers (giving competence to teach the first six grades). Five other Faculties have teacher education in their programmes, and therefore, it is this Faculty that has a coordination role for all teacher education in the University. It is noteworthy that the majority of full-time degree students in this Faculty are in teacher education programmes.
The interviews suggested to us that the management team (the Dean and his immediate colleagues) is putting an emphasis on management and leadership. However, the fact that the Departments remain powerful in determining their own issues means that there are still gaps in the development of Faculty-wide, coherent leadership. The Departments are also significantly different in size and tradition, which also affects the Faculty level discussion. Given the relatively short time that this Faculty has been in existence with the present structure, we believe that good progress has been made, and we encourage further steps towards achieving cohesion across the Faculty. There is room for further coordination, collaboration and harmonisation, especially regarding curriculum design and development and shared leadership.

The management and leadership of teaching seem to focus on the departmental and programme levels. Whilst teaching takes place at the departmental level, leadership and coordination at the Faculty level is also important. We formed an impression that, despite the shared mission of the Faculty, there was not yet a vision for the entire Faculty that all were committed to work for. The Heads of Department see their role as academic leaders and take on responsibility for their Departments, including human resource management. The new structure of the Faculty was, however, seen as an opportunity to get support and to work through the boundaries of disciplines, and to create more interdisciplinary cooperation inside the Faculty. The most successful experiences so far seem to have been in research and in the joint organisation of doctoral studies, but there are plans for conducting an MA programme in psychology and educational sciences based on collaboration within the Faculty and with other Faculties; we welcome this development.

The Panel recognised that the Faculty relies on wide, democratic participation in different committees as part of a common decision-making process. The committees of different kinds (in this area, most importantly, the Teaching Committee) are seen from the Faculty level as being important tools in preparing for official decision making. Similar to other large Faculties, there are some discrepancies in how different strategic units operate and work together in harmony. Two meetings appear to have important functions:

1. The Faculty Council Preparatory Meeting: A week before the Faculty Council’s official meeting, interested members meet to prepare the matters to be discussed by the Faculty Council. This meeting also provides an opportunity to examine different viewpoints and, if necessary, brief the presenting officials with supplementary information or viewpoints that require changes in the agenda. This procedure ensures that matters are well prepared and thoroughly discussed collegially before decisions are made. In practical terms, this means that anybody can come and have a role in preparing things. This meeting is usually attended by the majority of the Faculty Council members, including representatives of all categories and also one or two Administrative Principals of the university practice schools.
2. The Management Group consists of the Deans, the Heads of Department, the Faculty Academic Affairs officials, the Faculty Heads of Administration and Planning and other presenting officials. This group mainly deals with issues of leadership and management, financial matters and certain strategic guidelines. Its composition also varies depending on the matters to be discussed.

The Teaching Committee plays an important role when preparing common matters, instructions and recommendations for the Faculty Council meetings. This Committee has both teacher and student representatives of all five Departments as well as the International Affairs officer, the Faculty Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy and the Head and Coordinators of the Faculty’s Academic Affairs. In addition to these three groups, the Departmental Steering Groups also prepare matters to be decided on at the Faculty Council meetings.

Whilst this structure appears to be very comprehensive and allows full opportunity for participation, based on comments made to us, we wish to raise a number of concerns that the Faculty may wish to explore further. Most important were some differences of view about the relative balance in leadership and management between the Faculty and Departments; whatever the outcome, some clarification is needed. Also, whilst opportunities for participation are excellent, this, in itself, does not lead to full transparency in decision making. The use of a preparatory meeting is useful and can represent good practice, but it was also put to us that this was where, in effect, decisions were made; this raised some concerns in our mind, at one level about the repetition of debate and inefficiency and at another level about the role of the formal decision-making body in shaping and taking responsibility for policy. In our congested timetable, it was difficult to form a full picture. However, several of those interviewed shared our observations. This suggests a need for further clarification of decision-making structures and lines of responsibility. At the departmental level, Faculty strategy and policy were seen primarily as guidance rather than as decisions from management and leadership to be implemented. This view reflected an absence of incentives and follow-up procedures. It was, however, also stated that some Departments had used the strategic plan for the University and for the Faculty in drawing up their own strategies and had interpreted key principles within their own disciplines. However, this represented local initiative rather than any sense of obligation.

The Faculty has developed a common feedback system that now runs on the WebOodi system. The Departments have involved students in the development of the assessment of teaching and studies. The Faculty wants to enhance the ways feedback is discussed with the students during the courses and in the different committees. The Departments also want to promote more informal ways to discuss feedback with the students as a natural part of their studies. The students we met seemed to be very satisfied with their studies and with the Faculty. Students see their study environment as being non-hierarchical and their teachers and
educational leaders as easy to approach. The Panel was, for example, told that some changes had been made to course structures after students had taken a stand on a particular issue. Staff were seen as sympathetic and responsive. The Faculty also enjoys outstanding facilities that help to establish a strong teaching environment.

Due to changes brought by the Bologna Process in the degree structure, the Faculty has gone through a review of the students’ study load. Similar to other Faculties, most students seem to have paid jobs besides their full-time studies. The Panel did not have time to obtain a detailed profile of the jobs, nor the weekly workloads of students. Some students seem to have part-time jobs in their fields, e.g. schools or research teams, which, they told us, gives relevant work experience for later employment. Some students also argued that part-time, more routine labour-based jobs were good for developing the motivation to study. The Panel was told that in some Departments teachers were collecting data about students’ study-related workload. Nevertheless, the Panel thinks that it is important both to have better information about the study-related workloads and to intensify efforts to have students more engaged in their studies.

It was mentioned that the Faculty is currently planning an international MA programme (“Intercultural Encounters”, due to start autumn 2009). Another international MA programme (“Interdisciplinary Studies on Everyday Life in Nordic Welfare Societies”) is in the planning phase. The Faculty is also applying for extra funding for organising subject teacher education in the English language from 2010 onwards. These initiatives are highly commended. Questions of internationalisation are discussed, for instance, at the Faculty level by the Teaching Committee, and issues are supported by the International Affairs Officer, together with the Faculty’s Academic Affairs personnel. However, again, it seems that Departments are quite independent in this area. The international support services in the Departments are taken care of by a network of contact persons coordinated by the Faculty Officer. It was stated by the teachers that we met that, generally, internationalisation was not a high priority for students and that, therefore, the number of outgoing students could be increased. One reason for the relatively low number of students that chose to go on exchange to foreign universities was that teacher education in most other parts of Europe is not at the Master’s level, as teacher education is in Finland. Many students in this Faculty, therefore, have found it difficult or irrelevant to go and study in a programme in another foreign university that is not in compliance with their own degree requirements. Even if students could find a university that offered suitable courses, they were, in most cases, very different from their own research-based studies. Furthermore, all those students who were studying in teacher education programmes had rather fixed study schemes that might not allow them to be away for a term or a full year without having problems in staying on schedule with their studies. On the other hand, notwithstanding these difficulties, this Faculty still represents a significant part of all teacher exchanges in the University.
The Faculty appears to recognise, and, indeed, relish the challenges of its own development. Shortcomings were openly and honestly recognised, combined with a strong will to act and to seek further improvements. This is confirmed by the number of teachers taking part in pedagogical training and by a positive and encouraging atmosphere for development actions. The Faculty obviously promotes the importance of teaching by creating good practice and by the criteria for evaluating applicants for teaching posts. As a starting point, they use the University's Teaching Evaluation Matrix that was prepared in cooperation with this Faculty. This matrix has also been promoted to some other Faculties as well. Development discussions (by the Heads) with teachers about work plans are conducted systematically in many, but not all, Departments.

Conclusions

Strengths
The Faculty will probably be restructured as part of the University's general reforms. This is most likely to mean a new departmental structure and new procedures for appointing the Heads of Department.

- The Faculty is, according to views expressed during the Panel's visit, well prepared and committed to change. The Faculty leadership shows a strong strategic awareness and has formulated strategies regarding key development areas, such as research-based teaching and internationalisation as well as pedagogical support for teachers and further pedagogical training.

- The Faculty offers an encouraging atmosphere for interdisciplinary activities and development both for staff and students. The attitudes throughout the Faculty towards student influence and feedback are very positive.

In addition to this Faculty's nationwide responsibility for various teacher education programmes and its coordinating role with five other Faculties, the Faculty has a key role to play in the entire University in terms of the pedagogical development of teaching staff. The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education is located in this Faculty and coordinates the network of Senior Lecturers in University Pedagogy in other Faculties in the University.

- The Faculty's clear strength is the knowledge and experience that it has through the staff on pedagogy, pedagogical research and assessment of teaching. This arrangement guarantees a good flow of know-how from this Faculty to others in developing teaching. This Centre is also instrumental in coordinating research related to new methods of teaching in the University.
Good practices

- The Faculty sees that it has a special mission in the University to contribute to the development of teaching across the University. This includes modelling of good teaching and experimentation with different teaching methods, and the development of tools that can be generally applicable. One example that could be mentioned is the development of two systematic matrices used when taking the teaching qualifications of teacher applicants into account.
- The Faculty has a working group planning a multidisciplinary MA programme in psychology and educational sciences. This is a clear step towards creating more profound cross-departmental cooperation in the planning of undergraduate studies.
- Committees and working groups are seen as tools for understanding different views within the whole Faculty, which is seen as very important in the leadership of education in the Faculty. Wide democratic participation of staff and students is very much appreciated in the discussions about development in the Faculty.

Recommendations

The Faculty has a twin challenge: how to bring more coherence and cooperation to a large Faculty with five very different Departments, and how to manage the forthcoming departmental restructuring that will surely raise dissenting views within the Departments and will not be easy to manage. Simultaneously, the Faculty is further developing its internal management and leadership, in tandem with its interface to the University’s central administration.

- We recommend that the Faculty undertake a review of its arrangements for overall strategy formation and implementation in order to clarify the vision of the Faculty based on a shared purpose and mission. This would require new forms of cooperation between Departments and among the staff in the Faculty, for instance, further work on curriculum development, networking with key stakeholders both within and without the University, and the use of comparative analysis, possibly with other Faculties and with cognate groups outside the University. This would also involve a review of responsibilities and monitoring linked to the implementation and follow-up of Faculty level decisions and strategies.

Internationalisation is an important strategic principle of the University as a whole as well as of each Faculty. Teachers in this Faculty are some of the most active in using available international exchange opportunities. However, for the reasons mentioned above, the number of outgoing degree students from this Faculty is low compared to the size of the student population.

- We recommend that the Faculty explore the possibility of alternative arrangements for students, especially in teacher education programmes,
to benefit from international exchanges, such as shorter visits to foreign universities and work-related placements abroad as part of the degree requirements.

- We further recommend that the Faculty consider ways to improve cooperation between incoming students and the Finnish students in order to increase mutual interaction among students.

Academic leadership is an area of research closely related to this Faculty. The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education is directly involved with the study and development of educational leadership. Therefore, this Faculty is a natural base for developing management and leadership in education in the University more generally. Such expertise should be utilised more fully within the University.

- We recommend that the Faculty encourage further collective efforts to conceptualise the term ‘management and leadership of education’ in collaboration with the University’s management team, and develop a further range of management and leadership development programmes to meet the growing needs of University academic and administrative staff.
7 Faculty of Biosciences
7.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Biosciences
A Introduction

The Faculty of Biosciences commenced operations on 1 January 2004. The Faculty comprises two departments, the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, located at Viikki Campus in Helsinki, and the Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences in the city of Lahti. The Faculty also conducts teaching and research at the Biological Stations of Kilpisjärvi and Lammi and at the Tvärminne Zoological Station. The Faculty Office provides administrative and other support services to support teaching and research.

The Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies has served as a coordinating body for the evaluation. The Committee’s broad-based representation includes both Departments (including all major subjects of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences), the Faculty Office and student organisations. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs chairs the Committee. The evaluation has been discussed in Committee meetings since November 2007. The head of academic affairs was appointed to be the Faculty’s evaluation contact person.

The Committee prepared instructions providing guidelines on the evaluation and information about its implementation. These were sent to the departmental steering groups on 11 December 2007. The steering groups were requested to respond regarding departmental-level implementation of the self-evaluation by 29 February 2008. It was recommended that the report be written in either Finnish or Swedish. The instructions also provided the date and other information on the joint Faculty-departmental self-evaluation phase two workshop. It was requested that the heads and deputy heads of the departments as well as departmental appointees participate in the workshop.

The Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences appointed a working group under the deputy head to prepare the self-evaluation. The appointed membership comprised the professor of molecular biology, the acting professor of cellular and molecular biology (instruction in Swedish), the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy and a student member. The self-evaluation report of the Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences was prepared by the head of the department, the professor of soil ecology and the university lecturer providing academic advice. At the Faculty level, the self-evaluation was performed by the dean, the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the head of academic affairs, the international affairs planning officer and an academic advisor.

The workshop was held on 6 March 2008. Invitations were sent to the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies members and to departmental appointees. A total of 20 teachers including the dean participated in the workshop.
as well as student and staff representatives. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs served as chair. The self-evaluation reports of the Faculty and of both departments were presented at the workshop, and material was produced for the Faculty’s joint self-evaluation report.

The joint self-evaluation report of the whole Faculty was drafted after the workshop in a meeting of the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies.

B Description of the management of education in the faculty and its departments

The Faculty level

The evaluation of education in the Faculty of Biosciences has been organised to promote attainment of the Faculty’s educational objectives and quality assurance development of teaching. Responsibility for decision-making, preparation, follow-up and development has been distributed suitably between the deans, the Faculty Office and various other bodies.

The dean comprises the dean and two vice-deans. Basic-degree, i.e. graduate, education is delegated to the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, while doctoral education with its close ties to research come under the responsibility of the vice-dean in charge of research affairs.

The duties of the Faculty Council, assigned by the Universities Act and the University’s Administrative Regulations, include making decisions on dissertations and licentiate theses and approving Master’s theses according to the standing regulations of the Faculty. The quality and common assessment principle for theses and dissertations is thereby ensured. The Admissions Board and the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies, serving under the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, are assigned duties and instated for an administrative term.

The Admissions Board is in charge of developing student admissions, following up on the impact of admissions principles and preparing these principles.
STRUCTURE OF THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION: BASIC DEGREE EDUCATION
Faculty of Biosciences

FACULTY

DEPARTMENTS

STRATEGIC STARTING POINTS

- Strategy policy formation and broad-based preparation
- Decisions affecting strategy and their documentation
- Faculty target programme
- Action plan for the development of teaching and studies

- Surveys, studies, feedback
- Teaching development seminar
- Dean and head of the department
- Q&A session

- Personell planning
- Teaching programme

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

- FACULTY COUNCIL
  Dean (chair)

- COMMITTEE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING AND STUDIES
  Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs (chair)

- PLANNING COMMITTEE
  Dean (chair)

- ADMISSIONS BOARD
  Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs (chair)

- DEPARTMENT OF BIOLOGICAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES
  Head (chair)
  Deputy head (teaching)

- MAJOR SUBJECT COMMITTEES
  Responsible professors (chairs)

- Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

- TEACHING MEETINGS
- DEVELOPMENT SEMINARS

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND SERVICES

- FACULTY OFFICE/Academic Affairs
  Head of academic affairs
  Planning officer for international affairs
  Academic advisor

- SENIOR LECTURE OF UNIVERSITY PEDAGOGY
- SPECIALIST IN WEB-BASED INSTRUCTION

NETWORKS

- COOPERATIVE NETWORKS
- NETWORKS OF DEANS AND OFFICIALS
- SUBJECT-SPECIFIC STUDENT ORGANISATIONS
- ACADEMIC ADMINISTRATION MEETINGS
- ACADEMIC ADVISORS
The Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies is responsible for the development and follow-up of basic-degree education; it also prepares decisions, orders and instructions related to basic-degree education for decision by the Faculty Council. The Committee submits an annual report on its activities to the dean.

The Planning Committee, a joint Faculty-level operations and planning body. On of its task is to work on the establishment of teaching posts. The Planning Committee also reviews the Faculty’s annual report on operations, which includes the reports of other bodies.

The Faculty Office is in charge of academic services at the Faculty level. The head of academic affairs, under the dean, is responsible for managing academic affairs at the basic-degree level. The Research and Postgraduate Studies Officer handles doctoral degree matters. The international affairs planning post is shared with the Faculty of Pharmacy.

The Faculty includes three permanent support services posts. The academic advisor advises on basic-degree matters. The lecturer specialised in university pedagogy (post located in the Faculty as of 1 August 2008) supports teachers in pedagogical matters and conducts research in university pedagogy. The designer for web-based education (a shared post with the Faculty of Pharmacy) assists teachers with web-based pedagogical tools, best practices and copyright issues. In addition, a fixed-term planning officers are employed to produce analysed data for various kinds of clarification reporting for strategic decision-making.

Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences

The Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences comprises nine major subjects, which are divided into five degree programmes. The Department is also in charge of two separate Master’s degree programmes. Head of department, deputy head and the steering group are responsible for the management of education at the Department. Each major includes its own committee, a responsible professor and one or more academic advisors.

The head of the department is responsible for personnel planning and other strategic planning.

The deputy head of the department is in charge of educational planning and management. This is a recent division of work duties as the deputy head in charge of academic affairs was appointed to bolster academic management as recently as autumn 2007.
The departmental steering group is responsible for overall planning, supervising curriculum planning by the definitions of posts, and reviewing degree requirements and presenting them to the Faculty Council. The steering group decides the teaching programme. The department monitors educational progress by means of, e.g., the number of graduates, the teaching provided and the productivity of each major subject.

The major subject committees carry out departmental duties assigned to them under the responsible professor, propose initiatives regarding needs in their own academic fields and are responsible for the practical management of their activities. The major subjects are responsible for the planning and implementation of teaching and for the assessment of learning as well as for preparing degree requirements and the teaching programme for the steering group. All professors are major subject committee members. Responsible professors see to the distribution of work within their majors.

Open cooperation between major subjects is realised in the voluntary planning and coordination of joint teaching, as well as in other activities.

Joint teaching activities are coordinated in joint meetings of academic advisors.

The representatives of the major subjects are members of Faculty bodies. The Faculty target programme and guidelines for the development of teaching also steer the department’s management of education.

### Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

The Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences offers one degree programme containing one major subject. The planning of teaching is guided by the pedagogical objectives set forth for degrees, and every teacher participates in the planning work. The education offered is guided by the principle of congruence, which also facilitates teaching development.

The quality assurance organisation for teaching contains multiple levels and comprises the departmental steering group, weekly meetings of the whole staff led by the professors, teachers’ meetings (monthly meetings of teaching staff), development seminars (a once-per-term meeting of teachers) and a feedback day (a once-per-year meeting of teachers and students).

Quality assurance organs of the Faculty (the Faculty Council and the bodies) and stakeholders (Lahti Science and Business Park; Lahti University Consortium) are also part of the organisation, in line with the strategy goals and policies.
C Summary and analysis of the responses concerning the management of education, and the related strengths and development challenges

The Faculty level

- What ways of operating support the implementation and development of quality teaching?
- What kind of management is required to implement and develop quality teaching?

Strategic planning and consistent methods of operation

Defining objectives clearly and planning operations appropriately is of primary importance if quality teaching is to be achieved and developed. The Faculty Council determines the strategic policies and objectives in the target programme, which is approved for a three-year period. Preparations are based on reports by the Admissions Board and the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies on the functioning of student recruitment and basic-degree education, information in graduate databases, values discussions held in administrative bodies and during the Faculty's open teaching-development days, separately commissioned studies, and the work of the Faculty Office. Other reports are also used, such as reports on employment in the fields represented by the Faculty. Specific objectives, responsibilities, follow-up and reporting are determined in the target programme.

In order to achieve the objectives and ensure the high quality of operations, it is essential that uniform operating methods be observed in the Faculty. Uniform operating methods are reinforced by Faculty rules and guidelines, which are updated at three-year intervals. These include the Faculty's standing regulations as well as general instructions concerning Master's and Bachelor's theses. The standing regulations determine the range of education offered by the Faculty and policies on degree studies and structures. General instructions on theses define the amount of work required for theses and give directions to thesis writers and to their supervisors. Uniform guidelines are important since many Master's theses are completed in organisations external to the Faculty. The Faculty Council has passed a decision descriptions of grading principles, and it has approved a grading form
to help ensure consistency throughout the Faculty in assessing Master’s theses. The grade distribution for theses is being followed to ensure fairness.

Quality assurance of basic degrees

The Faculty emphasises high-quality student recruitment and fit-for-purpose student admissions to provide the Faculty with gifted and motivated students. The Admissions Board, which represents both departments (including all major subjects in the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences), prepares admissions criteria, presents the dean with approval recommendations on basic-degree students and grants study rights for minor and non-degree studies. Admissions are to a great extent carried out cooperatively with other universities, which guarantees a broad range of applicants. Student recruitment has been strategically developed based on several surveys and impact monitoring of the changes made. Master’s studies, for example, may be applied for biannually through a separate admissions process, but applying for Bachelor’s studies occurs through general student admissions. A strategic decision was made to concentrate international student admissions and English-language instruction in the Master’s degree stage. The Faculty’s English-language Master’s degree programmes have a separate admissions processes that recruits gifted students both from Finland and abroad.

The degree requirements are an important tool for the practical organisation of training. The Faculty Council confirms the degree requirements for a three-year period in order to better promote long-term educational planning, to evaluate the requirements’ long-term viability and to assess the possible need for structural reform. The Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies provides guidelines to the departments on formulating the degree requirements. Regarding the requirements, the departments are also asked to produce their degree programme objectives specific to the degree (B.Sc. or M.Sc.) and to describe the field of the major subject and its objects of research. Departments are also asked to describe the goals, contents and evaluation of all modules and courses.

The goals, responsibilities and work distribution of basic-degree education at the Faculty are included in the plan for the development of education, which is approved for the same period of time as the degree requirements. The Faculty’s target programme is prepared under the direction of the dean, while the educational development plan is the responsibility of a vice-dean.

The Faculty has delegated decision-making on implementing the teaching programme to the respective departments. The Faculty encourages and guides students to take advantage of the opportunities offered by international student exchange programmes and the flexible study right scheme (JOO).

The Faculty emphasises quality assurance in theses and has therefore developed a guide for writing the Bachelor’s and Master’s theses. Evaluation of the Bachelor’s
thesis is delegated to the teachers’ level. The Faculty Council decides on the evaluation and approval of Master’s theses at a proposal, based on at least two expert statements, by the professor of the major subject. The high quality of theses is fostered by the Faculty’s own Master’s awards and by honourable mention awards from Master’s supervisors. Students are asked to name candidates for the latter.

**Ensuring the qualifications of teaching staff and supporting teaching**

The significance of a qualified and motivated teaching staff is critical for the implementation and management of quality teaching. The Faculty uses its prerogative to fill university lecturer posts as a means for the quality assurance of teaching. The Faculty has introduced an appointment process based on a systematic and broad-based evaluation in which teaching can be emphasised as needed in defining university lecturer posts. The posts are filled through an open recruitment process based on appointment plans approved by the dean. Student representation and frequently also the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy are included in working groups set up for the appointment.

The reliable assessment of the teaching qualifications of applicants for the positions of docent, who make up an important teaching resource, is ensured by delegating the task to the departments’ standing assessment boards. There are numerous large research groups operating in the Faculty, and their researchers also devote a considerable part of their energies to teaching.

The Faculty supports the scientific research activities of university lecturers through a system research leaves. In developing practical teaching work, the support for teachers is part of the work duties of the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy and the designer for web-based education. The Faculty for its part ensures that teaching equipment is up-to-date by the annual grants it allocates for acquisition of small instruments.

The Faculty’s three biological stations provide a significant amount of field work education. In many of the disciplines represented in the Faculty, field work skills are important, and the stations are seen as a significant resource for teaching. The stations develop their teaching in cooperation with the departments. The stations have a common board comprising representation from both departments and from the Faculty level.

From the viewpoint of staff commitment, teaching management and strategy planning and implementation, the Faculty’s annual teaching development day is important as it brings different work communities together in an open discussion and promotes staff commitment through common goals and decisions.
Cooperative networks

The Faculty works in cooperation with other Finnish natural science faculties through biannual meetings of deans and vice-deans, and through active participation in student admissions processes.

The dean, vice-dean, head of academic affairs, international affairs planning officer, academic advisor, lecturer specialised in university pedagogy and designer for web-based education participate in the University’s internal cooperative network.

Strengths

The newness of the Faculty of Biosciences has made it possible to devise good operating methods and aim for efficiency in administrative tasks at the different levels. Regulations and guidelines to ensure educational quality were produced at the outset of the Faculty.

The management of education is organised so as to include all responsible actors in developing teaching at all managerial levels. The heads of departments and all professors responsible for major subjects are on the Faculty’s Planning Committee, which is the strategic planning and cooperation organ of the Faculty.

The Faculty, the departments and all of the major subjects of disciplines in the Faculty are represented in the Admissions Board and the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies, which are the most important basic-degree planning bodies of the Faculty. Every professor in the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences belongs to his or her respective major subject committee, which plans the teaching of the subject. University lecturers are represented in all administrative bodies, with the strongest representation on the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies and on the Admissions Board. Student organisations have agreed among themselves as to their most suitable forms of representation in the various administrative bodies. Faculty Office officials serve in the Faculty-level administrative bodies as secretaries and as drafting officers who prepare matters for discussion. Matters for discussion can be initiated by any student or staff member.

The Faculty provides its own resources to support the development and continued motivation of university lecturers through the research leave system.

Essential data for long-range strategic decisions and management is systematically generated and analysed in the work of, and projects directed by, the Admissions Board and the Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies.

Open discussion between the entire Faculty and the students, an integral part of good management, is promoted in the Faculty’s annual teaching development day
and in the joint Q&A session with the dean and the head of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences.

**Areas in need of development**

*Development of management*

The role of the Planning Committee in planning the Faculty’s strategic decisions should be made more functional than it is at present. Due to the novelty of the Faculty, the Planning Committee’s position and duties have not yet become established, and a variety of operational forms have been tried out.

The Faculty’s interest in active participation in the development of the campus’ burgeoning cooperation must be taken greater note of by the Faculty’s management system. Campus cooperation has been carried out in the Biotechnology Degree Programme, various Master’s Degree Programmes (MBIOT and MNEURO) and plant biology. It is also being developed with virology, biochemistry, microbiology and biostatistics. The dean of the Faculty is chair of the Campus Cooperation Committee.

Uniform guidelines on teaching and study feedback practices are being prepared in the Faculty. When the guidelines are put into practice, the usage of the different forms of feedback must be checked as well as the analysis of feedback data and how it is utilised at different levels. One form that has already been implemented is the feedback by Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies to departmental steering groups on issues that arose during the teaching development day.

*Development through management*

The Master’s Degree Programmes are a new form of training presenting many opportunities, but about which there is little experience. There must therefore be a particular emphasis on the management of quality assurance of the Master’s Degree Programmes, on the development of programme structures (e.g., towards greater multidisciplinarity and applicability), on the utilisation of English and on the assurance of well-functioning contacts with independent institutes (the Institute of Biotechnology and the Neuroscience Center) and top research.

The Faculty is aware of the difficulties of Master’s graduates in finding suitable employment outside of the University job market, and the extent of this problem and its causes have been investigated in many ways. The Faculty has its own project underway to survey the professional competence of graduates, employers’ conceptions of the knowledge and skills of the Faculty’s graduates, and to forecast the current and future job market. The Faculty has twice taken steps to reduce the number of students admitted to pursue the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. Another measure was to incorporate a compulsory professional-image course into the Bachelor’s degree requirements. Management practices should ensure the continuous consideration of the challenges of working life in the development of degrees.
The Faculty is host to large research groups and a great deal of top international research. The management is facing the challenge of how to remain at the top of research and the educational arena internationally, and how to apply the teaching potential of the top research groups more effectively towards benefiting the diversity and quality of teaching.

Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences

- **How does the unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?**

Planning is directed by academic fields of the Department. The major subject committees review all of the content taught as part of major studies. These committees include professors and other teachers in addition to researchers and students. Teaching is also planned in teaching meetings and in smaller working groups.

Educational providers outside the Faculty, such as the independent institutes of the campus, are represented in the major subject committees of the Biotechnology Degree Programme and of the separate MBIOT Master’s Degree Programme as well as in the MNEURO Master’s Degree Programme steering group.

Teaching methods are decided by the teachers, and discussion of methods occurs in, for example, review discussions. In the major subject committees, the teaching programme is planned, teaching resource allocations are discussed, and teaching is developed. The need to develop teaching arises from the expansion of knowledge and skills occurring in the discipline, the demands of working life, student feedback and the teachers’ needs for further skills and expertise to keep abreast of new content in the discipline. The lecturer specialised in university pedagogy provides support in the major subjects, participates in development projects in major subjects as needed and works to promote research-oriented teaching.

- **How does the unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?**

The Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies provides guidelines for on formulating the degree requirements. The major subject committees prepare the content of the degree requirements. The different degree-requirement proposals of the various major subjects are coordinated in an academic advisors’ meeting. The major subject committees present the degree requirements to the steering group, which in turn presents them to the Faculty Council for approval.
How does the unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

A suitable distribution of workloads is decided on in meetings of the major subject committee and of major subject teachers. The responsible professor follows and directs the distribution of work based on, for example, the review discussions. Every major subject professor takes responsibility for the distribution of workloads within their specialty.

How does the unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff?

An overall evaluation is used when filling posts, and this involves consideration of candidates' academic and pedagogical qualifications. When filling university lecturer posts, an evaluation of teaching skills is made by the appointment committee with the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy as a committee member.

Teachers' research activities are supported by responding favourably to their having periods free of teaching duties when concentration can be focused on research. For professors, this generally means grants approved by the Academy of Finland for senior researchers or Academy professorships. For university lecturers, the Faculty has developed opportunities for Faculty-supported leaves of absence for research. Teachers are also encouraged to seek research leaves supported by other research funding mechanisms.

Pedagogical training for teachers and doctoral students is promoted by the training offered by the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy together with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and designed to respond to departmental needs. The designer for web-based education trains teachers in the use of online educational tools. Training is also offered in English.

The two departmental assessment committees for appointments to docentships evaluate teaching skills, prepare statements for the Faculty Council and provide applicants with feedback and suggestions for development.

Strengths

- The activities within the major subjects are organised under the responsible professors and self-directed through the motivation of those involved.
- The recruited personnel are of high quality, education and motivation.
- A well-functioning campus: teaching staff are intimately connected to the research institutes, and this is utilised in the planning and carrying out of education.
• A good climate for dialogue: difficult matters are discussed constructively.
• The department has good contacts with students. Students are motivated to participate in the administration of education, and they actively take part in discussions of educational matters at the departmental and major-subject levels.
• The newness of the Faculty facilitates the establishment of new fit-for-purpose practices.
• The development of offering teaching in English.

Areas in need of development

• The organisation for managing education is to be clarified: the distribution of Faculty and department work and the responsibilities and tools in education management should be specified.
• Developing educational strategic planning.
• Increasing the cooperation between major subjects in the planning of teaching.
• Following educational productivity (e.g., the employment of graduates, the efficiency of teaching, the distribution of teaching across the different disciplines, the number of graduates, the setting of objectives).
• Developing information flow (particularly Major - Faculty).
• A channel should be made to connect activities involving motivated, creative teaching and development.

Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

How does the unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

Operations at the Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences are collective, based on open discussion with all necessary parties to resolve matters related to teaching. The Department follows the quality assurance policies of the University and is responsible for educational quality in its own field. Quality refers here to the department's goal-oriented and fit-for-purpose operational planning and implementation. Quality also entails transparency and community, which from an educational management perspective refers to openness in the delegation of responsibilities and obligations and to extending the recognition of competencies to all levels of the organisation. The Department also recognises the outstanding achievements of researchers, teachers and students, although this kind of quality is not directly incorporated in the department's goal-oriented quality work. These matters are highlighted when making arrangements as to the content, methods and development of teaching.
Multi- and cross-disciplinary approaches to environmental questions are given particular emphasis in the department’s curriculum. Core content analysis has been used as a tool for the overall planning of teaching; every teacher reviews their own course content quantitatively and qualitatively. Teachers can thereby see the connections between knowledge and skills in the subject of their teaching and relate these to the students’ given time for studies, the degree requirements and the curriculum.

Curriculum planning, degree requirements evaluations and core content analysis are the primary methods used to assure the quality of basic degrees. Other important resources include the students’ personal study plans as a curriculum planning and management tool, online education as a support for the learning process, and active teaching cooperation with the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences and regional educational organisations.

Educational quality depends on having a smoothly functioning organisation, including good management and allocation of teaching and other duties, and on having the related pedagogical skills available. The department’s most important pedagogical proficiency areas include skills in curriculum planning, in teaching methods, in the assessment of learning and teaching, in the supervision of studies and theses, and in its feedback system.

Though the independent work of teaching staff is not negligible, the managerial responsibility for implementing teaching rests with the head of department. Most matters are arranged through teaching meetings held on a monthly basis (on the first Friday of the month), through development seminars held once per term, or when needed, in separate workshop-type events. Meeting discussions cover all current teaching-related matters, the implementation of the curriculum, course-specific feedback and matters relating to the grading of students.

Monthly meetings are organised by a professor appointed by the head of the department. The professor compiles the meetings’ topical agenda, and the office secretary for academic affairs takes the minutes. Items discussed in the 2007–2008 academic year included the updating of literature for book examinations, the principles of practical training, the department’s ground rules and participation in research projects related to Faculty teaching development. The Department’s representative on the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies handles communications between the Department and the Faculty.

Development seminars are forums for discussing broad educational development matters, such as degree requirements, educational content, curriculum planning and summaries of student feedback days. The seminar takes place in facilities outside the department and lasts 1 to 2 working days.

On feedback days, which are held once per term, teaching staff receive feedback on courses as well as suggestions for improving teaching and departmental operations.
The interactive event works very well as a channel for feedback. Student feedback has a central role in the development of teaching. The feedback is sorted and reviewed in the development seminar, and approved suggestions for change are followed up in teaching meetings and feedback days. An important part of the feedback day is the summary of the previous year’s feedback and the presentation to students of the measures that were taken on the basis of that feedback.

How are degree requirements prepared and decided within the unit?

Departmental teaching staff, students and the office secretary for academic affairs participate in the continual, coordinated process of preparing degree requirements. The academic advisor and office secretary are responsible for coordinating the process. The development of content is followed up in monthly meetings, development seminars and, when necessary, separately arranged events. The departmental steering group approves the degree requirements and presents them to the Faculty Council.

The teaching staff is motivated to do development and preparation work. Students also have an important role in drafting the degree requirements and revamping the curriculum. The department’s academic advisor compiles the development suggestions from feedback day as part of the course for devising the personal study plans. Every student in this course participates independently or in small groups in the work of planning the curriculum.

How does the unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

Teachers’ work duties are checked during their review discussions with the head of department. The teaching programme is arranged in departmental teaching meetings. Collective decision-making is the basis for fairly apportioning essential duties and for giving attention to resource needs. Workload assessment and the distribution of teaching duties are mainly based on the University’s quality assurance programme. Critical discussions at the staff level are conducted in monthly meetings, development seminars and review discussions. The apportionment of teaching duties is based on the job descriptions of the teachers. Outside teachers are hired on a temporary basis when needed, or doctoral students are used to carry out courses offered in the curriculum.

The Department has a clear personnel policy, according to which there will be an increase in departmental research and teaching activities and especially in societal interactions in Lahti. The increase will be reflected in staff numbers in the coming years. In terms of teaching, this means ensuring sufficient staff resources to cover
laboratory operations and possibly establishing a new post for integrated teaching of the various ecological and environmental science fields.

**How does the unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff?**

The high level of teachers’ professional skills is due to successful recruitment. Teaching staff may freely participate in in-house training courses that they feel are important. There has been relatively active participation in the pedagogical training and development projects offered by the Faculty, the University and networks of higher education to maintain and develop professional skills. All teaching staff are also active in research projects in their respective scientific fields. There is therefore a discipline-specific emphasis, but the development of teaching skills and methods is also valued.

Department teachers, including teachers who are expert consultants and who take part in scientific publications and conferences, have participated in basic studies in university pedagogy, in supervision in the devising of the personal study plan (the WSW/W5W2-project) and in the TieVie information and communications training, and have presented the Department’s activities in the national conference of the Finnish Virtual University. Teachers also participate in short-term ERASMUS teacher exchange programmes. With Faculty support, one-term leaves from course teaching have been arranged for teachers. The practical arrangements caused by the leaves of absence are worked out in meetings on teaching. Every year a research leave is granted to one university lecturer.

**Strengths**

- Robust supervisory activities and organisational leadership
- Pedagogical leadership
- Students’ personal study plans are used as a tool of curriculum planning and management
- A committed, motivated teaching staff with complementary areas of expertise
- Clear division of responsibilities and a readiness for change
- An openly communicative, well-functioning and critical working community
- An understanding of the importance of curriculum planning and its placement as a subject of special emphasis
- Teaching grounded in solid research
- A high quality of students and an emphasis on their role
- Utilisation of student feedback
- Smoothly functioning cooperation with stakeholders
Areas in need of development

- Developing cooperative teaching between the Faculty of Biosciences departments
- Developing teaching in English and ensuring its quality
- Taking advantage of the opportunities afforded by working with the Lahti-area stakeholders
- Preparing for structural changes in the field of higher education
- Developing activities proportionate to the Department's size
- Ensuring consistency of teaching throughout the different stages of studies, i.e., developing overall management through pedagogical leadership
- How to focus teaching resources between Bachelor’s and Master’s studies

Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and development challenges in the teaching activities of the faculty as a whole

Strengths

Faculty teachers are scientifically productive and competent. Interdisciplinarity is in general use and thereby brings the study subjects into closer proximity, as shown by campus-level collaborative teaching (e.g., the HEBIOT Biotechnology Degree Programme and the MBIOT and MNEURO Master’s Degree Programmes in English). The Faculty is sought after as a place of study. Applicants greatly outnumber student admissions.

The Faculty is home to much top-level research and many international research groups. Major subjects at the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences are divided according to research fields. To support development and teaching, all professors are members of major subject committees, which also include representatives of other staff and students. The Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences has modes of operating appropriate to a smaller department.
The establishment of the Faculty enabled new fit-for-purpose Faculty-level administrative structures.

**Weaknesses**

The field of the Faculty does not currently offer sufficient employment commensurate with training. Student admissions have been reduced since it has not been possible to quickly improve the professional competence of graduates.

Uniform management of teaching is complicated by the great number of possible lines of studies and the education being structurally divided into six degree programmes and numerous major subjects. The space for consensus on how to develop the structures has been limited.

A deficiency of resources complicates the development of the personnel structure. Teachers are few relative to the number of students when compared to leading international universities. The reform of the University Act may increase the amount of duties, which would further aggravate the deficiency of administrative resources.

Effective campus-level teaching collaboration has been instituted in only some of the Faculty’s teaching fields.

**Areas in need of development**

Improving the professional competencies of degree studies by various means, for example: recognising changes in working life, utilising stakeholder contacts, including comprehension of employment matters in the degree requirements and developing professionally-oriented groupings of minor subjects and model study paths.

Clarification of the fragmented structure of education as well as of the distribution of management and leadership duties. Promotion of a common consensus. An aim is to develop functional cross-structures in the vertical organisation.

Quality teaching despite the deficiency of resources by means of research into learning, learning-orientation and student-orientation combined with research-oriented content, follow up on the functionality of the new degree structure, the new educational feedback system, online education, maintaining staff motivation, researcher participation in planning and implementing teaching (developing teaching in English), and campus collaboration.

Student recruitment at the Master's stage and the development of student admissions.

Internal communications and orientation training for new staff.
7.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Biosciences is a new, small unit established in 2004 and located at the Viikki Biosciences campus. The management and leadership of education are well targeted to continuous development according to the strategic principles of the University. The Faculty also gives priority to pedagogical development, improving the student feedback procedures, and raising the status of teaching among the staff. The self-evaluation indicates that there is still room for strengthening leadership over management, especially for a more pro-active approach to changes and development. As a young organisation, the Faculty has many developmental operations in progress, for example, creating a better internal quality assurance system, looking for opportunities to increase joint teaching and professional knowledge sharing between the two departments, and designing a survey to identify graduates’ competencies and employers’ expectations regarding young graduates’ knowledge and skills. The Faculty quite correctly sees that current degree programmes and internal synergy between the departments and field stations can be improved.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty’s target programme for 2007-2009 is a comprehensive guiding framework for the management and leadership of education. Based on the views of the staff, the current line of management and strategic steering is working well and providing the Faculty and its departments with good opportunities to exercise academic autonomy in planning and also in teaching. Characteristics of this Faculty in general and its two departments in particular provide special opportunities for innovation and the development of education. Strong in research in contemporary science and as a popular academic destination for many young people, this Faculty has an internal atmosphere that is favourable to innovations, including in teaching and learning. The Panel observed that there is a common will to work further in transforming teaching and learning towards more student-centred modes, which is a specific development priority in the Faculty’s development plan.

Quality assurance and timely information about educational processes and results are essential elements of the management and leadership of education. The Faculty has invested a great deal of time and resources in developing monitoring, especially for the system that collects feedback from students regarding teaching and studying. According to students, it is not always clear to them how the
feedback they give is used to improve the curriculum or teaching. There was an opinion expressed by some students that feedback is often collected in courses taught by the “better” teachers, not all of them. The Panel thinks that there are good reasons and many opportunities to further develop the feedback system so that it would better serve the management and leadership of education in the Faculty and in the Departments.

The feedback system has posed challenges for some time. Initially, the use of paper forms took too much time and work for compiling the information. Now, there are miscellaneous approaches but no one common solution because the two departments are so different and located far away from each other. However, the Faculty is developing uniform guidelines for its feedback system in order to improve the use of student feedback in the management and leadership of education. The aim of the system is to collect data at every level from degree programs to the steering group, to the department, and also to the Faculty. According to the information provided to the Panel by the staff and students, feedback is routinely collected from students for large courses but less consistently for small courses. Counter feedback can occur in discussions with students enrolled in the course; however, it is not possible for feedback on a course to be posted publicly due to privacy considerations for the teacher. The Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences has two feedback days annually where all teachers are invited to discuss the collected information.

Students that the Panel met expressed their fears of not being able to find desirable jobs after their graduation. They mentioned examples among their friends who have previously encountered difficult problems with finding proper employment. The Faculty also indicated in the self-evaluation and confirmed during our discussions that it is sometimes difficult for young graduates to find employment with their combination of studied subjects and respective Master’s Degrees. This suggests that there may be some deficits in how the Faculty collaborates with labour markets and also in how students are guided at the beginning and during the course of their studies. Student guidance as part of the management of education can play an essential role in helping students to make wise decisions regarding their minor subjects and extra studies that would enhance their employment opportunities.

Internationalisation is stated in the strategic plan to be an integral part of the University’s activities and mobility to be an important aspect. This issue is not well elaborated in the Faculty’s self evaluation, but the Panel considered it to be a relevant aspect to this evaluation, considering the international nature of the field of science of this Faculty. Indeed, internationalisation is a prioritised area for development in this Faculty. At the time of the visit the Faculty had 50 students studying abroad, which is close to the set target of 59. Most international students in the Faculty are at the post-graduate level or in the special Master’s Degree Programmes; very few are in the under-graduate programmes that are taught primarily in Finnish. The Panel heard that one rationale for increasing the
number of incoming international students is to have motivated and hard-working students to set a good example. At the same time, some students explained that it is not always so easy to go abroad because of financial reasons or simply because they fear that it would prolong their graduation.

Several actions are planned to enhance internationalisation. The Faculty intends to give more courses taught in English beyond the current two international Master’s degree programmes. For the teachers, changing the tuition language to English doesn’t seem to be a problem. However, courses taught in English are considered to be an obstacle for some Finnish students. Furthermore, increasing the mobility of teachers is another challenge. A lack of resources and over-loaded work responsibilities were mentioned by some teachers as an issue in developing more English language courses and materials. It is important when striving for a higher level to also consider how the changes can be managed on a larger scale so that the infrastructure and necessary support are built in at the same pace. Areas for improvement are the proper integration of international students studying in the Faculty and better information available in English to all students. It could also be useful for the Faculty to explore the possibilities of participating in programmes involving support for teacher and staff mobility.

A common observation we made several times at the University of Helsinki is the perception that Finnish students spend too little time on their studies - both on campus and at home. This observation is well in line with the recent Eurostudent III study that compared the social conditions, including use of time, of students in Europe. The insight of the Panel was justified by students who stated that they typically spend about 20 to 30 hours per week on average on their studies in the university and at home (of course, depending on the stage of studies and on individuals). This is also in line with the most recent survey findings by the Student Union (HYY). It is not clear to the Panel, however, why students’ workloads are below those in some other Faculties or in many European universities. Furthermore, the Panel didn’t hear any complaints from the teachers about students being absent from the teaching. The fact that most students are working part-time during their studies will certainly not help in finding more time to study and learn.

The Faculty is aware that having a qualified and motivated teaching staff is critical for high-quality teaching. In this regard the Panel believes that the management and leadership at the Faculty level is committed to implementing the basic intention of the University of Helsinki with respect to the development of teaching, namely to increase the application of student-oriented forms of teaching. An important step in monitoring and improving the quality of teaching has been the appointment of a senior lecturer specialised in university pedagogy who is in charge of supporting teachers in pedagogical matters and of conducting research on university teaching in August 2008.
During the visit with the management and leadership at the Faculty level, the Panel heard that the implementation of a more learner-centred approach to teaching in this Faculty has had a good start. This was confirmed by the students: they reported that methods, such as small-group work, independent work and learning, and web-based learning, are applied in some of their courses. They are also satisfied with the guidance they receive in composing personal study plans. Students said that it would be good to have more opportunities for practical, hands-on-experiences relating to their studies (outside the university).

In the discussion with the management and leadership at the Department level, it became clear that participating in the training in university pedagogy is encouraged, especially for the younger generation of teachers and the students who are involved in teaching in the Faculty. The teachers reported that this training in university-level teaching is generally much appreciated, but that in their opinion not all the courses that have been offered to them are useful. As an additional way to enrich their repertory of teaching skills, they mentioned the exchange of experiences among teachers and especially the possibility to participate in teacher exchange programs.

The Faculty has used the student feedback discussed above to modify their instructional methods. For example, feedback led to changing a course from a predominantly lecture format to a mixed format of lecture and exercises. The senior lecturer of university pedagogy provides feedback to first year students on their reflections and personal study plans. This Faculty is also offering teacher education for subject teachers and has teaching staff specialised in didactics, which is an additional opportunity for the Faculty to further pedagogical development. Alumni feedback is provided during a “Professional Image” course where they meet with students to discuss their work and employment opportunities.

**Conclusions**

**Strengths**

- Collegial commitment to development and change. The Faculty and its departments show a strong commitment to develop both the management and leadership of education. The Faculty has an agreed mission, and leadership seems to be based on that mission and is well distributed throughout the Faculty and both its Departments. The majority of teaching staff have engaged in professional pedagogical development, and there seems to be positive energy to move forward in improving teaching and learning in the Faculty. This constructive and hopeful spirit is the key resource as the departments move ahead and cope with challenges of continuous structural and educational change.

- A realistic and accurate view of the current situation and main challenges ahead. The Faculty’s self-evaluation provides a realistic and balanced
analysis of the situation of management and leadership in education. Many of the identified areas for development are relevant and should be incorporated into the Faculty's strategy and future action plans. This is crucial because sustainable improvement is only possible if the evaluation of the current situation is realistic and transparent. The Faculty shows courage by displaying its strengths in tandem with its weaknesses.

- A shared emphasis on developing teaching. Faculty leadership is very consistent in its support to give teaching a stronger status and role among the staff. This is clearly affecting the staff, who feel encouraged and expected to actively enhance their teaching skills. It is paramount that the Faculty leaders are showing a good example in this, as they seem to be doing at the moment of the Panel's visit, and also show through action that teaching is an important aspect of this research-intensive academic community.

- A positive energy in the student community. Students are another positive resource of energy in this Faculty. They seem to be ready for further change and willing to work with their teachers in search of new ways to teach and learn. Students also have a very good understanding of their own roles, potential, and future expectations, which all create a sufficient starting point for even more intensive student-teacher interaction. The Panel thinks that there are some unused opportunities in this positive student energy in developing the management and leadership of education.

Good practices

- Leadership support for teachers' professional development. The Faculty's leadership is providing its unconditional support to teachers in their quest for further professional development. There are other good examples like this in the University, but the Panel was impressed by the enthusiasm that this Faculty showed in developing the management and leadership of education, especially regarding pedagogic enhancement. This attitude leads the way in a Faculty that is facing many challenges and thus needs all the support for staff and students that is available.

- Recognition of good teaching performances. There is a positive movement in the Faculty at the moment to bring ideas and practices of good teaching into wider awareness. The Faculty's potential is based on strong pedagogic personnel, especially in its teacher education and with regard to the senior lecturer of university pedagogy, which provide a good foundation for the sustainable development of teaching.

- Feedback days to discuss the development of teaching based on students' comments. There are serious efforts to make better use of
the information provided by students on teachers’ teaching. Particular Teaching Feedback Days serve these purposes and provide a good environment for collegial discussions on professional development.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the Faculty strengthen its internal cooperation for restructuring the Faculty’s degree programmes. A common view among practically everyone in the Faculty is that the current structure of the Faculty’s degree programmes is not good enough. Therefore, we recommend that the Faculty, through its management and leadership functions, launch an internal curriculum development project to redesign the current degree programmes. This would also be an opportunity to improve internal cooperation and also incorporate new pedagogical approaches into the new curriculum (for example, learning from the experiences of the Faculty of Medicine). Possible ways forward include creating broader degrees with fewer major subjects, exploring options for non-discipline based degrees, and using an external advisory group to support the curriculum development in the beginning.

- We recommend that the Faculty enhance counselling and information services for students. Students need better and timely information for their personal study planning, particularly for improved employability and to be able to benefit from opportunities to study in other universities (abroad). Although information services have improved recently, the Panel believes that there is room for further enhancement, and additionally in order to make preventive mental health services more visible for students and staff.

- We recommend that the Faculty diversify the professional development of teachers. The Faculty should in the near future take measures and make further efforts to increase the efforts toward student-oriented pedagogy. This could be done through the current university pedagogy training system, but other alternative forms of lateral learning and professional development for teachers could be considered, such as Pedagogic Cafes (Viklo at Viikki Campus), shorter workshops on active learning methods, and participation in international conferences or workshops.

- We recommend that the Faculty put further efforts into the recognition of good teaching. This could be done by reducing administrative tasks, designing intelligent rewards, and ensuring networking with good teaching practices in other faculties. An important contribution to improving the quality of teaching would be to establish a better balance between research and teaching. This would be possible by releasing time for teaching by reducing the routine administrative tasks that burden
teachers today. The Faculty has made good progress in raising the status of teaching as a professional merit, but the Panel believes that more could be done by Faculty leaders.

- We recommend that the Faculty adopt a systemic approach to change and sustainable leadership. The Faculty is quite correctly making progress in many essential areas, such as developing teaching and study practices, curriculum planning, and evaluation and feedback systems. At the moment most of the efforts seem to be made separately as these issues become more generally identified. We would recommend that the Faculty’s educational leaders create their own theory-of-change in action that would be more systemic and build connections between different aspects of development.

**Other observations**

Thesis advising is one aspect of the student’s education that is not currently part of the formal feedback system. It would be beneficial to examine the possibilities for including feedback on thesis advising, including that performed by non-University advisors, and the planned uniform guidelines for feedback. Also, the Panel learned that teachers and professors do not routinely see their feedback from students. The uniform guidelines and feedback should address the consistent provision of this information to those teaching the courses. The Panel noted that it would be beneficial to explain to students at the start of a course what is being done differently based on feedback from previous students.

All academic staff are expected to participate both in teaching and in research, with the time required for administrative work increasing. However, workload norms for percentage distributions of effort across teaching, research, and administrative service are specific to each major and are negotiated accordingly. The contractual total of 1,600 hours per year is an unrealistic limit within which to accomplish a typical teacher and Faculty member’s work. Faculty commitment leads them to donate additional time for students, rather than limiting their work today, to maintain teaching excellence. Faculty can, however, apply for a sabbatical from teaching every 4 to 5 years. Such a sabbatical offers an opportunity to be released from teaching duties so as to concentrate on research productivity. An important contribution to improving the quality of teaching would also be to establish a better balance between research and teaching.
8 Faculty of Law
8.1 The self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Law
A Introduction

The Faculty of Law has established a permanent Quality Assurance Committee, which also includes student representatives. This Committee functions as the steering group of the evaluation of education in the Faculty.

The evaluation of education from 2007 to 2008 started in the Faculty of Law with a meeting of the Faculty leadership and the persons in charge of this evaluation. Also present at this meeting were the Faculty dean, the heads of the Faculty departments, the chairs of key committees, the Faculty head of academic affairs, who is also the Faculty contact person for the evaluation of education, the Faculty lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning, and the Faculty planning officer, who works in the Academic Affairs Office. The participants of the first meeting agreed on a timetable for the self-evaluation reports that the Faculty leadership and the departments were to write, and on the date of a workshop associated with the self-evaluation. In addition, the participants agreed on a schedule of subsequent meetings for the further processing of the self-evaluation report by the Faculty leadership. At the same time, the departments started to write their self-evaluation reports.

The Faculty self-evaluation report was written gradually. The process involved several meetings of the contact persons who discussed the progress of the report and added to the report structures. The Faculty’s operations manual was used as background material for the report. Each department wrote its self-evaluation report as appropriate for that department.

After the departmental and Faculty self-evaluation reports were completed, they were uploaded onto the wiki platform, so that the whole staff could comment freely on them. Then in early March 2008, an open Faculty day was arranged for the whole staff and student representatives.

The Faculty day started with a presentation of the departmental self-evaluation reports and the Faculty leadership’s report. All the reports were then discussed in a workshop so as to draw up a joint Faculty report. The following four themes, which had emerged in the self-evaluation reports, were chosen as the topics of the workshop: the leadership and commitment of students, cooperation and coordination between disciplines, curriculum design within each discipline and as part of teachers’ work, and the collection and effects of feedback. Each of these themes was examined from two perspectives: what has been achieved and what should be further developed. Participants could also mention other strengths and development areas associated with the management of education in the Faculty. The whole Faculty staff, including teachers, researchers and administrative staff, was represented. The participants worked productively and raised many important
issues during the day. These issues were considered as starting points for the joint Faculty report.

Because of the structure of law degrees, the Faculty of Law must handle many issues at the Faculty level which other faculties have decentralised to their departments. As a result, many issues relating to the management of education are closely connected to the operations of both the Faculty as a whole and individual departments. Issues relating to the management of education are thus addressed in the Faculty's evaluation report from the joint perspective of the Faculty and its departments.

Following the Faculty day, the evaluation report was further revised in two meetings of the Faculty's evaluation contact persons, after which the final Faculty report was uploaded onto the wiki platform.

B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty

The management of education supports the achievement of goals that have been set for the quality of teaching. Degree-oriented education and related operations are steered by the University's Strategic Plan, its Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, and the Faculty's target programme. Based on the latter two programmes, the Faculty writes an action plan for the development of teaching and studies for each three-year planning period.

The structure of law degrees differs from the degree structures of many other faculties. The structure and content of the Bachelor of Laws degree are primarily the same for all law students because most studies are compulsory for everyone. The Bachelor’s degree does not focus on any specific discipline and does not involve studies at a specific department; instead, all the Faculty disciplines are studied at the subject studies level. The Master of Laws degree provides students with more opportunities to choose studies according to their own interests. Because of the structure of law degrees, the Faculty of Law must handle many issues at the Faculty level which other faculties have decentralised to their departments.
The dean is in charge of the education that the Faculty offers. The further development of the Faculty curricula is coordinated by the departmental steering groups and the coordinators of various disciplines, who are appointed by the Faculty Council each year at the proposal of the head of department.

The Committee for the Development of Teaching plays a central role in the development of teaching in the Faculty. It plans and further develops both the structure of undergraduate degrees and the Faculty’s teaching from a long-term perspective. It also prepares the Faculty’s target programme and its action plan relating to academic affairs, assists the dean in the management of education, and carries out other tasks that the Faculty has assigned and that are associated with the development of teaching and undergraduate degree structures.

The Academic Affairs Committee prepares, on the basis of proposals by departmental steering groups, proposals for curricula and degree requirements, assists the Faculty in the monitoring and further development of teaching, and writes statements to the Faculty Council and the dean on applications concerning studies and students. The Academic Affairs Committee also prepares administrative matters associated with the Faculty’s study regulations.

The International Affairs Committee plans and prepares matters related to international academic affairs, and functions as the LL.M. programme’s management group. Each discipline submits its English-language curriculum to the International Affairs Committee for revision. The Committee also coordinates and monitors the Faculty’s international operations.

The Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills assesses the test lectures given by applicants for professorships and docentships. The Committee submits a statement to the Faculty Council on whether a test lecture can be approved. The Committee also further develops the assessment of teaching skills as part of the filling of teaching posts and submits, if necessary, motions on the procedure for assessing teaching skills.

The permanent Quality Assurance Committee monitors the implementation of the Faculty’s quality assurance scheme, assesses the functioning of quality assurance mechanisms and submits, if necessary, proposals to improve such mechanisms. In addition to monitoring quality assurance, the Committee monitors the quality of the Faculty’s research, education and societal interaction, paying particular attention to ensuring that the Faculty conducts research of an international standard and that teaching is of the highest quality, is based on research and takes into account the needs of individuals, science and society.

The Faculty Council further develops the Faculty’s teaching and research, submits proposals for the Faculty’s operational and financial plan and budget, and determines the criteria for distributing allocations. The Faculty Council discusses
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matters relating to the filling of professorships and to the approval of doctoral dissertations and Licentiate theses. The Faculty Council also submits a proposal on the number of the Faculty’s student intake and decides the admissions criteria and degree requirements.

The departments

The highest decision-making body at the departments is the steering group, which is responsible for the evaluation and further development of teaching at the departments and within disciplines. Each departmental steering group discusses degree requirements and teaching programmes at a special meeting, to which some departments also invite all the coordinators of individual disciplines or, if a coordinator is unavailable, a substitute named by that coordinator. The steering group writes a proposal on the degree requirements and teaching programmes and submits it to the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee. If necessary, the steering group meets with the coordinators of individual disciplines to discuss the degree requirements and teaching programmes based on feedback that the Academic Affairs Committee has provided. The steering group also monitors teaching assessment at the department in accordance with Faculty instructions and with more detailed instructions that it has issued to supplement the Faculty instructions.

Departments appoint a coordinator for each departmental discipline. Such coordinators are responsible for the general development of education in their scientific field and for the development and coordination of teaching in their discipline. The discipline coordinators are also responsible for calling a discipline-specific meeting (a meeting of all teachers in a discipline) to discuss the discipline’s degree requirements and teaching. If necessary, the teachers and researchers of a discipline discuss, at the invitation of the discipline coordinator, issues related to education, teaching and continuing education in the scientific field. Based on the outcomes of the discussion, the discipline coordinator writes a proposal on degree requirements and submits it to the departmental steering group.

The Department of Public Law has also established an academic development team. This active, permanent team is open to all departmental staff. Students and administrative staff also participate in the team’s operations, and each of the departmental disciplines is represented on the team. The team was created at the initiative of the head of the department, who also coordinates the team’s activities. The team is a practical means for the Department to ensure that everyone participates in the management of education.
C Questions concerning the management of education

- How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire Faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

- How do the units agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

- How do the units prepare and decide on degree requirements?

The key means of managing education in the Faculty of Law are centralised curriculum design and a student feedback scheme, which provides valuable information that supports the development of education.

A centralised process of curriculum design

To ensure the high quality of teaching in the Faculty of Law, the coordination of curriculum design has been centralised in the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Office. Below is a stage-by-stage description of this centralised process.

Stage 1: The start of the process
Curriculum design begins no later than late January or early February when the Academic Affairs Office sends instructions to teachers. Before these instructions are sent, they have been discussed by the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee. The instructions provide clear guidelines for the technical side of the curriculum design process. General instructions are also offered for, for example, the tailoring of the syllabus and for taking into account various associates’ (e.g., the Faculty library’s) views.

The following meeting of each departmental steering group is devoted to curriculum design. At this meeting, the Faculty lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning summarises previous feedback on teaching and gives suggestions for the following term’s curriculum based on that feedback. Student feedback on individual courses is made available to the course teacher, the departmental steering group, the teacher’s immediate superior and the lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning. If a given course receives negative feedback, the above lecturer offers support to the teacher for further developing the course.
The departmental steering group discusses the resources available for teaching. Student members submit proposals and provide feedback. Afterwards, the staff of each discipline meets to discuss the teachers’ plans and collect all the information concerning the discipline.

Stage 2: Curriculum design
Teachers write detailed texts on each course for the study guide. The coordinator of each discipline is ultimately responsible for ensuring that the discipline’s teaching period includes a sufficient number of compulsory courses at the subject studies level and that the teaching provided outside that teaching period complies with the instructions that have been issued. All teachers can choose appropriate teaching methods for their courses. The required literature for each discipline is also set in conjunction with curriculum design.

If no teacher is designing a given discipline’s curriculum (e.g., a post is yet to be filled) or some of the staff of a given discipline has not been appointed for the following academic year, the discipline coordinator must ensure that the curriculum is nevertheless designed.

The departmental steering group meets to approve the texts for the study guide and the literature set for each course. If any of the departmental course offerings overlap each other, the teachers offering those courses are asked to make the necessary changes. Student representatives are also present at this meeting to provide feedback and submit proposals. The secretary of the departmental steering group (or the discipline coordinator) submits the necessary documents to the secretary of the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee.

The Academic Affairs Office verifies that each discipline’s course information (including course times and places) has been received. Clear overlaps or teaching outside teaching periods and/or terms are brought to the attention of the discipline coordinators, who must address such issues. The Academic Affairs Office does not interfere with the contents of teaching.

The Faculty’s Academic Affairs Committee discusses the curriculum, provides feedback and requests, if necessary, additional information from the departmental steering group, which contacts the discipline coordinators when necessary.

The Academic Affairs Office then checks the curriculum and the set literature that the Academic Affairs Committee has discussed and possibly supplemented. At this stage, the Office verifies that the disciplines’ courses do not overlap each other unintentionally and that courses are offered in accordance with a recommended schedule and order.
Stage 3: Decision-making and implementation

The Faculty Council decides in late April or early May on the syllabus and the degree requirements. The proposal for the syllabus and the set literature submitted to the Faculty Council will be printed in the study guide exactly in the form that the Faculty Council approved of the proposal. At this stage, only corrections of printing or similar errors can be made. The Academic Affairs Office designs the layout for the study guide that the Faculty Council has approved, and submits the final layout for proofreading to the departments. The Academic Affairs Office then sends the final course catalogue texts to the printing press in early June. A first proof of the course catalogue arrives in the Academic Affairs Office for revision before Midsummer. After proofreading the first draft, the Academic Affairs Office uploads the catalogue to the Faculty website. The printed course catalogue is ready for distribution in late July. The Academic Affairs Office distributes copies to the staff, the students, the Faculty library and external associates.

The student feedback scheme

The success of teaching is measured by the quality of students’ learning and by learning results. The further development of teaching and examinations requires continuous assessment. The Faculty Council of the Faculty of Law decided on 9 June 2005 to start collecting centralised feedback from students. The Faculty and each teacher collect feedback from students on both courses and examinations. The Faculty lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning summarises the collected feedback and submits the summary to the departmental steering groups and student representatives. The collected student feedback is taken into account in curriculum design and the further development of teaching.

The Faculty of Law has highly motivated and active students. The Faculty’s student organisations participate in the collection of student feedback. The Finnish-language Pykälä and the Swedish-language Codex student organisations receive feedback through online feedback forms and Faculty forms. The organisations discuss online feedback in their meetings, and matters that require an immediate response are dealt with promptly. Other feedback is collected by the organisations’ committees into annual proposals for degree requirements. These proposals are discussed each year by the Faculty disciplines, Academic Affairs Committee and Committee for the Development of Teaching.

With regard to teaching in languages other than Finnish or Swedish, students are represented by the student members of the Faculty’s International Affairs Committee. The feedback reports concerning teaching in languages other than Finnish or Swedish are also discussed by the International Affairs Committee.
The strengths of curriculum design and the management of education

1. The teaching that the Faculty of Law provides is based on high-quality research. The Faculty has a strong research profile, and its research supports top-level teaching.

2. The starting point of curriculum design at the departments and in the Faculty is the autonomous status of each discipline, which means that matters relating to the content, methods and development of teaching in individual fields are primarily the responsibility of the coordinators and teachers of each discipline. Departmental teachers are the best experts with regard to the contents of teaching in their field and to the development of such contents. Teaching is successfully coordinated within disciplines, which is one of the strengths attributable to the disciplines’ autonomous curriculum design.

3. In recent years, teaching methods have diversified, and teachers have become interested in trying different methods. Departments have experimented both with teaching methods that increase the active participation of students and with problem-oriented teaching, especially in small groups and, to a lesser extent, large groups.

4. The Faculty of Law at the University of Helsinki has been assigned national responsibility in Finland for training a sufficient number of Swedish-speaking lawyers. The Faculty has a separate unit in Vaasa, which provides a completely bilingual (Finnish and Swedish) Bachelor of Laws programme. The Vaasa unit functions successfully and is thus one of the Faculty’s strengths.

5. The Faculty has been successful in offering courses taught by external experts. Practical skills courses arranged together with attorneys’ offices have been popular with students, and many attorneys have been willing to teach for no fee. Cooperation with external experts is a clear strength for the Faculty. The Faculty’s disciplines also cooperate with each other in providing study units. Joint teaching posts and the mobility of Faculty teachers across disciplinary boundaries have also increased interdisciplinary cooperation.

6. The Faculty has made great efforts to improve its student feedback scheme. The Faculty already applies jointly agreed principles to the collection of student feedback and will later introduce an electronic feedback system. The Faculty’s current feedback scheme functions especially well in the case of English-language teaching. Thanks to the Faculty’s highly motivated and active students, the Faculty is able to make its feedback scheme a more integral part of the learning environment. The Faculty’s student
organisations annually submit a proposal for degree requirements on the basis of the feedback that they have received, and this proposal is taken into account in the following year’s curriculum design process.

Areas of development in curriculum design and the management of education

1. At the Faculty level, the coordination of teaching causes problems every year in terms of both content and practical matters. Each year, the Academic Affairs Office checks the information that the disciplines have provided about the following year’s teaching, but because of the disciplines’ autonomous status, the Faculty does not intervene in the case of overlaps of teaching content within a discipline or shortcomings in the constructive alignment of teaching. The strong autonomy of the disciplines also means that each discipline can choose how many courses to offer, which may lead to too few course offerings in some disciplines.

2. The quality of the information that the disciplines provide to the Academic Affairs Office about the following year’s teaching varies considerably with regard to, for example, the descriptions of the content of study units. As a result, the descriptions published in the study guide also vary. At a practical level, the system of discipline coordinators has its problems. The duties of each coordinator of a discipline should be defined at the Faculty level. The coordinators of disciplines should be designated before the study guide is printed. A clearer definition of the role of these coordinators, as well as the provision of information about them, are also areas that the Faculty needs to develop. The coordination of teaching should similarly be improved.

In future an electronic tool should be developed to support curriculum design. This tool should also entail a closely integrated facility booking system and an electronic study guide. The tool would provide daily, weekly and monthly information about the Faculty’s teaching to the staff and the students. It would also facilitate and rationalise the staff’s curriculum design, improve students’ study planning and progress, and increase the efficient use of teaching facilities.

To improve the coordination of teaching, the Faculty should designate a member of the teaching staff to take charge of curriculum design and the management of education, as well as to ensure the coordination of teaching in the Faculty.

3. The Faculty needs to improve the constructive alignment of its teaching and the clear presentation of learning objectives. To ensure the constructive
alignment of teaching, the Faculty should define learning objectives for each study unit, the preliminary knowledge needed for a study unit and the workload required to complete a study unit. Learning objectives and assessment criteria must be clearly and plainly presented and made available to all students. In practice, this information should be cited in conjunction with the description of each study unit in the study guide.

4. An ever wider range of teaching methods should be introduced in curriculum design to complement traditional lecture-based teaching. The large number of students in relation to the small number of teaching staff in the Faculty hinders such an expansion of teaching methods, but the Faculty believes that it can develop teaching methods even with the current number of teaching staff if the teaching resources of the whole staff can be used more equitably. One future challenge for the Faculty is to diversify its teaching methods, even though student numbers may continue to grow.

5. At present, the Faculty of Law in Helsinki cannot fully implement the requirement of bilingual (Finnish- and Swedish-language) teaching imposed on it. The Faculty does not offer a separate study programme for Swedish-speaking students, nor has the Faculty appointed a person in charge of Swedish-language teaching. The Faculty’s Helsinki unit offers basic studies and native language studies in Finnish and Swedish, but the provision of Swedish-language subject studies varies according to discipline. The planning and implementation of genuinely bilingual teaching also in Helsinki is one challenge for the Faculty.

With regard to teaching at the subject studies level, the objective is to plan part of the course offerings so that teaching is provided in a given topic only in Finnish or Swedish, meaning that no parallel teaching in both languages is given. This objective has been achieved in the Vaasa unit of the Faculty of Law and in some disciplines in the Helsinki unit. Experiences of bilingual teaching have been positive, and students have participated actively in such teaching. A future objective is to create appropriate incentives for Finnish-speaking students to participate in Swedish-language teaching, for example, by integrating teaching in Swedish with teaching in a given legal branch.

The provision of Finnish- and Swedish-language teaching also involves challenges relating to human resources. For example, the current circumstances of the Faculty’s Swedish-speaking assistants and lecturer are problematic. Compared to the workload of the Faculty’s Finnish-speaking assistants, the workload of the Swedish-speaking assistants and lecturer is heavier because of translation assignments which take time from their other duties.
6. One challenge for the further development of the Faculty’s student feedback scheme is how to focus appropriately on both content-related issues and teaching methods. Other major challenges are to ensure that the feedback scheme becomes an integral part of studies and to commit students to this “feedback culture”. The creation of a coherent feedback scheme is also a challenge for the whole University.

7. The Bologna process led to a broad degree reform in the Faculty of Law. The effects of this reform on student progress and graduation are regularly monitored with a survey on students' learning and the Faculty’s learning environment. Important information about the success of the new degree structure can also be obtained from the University’s Etappi (“checkpoint”) system.

At present, however, information about the practical functioning of the new degree structure is insufficient. In the current degree structure, each discipline’s teaching is provided during a separate teaching period. This period ends with an examination given before the following teaching period begins. The provision of all teaching during a short period is challenging for the disciplines. Because of the difficulties involved in arranging lecture examinations associated with lecture-based courses in good time before the final examination, the results of many lecture examinations have not been published before the main examination in the discipline. This is necessary for study purposes, however, since lecture examinations provide compensatory credits for the final examination.

In conjunction with the degree reform, the Faculty planned a recommended study schedule for the Bachelor of Laws programme. Further information is still required about how well students are able to follow this schedule and the order of completing studies. The Faculty needs information about the actual points at which some students fail to follow the schedule so as to resolve any problems. It has already become apparent that the lack of set books available in the library hinders studying for examinations when an entire class follows the same schedule.

How do the units ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

Many persons at the departments are responsible for an appropriate distribution of teaching duties. Within each discipline, the staff and especially the coordinator of that discipline are responsible for the distribution of teaching duties. The head of each department also plays a central role in the distribution of tasks associated with teaching. A key tool for the appropriate distribution of teaching duties is the annual discussion concerning teachers’ work plans. Such plans describe how
working hours are distributed among various duties. The work plans function as planning tools for teachers and also as management instruments for academic leaders.

Some departments have tried to ensure an appropriate distribution of teaching duties through careful curriculum design: process descriptions and a well-structured curriculum design help to highlight everyone’s work, which in turn makes it easier to discuss duties and their distribution.

Other departments focus on the appropriate distribution of workloads in undergraduate and postgraduate teaching. Likewise, they pay careful attention to how resources are distributed between, on the one hand, teaching included in the degree requirements of each discipline and, on the other hand, undergraduate teaching that the discipline offers or organises for the entire Faculty.

Duties associated with teaching also include various administrative duties. Departments have been especially concerned with distributing such duties equitably. The Department of Public Law, for example, has promoted this goal by incorporating the election of committee members and participants in development work into the steering group agendas and by ensuring that the entire staff is in some way involved with various administrative duties.

Young scholars and employees are also encouraged to teach. According to the Faculty’s degree requirements, postgraduate studies can and, in part, must include teaching experience and training. Obligating researchers to teach has also been suggested, since researchers’ knowledge could be used more widely in teaching.

**Areas of development in ensuring an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching**

1. One challenge for both the Faculty and its departments is how to distribute teaching duties equitably among the departmental and disciplinary teachers. The Faculty leadership does not currently have information about how much each teacher teaches, nor does it have the tools to obtain such information. It would be extremely important, however, to chart exactly how much each teacher actually teaches during one academic year, as planned courses can be cancelled because of low turnout.

It would also be vitally important to reinforce the status of the teachers’ personal work plans as tools for the management of education at both the Faculty level and the University level. At present, no standard practices exist for drawing up, discussing and publishing personal work plans, and the University does not have a standard format for such plans.
An easy-to-use electronic tool should be developed for the monitoring of teaching by both teachers and academic leaders.

2. The inequitable distribution of teaching duties may lead to heavy workloads for some teachers, which can, at worst, cause health problems. When the current assistantships are terminated, it will be a challenge to re-assign the work duties that the assistants now complete to other staff.

*How do the units promote their teachers’ professional skills and knowledge?*

**The recruitment of teaching staff**

The Faculty aims to recruit high-quality staff, ensure the expertise, competence and continuous development of its staff, and maintain well-being in the workplace. Recruitment is open and non-discriminatory. Appointment processes are professional, impartial and transparent. The staff is recruited to permanent posts when possible. Special appointment committees are used in the filling of professorships.

The Faculty aims to further raise the standards of its research, increase the amount of research and promote an international frame of reference in research. International application processes are used when appropriate. The Faculty aims to strengthen its structure of posts with external funding.

Applicants for professorships, university lectureships and docentships must submit a teaching portfolio to the Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills. The applicants must also give a test lecture that the Committee assesses and either approves or rejects. The Committee then submits a statement based on the test lecture and the teaching portfolio to the Faculty Council. In the case of professorships and university lectureships, the Committee ranks the applicants based on their test lectures so as to ensure high-quality teaching in the Faculty. If applicants have equal merits in other areas, the test lecture may play a major role in an appointment process.

**Pedagogical support for the teaching staff**

The Faculty’s new degree structure and the introduction of new teaching methods require pedagogical support for teachers. The cornerstone for the further development of teaching is that the teachers are interested in teaching and have the opportunity to develop professionally by participating in training in university-level teaching and learning.
The Faculty uses its pedagogical expertise to ensure that assessment is a continuous and integral part of curriculum design and the planning of degree requirements. The Faculty’s lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning informs teachers of available training opportunities and of the possible educational uses of ICT. If necessary, teachers are offered training in university-level teaching and learning tailored to the Faculty’s needs. The lecturer also provides teachers with individual guidance and consulting and, upon request, gives feedback on teaching.

The Faculty and its departments encourage their staff to improve its pedagogical knowledge and skills. The Faculty teachers are interested in training opportunities.

**The Faculty teachers’ research opportunities**

The Faculty of Law has made a name for itself especially in research. Several doctoral programmes are currently operating in the Faculty. The Faculty wishes to ensure that its teachers can also carry out research, since high-quality teaching is based on research. Likewise, researchers are encouraged to teach. Each teacher must include in their work plans the time that they intend to spend on research. The Faculty aims to guarantee that each of its teachers has one continuous research period per year.

**Strengths in the promotion of the teachers’ professional skills and knowledge**

1. Applicants’ teaching skills are taken into account in the filling of professorships and university lectureships. If the applicants have equal merits in other areas, teaching skills can play a major role in an appointment process.

2. The Faculty teachers may and are encouraged to improve their pedagogical knowledge and skills. The Faculty lecturer specialised in university-level teaching and learning provides the teaching staff with personal feedback and guidance if necessary. The Faculty teachers are increasingly interested in trying new teaching methods and improving their pedagogical competence.

3. The starting point of the Faculty’s teaching is high-quality research. The Faculty wants to ensure that its teaching staff has the opportunity to devote one continuous period to research each year. Likewise, researchers are encouraged to teach.
Areas in need of development in the promotion of the teachers’ professional skills and knowledge

1. Teaching skills could be given even greater weight in the Faculty’s recruitment. Practices that provide rewards for teaching skills should be promoted.

2. As the Faculty cannot order its teaching staff to participate in pedagogical training, the teachers’ pedagogical competence is improving only slowly. Such improvement is also related to the development of the Faculty’s teaching culture in the long term. In some cases, participation in training is hindered by lack of time: there is simply no time for training in busy work circumstances.

3. The Faculty’s teaching staff should be advised on how to use educational technologies.

4. The Faculty wants to guarantee that each of its teachers can devote one period to research each year. At present, this cannot be guaranteed.

5. The Faculty cannot fill all its teaching posts in the present financial circumstances. This means that the workload of the existing teaching staff is growing. Excessive workloads are a problem for the teaching staff and hinder the ability to work.

D Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and development needs in the management of education within the whole Faculty

The Faculty of Law at the University of Helsinki is Finland’s leading law faculty. The Faculty’s teaching is based on both high-quality research and the efforts of skilled and motivated staff. The Faculty has highly motivated and active students, a fact which attests to the Faculty’s appeal among applicants.
The strengths of the Faculty of Law at the University of Helsinki with regard to the management of education are as follows

1. Teaching is based on high-quality, internationally renowned research. The teachers are experts in their disciplines.

2. The students are active and motivated.

3. The members of staff are leading professionals in their fields and want to develop professionally.

4. The curriculum design process is coherent and complies with an annual schedule.

5. The Faculty has invested in the development of its student feedback scheme. The Faculty’s student organisations use feedback actively and submit an annual proposal for degree requirements on the basis of the feedback. This proposal is used in curriculum design.

6. The Faculty provides its teaching staff with pedagogical support and the opportunity to participate in pedagogical training.

7. The Faculty’s Vaasa unit offers an entirely bilingual (Finnish and Swedish) study programme.

8. The Department of Public Law has established an academic development team which actively develops departmental teaching.

The areas in need of development with regard to the management of education in the Faculty are as follows

1. The improvement of the coordination of curriculum design, the introduction of an electronic tool for curriculum design and the appointment of a coordinator of teaching.

2. The development and maintenance of the constructive alignment of teaching.

3. The diversification of teaching methods and the use of educational technologies in teaching.

4. The increase of bilingual (Finnish and Swedish) teaching in the Helsinki unit.
5. The integration of the student feedback scheme with all studies and the introduction of an electronic feedback system

6. The monitoring of the degree reform and the resolution of any problems

7. A more equitable distribution of teaching duties among all departmental and disciplinary teachers; the Faculty leadership need a tool for better monitoring the implementation of teaching.

8. A stronger focus on teaching skills in appointment processes and the further development of practices that provide rewards for teaching skills

9. The improvement of the teachers’ research opportunities and the resolution of problems caused by unfilled teaching vacancies
8.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Law in the University of Helsinki is widely regarded as one of the leading centres for teaching and research in law in Europe. The Faculty has a number of important advantages, such as being able to attract highly qualified students and being close to the heart of the Finnish Government and legal profession. The Faculty is large and embraces a wide range of different fields of legal study. We were impressed by the vigour and commitment of the staff we met, by the leadership of the Dean and by the quality of the students. At the same time, however, our overriding impression was of a Faculty that could be even better if it really grasped the challenges of modern higher education and acted to strengthen its competitive edge. We believe that most staff want to move in this direction, and we hope that our comments and recommendations will help in the achievement of these aspirations.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty of Law consists of three departments: Public Law (4 sections/disciplines); Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies (10 sections/disciplines); and Private Law (9 sections/disciplines). In 2007, the Faculty had 75 teaching staff (including 34 professors); it had 2,054 students (including 1,541 full time). It issued 23 Bachelor’s degrees, 263 Master’s degrees, 12 Licentiate degrees and 13 doctorates. The staff-student ratio was 1:27. The Faculty offers a 180 ECTS Bachelor’s programme and a 120 ECTS Master’s programme.

The administrative structure of the Faculty consists of a Faculty Council, Dean (and Vice Deans), a number of committees (such as International Affairs, Assessment of Teaching Skills, Development of Teaching, Academic Affairs and Permanent Quality Assurance). The three departments have their departmental meetings and their three Heads of Department, with the Dean and Vice-Deans, meet in a Steering Group. Each discipline has its own meetings and each has its own academic affairs coordinator. Apart from that, the Department of Public Law has an academic development team. However, its mandate was not clear from the Evaluation Report, which merely stated that this team is a practical means for the Department to ensure that everyone participates in the management of education.

The Quality Assurance Committee also functioned as the steering group for this evaluation of education in the Faculty. It functions in parallel to the Assessment of
Teaching Skills Committee, which is only concerned with testing new recruits as to their teaching capabilities. Furthermore, there is a Committee for the Development of Teaching, which also plays a central role in the development of teaching in the Faculty. Finally, there is the Academic Affairs Committee, which also is involved in teaching. We have found the relationships of these four committees difficult to grasp, and noticed a similar confusion among many of those we met, and wonder why their activities are not being merged.

The structure and content of the one Bachelor of Laws degree are similar for all students (apart from the possibility to take electives and study abroad). The Faculty also offers one Master’s programme, also containing electives.

The content of courses is developed in highly autonomous disciplines (some consisting of one teacher, some are a bit larger); the curriculum is set Faculty-wide. All teachers also perform research. Due to the autonomous organisation in departments and disciplines, there is a variation in teaching methods, without an overall model determining a coordinated set up of the programme and the teaching of skills. The Faculty has a very decentralised organisation for the evaluation of courses and for receiving feedback from students; this extends as far as having two student organisations partly take responsibility for it.

The interviews have taught us that there is a need felt to adapt the structure of the Faculty and to create powers to ensure effective responsibility and coordination in a variety of areas:

- A consolidated organisation for the development of relevant student skills and giving these a proper place in the curriculum;
- Course evaluations and their impact upon courses and modules;
- An update of teaching methods and educational techniques to ensure that students acquire all necessary competences and skills and actually study the hours that can be expected; the interviews have taught us that many students study very few hours (less than 20 a week), even leading staff members into saying that the reading materials and expectations have been decreased to reflect this situation. We were informed that many students often do not participate in classes and lectures, and thereby gain wider educational benefits and experience, but simply study for the examination by reading the materials (book(s)) at their own pace.
- An even distribution of teaching workload: we were told of an example of a discrepancy whereby one person taught seven times as much as another teacher.

In the interviews, many people expressed the wish for a (strong) coordination in the development of teaching, skills and didactical approach. Also, it was put forward that the Faculty ought to create amongst the students, who have been selected very strongly and have passed a highly competitive admission test, a strong culture of
ambition and a greater will to strive for the best academic results. The fact that the Faculty has such good and talented students should lead to an ambition not to accept that they opt for taking exams on the basis of books only, but that they should also follow classes and engage in academic class discussion. Expected study times for students is a critical question. This relates to a general University of Helsinki-related issue, but, at the same time, the Faculty is in a strong position here because of its capability to select the best and the brightest. We were also very surprised that students seemed to be working less as their course progressed, not more. This trend is certainly different from study trends in other European countries.

From the self-evaluation report, it seems that the Faculty also assesses new recruits on their teaching skills; this is highly commended. We suggest in this respect that this process be even further elaborated upon by using a set of criteria. What seemed to be lacking, however, is a subsequent system to have a strong human resource management (HRM) policy, with every member of staff interviewed annually on their research and teaching skills and performance, linking such discussions to staff development and training, career development and staff rewards. This might include the programmes offered by the University Senior Lecturers in Pedagogy. We were told that some of these issues were taken care of informally, but we suggest that such discussions be given more structural basis, linking them with a good evaluation system, a greater use of performance indicators and the development of more formal established criteria. We consider these elements to be relevant in our suggestion that the Faculty drafts an all-encompassing educational plan.

An area where the students expressed some dissatisfaction was the apparent lack of guidance on the possibilities available to participate in international exchanges. However, the Faculty certainly has a relatively high number of students participating in exchanges (in 2007: approximately 100 outgoing and incoming students). In some courses taught in English, there is a substantial number of foreign students. The Faculty teaches about 50 courses in English. However, the visibility of foreign students in the Faculty is low, and there does not seem to be very intensive contact between regular students and exchange students.

We were also informed about some concerns with regard to a transparent and clear system of tracking the implementation of decisions taken in the Faculty. Much seems to happen through informal discussions and talks, outside of more formal decision making and recommendations. This had some advantages, leading to widespread involvement and participation, which was generally considered as a great asset and had created an indispensable element of democracy within the Faculty, but it also led us to identify some difficulty with unclear decisions, limited or no follow-up of complaints or feedback, and uncertain lines of responsibility in implementing decisions.

In the Faculty, one of the common ways to resolve problematic aspects of (or a lack of?) decision making was the establishment of an informal regular meeting
of the Dean, Vice Deans and Heads of Department. It seems to us that this might be a good way to overcome the too autonomous nature of departments and to establish better, more coherent Faculty policymaking, whilst at the same time keeping the strong autonomy of the disciplines intact.

Hereafter, we wish to suggest that the Faculty adopt stronger powers for the Dean and for the Faculty as a whole. In general, we feel that many members of staff will welcome what was expressed as academic leadership; at the same time, others might object to this as being contrary to the Finnish way of seeking consensus or as a contravention of traditional academic freedoms. We submit, however, that a more precise demarcation of powers, with a proper procedure to involve the Heads of Department or other staff as appropriate, does not stand in the way of proper consultations, but enables the Dean to take responsibility and make decisions and steer the Faculty. The Faculty has a strong research focus, but needs strengthening in the educational area in order to maintain (regain?) its proper place as a leader within the study of law in European higher education.

A good feature of the Faculty is that the average student seems to study approximately 5.8 years (BA and MA) and that 90% will make it to the final degree. This is certainly due to the very selective intake. However, if it is true that the law students study on average less than 20 hours per week, it is at the same time a reason for concern, relating to content and, possibly, standards.

**Conclusions**

We believe that it is inevitable, given the ambitions expressed to us by the University and the wishes and desires mentioned to us during our interviews, that the Faculty of Law has to make choices and take some difficult decisions. We have heard complaints about the limited financial resources. It is, however, our impression that the Faculty is not manifestly underfunded when compared to other European Faculties of Law. It would obviously require a further detailed benchmarking and more precise insights into funding and expenses, but it seems to us that when the Faculty sets itself a strategic course, it will be able to do so within existing resources. In that respect, we wish to make the following observations:

1. The Faculty staff consists of roughly 24% administrative and support staff (including library staff) and 26% professors; the remaining 50% are researchers, teachers and lecturers. We also recognise that the number of researchers in the Faculty is growing rapidly (unlike other categories of staff). In a modern university it is important to keep staffing levels under regular review in order to ensure that changing needs are being satisfied. We suggest that the Faculty may need to rethink the present balance; a review of procedures and management could yield valuable savings that could be released elsewhere in the Faculty. In particular, we are inclined
to think that for running one Bachelor’s and one Master’s programme, the number of administrative support staff might be generous and that more clever use of software in planning, teaching and scheduling courses could be helpful.

2. The Faculty is involved in two Finnish Centres of Excellence (one on Global governance and one on European law). This participation does not become obvious from the composition of disciplines and departments. Specifically, we suggest that the Faculty has to make choices in the range of chairs it has and the disciplines it offers. Evidently, major subjects cannot be deleted, but it is in the specialisms where choices can and should be made when having limited resources. Briefly, we believe that the Faculty needs to offer a smaller range of sub-disciplines and to choose a number of focused areas, e.g. aligned with the focus of the Centres of Excellence. In other words, to do less, but to be strong and to have critical mass in key areas. Such a policy would also strengthen the potential links between teaching and research.

3. The above requires sharp and balanced decision making and priority setting. The question that the Faculty has to ask itself is how quickly it wants to respond to its needs as they have been expressed to us, or whether it will resort to the gradual evolution of things before it can proceed (e.g. to wait for people to retire or to leave the Faculty). Does the Faculty wish to take things into its own hands and to act proactively? We have sensed that a substantial number of staff want to do the latter. We suggest strongly, therefore, that the Faculty undertake such a priority-setting exercise with the appropriate introduction of the necessary procedures of decision making. We have therefore recommended that the Faculty set a strategy (highlighting key features such as: research led, internationalisation, quality of education and visibility in the European ‘market’ of legal education) with the accompanying relevant priorities and sharp decision-making structures, allowing the Faculty to move forward and fulfil the ambitions of many of the staff.

Strengths
- The research of the Faculty of Law is of high quality and feeds into scholarly work and textbooks being written by the staff, and is being utilised in teaching.
- The Faculty commonly uses materials in English.
- The Faculty has a relatively large proportion of exchange students (coming in and going out).
- A large proportion of the students graduate within six years.
Good practices

- The Dean is responsible for academic affairs and for the quality of teaching. This form of “up front” leadership seems to us to send a clear message as to the importance of teaching and the need for leadership in this area.
- We appreciate the need felt to establish some committees (as if they were task forces) to focus the Faculty's attention on the quality of teaching (Teaching Skills Committee, Development of Teaching, Quality Assurance Committee).
- We applaud the initiative at the departmental level to involve everybody in the management and quality assurance of education, especially the focus of the Public Law ‘academic development team’.
- We also appreciate the focus upon teaching qualities when hiring new people and in establishing mechanisms to assure quality in teaching and evaluate courses.

Recommendations

- We recommend, in line with our general university findings, that the Faculty develops a generally shared vision as to the Faculty’s development over the next 10 years. The drafting of such a vision, or forward looking strategy, is helpful in determining the short term targets and goals, but such an endeavour also generates a joint perspective and common feeling, positively aimed towards the future. It also helps in determining and defining the shorter term activities and targets as they must be geared towards the longer term vision.
- Such a vision should include perspectives as to the position of the Faculty in Finland and in Europe, as well as internationally; notions about research and education strengths and new programmes and research foci; and fundamental notions on teaching philosophies and the integration of skills and competences in all curricula. We suggest that the Faculty develop a perspective on programmes being taught in English (Bachelor’s and/or Master’s) in order to be present in the European market of legal education. We were happy to learn that the Faculty is developing plans for a Master’s taught in English. Also, we suggest that the Faculty build upon its strength as a Faculty that can BOTH select the best students and participate in good research. It seems contradictory that this good research seems to carry more weight than the importance and pride to teach and to distil the best education and training in students.
- We recommend that the Faculty review its constitutional structure with a view to merging committees that deal with the quality of teaching and evaluation of teaching (Academic Affairs, Assessment of Teaching Skills, Development of Teaching, Quality Assurance Committee) into one. Once the task force nature of the three special committees (Quality Assurance Committee, Development of Teaching, Teaching Skills Committee) is abolished, members of the three committees can be merged into one. This would help to avoid confusion and overlapping of responsibilities.
of Teaching, Teaching Skills Committee, Development of Teaching) has disappeared and their mandates and duties have been mainstreamed, it is better to coordinate these activities in the regular standing Academic Affairs Committee. That will also give an opportunity to establish new task forces and/or special committees whenever the need arises.

- We recommend that the Faculty look to establish clearer and more transparent decision-making procedures, also implying the involvement of the academic staff, as well as mechanisms to monitor implementation and procedures to implement necessary innovations in education and quality assurance, human resource management and the even distribution of teaching loads.

Other observations
In general, we have recognised and applaud the reputation of the Faculty of Law, with good research and involvement in two Finnish Centres of Excellence, and also as a Faculty with excellent students. However, we submit that the Faculty does not (fully) benefit from its strengths. We suggest that the Faculty create a strong internal academic leadership for the Dean and streamline its decision making and implementation. The Faculty needs consensus based around the strategic component and more majority or devolved decision making, after due consultation, in implementing the strategic plan, reaching specific decisions and making specific choices. We advise the Faculty to develop a future-oriented vision and strategy with priorities and an action plan as to how and when these priorities will have to be implemented and with a specific focus and an all-encompassing educational plan pertinent to issues such as curriculum, disciplines, links to research focus, skills, competences, didactics, study load and study hours, internationalisation and the exchange of students and staff.
9 Faculty of Medicine
9.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Medicine
A Introduction

“Management of education at the Faculty of Medicine” refers to the management practices through which the Faculty’s training and educational services are organised. This report examines the management of the Faculty’s undergraduate education leading to the basic degrees of Licentiate in Medicine and Licentiate in Dentistry. The medical and dental licentiates are extensive degree programmes that involve all six of the Faculty’s institutes and departments as well as the Research and Development Unit for Medical Education (TUKE).

The working group for the quality of teaching, chosen for the 2007-2009 strategy period under the dean of education and the Undergraduate Education Planning Committee, is in charge of the educational management evaluation process. The group includes teacher representatives from all Faculty institutes and departments as well as student representatives, the head of academic affairs and representatives of TUKE. The senior lecturer in university pedagogy serves as group chair.¹

The Faculty’s self-evaluation of educational management has drawn upon various teaching evaluation processes, written materials concerning these processes and feedback received on the evaluations. The key evaluations include the following: the 2001-2002 international evaluation on the quality of education and degrees, the teaching quality self-evaluations and performance evaluations (which since 2003 have used the University’s quality evaluation matrices), and the University of Helsinki quality assurance audit of 2007-2008 and the Faculty operations manual.

¹ Members of the working group for the quality of teaching include: Eeva Pyörälä (chair), Lecturer in University Pedagogy; Velina Vangelova, medical student; Inka Luotamo, dental student; Heikki Hervonen, University Lecturer; Hilpi Rautelin, Clinical Teacher; Petri Mattila, Clinical Teacher; Leila Niemi-Murola, Clinical Teacher; Antti Sajantila, Professor; Lena Sjöberg-Tuominen, Acting Clinical Teacher; Timo Kuusi, Head of TUKE; Kimmo Suomalainen, University Lecturer; Tom Pettersson, Swedish Study Programme Coordinator; and Jonna Cannelin, Acting Head of Academic Affairs.
compiled at the time. In addition to these completed materials, the present state of educational management was examined. In early 2008 an online survey among the teaching staff was conducted on this topic (73 of the Faculty’s 205 teachers responded). The six Faculty institutes and departments and TUKE provided self-evaluation reports using anonymous web-based responses to the survey. On 12 March 2008, an evaluation workshop on Faculty and institute/departmental teaching activities was organised (with 35 participants). The workshop went over matters relating to educational management as framed by the steering group. Based on this work, a SWOT analysis was produced. This self-evaluation report is based on the above-listed extensive material.

B A description of the management of education in the Faculty and its institutes and departments

The Faculty

Strategy decisions on the Faculty’s teaching activities are made by the Faculty Council, which is led by the Dean. The Faculty Council decides the teaching programme, degree requirements and the standing regulations on the degrees. It also makes proposals regarding the number of student admissions to the Faculty and decides on admissions selection criteria as well as on Faculty teaching post appointments.

The Faculty’s Dean of Education is responsible for the preparation and implementation of the Faculty’s teaching-related tasks and is also in charge of drafting the action plan for the development of teaching and studies.

Before reaching the Council, the Faculty’s strategic policies on teaching are prepared in committees, i.e., in preparatory bodies representing teachers, students, teaching administration and teaching support staff.

The preparatory bodies relating to basic education at the Faculty include the following:

- The Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education is responsible for the planning and development of education. It submits proposals and statements on curricula and on the development of degrees. The committee monitors the coordination and assessment of study units.
The Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education is responsible for the planning and development of education. It submits proposals and statements on curricula and on the development of degrees. The committee monitors the coordination and assessment of study units.

The Planning Committee for Undergraduate Dental Education is responsible for the continual planning and development of dental education. The committee plans dental studies, primarily focusing on the clinical stage.

The Admissions Committee is responsible for selecting new medical and dental students. The Committee cooperates with the national Entrance Examination Working Group of Medical and Veterinary Faculties, which is responsible for developing entrance examination.

The Working Group for the Swedish-language Programme plans, develops and coordinates Faculty’s instruction in Swedish together with the undergraduate education planning committees.

The Committee for International Education and Research plans and develops student and teacher exchanges as well as teaching in English and the promotion of internationalisation.

The Board of the MD, PhD Programme is responsible for programme admissions, confirms supervisor nominations and research funding plans, makes decisions based on steering committee recommendations, nominates tutors, organises training and monitors progress of the programme goals.

The Research and Development Unit for Medical Education (TUKE) serves for the entire Faculty under the dean of education. It engages in strategic planning and teaching development. Its members of staff include the Finnish study programme coordinator, the Swedish study programme coordinator, the dental studies coordinator, the coordinator for international education, the university lecturer in university pedagogy, the specialist in web-based education and the Faculty’s university lecturer for IT education. TUKE is responsible for the pedagogical training of Faculty teachers.

Institutes and departments

The Faculty of Medicine consists of six administrative units, i.e., the Institute of Biomedicine, Haartman Institute, Institute of Clinical Medicine, Institute of Dentistry, Department of Public Health and Department of Forensic Medicine. Steering groups of these institutes and departments are in charge of planning and
developing teaching. Educational goals and measures are presented in their own target and policy programmes that are renewed every three years.

The renewed and integrated undergraduate education in medicine stresses cooperation between the various subjects. The institutes and departments are central to educational planning, and their teachers participate in planning, developing and carrying out the integrated study units. A course coordinator is assigned to every study unit in the Faculty. An academic year/term coordinator is designated for each year or term. They are responsible for the coordination between the different study units.

The institutes, departments and their subdivisions organise meetings for the teaching staff to plan their upcoming study units and to distribute the teaching work. The meetings also include a review of student feedback, and development of future teaching, using feedback as basis. Tutorial nurses also participate in the administration of teaching activities. Together with the “course hosts”, they divide students into groups and, together with teachers and students, take care of practical arrangements for the courses.

**Student participation in educational planning and development**

Students actively take part at all levels of the Faculty's educational planning and development. Student organisations, medical and dental undergraduates' associations, the Swedish medical students' association (Thorax) and the Junior Doctors' Association (JDA) have representation on all of the educational planning committees. There are student members on the Faculty Council and in the institute/departmental steering groups. The board meetings of these organisations review current issues of the development of the Faculty's education. Student representatives are informed of the association board positions on matters under review.

Hosts are elected from each year of students (medical and dental courses have their own hosts). Together with the tutorial nurses and the responsible teachers, they participate in planning and developing practical arrangements for teaching.

An essential tool for the development of teaching is the course-specific feedback provided by students. There is a high course feedback response rate at 80%.

The medical students' organisation awards the Lecturer of the Year and Group Teacher of the Year. The dental undergraduates' organisation selects the Teacher of the Year.
C A summary of the responses to the management of education questions

All faculties and institutes/departments received a questionnaire from the University of Helsinki’s steering group for the international evaluation of the management of education. These questions were used as the basis for their self-evaluation. Some of the questions concern educational management at the institute/departmental level and some at the faculty level. The questions were the following:

**Management of education at the institutes and departments**
1. How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?
2. How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?
3. How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?
4. How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff?

**Management of education at the faculty level**
5. How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

The Faculty institutes/departments are not responsible for the basic, intermediate and advanced study modules. Instead, the basic degrees include contributions from every institution/department. The degree module is prepared in the committees appointed by the Faculty and they include representatives of all the institutes/departments. Degree modules are then brought to the Faculty Council for approval. A challenge is how to coordinate and improve the compatibility of the different study units offered by the institutes and departments. The institutes and departments plan, implement, evaluate and develop study units on the basis of feedback. At the Faculty level, teaching is managed so that it proceeds systematically, forming a degree where progressive knowledge and skills are developed, culminating in the practical work of a doctor or dentist.

The Faculty of Medicine evaluation group modified the questions to better suit the operational environment of the Faculty. In addition, some of the questions were honed to apply more specifically to the future development of educational management at the Faculty. The Faculty wished to have a sharper focus on for example research opportunities for teaching staff and on how well the Research and Development Unit serves the staff’s professional skill and competency development needs. It is important to gain information on how the coordination of study units...
The steering group’s questions were adapted for the operational environment of the Faculty as follows:

1. How are educational content, methods and development arranged within your unit?
2. How are degree requirements prepared and decided on in the Faculty? How can your unit contribute to the degree requirements?
3. How does the unit ensure that teaching duties will be appropriately distributed?
4. How is a high level of professional skills and competencies promoted within your unit?
   a. What opportunities do teaching staff have for conducting research?
   b. What kinds of opportunities do teaching staff have to participate in pedagogical and other professional qualifications training?
   c. What are the most important criteria in your unit for recruiting teaching staff?
5. How is the implementation and development of quality education supported in the Faculty? How is the implementation and development of the Faculty’s education managed?

In addition to the questions asked of all faculties, some questions specifically concerned the Faculty of Medicine’s management of education and its challenges:

6. How does your unit manage the coordination of different study units? How does the Faculty manage the coordination of study units so that the degrees (Lic. Med. and Lic. Dent.) are integrated in a coherent way?
7. How well are you kept informed of important changes in the Faculty’s teaching programme and degree requirements?
8. What areas need improvement in the management of education in your unit? What areas need improvement in the management of education in the Faculty of Medicine?

is being managed between institutes and departments as well as between the Faculty and the institutes/departments. The flow of information between the Faculty, the institutes/departments and the teaching personnel with respect to curriculum and degree requirements poses a central challenge, as the curricula are implemented as collaboration between the institutes and departments.

The web-based survey conducted in January 2008 of the entire Faculty received responses from 73 teachers and other teaching staff representatives of the six institutes/departments and TUKE. Every response was forwarded anonymously (e.g., without job titles) to the respective steering group. The institutes/departments prepared self-evaluation reports on their teaching activities based on these responses and on their other materials and discussions. The Faculty and institute/department workshop primarily covered the questions posed by the University steering group, the educational strengths and development challenges. The 35 participants included representatives of the institutes and departments, committees and the Faculty’s Academic Affairs Office. A SWOT analysis was carried out on the material generated in the workshop. The following section reports on the responses to the faculty questions, as adapted for the Faculty of Medicine, and the Faculty’s own questions.
The faculty questions adapted for the Faculty of Medicine

1. How are educational content, methods and development arranged within your unit?

The work of preparing, planning and developing studies is a long-term process. Every study unit has an assigned course coordinator. The course coordinators consult with professors, teachers and working groups on study contents and learning goals, practical implementations and pedagogical and content development. The course coordinator has a major responsibility for Faculty teaching as well as a real opportunity to impact its development. Integrated course coordinators have a particularly high responsibility since their work involves interdisciplinary and interdepartmental planning. Institute/departmental steering group reviews educational changes, and its decisions are forwarded to the planning committees for undergraduate medical and dental education. The respective committee reviews the plan of studies, sets up interdepartmental working groups for carrying out additional preparatory work if needed and submits proposals to the Faculty Council on the content and methods of teaching and on the options for completing studies. The Faculty Council makes the final decisions.

Teaching occurs primarily in small groups. Therefore, every teacher who participates in a study unit must be familiar with the study unit’s goals, methods, materials and assessment methods. The departments have well-functioning systems for conducting teaching meetings. Educational content, methods and assessment are discussed in teaching meetings that are attended by the entire teaching staff. Before a course begins, a preparatory and planning meeting is held to discuss the distribution of work between teachers. After a course ends, a meeting is held to go over student feedback and apply it towards changing and developing the course. Informing students of the changes that are made on the basis of their feedback constitutes a major challenge. These kinds of teaching support and development meetings, however, are not organised in all of the departments, where the management of education is instead left to the active initiative of individual teachers.

Some of the institutes and departments organise annual strategy days and planning seminars to conduct complete reviews of their educational content, methods and especially their teaching development. A teaching day aimed at all Faculty teaching staff is organised annually and includes discussions on current topics in education as well as presentations on good teaching practices and development trends. The Faculty also participates in annual nationwide teaching days, where all the faculties that provide medical and dental education contemplate together challenges and developments in education.

Developing teaching and discussing teaching development issues with the Faculty’s collaborative partners constitutes a major challenge. A considerable share of the Faculty’s clinical teaching takes place at Helsinki University Central
Hospital, the hospitals of the Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa, and the City of Helsinki health centres. The Swedish-language programme of studies is carried out in bilingual hospital units. Practical dental training is organised at the University Dental Clinic, a City of Helsinki dental care centre located in the Institute of Dentistry building. Working groups and follow-up groups exist for educational development and for follow-up with collaborative partners. In addition, TUKE organises informational and training events as needed for non-University teachers who participate in clinical training.

2. How are degree requirements prepared and decided on in the Faculty? How can your unit contribute to the degree requirements?

The goal of undergraduate medical and dental training is to prepare students for the professional practice of statutory basic health care. An additional goal is to foster in students the capacities to retrieve, critically assess and apply information. Professional medical and dental practice is regulated by acts and decrees, which set clear requirements for education and training.

The two basic degrees of the Faculty of Medicine are the Licentiate of Medicine (360 ECTS credits) and the Licentiate of Dentistry (300 ECTS credits). The basic degrees are built around a core curriculum. The content and goals of learning and the methods of assessment are defined for the study units. A course coordinator is assigned to each study unit, and there is a coordinator for each academic year. Degrees involve educational cooperation between the institutes and the various departments.

Degree requirements are reviewed in the Faculty in stages. At the institute and departmental level, degree requirements are reviewed by discussing the course catalogue texts. Changes to the course catalogue are made in two stages. Teachers plan and write change proposals to the course catalogue for the courses that they are in charge of. The proposals are discussed in the steering group and forwarded to the planning committee for undergraduate education and to the Faculty for approval. Changes are generally based on developments in the field or on students’ feedback and initiatives. This is a workable system for preparing and deciding on the degree requirements of the Faculty. However, the teaching staff desires greater transparency and wants to be better informed about the decisions and changes.

The work of planning the studies for the degrees as a whole is done in the planning committees for undergraduate medical and dental education, which include representation from the teachers from the six institutes and departments, Finnish and Swedish speaking students, dental students, TUKE and the academic administration. Students play a very active role in the curriculum work. When
needed, the committees set up working groups to prepare proposals and amendments concerning degree requirements. Students and teachers of the different institutes and departments are represented in the working groups. The planning committees for undergraduate education review all proposals to change the course catalogue. After this, the degree requirements are approved by the Faculty Council.

The medical and dental licentiate degrees are broad and relatively rigid compared to other basic degrees of the University. Extensive reforms are a challenge due to the rigid curriculum and tight schedules of the study years. By modifying the contents of the “Growing to be a Physician/Dentist” studies (11.5 ECTS credits), it has been possible to introduce some new elements into the degree.

3. How does the unit ensure that teaching duties will be appropriately distributed?

Officially, the distribution of teaching duties is handled by the head of the discipline and is planned in connection with the human resources plan. The duties are distributed on the basis of qualifications, competencies and the teachers’ areas of interest. In practice, the distribution is carried out in teaching meetings. All teaching staff in the given field participates in the meetings. Student feedback is analysed in the meetings, and changes for implementation are based on the feedback. Student feedback is also taken into account in allocating teaching duties.

A challenge that has arisen in the departments is the uneven distribution of teaching. The principle that “everyone teaches and everyone conducts research” is not realised in practice. Instead, the teaching load falls disproportionately on some teachers, allowing them little time for research. In addition, some teachers have stated that there is insufficient time for teaching development. Middle-level teachers are often in temporary teaching positions, which hinder them to maintain a long-term focus on teaching and research. More permanence in teaching posts is needed for the development of teaching at the department level. The Faculty is designing a survey of human resources in order to determine the teaching load of the institutes and departments and the number of teaching personnel. The goal is to find a basis for a more even distribution of the teaching burden between the institutes and the various departments.

Education in the Faculty of Medicine is also provided by outside teachers. For the clinical stage, teaching is provided by hospital and health centre clinicians. How to distribute the teaching workload between non-University clinicians and University teachers poses a challenge at the Faculty level. Another challenge is how to guarantee adequate teaching support for non-University clinicians.
4. How is a high level of professional skills and competencies promoted within your unit?

A high level of professional skills and competencies is promoted among teaching staff by organising orientation training on educational content, goals and teaching methods for beginning teachers. All of the problem-based learning (PBL) teachers are required to have pedagogical training in PBL methods. The teaching staff participates in TUKE’s pedagogical training. At the Faculty level, TUKE regularly organises a joint teaching day for all teaching personnel. Peer support and teaching meetings have been mentioned by teaching staff as important for promoting professional skills and pedagogical competencies. The staff also has noted that carefully reviewing student feedback is essential to promoting the teachers’ professional skills. Teachers have stated that having opportunities to participate in training events, seminars and international scientific conferences in their respective academic fields is important for the promotion of professional skills and competencies.

4a. What opportunities does teaching staff have for conducting research?

The opportunities for carrying out research are unevenly distributed among Faculty teachers, despite research work being a requirement of all teaching posts. A factor conducive to research possibilities of the Faculty teachers is the fact that research work is highly esteemed and encouraged in the institutes and departments. The University offers a stimulating research environment and in principle good facilities. If a teacher has funding for research from outside the University, his or her research prospects are good. However, without external sponsorship, research is not possible. The distribution of teaching is clearly uneven in the departments as those with the heaviest teaching burdens do not have time for research during the term. Research has to be done outside the term and in teachers’ free time. Acting teachers stated that their possibilities for conducting research were weak. The teachers felt that the increased amount of administrative tasks at the University has used up time, especially at the expense of research work.

4b. What kinds of opportunities does teaching staff have to participate in pedagogical and other professional qualifications training?

The Faculty has offered pedagogical training to its teachers since 1993. TUKE is responsible for the pedagogical training. The Faculty’s 10 ECTS credit course on the university pedagogy has been taken by over 200 Faculty teachers. Some of the teachers have continued their university pedagogy studies through the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. The Faculty’s central learning method is problem-based
learning (PBL), in support of which PBL courses and tutorial continuation classes are held regularly for teachers. In addition, short courses, theme days and teachers’ meetings support teachers’ pedagogic competencies and networking.

According to the teaching staff, the Faculty affords particularly good opportunities for participating in pedagogical training. The departments encourage their teachers to take part in pedagogical training, and there is really active participation by Faculty teachers. The Faculty’s own Research and Development Unit organises the pedagogical training. By having its own unit, the Faculty is able to provide an adequate amount and diverse range of training, and the training can be tailored to suit the different needs within the Faculty. The clinicians that participate in the Faculty’s clinical teaching may also participate in the pedagogical training. Pedagogical training is an official criterion in recruiting teachers.

4c. What are the most important criteria in your unit for recruiting teaching staff?

The most important recruitment criteria for teaching staff included quality of research activities and teaching experience. Scientific merits take priority over teaching skills, particularly in recruitments for posts. High-quality research is stressed more than teaching qualifications; thus successful research work is a key condition for receiving an appointment. Only secondarily are teaching qualifications and pedagogical training taken into account. On the other hand, teachers with markedly poor student feedback are not recruited as teachers. For PBL-based teaching, teachers are required to possess formal PBL tutorial training as well as expertise in their field.

Educators who provide the Faculty’s clinical-stage teaching must have in addition to a doctorate a medical or dental specialist degree. Having a medical or dental degree as well as clinical experience is seen as an advantage in appointments to teaching positions in pre-clinical stage studies. Recruiting qualified medical and dental teachers poses a real challenge for the Faculty, particularly the recruitment of clinical-stage middle-level teachers (clinical teachers and university lecturers). University career options are not currently very attractive to medical or dental specialists. The teaching staff has become multidisciplinary in recent years, especially as concerns the pre-clinical stage. The multidisciplinary background of the teaching staff represents both a challenge and an opportunity for the Faculty.
5. How is the implementation and development of quality education supported in the Faculty? How is the implementation and development of the Faculty’s education managed?

Supporting the implementation and development of quality education in the Faculty

The Faculty established its own unit to support training (TUKE, the Research and Development Unit for Medical Education) in 2002. From the web-based survey and the six institute/departmental reports on educational management, it became apparent that the activities of TUKE are the key to implementing and developing quality teaching at the Faculty. TUKE organises pedagogical training, orientation events, web-based education days, web-based teaching guidance and a teaching day as well as custom-made courses and meetings when needed. According to the respondents, TUKE’s variety of pedagogical training events for teachers supports the implementation and development of quality education. In addition, the Faculty has a very well-functioning student feedback system with a response rate of over 80%. TUKE is in charge of maintaining and developing the student feedback system. The implementation and development of quality teaching receive further support by the Faculty’s best practices for learning assessment (the examination system, the Progress test, the OSCE, log books and constructive feedback).

The development of quality teaching has been bolstered by the Faculty’s recent measures to make temporary teaching positions permanent. The Faculty has also given further backing to develop teaching by granting funding for various advanced and elective courses.

Management of the implementation and development of Faculty education

Education is managed by the dean of education and the Faculty Council assisted by the planning committees for undergraduate education. Special appreciation has gone to the students for their dedication to educational development work. Teaching development is also supported and followed by TUKE. The teaching staff, however, viewed Faculty educational management as somewhat distant. The reason they gave was the paucity of information from the planning committees for undergraduate education and the lack of discussions between the committees and the units that provide teaching. It was suggested in the workshop that communication could be improved by establishing an area in University ALMA intranet containing the minutes of committee meetings. It was also proposed that the interaction between the preparatory committees be improved and that dialogue be developed between the committees and the institutes/departments.
Appreciation was also voiced for the Faculty’s appointment of a dean of education to manage teaching activities. In the workshop it was suggested that the dean of education visit the institutes and departments regularly. This would increase the interaction between the Faculty’s educational management and the teaching staff of the institutes and departments.

Questions concerning the Faculty’s management of education and its challenges

6. How does your unit manage the coordination of different study units? How does the Faculty manage the coordination of study units so that the degrees (Lic. Med. and Lic. Dent.) are integrated in a coherent way?

How does your unit manage the coordination of the different study units?

Different practices have been developed in the institutes and departments to coordinate study units. In the Institute of Biomedicine and the Haartman Institute, the coordination is done systematically. In the smaller departments, such as the Departments of Public Health and Forensic Medicine, coordination is done in teaching meetings. In the Institute of Clinical Medicine, the coordination is done by coordinators, course coordinators and tutorial nurses. In the Institute of Dentistry, the study units are coordinated mainly by the institute’s academic affairs office according to guidelines provided by the planning committee for undergraduate education.

From the beginning, the study units of the Institute of Biomedicine have been planned to form a continually progressive set of preclinical studies in which the learning goals of the different subjects form a unified continuum. Course contents and learning materials are public and available to all teachers via the digital course library maintained by the National Library of Health Sciences. Changes to the education are based on student feedback. The Institute’s course coordinators work closely together to arrange the teaching work amongst themselves. The Institute also has a teaching development working group in which the study unit contents are refined.

Education in the Haartman Institute employs a holistic approach, although some of the teaching is dispersed between different study blocks. Coordination is carried out by the clinical teachers. The coordination occurs horizontally between the different fields in the Institute and vertically between the Institute and units of clinical studies. Discussions among teachers ensure that there are no overlaps or important gaps in teaching. Core content analysis to support the coordination has not yet been fully exploited, having been used by only a few teachers.
How does the Faculty manage the coordination of study units so that the degrees (Lic. Med. and Lic. Dent.) are integrated in a coherent way?

In the study reforms of the 1990s the Faculty carried out an integration of most of its study subjects and organised the undergraduate studies into comprehensive study units, each including specific learning goals, contents and methods of assessment. A survey of essential informational and professional competencies was undertaken in the 2000s with core content analysis, using a computer application designed for this purpose. Tapping the benefits of core content analysis for study-unit coordination and study field integration is a process still requiring much work.

Core content analysis is often mentioned in teachers’ responses as an important tool for improving the coordination and compatibility of study units, resulting in degrees that are meaningfully coherent totalities. Core content analysis and its computer application are not yet in full use as tools for “vertical integration”, which refers to the systematic deepening of learned knowledge and skills as the student progresses through studies.

The planning committee for undergraduate education is responsible for coordinating the study units. Study-unit coordination is discussed in the committee, but the current emphasis of different fields in the curricula may change little, due in part to the autonomy of the institutes and departments. The responsible individuals of departments, institutes and units should be in touch with each other in a more systematic way in order to eliminate overlapping topics and to identify significant gaps. In developing the degrees, open communication and work methods between the committees and the institutes/departments are important educational development targets of the Faculty.

To coordinate study units, TUKE has a coordinator for the Finnish and Swedish medical study programmes as well as a dental studies coordinator. It is hoped that the coordinators will be effective in bringing about the coordination of studies and in achieving greater vertical integration. The Faculty also needs a clear view as to medical and dental studies in the pre-clinical stage, i.e., how they are vertically integrated and scheduled in the two degrees.

Systematic and cohesive Lic. Med. and Lic. Dent. degrees are not the result of the Faculty working on its own on the development of education. The Faculty participates in both national and international teaching and degree development work. It takes part in nationwide training planning meetings that create common development policies for the training of Finnish doctors and dentists. Faculty teachers and students also take part in international medical and dental educational development congresses (such as AMEE and ADEE). To sum up, the work of degree and curriculum development is carried out on multiple levels: at the departmental and institute as well as other subdivision levels, at the Faculty level, and at the national and international levels.
7. How well are you kept informed of important changes in the Faculty’s teaching programme and degree requirements?

A central educational task facing the Faculty concerns communicating changes that occur in the teaching programme and degree requirements. Degrees are implemented with the participation of all teachers who, along with tutorial nurses, should have a good and up-to-date understanding of degree and teaching-programme changes.

The Faculty has an email list for the teaching staff. The list has proven to be an excellent channel for communications on teaching activities. However, the teachers stated that they received information on degree requirements only when new course catalogues were published. Faculty teaching staff feels they are insufficiently or only occasionally informed of the work of the Faculty Council and the educational preparatory committees. Communication and cooperation should be improved between the institutes/departments and the units, as well as between the committees. There is a desire for committee operations to become more transparent by, for example, making the meeting minutes available on the University’s ALMA intranet pages.

To improve information flow, it was suggested that general information meetings led by the dean of education be organised for all teachers. The needs assessed by the undergraduate education planning committees and the solutions to those needs could be brought forward in such meetings, providing also a chance to discuss the needs for changes to the teaching programme.

Internally, information flow in the institutes and departments is generally considered good. Essential changes to teaching within the various fields of study are communicated by the heads of the institutes, departments and subdivisions. The work of tutorial nurses in distributing information received praise. They kept the teaching staffs of the departments and subdivisions well informed of the practical changes to the teaching.

Regarding the communication of Faculty teaching activities, improvements in the general flow of information and the more active use of online communications channels were desired. The Faculty website was mentioned as a target for development (this work is in progress as renovations to the Faculty web pages were begun in autumn 2007). The Academic Affairs Office should make more of their services available online. Developing the use of the digital library of course material was also requested.
8. What areas need improvement in the management of education in your unit? What areas need improvement in the management of education in the Faculty of Medicine?

Targets for development regarding the management of education in the unit

The management of education faces challenges at the unit level. It was requested that there be unit-level meetings to provide an overall perspective on Faculty teaching activities as well as meetings for cooperation between the various departments. Follow-up should be done to see that the workload of teachers is evenly distributed so that all teachers would have the time and opportunity to conduct research. In filling teaching posts, more emphasis should be placed on the applicants’ abilities and desires to participate in teaching activities and development.

At the unit level, it was desired that there be a greater shouldering of the responsibility for undergraduate teaching by the head of the academic field of study. Professors put a particular emphasis on research and post-graduate training. The burden for the content and development of undergraduate teaching thereby falls on middle-level teachers (university lecturers/clinical teachers). Quick turnovers in teaching staff also lead to problems, resulting in the additional work of organising orientation training for the replacements.

In addition to developing one’s own unit, closer cooperation was desired between the subdivisions, departments, institutes, the planning committees for undergraduate education, TUKE and the Faculty. Through cooperation, course content could be better integrated and coordinated. Peer assessment of core content analysis between the study fields could improve the prospects for coordinating the contents of studies. It was requested that TUKE supported better the activities of the institutes and departments.

Targets for development regarding the management of education in the Faculty of Medicine

Important targets for the development of educational management were proposed, and these are continuations of development processes already underway in the Faculty. The most important of these includes making optimal use of core content analysis in determining the Lic. Med. and Lic. Dent. degrees and increasing vertical integration in the work of curriculum planning. It is proposed that a cross-disciplinary working group between the institutes and departments be set up for vertical integration based on core content analysis. The focuses of teaching should be re-assessed in terms of the rapid developments in the academic fields. Vertical integration and the core content that forms its basis are Faculty targets of continuous development. These targets should be openly discussed with Faculty teaching personnel.
It is requested that the Faculty be more active in developing the degree in dentistry. The responsibility for developing dental education includes the entire Faculty, not only the Institute of Dentistry. The definition of core competencies, based on the core content of the degrees, provides a firm basis for the coherent vertical integration of studies. This requires a closer cooperation especially between the pre-clinical studies and clinical studies of dentistry as well as a well-planned integration of the dental studies programme with biomedical studies.

There should be more open events for the entire teaching staff of the Faculty on such themes as educational visions, strategy, goals and methods. A new educational management practice that is planned is for the dean of education to make visits to the institutes and departments. Feedback from both students and Faculty alumni could be used to further develop teaching. Feedback from working life is in fact a central development target of the Faculty. It is hoped that TUKE will develop this kind of managerial tool for the Faculty’s use.

Faculty teaching occurs primarily in small groups. Student enrolment figures have increased since 2002, and dental student enrolment will increase again in 2008. Teaching group sizes have therefore also grown, which is a concern that students have addressed for years. The workload of teachers has also increased accordingly. Of special concern is the situation of clinical-stage teachers since group size may not be increased for courses involving patients.

It is hoped that a heightened regard for teaching can be developed through educational management. In practice, teaching and teaching development should have greater visibility in decisions on appointments of teaching posts. The institutes and departments should actively recruit academically qualified physician-teachers into their teaching staff and the Faculty should strive to improve the appeal of academic careers in order to ensure high educational quality for the future.

D A summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development in the management of education

The bodies that prepare, decide on and carry out teaching constitute the strength of the management of education in the Faculty. Course coordinators, academic year coordinators and tutorial nurses have a commitment to education. There is
a well-functioning system in place for conducting teaching meetings. The Faculty has its own teaching support unit (TUKE, the Research and Development Unit), which provides pedagogical support and training and participates in preparing and implementing teaching development work. Faculty students play an active multileveled role in educational development. Students also have an impact on education through the web-based student feedback system. Student feedback is discussed in teaching meetings, and amendments to teaching are made on the basis of the feedback.

It is considered positive from an educational management perspective that the basic degree is regulated by acts and decrees. A challenge is the rigidity of the degree structure and academic term coordination, which limits degree reform and the introduction of new elements to studies. Other major challenges include coordination of the different study units between the institutes and departments and development and implementation of systematically progressive degree. Core content analysis is hoped to facilitate the progress of vertical integration. Other targets for development include increasing communication on preparatory and decision-making processes and making them more transparent.

There have been demands from the departmental and subdivisional levels that the heads of the academic fields will take on a greater share of the responsibility for undergraduate teaching and that there will be a more even distribution of teaching work between teaching staff. Research work is more highly valued than teaching work when making appointments. Teaching duties are not distributed evenly within the departments, which hinders the research of those bearing the teaching work. An elevated regard for teaching is hoped to be achieved through educational management. Qualified clinical-stage teacher recruitment has become increasingly difficult, and making university careers more attractive is a central challenge of the Faculty.
## SWOT analysis of the management of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Teaching meetings, open atmosphere</td>
<td>✓ Rigid degree structure and strong traditions hindering educational reforms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Planning committees for undergraduate education</td>
<td>✓ Insufficient stress on teaching qualifications when recruiting teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The active role of students</td>
<td>✓ Weakness in the information flow regarding Faculty preparatory and decision-making processes and weak transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The acts and decrees regulating degrees</td>
<td>✓ Encouragement for teachers to do research, good facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The Faculty’s own extensive pedagogical training and support unit TUKE</td>
<td>✓ Developing education with collaborative partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Encouragement for teachers to do research, good facilities</td>
<td>✓ The core content database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunities</th>
<th>Threats</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✓ Course coordinator activities</td>
<td>✓ Insufficient resources directed to the development of teaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The teaching staff’s multidisciplinary backgrounds</td>
<td>✓ Decline in the appeal of university careers among clinicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Professors committed to undergraduate teaching</td>
<td>✓ The active initiative of the planning committees for undergraduate education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ The active role of the planning committees for undergraduate education</td>
<td>✓ An active role for the dean of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ An active role for the dean of education</td>
<td>✓ Developing education with collaborative partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓ Developing education with collaborative partners</td>
<td>✓ The core content database</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

A constructive assessment of the Faculty of Medicine identified numerous strengths. The Faculty Research and Development Unit for Medical Education, TUKE, as one interviewee stated, “is invaluable.” Many teachers have undergone training, and some have collaborated in research with TUKE personnel. Interviews identified a desire for management and leadership training - particularly on leading change, such as that represented by the upcoming planned major reform. Medical and dental students in the faculty of medicine have a well-functioning online feedback system with high participation rates. Students are represented on all committees and have active input into decisions regarding education. The Faculty has a well-defined internationalisation strategy. As with all academic entities, there are concerns about the adequacy of resources and the workload for faculty - particularly concerning adequate research time for teaching faculty. Additional challenges that were noted in the interviews include the students’ desire for more vertical integration of clinical experiences into the pre-clinical years, increased flexibility of the curriculum, and with the expansion of the number of dental students, more clinical training sites or opportunities are needed.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty of Medicine, consisting of six (6) independent institutes and departments, is responsible for undergraduate education for the basic degrees of Licentiate in Medicine and Licentiate in Dentistry. The steering groups of these six units develop teaching plans. Medicine and dentistry students study together for the first two years, and there is only a small distinction made between which program is student is taking. However, they diverge for their clinical training. Teaching in the basic degrees requires contributions from each institute and department; thus they are not alone responsible for the study modules. Acts and decrees set specific requirements for professional medical and dental practice education and training.

Notwithstanding the high level of satisfaction with their education in this Faculty, the students who were interviewed complained about the rigidity of the educational system and strongly requested vertical integration by involving clinical aspects in the preclinical training. Stability in the curriculum has two aspects: it both slows revisions by focusing on the whole educational experience and it provides stability for the quality assurance of learning content. As the next curriculum revision is
examined, the current course “Growing to be a Physician or a Dentist” has provided a place for some additions and may offer additional opportunities.

Three additional programmes complement instruction for the basic degrees: the Working Group for the Swedish Training Program, the Committee for International Education and Research, and the Board of the MD, PhD Programme. Full integration of clinical teaching, calibration and quality assurance are based on collaborations across numerous entities, including Helsinki University Central Hospital, the Hospital District of Helsinki and Uusimaa, the City of Helsinki Health Centre, bilingual (Swedish) hospital units, the University Dental Clinic of the Helsinki Health Centre, and the Special Dental Care Unit of the Helsinki Health Centre. Students reported that the expanded dental program is straining the capacity of the available training sites.

Within statutory requirements, departmental autonomy and EU guidelines, the academic content of the curriculum and instruction are managed under faculty governance. The Faculty Council, led by the dean, determines the teaching program, requirements and regulations for each of the basic professional degrees. The dean of education is responsible for implementing teaching action plans. The Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education makes curricula and degree development proposals. It also monitors, coordinates and assesses study units. A comparable committee exists for dentistry, the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Dental Education - though it emphasises clinical studies. The coordination of learning across time and disciplines occurs through integrated study units, each of which has a course coordinator. In turn, an academic year or term coordinator has responsibility for linkage between integrated study units. Course coordinators consult with faculty, teachers and working groups on core schools, content and logistics.

The Faculty has taken the basic guideline of the University, the focus on student-centred forms of teaching, very seriously. First, activating and interactive instructional methods, especially problem-based learning in the first two years and case-based (“bedside”) learning in the higher years, are widely practised. Small-group learning is the major teaching method. The students who were interviewed were very positive about this learner-centred approach in the Faculty.

Second, the Faculty Research and Development Unit for Medical Education (TUKE) promotes this approach by providing pedagogical training, orientation, web-based instruction for the Faculty teachers and, as required, individual course support. Although this training is voluntary, it is very popular among the staff: each year 25 teachers participate and there is a waiting list; all 8 teachers interviewed by the Evaluation Panel have completed pedagogical training. TUKE also has responsibility for and manages the student feedback system. Tutorial nurses provide additional administrative and coordination support, though they are not on the Medicine
Planning Committee. Elected medical and dental student hosts contribute to the planning and logistical aspects of teaching.

Every year a “teaching day” is organised where teaching practices and experiences are exchanged and discussed. All of this results in a very productive pedagogical network in the Faculty. Third, TUKE participates actively in research in medical education as evidenced by publications in journals and involvement in medical education conferences.

Internationalisation and mobility are integral parts of the University’s strategic plan. It is not elaborated in the Faculty’s self-evaluation, but it is relevant to the management and leadership of pedagogy. For the Medical faculty, internationalisation is identified as an important goal in its action plan. From the faculty management, we learned that internationalisation is more advanced in research activities, where the many international guest researchers participate in teaching whenever it is appropriate. The faculty aspires to start a Master's programme which would not require a medical degree and which will add to its international dimension. Twenty to thirty Erasmus agreements exist, and FIMSIIC has its own system for organising clinical experiences abroad. However, the students we encountered were reluctant to go abroad except for Nordic countries, believing that the time spent abroad would add to their total study time. In an apparent information gap, this view was contradicted in subsequent interviews with teachers.

The Faculty’s internationalisation strategy is about focus. The vice-dean stressed their preference for deeper relationships with selectively fewer partners. It was refreshing to hear a Faculty express a strategy focusing on quality rather than quantity. For this faculty, internationalising was a broader concept and deeper than just moving students around or a number in the action plan.

Conclusions

Strengths

- There is a good relationship between the students and all aspects of the Faculty and University, with strong student involvement and influence in planning committees and the board.
- Collegiality rather than competition among students, and a sense of community among Swedish students
- Strong and enthusiastic Faculty and teachers
- Systematic learning assessments and feedback are integral course components: the course-specific student feedback system has a very high (> 80%) response rate.
- The Faculty Research and Development Unit for Medical Education (TUKE): both as a training resource and for research collaboration
• Recognition by the higher education advisory council. Institutes and departments represent strong and diverse resources for student education.

• Students actively participate in educational planning and development - representatives are on the Faculty Council and the steering groups in the six administrative units.

• Swedish programme students were particularly satisfied with their educational experiences, the small community environment and close relationships with their Faculty.

Good practices

• The Faculty Research and Development Unit for Medical Education (TUKE) supports pedagogical training for university and for non-university teachers. An annual teaching day for all faculty, covering good teaching practices and trends

• Problem-based learning (PBL) teachers must have pedagogical training in PBL instruction.

• Teaching support and development meetings prior to, and following each course, using student feedback to revise the course

• Core content analysis as the method to rationalise the curriculum; examples include: collaborative multidisciplinary development of the curriculum for pain and palliative medicine; rationalizing the curriculum to create more intensive learning experiences, e.g., forensic medicine and toxicology; and the integration of microbiology and immunology with clinical disciplines.

• Student organisation awards for teaching: for medicine, Lecturer of the Year and Group Teacher of the Year; for dentistry, Teacher of the Year

• Student feedback is required. At the conclusion of the course, each student receives an e-mail reminding them to submit feedback and providing a weblink to do so. Feedback information is collected and transmitted to docents and non-University teachers.

Recommendations

• We recommend that the Faculty increase the information flow among the autonomous institutes, departments and faculty using a mixed strategy of technology / web resources and regular personal meetings. The timing and technology of information sharing should support the organisational structure for the collaborative curricula between the Faculty and the institutes and departments. This means that information must pass efficiently from the institutes and departments to the Faculty and from the Faculty to the institutes and departments.

• We recommend that the Faculty make a regular, formal communication process to inform students (counter feedback) of changes that result from their feedback.
• We recommend that the Faculty address the issue of staff workload. Attracting and retaining strong teachers will require attention to workload, quality of life and rewards/recognition. Time for research is particularly needed if teachers are to be effective as academicians.

• We recommend that the tutorial nurse be on this Planning Committee as this would bring an important source of information and insight concerning daily operational issues. The tutorial nurse is now a member of the Dental Education Committee, but is not on the Medicine Planning Committee.

• We recommend that the Faculty organise administrative tasks so that teachers are only doing that work which only they should do.

• We recommend that the Faculty act to inform students about international opportunities and that they have the correct information concerning recognition and transfer of credits. It would also be useful to identify additional training site options for dental students.
10.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Pharmacy
A Introduction

The evaluation of education carried out at the University of Helsinki focuses on the management of education on various levels. The goal is to enhance the management of education by evaluating its present state from a critical perspective, recognising strengths and areas in need of development, and by receiving international feedback on the quality of operations. The evaluation will focus on those academic and administrative leadership practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor's and Master's degrees to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. Broadly speaking, the management of education encompasses the entire academic community. The evaluation will help units to learn from their own activities and those of other units, as well as from existing good practices. The University community as a whole will also gain a deeper insight into the management of education and its significance for the quality of teaching, learning and degrees.

In the Faculty of Pharmacy, the evaluation process is the responsibility of the Academic Committee led by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs. The self-evaluation was conducted in three stages. Based on University-wide examples, the Faculty published self-evaluation guidelines and a list of self-evaluation topics, which form the basis for evaluation, in December 2007. From December 2007 to January 2008, the Faculty conducted two surveys to collect evaluation data. The first one was carried out in the Faculty's teaching units (divisions) and the second one on the Faculty level (academic leadership, academic administration and services). The second stage of the process involved a workshop for the Faculty and its divisions, which was arranged on 29 January 2008 for representatives of the academic leadership, teaching staff, researchers, students and non-academic staff. Under the lead of an outside consultant, workshop participants discussed the self-evaluation reports and drew up a joint report for the Faculty based on group discussions and prioritisation. Topics brought up in the self-evaluation reports and during the workshop were also discussed at the leadership training event for the Faculty's superiors on 13 February 2008. This resulted in the creation of working groups in charge of determining concrete improvement proposals and a schedule for the prioritised areas of development: (i) rewards, incentives and review discussions, (ii) orientation activities, (iii) professional development and (iv) development of management and leadership.

The first version of the self-evaluation report was published on the online evaluation site (wiki area) in early March 2008 to give the Faculty's staff and students an opportunity to comment on and revise the content. The final self-evaluation report was drawn up on the basis of individual self-evaluations in
cooperation with the Faculty's academic leadership, divisions, teaching staff and students. It was completed on 31 March 2008. This self-evaluation process proved to be fruitful, as it generated a great deal of discussion about teaching and its implementation, both in the divisions and the entire Faculty. Self-evaluation helped the Faculty to identify its strengths and areas in need of development, as well as to determine corrective measures and define the parties responsible for them. The Faculty, Academic Committee and divisions will adopt the improved practices in the current strategy period 2007–2009.

B Description of the management of education

Management of education and strategic planning

The values that guide the University of Helsinki and its community are stated in the University’s Strategic Plan. Among other things, they include the principle that all teachers do research and all researchers take part in teaching. The Faculty of Pharmacy promotes and complies with the University’s core values – criticism, creativity and the quest for truth – in all of its activities. The Faculty’s targets and view of the future are based on the foundation laid out in the University’s strategy, which has been adapted to the operations and development needs in the Faculty’s target programme, human resources policy and operations manual (i.e., the Faculty’s quality documents). Strategic decisions and development plans are put into practice as described in the action plans for teaching and research.

The Faculty of Pharmacy manages its education and does strategic planning in a goal-oriented and comprehensive manner. Development work focuses on studying and evaluating existing teaching practices and the work environment, as well as improving identified areas in need of development. The Faculty Council, dean and vice-dean in charge of academic affairs have overall responsibility for matters related to teaching and for the quality of degrees. The planning and development of education is overseen and carried out by the Faculty’s Academic Committee, operating under the lead of the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the committee’s working groups (of which there were three in the academic year 2007–2008: one handling the development of teaching, one planning the orientation course and one dealing with theses), as well as the Admissions Board in matters

1 See also Appendix 1, page 287: Structure of the management of education
pertaining to student selection (Figure 1). The committees and working groups include student representatives and representatives of each division. It is essential that all of the disciplines, strands and people responsible for courses commit themselves to jointly agreed targets and operating models. Students have the opportunity to influence the development of education at all levels and stages. The Academic Committee prepares the matters to be discussed, and the head of academic affairs presents them to the Faculty Council. In addition to division staff, active participants in development work include the Faculty’s lecturer specialised in university pedagogy, the head of academic affairs, the academic advisor, the permanent university instructor in pharmacy training, the advisor in web-based education, the international affairs officer, as well as planning officers employed for various development projects.

The Academic Committee is in charge of the overall planning of education offered by the Faculty (strategic planning), the preparation of degree requirements and curricula, as well as the all-encompassing development of education in cooperation with different disciplines, committees and, for example, the steering group for quality assurance (Figure 1). The Academic Committee is in charge of planning and monitoring the implementation of the two-tier degree system (the Bologna process) using curriculum core analyses and the reproportionment of studies. It is also responsible for enhancing the evaluation of the quality of education and quality assurance methods, monitoring study progress, coordinating student and teacher feedback, and developing exchange programmes for both students and teachers. The Academic Committee arranges two annual feedback events focusing on education, as well as a development seminar for staff and students on an annual basis. The committee’s communal approach ensures that full attention is given to

Figure 1. Organisation and management of the Faculty’s education
the opinions of the teaching staff and students and that the parties can form a shared view of matters. The achievement of targets and the implementation of development measures defined in the action plan are monitored and evaluated monthly by the Academic Committee, every six months at student feedback events and every spring and autumn in the Faculty’s development seminar for teaching and research. The Faculty’s academic leadership also presents its reviews and reports on targets and development measures to the Faculty Council during the development seminars.

Planning of education and curriculum design

The divisions, strands, people responsible for courses, as well as individual teachers design and develop their teaching and are accountable for it. The divisions ensure that courses are arranged and that a coordinator is assigned to each course. The course coordinator plans teaching, sets learning objectives, recruits teachers and allocates their duties, implements teaching, and handles any other practical arrangements. A lecturer specialised in university pedagogy works with the teaching staff to develop teaching and learning in the Faculty and to carry out relevant research and surveys. The lecturer also coordinates and arranges the Faculty’s in-house training in university pedagogy jointly with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education. The head of academic affairs is in charge of academic administration and student services in the Faculty Office and supports divisions in curriculum design. The designer of web-based education is
responsible for and supports the development of ICT for teaching purposes, while the international affairs officer deals with international academic affairs.

Thanks to the amount of time and resources allocated to designing and developing education, the Faculty now has a well-defined curriculum. Based on a strand model, the curriculum’s strength comes from course entities that span the entire study time. They are planned and implemented jointly by the different divisions (disciplines). Development work and guidelines are based on investigations into teaching and learning in the field of pharmacy. The investigations show that students have trouble acquiring a deep understanding of their disciplines due to the fragmented nature of their studies. The Faculty’s teachers want to increase cooperation across disciplines and hope to get support for the development of teaching and evaluation. The strand model has increased cooperation and the flow of information between divisions, as well as reduced the fragmentation of studies. However, the overall targets of the strand model and more effective integration of teaching still need to be developed for permanent changes to be achieved in teaching practices (cf. Table 1). The Faculty’s university-funded three-year development project (a central area of development in the strategy period 2007–2009) also aims at developing and implementing the strand model.

**Learning objectives and core curriculum**

The learning objectives are jointly drawn up by the teaching staff, students, pharmacy teaching units in Finland and abroad, as well as labour market representatives. In conjunction with core content analyses, OODI objectives, as well as action, evaluation and feedback models are defined for each course. The degree objectives were determined during the degree reform in 2005, at which time the courses and their content were designed to form sensible entities that grow gradually more elaborate. Core content analyses have brought further insight into course content and reduced overlaps in teaching. Analyses of courses must be available online. The course coordinator updates the core content analyses each time a course is revised and at least every three years. Every teacher is expected to develop the content of courses and enhance evaluation using core content analyses, action plans and course feedback. The Faculty of Pharmacy participates in the W5W2 project, which is a part of the Bologna process. It involves defining the learning outcomes for each course in compliance with EU requirements.

**Quality assurance of education**

Personal study plans and their supervision cover all degree studies, both Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees, and form an integral part of the Faculty’s quality assurance of education. According to the University’s checkpoint system (“Etappi”), which is used to monitor study progress, only a few pharmaceutical students are annually
requested to submit a report explaining the reasons for their studies being delayed. To promote high-quality teaching, the Faculty has drawn up an operations manual under the lead of the steering group for quality assurance (Figure 1). The manual contains a comprehensive description of the Faculty’s practices, procedures and responsibilities. Related to this, the Faculty has begun to develop indicators for the evaluation of teaching, as well as to enhance good practices. The operations manual is used as a tool in staff orientation. In addition, three of the Faculty’s six divisions have drawn up their own manuals with more specific descriptions. The University of Helsinki passed the quality audit performed by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council in spring 2008.

**Significance of teaching qualifications in the filling of posts**

The Faculty aims to fill vacancies and project duties systematically and methodically. It has recruited personnel for prioritised areas of development (e.g., a lecturer specialised in university pedagogy and a university instructor for pharmacy training). Teaching qualifications are considered to be important. The duties related to each post are clearly defined in order to facilitate the filling of posts and to make it easier to compare the teaching qualifications of applicants. The appointment process makes use of academic portfolios and takes into consideration the teaching qualifications and pedagogical training of applicants. Experts and demonstrations of teaching skills are used in the selection process. An appointment committee consisting of professors, a representative of the teachers’ and researchers’ group and a student representative is always set up when filling posts for professors. Preparations related to the appointment of university lecturers and assistants are handled by division heads and professors.

**Pedagogical competence of teachers**

The Faculty’s teachers are enthusiastic about teaching and its development, as is seen in their active participation in pedagogical training. Teachers apply new ideas learned in training to their teaching and get support from the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy. Teachers evaluate and develop their own teaching, for example, using the Faculty’s comprehensive course feedback system. Matters related to teaching are discussed in the divisions and at the Faculty level. Regularly arranged events (e.g., the Teacher Forum, see Figure 1) support teaching and enable the dissemination and evaluation of good teaching practices. This, in turn, helps the Faculty to identify areas in need of development and to implement solutions.
C Summary of responses to questions concerning the management of education

Table 1 lists the strengths and areas of development of education in the Faculty of Pharmacy as determined in the self-evaluation process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Areas in need of development</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repeated rewards for the development of education in recent years</td>
<td>Defining the strand model, following up on its implementation and developing it into a uniform entity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vice-dean in charge of academic affairs and lecturer specialised in university pedagogy</td>
<td>Enhancing cooperation between divisions and increasing teaching collaboration within the University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active Academic Committee, knowledgeable Admissions Board and functional academic administration</td>
<td>Breadth of participation in educational meetings and other activities, especially at the Faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic approach to the continuous development of teaching</td>
<td>Equal distribution of teaching duties in divisions, turnover among the teaching staff and the sometimes inadequate substitute arrangements, clarification of the duties of support personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular and comprehensive development seminars for the Faculty and divisions, meeting procedures promoting communal behaviour (divisional meetings, educational meetings, Faculty meetings)</td>
<td>Recruiting of the most suitable/competent teacher/researcher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive core content analyses about course content, an improving feedback system (collection of feedback in divisions and courses, provision of feedback)</td>
<td>Increased training for superiors (distribution of duties, responsibilities, announcements, communication, rules), extensive discussions about work plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research opportunities for teachers</td>
<td>Coordination of the teaching content of external lecturers in individual courses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good and versatile orientation practices</td>
<td>Dissemination of good orientation practices to all units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention given to changing needs and continuous social development when planning education (students/employers/society)</td>
<td>Specification of learning outcomes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 1. Strengths and areas in need of development in the Faculty of Pharmacy*
Agreeing on the content, methods and development of teaching

How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

Operations management processes and the Academic Affairs Committee help the University to steer the faculties. Every three years the University draws up a strategic plan that includes its long-term vision, objectives and targets, as well as the methods used to attain them. As previously explained, the Faculty Council, dean and first vice-dean have overall responsibility for matters related to teaching and the quality of degrees in the Faculty of Pharmacy. The Academic Committee prepares matters related to teaching and studies, and the Admissions Board prepares matters related to student selection, which are then presented to the Faculty Council by the head of academic affairs. The planning and development of the Faculty's postgraduate education is handled by the Research Committee. Cooperation and communication with the Academic Committee has worked well. Divisions, strands and course coordinators are responsible for the content, methods, development and evaluation of teaching, as well as for the quality of learning outcomes. Students take responsibility for their learning and the progress of their studies in line with their personal study plans, for signing up on time for courses and exams and for finding a place for practical training. In line with the principles of the Bologna process, students actively participate in the development of course content and Faculty operations, as well as give feedback during courses and at feedback events. Students are always represented in the Faculty Council and committees (Figure 1). The Faculty and divisions regularly arrange development seminars to plan education on the basis of collected experiences and feedback. Development seminars are considered to be one of the Faculty's strengths. The self-evaluation process brought forward the idea of making the seminars into two-day events: the first day for individual divisions and the second for the Faculty as a whole. The seminar programme would include common themes, and discussions would continue at the Faculty level after being handled by individual disciplines.

During the Bologna process, the Faculty set up a curriculum model based on strands, which was introduced in 2005. What makes the model strong is that it consists of modules that continue from the first to the last year of studies and that are jointly designed and implemented by all divisions. The goal is to integrate pharmacy disciplines into multidisciplinary modules and to promote scientific thought and professional growth related to the development of students into professionals in their field. The Faculty aims to bring disciplines closer together and to reduce the fragmentation of studies by guiding students towards constructive deep learning. The strand model continues to be developed. It is still considered to be challenging, even difficult, to get a clear picture of the model because of its versatility and the partial overlaps between strands. The strand model must also be monitored more efficiently, for example, by making better use of research data measuring the
practical implementation of the model and the learning of students. The Faculty believes in the importance of the strand model and has hired a planning officer to handle its implementation. In practice, implementation will be arranged through the Academic Committee and working groups. For the strand model to succeed, all parties must commit themselves to it. They must also be given the chance to participate in its development. The model is now developed one strand at a time to ensure collaboration. The goal is to find a shared view of the requirements for strands, that is, of what students are expected to learn. To develop into specialists, students need theoretical competence as well as professional and interactive skills.

Drawing up detailed learning outcomes is considered to be a common area of development. The content of teaching is clearly defined. It complies with EU regulations and the degree objectives jointly agreed upon by teachers and students, as well as by national and international cooperation parties. Each course has at least one coordinator in charge of the course content, methods and development and of overall course management. Teaching methods call for continued attention. Every now and then it is helpful to consider what needs to be taught and how. The quality of teaching and development measures are considered to be good overall, as indicated by the numerous quality awards for teaching that the Faculty of Pharmacy and its teachers have received in the 21st century.

Development of feedback policies

The Faculty has developed many effective ways to collect, analyse and use student feedback, which is collected by individual teachers and at the level of strands, divisions and the Faculty. Feedback gives precise information about the quality of teaching and any needs for development. The Faculty’s web-based feedback system also makes it possible to give course-specific feedback to students and to arrange feedback events once a term. The utilisation of feedback must be further enhanced to offer real added value to the teaching of the divisions. Feedback given to students should also be increased. The Faculty’s Academic Committee evaluates the implementation and results of teaching based on feedback collected from selected courses. The assessment of the impact and success of individual degree programmes is based on the University’s Teaching Evaluation Matrix. The Faculty actively participates in studies of learning results coordinated by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.

Reporting is part of the operations management and quality assurance system. Annual reporting is carried out according to the guidelines drawn up by the Department for Strategic Planning and Development. The Faculty does not prepare a separate report of activities. Divisions produce internal reports on their teaching and feedback, and this has been found to work well. A field worth developing is the reporting on good practices and educational development measures, which is carried out, for example, in the Teacher Forum. It helps the Faculty and
teachers to enhance courses and course modules (strands). The dissemination of information and participation in joint events are key to understanding operations as a whole. Personal responsibility, activity and commitment to common goals are prerequisites for the successful development of education. The staff still has room for improvement in this respect.

The Faculty regularly employs outside lecturers in its teaching. Their competence ensures that the changing needs of the labour market are taken into account in teaching and that education remains versatile and imparts information relevant to working life. The coordination of external course content is often found to be difficult. Outside lecturers typically persist in talking about their chosen topics even though this may lead to overlaps in teaching. The work of lecturers could be coordinated, for example, by using clearer guidelines and by the Faculty’s own teachers occasionally participating in lectures.

International activities

The Faculty emphasises international activities in managing and developing teaching. The University offers English-language courses to teachers, and the Faculty encourages teachers to give lectures in English. The amount of teaching in English has been increased especially in advanced and postgraduate studies. English-language courses at the advanced stage offer an internationalisation option for students who are pursuing a Master’s degree but do not plan to take part in international student exchange programmes. The goal of English-language education is to enable Finnish students to improve their discipline-specific competence in English, as well as to offer additional study opportunities to the Faculty’s exchange students and visiting postgraduate students. The objective is to make extensive use of English-language literature and articles in the intermediate studies of both the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The use of English-language materials and summaries written in English ensure that Finnish-speaking degree students begin to develop their field-specific competence from the very beginning of their Bachelor’s studies. Foreign degree and exchange students are encouraged to participate in the orientation and language courses that the University arranges for international students. International students get academic advice in English from the international affairs officer and from the divisions. Courses are also given in English in all major subjects.

Visiting lecturers and researchers take part in teaching in many different ways. Exchange programmes for teachers will be enhanced in cooperation with select partner universities (London, Utrecht, Leuven, Bath, Baltimore, Sydney, Otago). The Faculty also engages in special activities by arranging and participating in international conferences focusing on the development of pharmaceutical education. These include the Basel FIP Congress in 2008 and the Life-Long Learning Congress that will be held in Helsinki in 2009.
Preparing and deciding on degree requirements

How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?

The goal is to develop the degree system and education in line with the principles adopted in European education and the Bologna process. Some of the main objectives are to clarify and harmonise degree structures, engage in international cooperation, increase networking and mobility, cooperate with European institutions in the fields of learning and quality assessment, as well as to emphasise a student orientation in teaching and learning. Education aims to prepare students for expert duties in the medical and pharmaceutical fields, as well as to provide them with the skills required for further studies. This calls for a good command of the core curriculum and the ability to apply it. The academic and professional objectives of education are described in core content analyses. The goal of teaching is to ensure that students reach a high level of profound and critical understanding of matters and acquire skills based on scientific research.

The degree requirements are defined in the standing regulations of the Faculty of Pharmacy. The Faculty’s quality manual provides guidelines for designing and developing education. Discipline-specific core content analyses should be openly available to teachers and students to make it easier to identify any overlaps in the content of courses. Since many of the courses arranged in the Faculty are common to several divisions, it is essential to ensure that the course elements form a functional entity. A task that needs to be emphasised is the further reduction of overlaps in inter- and intra-divisional education. The best way to do this would be to employ strand coordinators, but the Faculty does not have the resources for such a measure. For now, the most suitable approach is to openly distribute the core content analyses of divisions (in WebOODI) and to make active use of them when designing courses.

Labour market contacts in teaching and studies

One of the Faculty of Pharmacy’s definite strengths is that the needs of students, employees and society are taken into account in the degree requirements. In addition to social interaction, which is included in the principles of research and degree-oriented education, the Faculty plans and implements continuing education in cooperation with the Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education and the Pharmaceutical Learning Centre. The Faculty annually organises several continuing education and specialisation training events with other players in the field. The goal is to conduct research, maintain contact with labour market representatives and keep abreast of changing skill needs to ensure that education gives students a good preparation for working life and that the Faculty can continue to educate new, innovative experts in pharmacy. Future development in the field is taken into consideration and actively influenced, where possible. Innovations resulting from
research and experts trained by the Faculty are core elements of social interaction. Research affects teaching, continuing education and the development of society by producing profound expertise and competence. The Faculty’s teaching staff is active, competent and pedagogically trained. This enables the Faculty to meet the requirement levels jointly agreed on for students. Scientific research in the field is actively brought up in teaching, and teachers make professional visits to companies and other labour market entities. The Faculty’s academic leadership and teachers must continue to actively interact with society. Everyone involved in research and education must understand the significance of their activities and the social impact that the consequences of their activities may have.

**Ensuring appropriate distribution of teaching duties**

How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

Information transfer and an open atmosphere for discussion play a central part in the activities of all organisations. In the Faculty of Pharmacy’s view, good practices include divisional educational meetings, the Academic Committee that is in charge of Faculty-level work distribution, strategic matters and follow-up of development work, as well as the committee’s working groups, such as the pharmacy training group (Figure 1). These entities have taken charge of divisional activities and responsibilities, which is something as the organisational structure of the Faculty has lacked was planned and executed in such a way that departments are not needed at all (See Fig. 1). Good practices related to leadership include the annual teaching development events for staff and students, which offer a good venue for planning education, analysing the results of development measures and discussing equal work distribution and other topical issues affecting students and staff. Educational meetings are a strength, but also an area in need of development. It is important to ensure that educational meetings and working groups function democratically. Instead of always appointing the same people to different duties, every member of the work community should be given the opportunity to assume responsibility. Someone in the division should be in charge of examining how teaching duties have been distributed in the previous action periods. The team distributing duties must include an individual familiar with the curriculum and its content, as well as the load that individual duties put on an employee.

Work plans are prepared by holders of teaching positions. However, such plans and the role they play should still be jointly discussed. Leadership should also be clarified and work distributed more evenly. In line with the University’s strategy and the Faculty’s decisions in principle, all researchers take part in teaching and all teachers carry out research. Staff members should be given challenging research topics, as well as the time and resources to do research. This could take the form of, for example, a leave of absence. Participation in international teaching and research
seminars must be encouraged also in the future. In some cases, the Faculty finds it to be problematic that some researchers do not take part in teaching and that some teachers do not have time for research. The annual workload of 1,600 hours per employee is far from sufficient to take care of both teaching and research. Teaching must be planned on the basis of resources available at the divisional and Faculty levels. However, teaching and research must not be contrasted with one another. The relationship between teaching and research is basically a question about leadership solutions. Owing to a lack of time and resources, it is sometimes difficult to reach an optimal balance between the two fields.

**Promoting the expertise and competence of the teaching personnel**

*How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?*

**Human resources strategy**

The concrete plans concerning staff structure are included in the human resources policy. Recruitment decisions are made by the Faculty Council or the dean, in line with the Administrative Regulations of the University. The advertisement of vacant positions is centrally handled by the Administration Office, the goal being to give a consistent image of the University as an employer and to ensure that regulations are correctly applied. Provisions on the appointment of professors are laid down in the Act and Decree on the Appointment of Professors and Associate Professors. Other positions are filled according to the provisions laid down in the Act on State Civil Servants and possibly other regulations concerning the qualifications required for the position. The Faculty observes the University’s common pay policy according to which all employees are treated equally and fairly.

The Faculty’s appointment procedures ensure that the best applicants are selected as researchers and teachers. This ensures continuity in teaching. Teaching qualifications are emphasised during recruiting, even though pedagogical training, for example, does not automatically imply good teaching skills. Sometimes an applicant may be the one best suited for a teaching post even though he or she may not be the academically most qualified applicant. Based on student feedback, the departments’ own researchers may also be recruited as good teachers. The Faculty understands that it may be difficult to recruit the most suitable and qualified people in the future and that teachers and researchers may sometimes require further training. The study content in pharmacy is regulated by EU legislation, which makes it more difficult to recruit people with degrees from other fields. Posts must be defined carefully so that the duties and appointments are optimal in terms of the Faculty’s needs, irrespective of the applicants’ educational background.
One of the biggest challenges to the long-term nature and continuity of teaching is the turnover of research and teaching staff. Fixed-term employment relationships, typical of Finnish universities, are also common in the Faculty of Pharmacy, making long-term planning of research and teaching difficult. For example, it is difficult to deal with long leaves of absence with temporary employees. The Faculty tries to maintain continuity, for example, by archiving teaching materials and completed credits. In this way, teaching material remains within the Faculty even if the substance competence of individual employees is lost. Nevertheless, introducing a novice to the job is considered to be difficult. The main role of a leader is to increase staff commitment and keep an eye on the workload. Superiors must discuss work prioritisation with their subordinates and, if required, turn to professional supervision and workload assessment. Prioritisation may require employees to give up some matters important to them, but work should constantly involve prioritisation. Staff mobility is particularly noticeable in externally funded projects and among postgraduate students. Turnover can also be seen as a strength, although it poses a challenge to the continuity of operations. Fixed-term employment and staff turnover hinder the development and maintenance of substitute arrangements, which burdens the staff. Colleagues help one another, but there is often too little time for employees to find the best way to handle tasks, and they must, instead, simply focus on how to cope with the accumulating duties. Substitute arrangements need to be developed in both Faculty-level administration and the divisions.

Orientation

Orientation introduces new employees to the division’s staff, procedures and work. It also ensures their adjustment to and enjoyment at work. Orientation to teaching duties is particularly important when young researchers get involved in teaching. Orientation can be supported with orientation materials, Faculty and divisional operations manuals, as well as the University’s general orientation material. The employee’s immediate superior has primary responsibility for orientation. General orientation to the University community and the Faculty is the responsibility of the head of administration. The orientation of a new employee is considered to be both a strength and an area of development. Apart from the head of division, orientation also involves other people in the division. Operations manuals, orientation folders, teaching folders and guidelines stored in Alma can also be of use in orientation. The online environment (ApuMatti, Blackboard) could be used more efficiently, for example, to store teaching materials. Since new teachers often find it difficult to get a grip on the content of teaching, senior teachers and their support play an important part in enhancing the competence of new employees. The master-apprentice principle, in which the orientation of a new employee takes place gradually through personal guidance, has been found to be a good method. It takes time to become a good university instructor. Instructors must be given enough time to increase their competence by offering them pedagogical training and time to carry out their own research. Preparing for personnel changes
makes the transition easier. In the ideal situation, the predecessor and successor have enough time to work together for tacit knowledge to be transferred and continuity to be ensured.

Every Faculty employee is responsible for his or her competence and its development. The management of education also involves competence management, and each superior is responsible for maintaining and developing the staff's skills. The University arranges centralised in-house training, which the staff can take part in. Competence is promoted, for example, by encouraging the staff to take part in pedagogical training, in-house training, Open University courses and continuing education, as well as to get acquainted with online teaching environments. Education provided by the Faculty and the University has been very popular among teachers and researchers from the Faculty of Pharmacy. It would, however, be a good idea to break pedagogical training into smaller parts so that an even bigger share of the teaching staff could take part in it. Pedagogical training that consists of big modules often takes up too much of the annual workload. Business, internationalisation and leadership have been proposed as topics for further training in the Faculty.

The Faculty supports the versatile use of different teaching and assessment methods. This is a form of pedagogical training offered to teachers during their working hours. Practices that have been found to work well are introduced to all Faculty teachers (cf. Teacher Forum events). The lecturer specialised in university pedagogy is responsible for the research and investigation related to the development of teaching and learning, coordinates the Faculty's in-house training in university pedagogy and arranges training in cooperation with the University of Helsinki Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education. The designer of web-based education is in charge of the development of ICT for teaching purposes, the coordination of in-house training and the organisation of training in cooperation with the Education Centre for ICT and other faculties on the Viikki campus.

**Well-being of the work community and review discussions**

The work community's well-being is one of the core values and areas in need of development in the Faculty of Pharmacy. It is a good idea, every now and then, to consider the reasons for doing one's job. Even small rewards do much to increase well-being at work. Rewarding and encouragement are some of the main tasks of leaders and superiors. It is important to give positive feedback, as it boosts self-esteem and a sense of identity. Constructive criticism is a good form of feedback. In the best case, it can help to develop and improve the employee's work. If negative feedback is unavoidable, great consideration should be given to the situation and way in which feedback is given. There are good feedback practices in place. The Faculty of Pharmacy enjoys an open atmosphere, and crises are usually tackled at an early phase. Feedback is given at review discussions and good work is also honoured in public, for example, in the form of the annual “Innoopeli” award.
There is, however, always room to develop feedback methods by implementing new, small rewards and making use of different types of incentives offered by the new salary system.

Not only superiors, but every single employee as well is responsible for maintaining well-being in the work community. Owing to limited resources and in order to decrease the workload, it is essential to prioritise tasks. The Faculty’s employees can learn about work prioritisation from one another: some divisions prioritise tasks, others do not. Professional supervision and sensible work organisation are related to well-being at work, and both have room for improvement. It is crucial to sum up the essentials. The staff’s well-being at work is monitored with work satisfaction surveys that are carried out every three years in cooperation with the University’s Human Resources Department. The University has drawn up guidelines for solving different types of problems that may arise in work communities. Superiors are to ensure that such situations are identified and reacted to. The units of the Faculty of Pharmacy aim to offer their staff different types of activities that maintain well-being at work. The Faculty has also used the services and support offered by the University’s Occupational Well-being Unit. The new salary system plays a significant part in encouraging good practices and rewarding them.

Superiors and employees must conduct review discussions at least once a year in line with the University’s guidelines. Discussions are conducted by the immediate superiors, who are also in charge of documenting the matters agreed. All personal matters handled in review discussions are confidential. This best practice recommended by the Faculty has not yet achieved full coverage. The Faculty complies with the University’s Equality Policy and the Policy Against Discrimination. The Faculty has appointed a contact person for matters pertaining to equality. The contact person is in charge of communicating the Faculty’s views on equality and may, if required, refer individuals in need of help or guidance to the equality advisor, labour protection representative or shop stewards.

**Supporting and managing the implementation and development of high-quality teaching**

*How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?*

At the University of Helsinki, quality means appropriate operations and results of a high quality. In the Faculty of Pharmacy, high-quality operations mean streamlined, transparent and predictable activities: the Faculty’s objectives, methods and evaluation are jointly determined and agreed on. The Faculty operates according to agreed principles and evaluates its activities and results on the basis of the
objectives set. The Faculty maintains and develops a quality assurance system (= quality manual), which provides support and organisation to the implementation of functions, ensures the quality of operations and promotes the Faculty’s development.

Planning the content of teaching, choosing the teaching methods and deciding on development measures are all concrete management methods related to teaching. The management of education – and academic leadership in general – is a new and, as yet, little examined topic at universities, which makes it difficult to conduct management analyses. The university community is a challenging management environment, seeing as the objectives and functions of different faculties and disciplines vary considerably and their management requires different types of methods and models. **The management of education is still in the early phases of development at the University of Helsinki. Consequently, the focus of management in the Faculty of Pharmacy is often on plans and objectives.** In the Faculty’s view, the biggest challenge in and the main objective of management is to motivate and inspire the staff, as well as to commit all employees to common goals and their achievement.

**Managers and leaders must determine, implement, monitor and assess the selected, important policies to maintain high-quality operations in the academic community.** Academic leadership is mainly organised through cooperation between the Academic Committee, Admissions Board, academic administration, strands, divisions and coordinators. The divisions are active and bear their own responsibility for operations and the steering group level. Departments send the Academic Committee requests for action, and the representatives of each discipline are required to inform their divisions about matters related to the committee. The head of academic affairs disseminates the information to the Faculty Council. Divisions have not always been sufficiently informed about decisions made by the Academic Committee. Communication needs to be further developed. Information flow could be improved by drawing up common guidelines for divisions. This would also make the Faculty’s operations clearer to students and outsiders. The use of available information is also in need of improvement. It would be a good idea for planning officers to regularly report on their work in the Academic Committee and describe the main points brought up in studies about teaching. The Faculty’s teaching is also evaluated by the working groups focusing on the development of teaching, pharmacy training and specialisation training.

Profitability, economy and service ability can only be improved if the staff jointly participates in preparations for decision-making. In line with the cooperation policy, cooperation is carried out at the levels of Faculty, units and individuals. Matters handled in cooperation are set out in the University’s cooperation policy. Faculty-level cooperation is the responsibility of the Faculty’s Planning Committee. Management surveys are carried out by the Faculty’s dean and the deans in charge of research and academic affairs in cooperation with the Faculty’s head
of administration. Surveys are conducted twice a year, in the spring and autumn. The autumn survey focuses on teaching and the spring survey on research. The management assesses the implementation of the Faculty’s target programme and action plan at the time of the survey and draws up action policies to develop operations. The surveys are discussed by the Faculty Council.

Administrative and support services provide support for arranging the Faculty’s basic duties and ensure that they are of high quality. These services are provided by the Administration Office and the Faculty. The Administration Office has centralised the production of some of its support services to the central administration, while the provision of other services has been distributed to the campuses. The Faculty’s administrative and support services are provided by the Faculty Office and divisions. For administrative and support services to function well, the teaching and research staff must cooperate and trust one another. The head of administration is responsible for developing administration and securing uniform criteria in the recruitment of administrative and support staff, as well as for ensuring that the duties are taken care of and that employees have the opportunity to develop their competence. The goal is to arrange administrative and support services efficiently so that matters are dealt with professionally, correctly and in cooperation. This also supports a type of leadership that suits the nature of university activities by renewing the management system, creating a good environment for leadership, clarifying responsibilities and work distribution, and identifying disguised administration.

In the main, the Faculty’s academic administration works well. The main area in need of development is the distribution of labour between the Faculty Office and divisions, which needs to be clarified. For example, the administrative support personnel could take part in division meetings once or twice a year.

The Faculty’s quality assurance system is documented in the operations manual. Divisions, the DDTCDR research centre and research groups also have their own, more detailed operations manuals and guidelines. The Faculty has a quality assurance steering group, appointed by the dean, which supervises, monitors and controls the functionality of the Faculty’s quality assurance system. The steering groups consist of the vice-deans in charge of teaching and research, the head of administration, the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy, divisional quality coordinators and a student representative. The Faculty of Pharmacy is involved in external audits of the University, as well as in assessments of teaching and research. To evaluate the quality of operations, the Faculty uses key figures that are required by the University and are included in the Faculty’s target programme, as well as other indicators that describe the Faculty’s goals. Divisions also have their own indicators for evaluating activities, which are used to support the supervision and development of operations. The Faculty Office collects the key figures from the University’s statistics and database services. The evaluation is carried out on an annual basis by the deanship. Key figures are followed over a period of five years. The figures and assessment results are discussed as long-term trends at six-monthly feedback events (research seminar, teaching feedback event) and are used to
develop operations. Development ideas that arise in daily teaching and research activities are discussed in the appropriate committees and in divisions. Development needs also come up in conjunction with feedback, audits and assessments and during annual University performance negotiations.

The Faculty has arranged several development projects, but activities may easily fall apart due to limited resources. To prevent this from happening, the Faculty prioritises matters and postpones less urgent ones since it cannot implement all of them. Examples of inputs into good practices and the prioritisation of development areas include the annual seminars on the development of teaching and the strand model, whose development has focused on one strand at a time. The development of teaching can be enhanced by increasing cooperation between divisions and launching a close dialogue in order to identify the main areas of development and to prioritise activities. The development of education involves everyone: the Faculty’s academic leadership and heads of divisions must encourage the personnel to participate in joint development work also at the Faculty level. The challenge is to get all Faculty employees to commit themselves to the development of teaching so that development does not only involve the same group of active developers year after year. Clarification of leadership culture is one of the areas in need of development: work distribution, responsibilities, communication and common rules must be made clearer.

D Summary: strengths and areas in need of development in the faculty’s management of education

The Faculty of Pharmacy’s strengths concerning the development and management of teaching and education are related to its solid expertise based on high-quality teaching and studies (theoretical and labour market skills in the field of pharmacy). Labour market contacts, personal study plans and their supervision, stretching throughout the degree studies, as well as a high percentage of completed degrees and an excellent employment situation, ensure that students feel motivated to complete their studies and move on to versatile duties in their field. The Faculty of Pharmacy manages its education and does strategic planning in a goal-oriented and comprehensive manner. Development work led by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs and the Academic Committee is carried out by examining and assessing good teaching practices and the labour market situation and improving any areas identified during the examination and assessment. A shared operating
model and extensive student involvement in development work, including feedback systems, are the cornerstones of development work and the management of education. The implementation of a strand-based curriculum model is an important, pedagogically well-reasoned strategic choice. Making it functional is still a great challenge to the Faculty’s disciplines and teachers. Owing to limited resources, it is impossible to put equal emphasis on all strands simultaneously. Other significant areas of development, in terms of the management of education, include the workload of teachers and academic administration, the development of substitute arrangements, participation in joint matters especially at the Faculty level and the increase of training for superiors.

The Faculty of Pharmacy’s goal is to maintain and further develop the quality of the work community (the University of Helsinki quality award for work communities 2001) and the enhancement of teaching and learning (the University of Helsinki centre of excellence awards for teaching 2006 and 2007). The objective is to achieve the status of a national centre of excellence in teaching and be in the forefront in national and international operations in the strategy period 2010–2012.
STRUCTURE OF THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION
Faculty of Pharmacy

STRATEGIC STARTING POINTS
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NETWORKS

- Network of heads of academic affairs
- Network of lecturers of university pedagogy
- Subject-specific student organisation

Appendix 1
10.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Pharmacy is a relatively young organisational entity, having been established in 2004. It offers two tiers of professional degrees (Bachelor’s and Master’s) in addition to doctoral studies. It has a notable strength in the culture that it has created: there is a focus on the well-being of the work community and procedures that enhance communal behaviour. This Faculty has already received numerous recognitions for teaching excellence: 2004: The University of Helsinki Award for the best Ph.D. thesis in 2004 (Dr. Niklas Laitinen); 2005: The University of Helsinki Award for the High Quality of Teaching in 2005; 2005: Endowed Professorship in Pharmacoeconomics; 2006: University of Helsinki, Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education Teaching Award to Dr. Yvonne Holm; 2007: The University of Helsinki Centre of Excellence in Teaching; 2007: Albert Wuokko Award to Dean Raimo Hiltunen for Excellence in Developing Teaching and Research in the Field of Pharmacy; 2008: The Faculty was selected by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council (FINHEEC) as a candidate for a National Centre of Excellence in Education (the Faculty is among 20 finalists, the decision will be available by the end of 2008). A major curriculum initiative that is underway is linking the educational content across disciplines and years in each program; the mechanism for achieving this is the strand model. Student satisfaction with teaching and learning is high. The Panel believes students would benefit from more emphasis and didactic clarity on the role and fit between each of their courses and the strand - producing a professional cognitive framework that would carry forward to their professional practice and identities. A particular challenge is the matching of resources to mission under the Bologna process agreements. The Faculty of Pharmacy has an active Bachelor’s degree programme which leads to a professional degree as a pharmacist and employment in a pharmacy. In 2007 there were 166 graduates; however, the University’s productivity metrics do not recognise these graduates unless they continue for an additional, Master’s degree. Achieving adequate resources to continue developing the strand model would be facilitated by recognition of the productivity and resources represented by graduates of the Faculty’s programme for Bachelor’s pharmacy students.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty of Pharmacy began operation as an independent faculty in 2004; previously it was a Department in the Faculty of Science. The Faculty with its 900 students is located on the Viikki campus. As a recently formed Faculty, its small
size and location in the multi-disciplinary bioscience campus provide unique opportunities for modern management and leadership of education. The Faculty has utilised this opportunity well and expresses its academic organisation intentions clearly in its 2007-2009 Development Plan. This Plan is the Faculty’s strategic framework and it is well aligned with the University’s values and goals. This Faculty is currently a candidate as a National Centre of Excellence in Education, placing it among the top twenty Faculties in the nation.

An important part of university-wide strategic management is the interconnection between central administration and the Faculties. The Panel was impressed by how this Faculty has been guided in its own strategic thinking from the University’s strategy and how education leadership is a priority in the Faculty’s management process. Our visit to the Faculty showed that there seems to be an effective division of responsibilities and shared leadership of overall operations, and that development of teaching has a central role in the Faculty’s strategic development.

In line with the University’s basic intention to increase student-oriented teaching, the Faculty aims to induce and foster constructive, deep student learning. For example, the entire Faculty appears to be committed to a strand-based curriculum and to share a common will to continue development of this innovation. At the Faculty level this curriculum model is instrumental for activating interactive teaching methods, such as group work and discussion courses. Their introduction is also fostered by involving “senior” students in teaching. The interviewed students confirmed that student-oriented forms of teaching are applied, although there are substantial differences between the teachers. Especially in the first year lecturing prevails, but later on group work and problem-based learning are more common.

Implementing a learner-centred approach to teaching has been facilitated by having a lecturer specialised in university pedagogy within the Faculty of Pharmacy. The Management and Leadership at the Division level told the Evaluation Panel that they strongly encourage the (voluntary) participation of the staff in the training in university pedagogy. We were told that now about 30% of the teachers have been involved in this training.

The two-tier professional degrees offered by the Faculty of Pharmacy reflect learning objectives and pedagogical approaches in European education and the Bologna process, emphasising the central role of the student in teaching and learning. The strand model is a form of long-term thematic curriculum planning (e.g., “From Molecule to Drug Product”) spanning the 3-year Bachelor period, and subsequently, strands have been developed for the Master’s programme that integrate contents from different disciplines. As such, these strands are planned and implemented in cooperation among different Divisions of the Faculty as well as teachers from the Faculty of Science (e.g., chemistry). Currently there are 6 such strands. This approach to curriculum planning is relatively new and, thus, still under development. Since this is a major innovation, the Evaluation Panel was surprised
to hear from several interviewed students that they were not aware that some courses that they take follow a strand. The interviewed teachers were surprised to learn this, and speculated that it was likely due to students' information overload at the start of their studies. They also realised that they have to do something about this situation. Furthermore, the students said that in the sequence of courses from a strand there is overlap which is sometimes - although not always - of no apparent utility. Teachers are aware of this, but think that these overlaps are mostly helpful from a didactic perspective.

The Panel's impression is that managing workload and staff time remain one of the biggest obstacles to developing management and leadership of education in this Faculty. Much of leaders' and teachers' time is spent on administration, often routine tasks that if done by assistant personnel would release more time to focus on leadership.

In the strategic plan, internationalisation is an integral part of the University's activities. This issue is not well elaborated in the self-evaluation, but the panellists consider it relevant to the management and leadership of pedagogy. For the Faculty of Pharmacy, internationalisation is declared to be important, is incorporated in the action plan and is represented in the three-year targets. However, the Faculty do not consider it a strength at present. Currently, some international exposures originate in the research functions of the Faculty. For example, the Centre for Drug Research recruits international researchers, who then also teach. The numbers of students now going abroad is not large, but visiting international students were recognised as an important experience at home for the Finnish students reluctant to go abroad. Students expressed interest and desire for practice experiences abroad.

Conclusions

Strengths

- The student is the centre of the teaching role, participating in committees and working groups. The professional practice training sites were uniformly praised by the students.
- Faculty participating in the strands work together to plan the strands, for example, the Faculty of Science is responsible for teaching chemistry and meets with the Faculty of Pharmacy to work together. Moreover, the curriculum is well defined, using the strand model which spans the entire period of professional study to minimise fragmentation. This supports both broad and deep learning.
- A focus on the well-being of the work community and procedures that enhance communal behaviour.
- Professional education that is arranged by The Palmenia Centre for Continuing Education and The Pharmaceutical Learning Centre.
The administrative office has a strong, positive service attitude and aims to reduce extra work that teachers do that could more appropriately be performed by that office.

**Good practices**

- The pedagogy course includes training both in instructional and in assessment methods. The Teacher Forum for disseminating good practices and educational development measures. Teaching skills and pedagogical training are emphasised during faculty recruitment.
- Substantial instruction in English in all major subjects, both in courses taught by University of Helsinki faculty and by visiting instructors and Docents. Use of outside teachers injects active professionals with a deep knowledge of current relevant issues concerning pharmacy practice.
- Faculty and staff attend leadership training arranged by the Personnel Unit of the University. Faculty participation in research conducted by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.
- Students experience a range of instructional methods, from lecture, group work and problem-based learning to off-campus practice experiences. Once a term there is a day for student feedback for the entire Faculty.
- The IPSF provides a coordinating opportunity for pharmacy students to have professional experiences abroad.
- Recruitment is coordinated by the Administration Office, which both provides administrative support and assurance of conformity to the Administrative Regulations of the University.

**Recommendations**

- We recommend that the faculty expand the recognition and support for teaching excellence.
- We recommend that the faculty strengthen leadership succession by including teachers and professors who are not yet in a management position. Faculty and staff are attending leadership training arranged by the personnel unit of the university.
- We recommend that the faculty monitor the strand model and continue to make improvements based on applied research results. Funding for the strand model’s development expires 2009; University support for continued development of the strand-based curriculum model is recommended for the following three-year strategy period to continue work with this model. Furthermore, at the beginning of a student’s course of study and regularly throughout, explain and reinforce the strand model as the framework for integrating learning across the professional curriculum. For the Bachelor’s students, awareness of the strand model could enhance their professional identity.
• We recommend that the Faculty more fully integrate and coordinate external course content with the curriculum objectives, for example through co-teaching by full-time faculty, observation of lectures and peer review/feedback.

• We recommend that the Faculty assess relative workloads and the distribution of duties annually, with rotation of responsibilities. Moreover, the use of fixed-term employment contracts and the duration of the terms should be re-examined and recommendations made in consideration of research and teaching staff turnover.

• We also recommend that the Faculty expand the orientation of new faculty to Alma and Blackboard to expedite their mastery of optimal instruction and education management, and standardise Faculty orientation to optimise opportunities for appropriate work to be done by the Administrative Office. Also, the web-based feedback system is highly structured; our interviews suggested that it would be more useful if it were more flexible.
11 Faculty of Science
11.1 Self-evaluation of the Faculty of Science
A  Overview (description of the production of the self-evaluation material)

The dean of the Faculty requested the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching to coordinate evaluation at the Faculty level and appointed the head of academic affairs as the Faculty’s contact person. The Committee for the Development of Teaching discussed the evaluation guidelines submitted by the University’s central administration at its meeting in November 2007 and sent Faculty-level guidelines to the departments on the basis of these discussions. The guidelines provided detailed instructions about preparing the self-evaluation material and laid out the schedule for the evaluation process.

Stage 1 of the self-evaluation

The heads of department appointed evaluation contact persons for each department and set up a working group to coordinate evaluation at the department level. Most departments assigned coordination to the department’s committee for the development of teaching. Students took part in the preparation of answers related to departmental self-evaluation.

The Faculty’s head of academic affairs prepared preliminary answers to Faculty-level questions in cooperation with representatives of the Research & Development Unit for Science Education. The answers were finalised at meetings held by the committee for the development of teaching.

The contact persons for the departmental evaluation, representatives of the R & D Unit for Science Education and the Faculty’s head of academic affairs met, under the lead of the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, at the beginning of January and February to exchange experiences about the implementation of the first phase of the self-evaluation. Faculty- and department-level answers to questions about the management of education were completed at the end of February.

Stage 2 of the self-evaluation

The head of academic affairs and the a senior lecturer of university pedagogy (from the Research and Development Unit for Science Education used the departments’ self-evaluation reports to define five themes that were discussed at a workshop held at the beginning of March. The workshop was attended by people in charge
of the development of teaching and of academic administration at both the Faculty and department levels, as well as by student representatives. Workshop participants discussed the following themes in three stages:

1. Giving, collecting and using feedback,
2. Improving teaching skills and making teaching methods more versatile,
3. Information flow and operations of the work community,
4. Making students part of the academic community, and
5. Multidisciplinarity and cross-disciplinarity on campus.

Activities were supervised by an outside consultant. During the discussions, participants defined the strengths and weaknesses of the Faculty’s education, produced content for the Faculty’s joint self-evaluation report and pointed out actual areas in need of development.

The Faculty’s self-evaluation report was written on the basis of department reports and workshop discussions. The report was submitted to the departments’ contact persons for comment and was then discussed by the Committee for the Development of Teaching. The final version of the report was submitted to the heads of department for comment, after which the dean approved the self-evaluation report at the end of March.

B Description of the management of education

A diagram of the structure of the management of education is appended to this document. (See appendix 1, page 320)

The Faculty

Every three years, the Faculty Council confirms the action plan for the development of teaching and learning based on the target programme. The implementation of the plan is coordinated and monitored by the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching. The Faculty’s internal division of responsibilities takes into consideration the focal areas that the Faculty’s target programme has defined for the development of teaching: the planning of teaching, quality of learning, the teaching skills of teachers, student guidance, subject teacher education and internationalisation. The committee is also responsible for preparing the allocation
of funding related to the development of teaching and for preparing other academic matters, such as degree requirements and statements, for treatment by the dean or the Faculty Council. The dean appoints a member from each department and student representatives to the Committee for the Development of Teaching. Other committee members are the Faculty’s a senior lecturer of university pedagogy, the planning officer in the R & D Unit for Science Education and the international affairs officer. The committee is chaired by the Faculty’s vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, and its term is three years. The committee’s secretary is the Faculty’s head of academic affairs, who, in the role of a manager, is in charge of the Faculty's academic administration.

The Faculty’s Planning Committee takes part in planning the Faculty's operations and finances and in allocating resources. Based on the dean’s proposal the committee may also handle other matters. The Planning Committee is the cooperative organ at the Faculty level. Committee members include the heads of department, the head of the library, a representative of the personnel organisation, a representative of the teachers’ and researchers’ group and student representatives.

The Faculty’s Admissions Board prepares, develops and monitors the Faculty’s student selection. The board decides on the selection of new students for the lower and higher academic degrees and the flexible study rights scheme and for non-degree studies. The Admissions Board also prepares selection-related matters for the Faculty and handles appeals concerning student selection.

The Faculty has a Research and development Unit for Science Education; whose operations are led by a senior lecturer of university pedagogy. The unit also employs a planning officer and part-time project workers. The unit develops teaching, guidance and studies in the Faculty in cooperation with teachers from different departments. It arranges training in university pedagogy for teachers and orientation courses in pedagogy for new postholders. The unit maintains a peer network for teachers, conducts research related to the teaching and learning of natural sciences and the development of teaching, as well as coordinates quality assurance within the Faculty.

The Faculty Office takes care of the administration of academic affairs and student services under the lead of the head of academic affairs. The administrators managing academic affairs in the Faculty Office and in the departments form a network that meets regularly under the lead of the head of academic affairs. The activities of the network for academic administration representatives aim to enhance information flow between the departments and the Faculty Office and to provide support and training to people handling academic affairs in the departments. Network meetings deal with topical practical issues related to the planning and organisation of teaching.
The contact persons for international affairs form a network that convenes when needed under the lead of the Faculty's International Affairs Officer.

Support for web-based education is arranged by each individual department, and support personnel have their own network.

The departments

In the departments, the preparation and implementation of training-related matters, as well as decisions on them, involve the departmental steering group, head of department or deputy head of department, directors of specialisation studies, the head of studies or department secretary, student advisors and the working group for the development of teaching. The working group for the development of teaching includes teachers, students and representatives of academic administration.

Forums that play an important part in the cooperative preparation of matters include departmental strategy, development and feedback seminars, professor meetings and other staff meetings.

The steering group plays a key role: it handles all important development projects and policy decisions. The working group for the development of teaching is in charge of preparing degree requirements and other academic affairs for the departmental steering group, designing the curriculum, preparing and coordinating teaching development projects, preparing presentations related to the success of teaching, developing teaching methods and monitoring the quality of teaching and learning. The head of studies or department secretary is actively involved in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of matters related to education.

Departments appoint coordinators and contact persons for the most important matters. The departments’ personal study plan coordinators, contact persons for international affairs, contact persons for practical training and labour market representatives, tutor contact persons and advisors in web-based education are in charge of the implementation and monitoring of matters in their own fields of responsibility.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

Management of education in the Faculty

- How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

Documents steering activities

Documents common to the whole Faculty and confirmed by the Faculty Council form the foundation for the implementation and development of teaching.

One of the main documents guiding education is the action plan for the development of teaching and learning, which is based on the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies and the Faculty’s target programme. It is prepared for three years at a time by the Committee for the Development of Teaching. The plan encompasses all of the actual measures that will be carried out in the period and lists them under different themes. A planning and implementation schedule, responsibilities and the source of resources has been listed for each action. The action plan is approved by the Faculty Council. Before approval, the plan is discussed in each department and sent for comment to all cooperation parties defined in the plan. Preparations that take into consideration all of the responsible parties ensure that all parties are committed to the plan.

Departments draw up their own target programmes that cover the entire planning period and include the key objectives, from the department’s point of view, that are in line with the University’s strategy and action plans.

The standing regulations for degrees are included in the Faculty’s degree regulations, which the Committee for the Development of Teaching prepares and the Faculty Council confirms. The degree regulations form the basis for the preparation of degree requirements and the curriculum in departments.
Both the Faculty and the departments have an operations manual that describes the key operations and operating principles of units, and the quality assurance elements included in them. Operations manuals aim to ensure that operations are of a uniform and systematic nature and that results are of a high quality.

**Management of the development of education**

The University controls the Faculty’s operations through its operations management processes. The Faculty, in turn, controls the operations of its departments through its own operations management process. Under the lead of the dean, the Faculty, its departments and the Kumpula Science Library carry out performance negotiations concerning the planning period on the basis of the Faculty's and departments’ target programmes. The performance negotiations focus on the Faculty’s research, education, finances and administrative and support services. Follow-up meetings with the dean and the departments are arranged during the planning period.

The Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching annually monitors the implementation of the action plan for the development of teaching and learning and gives the departments further instructions about matters mentioned in the plan. For example, the guidelines for the preparation of degree requirements in spring 2008 requested departments to take into consideration the inclusion of learning objectives and scheduling models in curricula. The Faculty allocates funding reserved for the development of teaching to the implementation of measures mentioned in the plan. The departments draw up a more detailed plan, including budgets, for the implementation schedule of actions and submit the plan to the Committee for the Development of Teaching. The committee prepares a proposal on the allocation of funding for the dean, who makes the final decision on the matter. If required, the main matters concerning the planning of operations and the allocation of resources are also handled by the Faculty’s planning committee.

The departments submit annual reports on the achievement of targets and the use of funding to the Faculty. The reports are handled by the Committee for the Development of Teaching. Every three years, the committee draws up a report on the development of teaching in the Faculty and defines the areas to be developed in the next three-year period.

**Support for the development of teaching**

The Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching convenes once a month under the lead of the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs to prepare matters that will be decided on by the Faculty Council or the dean and will be communicated to the departments or used as a basis for further action. Each committee member representing the personnel of his or her department is a member of the department’s working group for the development of teaching, often the chairperson. The committee may request comments from the departments’ working groups for
the development of teaching either in advance or during preparations. This ensures appropriate decisions and promotes interaction between the Faculty and departmental coordinators.

The Faculty’s a senior lecturer of university pedagogy and the academic planning officer are members of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching. They regularly participate in the activities of departmental working groups for the development of teaching and other networks. The R & D Unit for Science Education arranges training and workshops to support the implementation of issues listed in the Faculty’s action plan for teaching and learning, as well as to deal with other topical matters. Invitations to the events are sent to teachers and academic leadership representatives in the departments. Some of the events are informal meetings where participants can exchange experiences; others are training events to which representatives of each department are invited. The R & D Unit for Science Education works in close cooperation with the Faculty’s head of academic affairs and reports to the dean on its activities.

Supervised by the head of academic affairs, the employees handling academic affairs in the Faculty Office are in charge of the general administration of teaching and degrees, the organisation of student selection and student services. The Faculty Office provides general student services to all students of the University of Helsinki. Academic advice is given in the Faculty Office and in the departments.

The R & D Unit for Science Education helps students to develop their study skills and write their theses. It also arranges events related to labour market orientation. A counselling psychologist and a project officer responsible for labour market studies also work part-time in the unit.

The Faculty Office and departments have appointed contact persons or coordinators who manage the core entities. For example, practical training places are jointly distributed and administered by the person in charge of practical training matters in the Faculty Office and the departments’ contact persons. The Faculty’s international affairs officer coordinates activities related to international studies through the contact persons for international affairs.

**Networks**

The administrators in charge of academic management and leadership in the Faculty belong to several intra-university and national networks. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs regularly participates in vice-dean meetings convened by the vice-rector responsible for academic affairs. Senior lecturers of university pedagogy, heads of academic affairs, international affairs officers and academic advisors have their own networks.
The Faculty has a network for academic administration representatives, which the head of academic affairs convenes twice a term. Network meetings deal with topical academic administration issues, such as changes to be made to the degree regulations and details related to the monitoring of study progress. The networks improve information flow, ensure that matters are handled similarly in different departments and enhance administrative processes. Corresponding networks are in place for advisors in web-based education and people in charge of international academic affairs.

**Strengths**

Except for the Department of Astronomy, all of the Faculty’s departments and units are located on the Kumpula campus, which forms a close-knit and efficient community. The Faculty has entrusted the departments with the decision-making powers allowed by the University’s Administrative Regulations. This enables decisions to be made efficiently and appropriately close to the party handling practical implementation. The Faculty employees who participate in the development of teaching, the implementation of activities and management are very effectively networked. Many different channels are used to distribute information: the intranet, e-mail lists, newsletters and online news. Matters are handled systematically and uniformly according to jointly made decisions. The Faculty supports the competence of teachers and academic administrators with training and by developing network operations.

Based on the results from the previous international evaluation of education and degrees carried out in 2001–2002, the Faculty has focused especially on the quality assurance of education, on increasing student orientation and on pedagogic education for teachers. Systematic and goal-oriented development of teaching has been managed through development projects common to the whole Faculty: in 2004–2006 the Faculty carried out two development projects, one focusing on the quality assurance of education and another dealing with pedagogy. In early 2007, the Faculty set up a R & D Unit for Science Education led by a senior lecturer of university pedagogy. The lecturer is the Faculty’s expert in pedagogy and coordinates education in university-level teaching and learning on the campus. Concrete examples of development work include the creation of Faculty-wide guidelines and methods for personal academic guidance, special clinics to support students nearing the end of their studies, training in university pedagogy for teachers and regular peer meetings arranged as “teacher cafés”. Patient and systematic development of teaching has given rise to a new operating culture in the Faculty. People get together in workshops and teacher cafés to network, exchange information and talk about experiences.

The operations described above have made information flow and interaction more efficient and versatile between different departments and within the Faculty. Academic and administrative employees now work in closer cooperation with each
other. It is also easier for the Faculty to identify differences in the management of academic staff and that of administrative and support staff, as well as the responsibilities involved.

**Challenges and areas in need of development**

The Faculty’s departments are big and independent. They differ from one another in terms of their operating methods and the stage at which they are in the development of processes and other matters. Many of the Faculty’s departments are further divided into divisions and units. The Faculty accepts this versatility in its internal structure and understands that management is a challenging task in a big faculty. **More emphasis must now be put on the utilisation of synergies** in order to make operations as efficient as possible, to reduce overlaps and to make the distribution of labour clear and appropriate. The Faculty also considers its internal versatility to be a strength, as differences in the procedures adopted by different departments give depth to the Faculty’s operating culture.

The departments have several coordinators and contact persons for different subject matters, who often handle these responsibilities in addition to their teaching duties. The risk of this is that coordinators and contact persons cannot concentrate on the subject matter in great detail or give it the attention it deserves. All departments need a **head of studies** or a department secretary, who is responsible for planning and arranging education in cooperation with the head of department. Large subject matters probably need their own coordinator, since a single person (e.g., the head of studies) cannot handle everything in a big department. The goal is for each department to have a person in charge of the development of teaching (e.g., the chairperson of the working group for the development of teaching), as well as a person in charge of academic administration. This would enable the teaching and administrative staff to focus on their own duties.

**The main objectives for the development of education must be defined with a long-term perspective in mind: a three-year period is a short time for developing education.** The improvement of operations should not be solely based on short-term projects. All department-specific projects must promote the achievement of the main objectives set for the development of education. Development projects must comply with the Faculty’s target programme and the strategic plans of departments.

Further emphasis must be put on the last phase of the operations management process, which involves analysing the achievement of targets. The **impact of the measures taken** must be carefully assessed before planning new actions. Attention must be given to the quality of project reports, and the reports should be used as a tool to analyse the achievement of targets. Reporting must be scheduled appropriately so that the results of projects and the achievement of targets can be truthfully recorded in the reports.
The Faculty has set up several feedback systems, which have been enhanced based on the results obtained from teaching evaluations carried out in recent years. The Faculty's departments regularly collect and analyse feedback in many different ways, but a systematic evaluation system for the quality of teaching and learning that would have an appropriate impact on activities is still in the making. The goal is to create a system that supports the development of well-planned teaching and learning and serves as an effective tool for the management of education. When developing the system it is important to define the parties that are responsible for activities and to decide on the launch of development measures based on evaluation results.

Management of education in the departments

How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?

Preparing and confirming degree requirements

The departments are divided into research-based divisions, laboratories, research groups or research units. The teaching imparted by the departments is organised according to the specialisation option and the Master's programme. Specialisation options and Master's programmes reflect the focal areas of research and teaching. They each have their own degree requirements, which aim to provide students with the special skills and the academic foundation needed in the field. When teaching is planned individually for each option, departments can create a strong connection between research and teaching.

Departments use the Faculty's degree regulations as a basis when preparing the degree requirements and curriculum. The degree regulations include the standing regulations concerning the Faculty's degrees. The degree regulations are confirmed by the Faculty Council. Any changes made to them are prepared at the meetings of the academic affairs network and in the Faculty's Committee for the Development of Teaching.

The departments prepare the degree requirements for each individual discipline under the lead of the directors of specialisation options. They are then handled by the departmental working groups for the development of teaching. Each working group finalises the curriculum of its department and ensures, among other things, that the evaluation guidelines of different departments are harmonised. The degree requirements are approved by the department's steering group before being submitted to the Faculty Office. In the Office, the Faculty's head of academic affairs prepares the degree requirements for the Faculty Council and ensures that the standing regulations mentioned in the degree regulations have been taken into consideration. The Faculty Council confirms the degree requirements presented by the head of academic affairs.
Feedback received from employers and students is taken into account when drawing up degree requirements. The international compatibility of degrees is also taken into account when planning changes. The degree requirements’ compliance with labour market needs and the development of their content is monitored through the contacts and interest groups of research groups. The LUMA Centre offers the Faculty a channel for maintaining close and active contacts with schools and the rest of society. Student feedback is collected, for example, through course-specific questionnaires and personal study plan guidance, as well as after graduation. Significant changes to degree requirements are also discussed in interdepartmental working groups and at professor meetings. The goal is for each department to engage its whole community in creating a good balance between the different degree elements.

**Strengths**

Teaching is based on research that is of high international quality and on internationally established curricula. Planning teaching individually for each option ensures a strong connection between research and teaching.

Degree requirements are prepared clearly and transparently, and departments are notified of the preparation schedule well in advance. Both teachers and students have good opportunities to affect the content of degree requirements. Students participate in preparations through student feedback, in the departments’ working groups for the development of teaching and in steering groups. The Faculty’s degree regulations clearly delineate how to plan degree requirements.

The degree requirements’ compatibility with labour market needs is actively monitored.

**Areas in need of development**

Cooperation between specialisation options should be deepened both within and between departments.

### Agreeing on the content, development and methods of teaching

**How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?**

**Management of the development of education**

The working group for the development of teaching is in charge of developing education at the department level. The group’s duties include preparing degree
requirements and other academic affairs for the departmental steering group, designing the curriculum, preparing and coordinating teaching development projects, preparing presentations related to the success of teaching, developing teaching methods and monitoring the quality of teaching and learning. The methods adopted by working groups differ depending on the department. In some departments, work is highly organised, while in others it is more informal. Students are represented in the working groups of all departments. The working groups are usually led by one of the department's professors or university lecturers, appointed to the post for one three-year term at a time. Some departments also have a working group for web-based or virtual instruction, which focuses on enhancing the prerequisites for the development of online courses.

All significant projects and policy decisions related to the development of teaching are handled by the department's steering group. The head of studies or department secretary is actively involved in the preparation, implementation and monitoring of matters related to education. The responsibility for managing the practical implementation of teaching is held by the director of each specialisation option or the laboratory or department superior.

Teaching-related matters are also discussed in departmental development and feedback seminars, which most departments arrange once or twice a year. Cooperation with student organisations is active, and the organisations are asked for separate statements during the preparations of important matters.

**Development of teaching methods**

After the previous international evaluation of education, the Faculty has focused on making its teaching methods more versatile and increasing student-centred forms of teaching. Special emphasis has been put on the creation of peer support networks for teachers, the development of web-based education and the improvement of the quality of learning. Teachers are encouraged to adopt new teaching methods, helped by the peer support network and the Faculty’s R & D Unit for Science Education. The objective is to make good practices systematically and regularly known to all teachers with the help of, for example, experiments, surveys and studies related to the quality of teaching and learning.

In many departments, decisions on the teaching methods used in individual courses are made by the course coordinators. The management system gives teachers the freedom to use methods they have found to work well and to develop the content of their courses. In some departments, the working group for the development of teaching makes the decisions on course content and teaching methods. Determining learning objectives that are appropriate for the degree as a whole, as well as for the major or minor study module, enhances commitment to course content. Courses are designed, implemented and evaluated in line with the principles of constructive alignment. Clearly worded learning objectives help
teachers to define concrete course evaluation criteria, which are also accessible to students. This gives students a clear understanding of the expected learning results and the scheduling and time the course requires.

It is important to find teaching methods that support the learning objectives of each course and to offer teachers the opportunity to develop their own courses in a suitable and controlled manner. Discussing and developing the content and learning objectives of education in the departmental working groups for the development of teaching promotes the controlled use of teaching methods. This procedure should be adopted in all of the Faculty’s departments. Centralised monitoring and coordination of the departments’ teaching methods also ensures that students can use many different study methods in different types of learning environments. From the students’ point of view, versatile teaching methods are enriching: students must be able to adopt different types of learning methods.

**Utilisation of feedback systems**

Student feedback is valuable for developing the content and forms of teaching and identifying problems related to studies. The Faculty’s departments collect and analyse feedback in many different ways. Most courses use an online form to collect feedback, which is analysed by the course coordinator. Feedback is also examined by the heads of department, heads of study or the working groups for the development of teaching. Students give feedback in conjunction with their personal study plan guidance, and the spontaneous oral feedback they give during courses is considered to very valuable. Many departments have decided to analyse feedback in the review discussions between teachers and their immediate superior. Feedback affects teaching arrangements and, to some extent, teacher selection in all departments.

**Strengths**

All departments have working groups for the development of teaching, whose activities have increased the consistency, openness and clarity of the planning and development of teaching.

Feedback is collected systematically, regularly and in versatile ways in different areas of teaching. Feedback collection is a part of normal activities. It has an impact on the content of teaching and on teaching arrangements.

Students and teachers interact naturally with each other. Cooperation with student organisations is active.

**Areas in need of development**

Teaching methods must be defined and used in a controlled way and closely linked to learning objectives. A clear overall plan should be drawn up for the
learning objectives, content of teaching and teaching methods, which would be centrally monitored and coordinated in the working groups for the development of teaching. All departments should continue to disseminate good practices and teaching experiments at the department level.

Challenges to the use of feedback include speeding up the feedback cycle, increasing feedback activity and organising more systematic feedback to be given to students. Although departments have performed a variety of experiments to answer these challenges, some departments still lack established procedures. The creation of a feedback system that motivates students and has an effective impact on procedures will be continued as a Faculty-wide project. Instead of the collection and analysis of general feedback, the Faculty will begin to focus on the evaluation of learning results and on “targeted feedback”, which is used to collect information about a previously defined topic related to the evaluation of learning. The topic that is to be studied on the basis of feedback will be individually defined for courses. This will make feedback collection more meaningful for students, especially since the feedback will be handled in the counter-feedback given at the end of the course. Counter-feedback will also be used at the beginning of courses by explaining to the students how the course has been developed.

Feedback should be made better use of in discussions between superiors and teachers, as well as in meetings held by the working groups for the development of teaching. The goal is to develop a systematic approach to evaluating the quality of teaching and learning, which offers information about the quality of learning and is of real use for those managing the development of education.

**Ensuring the appropriate allocation of teaching duties**

*How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?*

All of the Faculty’s units comply with the University’s personnel and pay policy. The departments’ human resources plans guide the use of teaching staff and the development of the personnel structure. Human resources plans include guidelines concerning the personnel’s well-being and management. Their implementation is monitored by departmental steering groups, heads of department and immediate superiors. Departments make their plans for the annual workload in writing and in compliance with the agreement on the working hours of teachers.

In the case of permanent teachers, teaching duties are planned individually for each specialisation option and as an integral part of syllabus preparation and review discussions. While preparing the teaching programme, the directors of studies draw up a proposal for course teachers. Teachers, in turn, submit annual work plans to the head of department. Based on this information, the coordinators of disciplines
who belong to the working group for the development of teaching complete the proposal for the allocation of teaching duties and draw up a schedule for their own discipline. The chairperson of the working group coordinates the preparation of the entire department's teaching programme and schedule of classes.

The head of department monitors the allocation of teaching duties on the basis of work plans. If needed, course responsibilities can be modified or part-time teachers hired to assist full-time teachers.

Part-time teachers are usually students who are in the final phases of their Bachelor's degree, already working on their Master's degree or doing postgraduate studies. They primarily teach small groups and problem-solving classes in basic and intermediate studies. The amount of teaching duties is determined flexibly for individual periods so that teaching does not excessively hinder the teachers' own studies. Courses and their content are always managed by a lecturer or professor.

In line with the University's principle, the goal is for all teachers to do research and all researchers to teach. Researchers typically teach their own field of specialisation. Young researchers have also taught basic courses in order to accumulate teaching experience. Teaching is part of the overall workload of researchers.

The practice used in the Department of Computer Science is a good example of how to allocate teaching duties. Teachers and researchers plan their overall workload and the share of teaching in it by using department-specific norms that take into account the time needed to prepare what is being taught. This time depends on how demanding the course is and how new it is (in general and to the teacher), as well as on other factors, such as an exceptionally great need to develop material and the recurrence of teaching (exercise groups etc.). The time taken up by teaching duties is standardised using hourly coefficients for contact teaching, which range from a value of 2, assigned to recurring group teaching, to a value of 9, assigned to lectures for a new course. The goal of precise standardisation of teaching duties is to ensure that teachers immersed in an active research phase have enough time for research.

**Strengths**

Departments have also assigned teaching duties to international researchers and postgraduate students. This has promoted internationalisation at home and increased the opportunities for students to take part in courses held in English.

**Areas in need of development**

In several departments, personnel resources are quite limited in relation to the number of students. The increased workload of teachers in the fields of teaching and thesis supervision has weakened their opportunities to do research and develop education.
The situation could be alleviated by departments determining the items included in annual workload calculations in more detail and by each department appointing a coordinator for academic administration. Supported by the Faculty, all departments should be more systematic about distributing work in such a way that the teaching and research personnel can concentrate on teaching and research, while administration is handled by specially assigned professionals.

Promoting solid professional skills and competence among the teaching staff

- *How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?*

Recruitment of teachers

The goal of determining the scope of teaching posts is to ensure that the focal areas of teaching and research important to departments are distributed appropriately. The Faculty has set up university instructor posts for which it appoints individuals who have excelled especially in teaching. The structure of permanent teaching posts, in all fields, is based on the human resources policy. When assessing the teaching skills of applicants, attention will be paid not only to research merits and other demonstrated skills, but also to pedagogical training, previous experience in teaching, the ability to develop teaching materials, any other teaching merits and teaching skills as demonstrated in lectures. The Faculty uses academic portfolios as a tool for documentation.

The objective is for substitute arrangements to cover the entire leave of absence, and at least one academic year depending on the needs and competence requirements of the specialisation option in question. Substitutes are recruited on the basis of review discussions, as proposed by the coordinator of the specialisation option.

Part-time teachers are recruited on a term-by-term basis. Academic administration collects information about the required amount and field of teaching from new and previous part-time teachers. Recruitment criteria are public: competence (degree/study success), experience and teacher aptitude. Studies in education and teaching experience are taken into consideration in the same way as when recruiting full-time teachers.

Research opportunities

Teaching is based on research of internationally high quality. The teaching staff does active research, which maintains expertise in the field and ensures the use of the latest research data in teaching. Some departments support the research
activities of teachers by ensuring that they have one period free of teaching duties. Some departments also support teachers’ research activities and other competence development with sabbatical arrangements that allow teachers to focus on research or a teaching development project for one term.

**Studies in education**

The pedagogical competence of teachers is a prerequisite for high-quality, research-based teaching and learning. The Faculty’s R & D Unit for Science Education arranges training in university pedagogy for teachers and orientation courses in pedagogy for new postholders. The unit maintains a peer network for teachers, coordinates the development of web-based pedagogy and arranges training in the use of ICT for teaching purposes in cooperation with the University’s Educational Centre for ICT.

Pedagogical training is taken into account in the salary system when assessing personal work performance. The interest in pedagogical training has increased in recent years, with more and more teachers completing study modules in university pedagogy. The Faculty's postgraduate students can complete training in university pedagogy as part of their postgraduate studies. From the point of view of management, the challenge of pedagogical training is to make participation in and the monitoring of training more systematic.

The Faculty has initiated a practice in which a senior lecturer of university pedagogy assesses the teaching skills of teachers and gives feedback on their pedagogical skills in individual feedback discussions. Teachers have not made much use of this type of feedback. Some departments support the development of teachers and courses by having members of the working group for the development of teaching discuss the development of courses with individual teachers.

**Review discussions**

All teachers have an immediate superior, with whom they conduct annual review discussions and pay discussions. During the discussions, the teacher and superior discuss the teacher’s professional competence and its development and agree on the objectives for the following year. The Faculty encourages managers and immediate superiors to participate in managerial training.

**Strengths**

The majority of teachers do active research, which maintains expertise in the field and ensures the use of the latest research data in teaching.

The Faculty identifies and distributes good practices, ensuring that they are available to the entire teaching community. Operations are coordinated to ensure that the distribution of good practices is systematic and does not happen at random.
Teachers have good opportunities to develop their professional skills. Managerial training is under special focus at both the department and Faculty levels.

**Areas in need of development**

More emphasis should be given to pedagogical training and teaching qualifications when recruiting teachers.

The Faculty should make more use of sabbaticals and periods free of teaching.

Participation in pedagogical training should be made more systematic and it should be monitored better. Although training has become more popular, it could be further enhanced in pedagogy and ICT. Differences in the pedagogical skills of teachers should be reduced in the departments. Education must be part of routine operations and be included in the annual workload. Teachers should be motivated to develop their teaching and competence with the help of the salary system and encouraging review discussions. The teaching qualifications of teachers, the feedback they receive and their educational training should always be taken into consideration when assessing personal work performance. The management system should more systematically support the pedagogical and professional development of teachers throughout their careers.

**Special features of the management of education in individual departments**

The Faculty’s departments differ from one another. The management of education also differs depending on the size of the department. Big departments organise their management by systematically assigning responsibility to different parties and by forming networks to coordinate management and make it effective. Smaller departments do not need the same kind of organisational structure.

The departments are at different stages in their development of education and related processes. This creates challenges to the management of education at the Faculty level. The following sections describe each department’s special characteristics concerning the management of education and areas in need of development.

**Department of Physics**

The Department of Physics was the only Finnish institution whose education was assigned to the excellent category in the CHE (Centre for Higher Education) evaluation focusing on European education in science in 2007. Around 1.3 per cent of ERASMUS-qualified departments of European universities belong to this category.
The strengths of the department's management of education are closely related to the matrix organisation used in the planning and development of teaching. One dimension of the matrix organisation consists of a research-based departmental division, while the other dimension consists of a division based on individual disciplines and the assignment of professors coordinating individual disciplines. This enables teaching to be planned and developed across research fields and disciplines. Different disciplines and research fields also support each other. Research pervades all teaching, and teaching is not controlled by any specific field of research but treats all fields equally.

Long-term planning is clearly related to the department's research strategy, which, in turn, guides medium-term operations and the development of the annual syllabus. Directors of study and academic advisors appointed for individual disciplines form a preparatory group, whose operations are linked to the activities of the working group for the development of teaching and to the management of the department. The long-term nature of strategic planning and the departmental strategy guide both medium-term and discipline-specific planning. The development and planning of education is discussed, prepared and implemented in a coordinated manner at many levels.

Areas in need of development
- Enhanced use of the matrix organisation and improved flexibility in the procedures of academic administration
- Systematic utilisation of feedback collected from personal study plan guidance in the planning and development of teaching

Department of Geology
The Department of Geology is relatively small, which facilitates interaction between the management, steering group, department secretary in charge of teaching, teachers and students. As far as its resources allow, the department can quickly respond to student feedback and wishes, as well as to labour market needs. The department's size also enables all full-time teachers to participate in the activities of the educational steering group.

Areas in need of development
- Long-term development of teaching and funding available for the development
- Small number of teachers in relation to the growing number of students
- Development of degree guidance procedures

Department of Chemistry
The department's divisions (the Laboratories of Analytical Chemistry, Inorganic Chemistry, Physical Chemistry, Organic Chemistry, Polymer Chemistry and Radiochemistry, as well as the Laboratory for Instruction in Swedish and the Teacher Education Unit) plan the content of education and implement teaching in their
own fields. The Laboratories of Inorganic, Physical and Organic Chemistry and the Laboratory for Instruction in Swedish hold the main responsibility for Bachelor-level education. Each laboratory has appointed a superior in charge of the laboratory’s operations and the supervision of teaching. All of the department’s laboratories, the Teacher Education Unit and students are represented in the working group for the development of education. The working group has systematically strengthened its position in coordinating, preparing and developing department-wide teaching matters. This has resulted in considerably closer interaction between laboratories.

The Teacher Education Unit and its research on chemistry education offer support and expertise to the staff. The use of information technology is one of the department’s strengths in terms of teaching methods. A large portion of the staff has also participated in related training. The eChemicum project, which supported web-based education, provided a good foundation for the use of information technology (the use of tools for teaching purposes, software for computer classes, molecular modelling in teacher training and the introduction of these in class instruction).

**Areas in need of development**

- Establishing the academic coordinator’s duties as part of the department’s academic administration
- Improving cooperation between laboratories in order to enhance teaching and the planning of education at the department level
- Developing interactive teaching cooperation with other departments and faculties
- Improving the commitment of staff and students to the supervision of studies

**Department of Geography**

The head of the Department of Geography defines the department’s strategy and presents it to the steering group and students, as well as to the staff at the cooperative meeting. Based on University, Faculty and department strategies, the department’s working group for the development of teaching prepares a three-year plan for the development of education.

In addition to the study guide, the department maintains a more wide-ranging curriculum with information about all the courses and examinations. The curriculum is updated once a year, at the latest in August before the beginning of the academic year. Course information is collected from the teaching plans returned in the spring. The curriculum lists the course coordinators or examiners, the primary target group of the courses, course prerequisites, general course descriptions, the objectives and core content of the courses, as well as their teaching method and assessment.
Areas in need of development

- Cooperation between specialisation options must be further enhanced to prevent fragmentation in teaching.
- The department’s focal areas in research should be given more emphasis when planning the degree requirements and teaching programme.

Department of Mathematics and Statistics

The department encompasses two disciplines and is located in two faculties: the Faculty of Science and the Faculty of Social Sciences. This means that at the highest level the department is managed in cooperation by the departmental steering group, the head of the department and both faculties. Differences in the two faculties’ procedures concerning certain teaching-related matters lend additional features to the management of education.

The content of education in mathematics has remained relatively stable in the past decades, which has enabled management to be based on a long-term approach. However, both teachers and students have also been given room for creativity. This has given rise to development measures initiated by the staff and students and carried out in cooperation with the departmental management. The measures have been used to support students at different phases of study, and many of them have had long-ranging effects. Examples of such measures include a form of peer support, proposed by students to be of assistance in first-year studies, as well as new ways to teach and complete courses.

Teaching in statistics is handled by the two faculties, making the department’s exceptional position particularly notable in that field. A significant portion of statistics education consists of minor subject teaching, which is imparted on the city centre campus and is, to a certain extent, taken into consideration in the funding of the Faculty of Social Sciences. The integration of statistics education in the two faculties is still ongoing. Students of statistics graduate from either the Faculty of Social Sciences or the Faculty of Science.

Areas in need of development

- Ensuring sufficient resources for minor subject teaching and organising a sensible study offering for the faculties’ own students and students from other faculties based on the needs and skills of each target group
- Developing methods for small-group teaching and training teachers of small groups
- Developing a centralised system for the department, which will offer immediate assistance in problems related to studies or teaching. Support for university pedagogy offered by the Faculty will be used to this end.
- Closer monitoring of phenomena related to teaching and learning, and the use of collected information among teachers and students
- Developing the supervision of study skills
Department of Computer Science
The Department of Computer Science manages education through open and communal processes with clearly defined objectives and responsibilities. Responsibility for the development of teaching has been assigned to the working group for the development of teaching, while academic administration is the responsibility of the head of studies. The content of degrees and teaching methods are developed in cooperation by the entire department, including the students. The department systematically monitors its educational development projects and publishes reports on them. Monitoring material and reports are used in development work. Activities are of a long-term and systematic nature, as shown by the department adopting information systems and structures supporting management long before they were introduced elsewhere in the University. Examples of information systems include the education information system (exam administration, enrolment system, course records), thesis database, course feedback system and course homepages. Examples of structures include student involvement at all levels, extensive annual departmental strategy seminars, as well as versatile development of ICT as support for learning (simulators, training products and tools for communal learning). The Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council nominated the department a national centre of excellence in 2007–2009.

Owing to rapid changes in the field, the department has regularly revised its degree requirements. New degree requirements are designed bearing in mind international developments in the field, the competence profiles and main themes of Master’s degrees, as well as the learning objectives defined for individual courses.

The annual workloads of teachers and researchers are based on department-specific norms, which also take into consideration the time needed to prepare teaching. Pedagogical and other training is also considered to be part of the annual workload. Teachers’ research activities and other competence development are supported with sabbatical arrangements that allow teachers to focus on research or teaching development projects during one term.

Areas in need of development
- Supporting the activity of students in development work
- Producing course material suitable for communal learning
- Developing and using learning evaluation practices that enhance constructive alignment
- Developing ICT applications that support learning and the distribution of good practices

Department of Astronomy
The head of department coordinates the management of education in cooperation with the department’s research directors and the working group for the development of teaching. The head of department and the directors of research groups meet three times a year to discuss educational matters that concern the whole department.
Furthermore, the department arranges three separate discussions between the key persons of each research group and the department’s management which focus on matters related to the research group’s own teaching. Education is discussed on a department-wide scale at the department’s development seminars, which are held twice a year and are open to both the staff and students.

The department has defined four main objectives for the management of education: a) Bachelor’s degree in three years, b) Master’s degree in two years, c) research meets education and d) utilisation of Finland’s ESO (European Southern Observatory) membership in astronomy teaching. The biggest emphasis is put on objective b), since systematic support for Master’s studies has been found to significantly affect study motivation and, consequently, speed up graduation. The objectives aim at a Master’s degree that is competitive both nationally and internationally and provides a sufficient foundation for becoming a researcher in astronomy. The degree also enables the holder to work in other fields of natural sciences in universities and research institutions and, depending on the minor subjects included in the degree, prepares students for duties in the IT sector and in the popularisation of science.

Areas in need of development

- Motivating researchers to develop their pedagogical skills and utilise modern teaching methods in addition to doing research
- The small number of full-time teaching staff in relation to part-time and external teaching resources hinders planning and management.
Summary of the strengths, challenges and areas in need of development of the management of education

Strengths

- Responsibilities are clearly defined in the management system and known to all.

- Teaching is developed systematically and goal-orientedly and is guided by the Faculty's action plan for the development of teaching and learning.

- The Faculty's Committee for the Development of Teaching has a strong role as a group coordinating Faculty-level education. All departments have working groups for the development of teaching, whose activities have increased the consistency, openness and clarity of the planning and development of teaching.

- The Research & Development Unit for Science Education has a well-established position in the development of teaching. Networking and the distribution of good practices work in all fields of education: teaching, pedagogical training and academic administration.

- The preparation of matters takes into consideration all parties responsible for activities and is both clear and transparent. Both teachers and students have good opportunities to influence matters. Matters are handled in a standardised manner and on the basis of joint decisions made in advance.

Challenges and areas in need of development

- The feedback system for the quality of teaching and learning that is used as a tool for management.

- The utilisation of monitoring results and feedback in operations management and leadership.
• More detailed analysis of the achievement of objectives and assessment of the impact of completed measures.

• Controlled and systematic use and monitoring of teaching methods.

• Support given to the activity of students in the development of teaching.

• Encouragement to participate in pedagogical training and monitoring of participation.

• Clarification of work distribution among the teaching, research and administrative staff and appointment of a coordinator for academic administration in all departments.

• Clearer specification of matters that need to be taken into consideration when calculating the annual workload of teachers.

• Increased emphasis on teaching merits in conjunction with appointments and the assessment of personal work performance.
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DOCUMENTS GUIDING ACTIVITIES

- Faculty target programme
- Action plan for the development of teaching and learning
- Operations manual
- Departmental strategic plans
- Strategic guidelines for the development of teaching
- Operations manual

ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP

- FACULTY COUNCIL
  - Dean
- COMMITTEE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TEACHING
  - Vice-dean
- Planning Committee
- STEERING GROUP
  - Head of department
- Meeting of professors
- Working group for the development of teaching

ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND SERVICES

- FACULTY OFFICE /
  - STUDENT AFFAIRS
  - OFFICE
  - Head of academic affairs
- SUPPORT FOR TEACHING
  - Senior lecturer of university pedagogy
- OFFICE
  - Department secretary / head of studies

NETWORKS

- Vice-deans
- Heads of academic affairs
- International affairs officers
- Senior lecturers of university pedagogy
- Student advisors
- Academic affairs network
- Teacher cafes
- Specialists in educational technology
- Student organisations

Appendix 1
11.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Science has seven departments. Six of them are located in the new Kumpula Science Campus area, while the Department of Astronomy is located elsewhere. The report of the Faculty provides a good description of the preparation and elaboration of the self-evaluation. The Faculty has, like all others, prepared an action plan 2007-2009 for the development of teaching and learning in line with the strategy for the management of teaching at the University of Helsinki. This action plan encompasses all of the main activities during the programme period and stipulates the responsibilities, timing and resources. Departments elaborate their own planning on the basis of this action plan. These documents form the basis for the activities in research and teaching strategies of the Faculty and in its Departments.

Bringing most of the Departments together on the Kumpula campus has brought along more cross-departmental coordination and offered opportunities to enhance the efficiency of operations. According to the staff interviewed, there are more informal meetings, for instance, the sharing of pedagogic experiences and the development of new teaching methods, than before. Being on one campus also makes timely management and leadership of education easier.

The development of teaching is a central theme in the Faculty’s strategy, and clearly involves an intention that, while teaching is based on research, it also is increasingly shifting towards student-centred modes of instruction. This is an ambitious strategic choice by a Faculty that has a long tradition in research and whose international reputation relies on excellence in scientific advancement and research. Several staff expressed their views that the action plan serves as an important guiding document for the management and leadership of education and that it should be treated as a longer-term target rather than as a description of concrete inputs by the end of the planning period. It is the opinion of the Evaluation Panel that the process that has led to the action plan and also its formulation represent good practices in the ongoing strategic planning and steering in the University. A major challenge for the Faculty in the near future concerns the monitoring and evaluation of the implementation of its action plan.
Management and leadership in education

Already after the previous international evaluation of education in 2002, the Faculty of Science has taken an important decision with respect to the development and improvement of teaching, namely to use a larger variety of teaching methods and especially to increase learner-centred forms of teaching. Teachers were encouraged to adopt and apply new teaching methods, helped by a peer support network and the Faculty's R&D Unit for Science Education. The objective was to make good teaching practices systematically and regularly known to all teachers.

During the Panel's visit at the Faculty the Evaluation Panel established that this intended focus on learner-centred teaching is taken seriously by the M&L at both the Faculty and the Department levels. Several Departments provide a strong research environment, but focus at the same time on the development of education and teaching. Furthermore, the interviews with the teachers and with the students have shown that over the past years substantial progress has indeed been made with regard to the implementation of learner-centred teaching: more activating and interactive teaching methods, such as discussion courses, small-group work and personal work by students are currently quite widely used. As an example we learned how the Physics Department is using the method of peer instruction developed by Eric Mazur at Harvard University as a strategy to engage more student activities. This is implemented in a systematic way for some modules, and not left to the choice of an individual teacher. This is an example of good practice, and illustrates how one can achieve in a Department change and development in a sustainable way.

Notwithstanding these positive developments, the interviews with the students have also revealed that with respect to the application of learner-centred forms of teaching there are still differences between the Departments and between individual teachers; some teachers are still using an information transmission model of teaching. In other words, the Faculty and the Departments are well underway toward learner-oriented instruction, but there is still space for broadening and improving this intended approach to teaching.

The increasing application of learner-centred teaching methods in the Faculty of Science described above has been facilitated by the establishment in the Faculty of an R&D Unit for Science Education, and the presence in this unit of two experts in university pedagogy who are responsible for organising orientation and training courses in university-level teaching for the staff. In the interviews with the teachers it became clear that the activities of these experts are highly appreciated, and contribute substantially to the emergence of what has been called above a culture of learner-centred teaching in the Faculty of Science. Moreover, this is also stimulated by informal contacts and meetings arranged as “teacher cafés” where experiences with innovative teaching methods and practices can be exchanged and discussed. Interestingly, in some Departments (e.g., Mathematics and Statistics) the
development of a student-oriented approach is also facilitated by involving “senior” students in the teaching, for instance, for supervising exercises in small groups.

However, an obstacle for the further broadening and improvement of this culture of learner-centred teaching is the fact that participation in the training in university pedagogy is voluntary. In this respect the M&L at the level of the Departments has pleaded in favour of further increasing these teacher professional development activities by creating additional incentives, for instance, by offering a more differentiated program of activities (not only courses lasting one year), by creating more conditions and opportunities for exchanging and discussing good practices, and by taking into account teaching skills in the setting of teachers’ salaries.

Internationalisation is stated in the strategic plan to be an integral part of the University’s activities, and mobility is considered to be an important aspect of it. In the Faculty there are contact persons for international affairs and an International Affairs Officer. Taking this into account, it was a surprise for the Evaluation Panel to find out that there was no student with international experience among the interviewees; they explained how there was not enough time or about having language barriers or other obstacles for not going abroad. From teachers the Panel learned that the introduction of the Bologna reform process has made it even more difficult for students of some Departments to participate in exchange programs. In the discussions with the M&L of the Departments it was confirmed that the potential for internationalisation is currently not exploited enough as a vehicle for the further development and improvement of the quality of education of the Faculty of Science. The Faculty together with the departments has to make stronger efforts to implement the internationalisation part of the strategy and action plan in the future.

An interesting suggestion that came out of the discussions is to give teachers the opportunity to go abroad to explore new ideas and approaches and bring them back home as examples of good practices. This can also be used as a way to award and stimulate good teachers by providing them with funding for a study visit or to participate in an international pedagogical conference.

The Faculty’s feedback system includes multiple input sources: online forms, course-specific questionnaires, discussions between faculty and students, student personal study plan guidance, and departmental feedback seminars once or twice a year. Student participation in departmental working groups for the development of teaching provides feedback on the content of degree requirements. Graduates and employers also yield feedback on teaching and learning.

Individual Departments vary in their systematic use of feedback. Not all Departments utilise the results of feedback to the same degree, nor review discussions between teachers and their immediate superiors. For individual courses, the feedback is mostly analysed by a course coordinator and may also be reviewed by the heads of
Department or working groups for the development of teaching.

It became clear to the Evaluation Panel that the better utilisation of the Faculty's feedback systems constitute in several respects a challenge for further development, more specifically with regard to operations management and leadership, and with regard to the quality of teaching and learning. The Faculty's self-evaluation report particularly noted the importance of “targeted feedback” as opposed to general feedback, and the importance of counter-feedback at the start of a course. In the interviews, students reported that they would be more motivated to give feedback if they received such counter-feedback or could see how their feedback has been used.

In principle workloads are determined by the statutory limit of 1600 hours per year for an individual faculty member. Few faculties in universities who are engaged in research, teaching and administrative service are able to accomplish their work within this limit. The Evaluation Panel learned that this is also true in the Faculty of Science, where the actual workload is in excess of this limit. In the interviews and from the available data it became clear that student/faculty ratios and the instructional activities of teaching and thesis supervision are displacing research time for some of the faculty. In addition, the Panel heard concerns that in the future administrative responsibilities may increase as the Department structures will be affected by the forthcoming new Universities Act.

Faculty workload is determined by annual work plans discussed and agreed upon between the head of the Department and the individual faculty member. Although teaching is in principle part of the overall workload of all researchers, the Evaluation Panel learned during the interviews that the balance of activities for teaching and research can vary substantially among faculty members. Notwithstanding the heavy teaching load of many faculty members, they are overall nevertheless doing a good job. Indeed, the interviewed students told the Panel that they are quite satisfied about the teaching in the Faculty of Science and the accessibility of their teachers. In the interviews with the teachers it became clear that attention to better rewarding their efforts to do good teaching would be highly appreciated.

Conclusions

Strengths

- The Faculty has an ambitious action plan with a strong focus on education and teaching.
- Substantial efforts have been invested in the Faculty and the Departments toward more learner-centred instructional methods, and this seems to be resulting progressively in a “culture of learner-centred teaching” in the Faculty of Science.
The presence in the Faculty of two experts in university pedagogy has strongly facilitated the increasing application of learner-centred teaching methods.

Students have the feeling that they have a voice in the Faculty.

There is a positive attitude in the staff toward the use of feedback in view of the improvement of teaching and learning.

Strong motivation of the staff for their teaching duties

Satisfaction of the students about the teaching in the Faculty

**Good practices**

- Presence in the Faculty of Science of an R & D Unit for Science Education
- The use of peer instruction as a method to facilitate and amplify learner-centred teaching
- “Teacher Cafés” offering opportunities for informal exchange of teaching practices and experiences
- The departmental steering groups include representatives of the labour market.
- Industry representatives lecture in courses, providing direct feedback.
- Some of the courses employ formative student feedback, allowing for immediate changes during the course rather than afterwards.
- In the Department of Physics teaching is taken into account in determining the salaries.

**Recommendations**

- We recommend that the Faculty create conditions and opportunities to further develop and foster this culture of learner-centred teaching and, thus, to increase and improve the use of student-oriented instructional methods. An important tool to achieve this lies in teacher professional development.

- We recommend that the Faculty continue to develop its action plan along its current course, and thereby special attention could be paid to elaborating a more sharpened focus on a longer-term vision for the Faculty. Furthermore, the Faculty should develop instruments for the assessment of its management and leadership of education.

- We recommend that the Faculty take necessary measures to install and promote formal as well as informal opportunities for the professional development of the teaching staff. Moreover, the Faculty should put substantial weight on teaching qualifications and skills in the recruitment procedure for teachers.

- We recommend that internationalisation, especially the mobility of students as well as teachers, receive more attention by the Faculty. Also, there is a need for a strategy and a related action plan to develop and exploit internationalisation as a vehicle for enhancing the quality of education in the Faculty.
• We recommend that the Faculty develop a pro-active alumni system for obtaining feedback, an introductory module for incoming students instructing them on how to provide constructive feedback, and a more systematic, consistent and timely use of feedback by the Faculty’s management and leadership of education, and additions to its use by the individual faculty members.

• We recommend that the Faculty strengthen cooperation between the Departments with respect to teaching, clarify the work distribution of the staff among teaching, research and administrative tasks, and set clear specifications of the factors that have to be considered in calculating and determining the annual workload of teachers.

• We recommend that the Faculty consider a system that would recognise the achievements of those pre-Bachelor’s and Bachelor’s students that leave the Faculty before graduation to other Faculties, given the role that this instruction has in preparing some students for professional careers elsewhere.

Additional observations
The Faculty of Science offers major subjects and concentrations across the science disciplines. In 2007, it graduated 398 Bachelor’s and 322 Master’s students. The University’s productivity metrics currently do not reflect the work and societal contributions of this Faculty at the pre-Bachelor’s or Bachelor’s levels, nor does it recognise that many, at least 1/3 of entering students in some majors, leave the Faculty when they are admitted to Medicine or another professional school. Their preparatory work in the Faculty of Science requires resources that represent student preparation for their subsequent role in society. However, the matching funds to support these students do not follow.
12 Faculty of Social Sciences
12.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Social Sciences
A Introduction

The Faculty of Social Sciences prepared its self-evaluation both at the Faculty level in a steering group that the Faculty dean had appointed and at each of the Faculty departments. The results of this preparatory work were discussed first in a joint Faculty workshop on 21 February 2008. The Faculty's evaluation steering group then wrote a draft report concerning the evaluation of the management of education and encouraged each department to comment on the draft. After the departments had submitted their comments, the steering group wrote the final version of its report.

The Faculty appointed Taina Joutsenvirta, a senior lecturer in university pedagogy, to coordinate the evaluation of education from 2007 to 2008. The Faculty's evaluation steering group was chaired by Riitta Jallinoja, vice-dean in charge of academic affairs. The steering group members included the following persons: Taina Joutsenvirta, who represented the Team for the Development of Web-based Education, Tuula Hakkola, head of academic affairs, who represented the administration of academic affairs, and Teivo Teivainen, head of the Department of Political Science, who represented department heads and professors. In addition, Tuula Pietilä, department administrator (Department of Social and Moral Philosophy), provided administrative expertise, and university lecturers Ari Haukkala (Department of Social Psychology) and Aino Sinnemäki (Department of Sociology) represented the teaching staff. The steering group thus had at its disposal the perspectives of all persons and staff groups who play a central role in the management of education at the Faculty level. The opinions of departments of various types and sizes, as well as the experiences of people in various teaching positions, were also represented in the steering group. The group began its work on 4 December 2007 and convened eight times. The group’s progress has been reported on in the wiki area of the Evaluation of education 2007–2008.

The Faculty departments began their work around the same time. Each department produced the basic materials for the self-evaluation in its own way. Some departments discussed their draft reports in a large group, while others decided that a smaller preparatory group was sufficient. Both the Faculty steering group and those associated with the preparatory work at the departments benefited from the operations manual prepared for a previous audit in 2007. This manual describes all essential operations in the Faculty and its departments. Other key documents included the Faculty’s target programme for 2007–2009 and policy programme for the development of teaching and studies 2007–2009. The documents that the departments have produced for their operational and financial planning were also used in the self-evaluation.
Dr Maaret Wager (Social Psychology) planned the Faculty's workshop process. The workshop participants included several people from each of the Faculty's departments, the key persons associated with academic administration and seven student representatives. The documents that the Faculty and its departments had produced were thoroughly discussed in the workshop.

B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty of Social Sciences as an operating environment

The Faculty of Social Sciences is a multidisciplinary, medium-sized faculty at the University of Helsinki. The Faculty has ten departments that offer a total of 13 major subjects. Of the ten departments, the Department of Mathematics and Statistics is jointly administered by the Faculty of Social Sciences and the Faculty of Science.

The Faculty offers the undergraduate degrees of Bachelor and Master of Social Sciences. The Bachelor’s degree is a research-oriented degree that provides the foundation necessary for the Master’s degree. The Master’s degree offers more profound knowledge and expertise in the field. Both undergraduate degrees prepare students for analytical and independent work.

The Swedish School of Social Science functions as an independent unit under the auspices of the Faculty. The students of the Swedish School of Social Science who have completed a Bachelor’s degree can continue to pursue a Master’s degree in the Faculty.

In 2007 the Faculty had more than 5,000 undergraduate students, of whom about 550 students were enrolled at the Swedish School of Social Science. The Faculty had some 170 international undergraduate students in 2007, and it welcomes about 180 exchange students each year. The Faculty admits about 500 new students each year through various admissions procedures. In the past few years, the Faculty students have annually completed some 350 Master’s degrees, including approximately 15 degrees completed each year by international students.
The Faculty has more than 400 members of staff, including fixed-term staff. The Faculty employs close to 100 teachers permanently (professors, university lecturers and university instructors). The ratio of teachers to students is one of the lowest at the University (in 2006 this ratio was 32 students per person year), taking into account teaching provided by docents and fee-paid teachers. The Faculty must also cope with the additional burden imposed by the large number of students completing minor subject studies in the Faculty, which is popular among students of other faculties. Almost 50% of the students at most Faculty departments are minor subject students from other faculties and universities. Another characteristic of the Faculty is the considerable number of students (about two-thirds) who work while studying. Active participation in various student organisations also causes delays in graduation. The above factors are challenging for the planning and implementation of teaching.

**Leadership strategy**

The management of education in the Faculty of Social Sciences is based on broad participation and the joint generation of ideas concerning the development of teaching. Decision-making is founded on democratic leadership, in which the staff and students are entitled to participate in curriculum design and decisions.

To achieve its objectives, the Faculty needs to ensure that elected academic leaders and the managers of academic administration cooperate successfully. Wider discussions on high-quality teaching take place in the Faculty workgroups and committees, departmental staff meetings, meetings with student organisations and more widely with students, as well as in Faculty seminars. The starting point is the view that high-quality teaching requires successful interaction between students and teachers.

Most Faculty departments are small or medium-sized and represent a single discipline. Departmental operations are usually planned and carried out quite independently on the basis of the Faculty’s strategic policies. Planning is based on nation-wide networks and internal networks within the University and the Faculty. Such networks provide broad perspectives and function as discussion forums, as well as supporting the preparation of decision-making. Although the Faculty encourages open discussion, the heavy workloads of both the staff and the students sometimes hinder participation in preparatory work.

**The objectives of education**

The degrees that the Faculty offers are based on research in social sciences. The Faculty produces experts with a wide knowledge of social and cultural issues and with the willingness to promote human values both locally and globally. The
strengths of undergraduate education include its multidisciplinarity, the Faculty’s comparative research on societies and cultures, and the Swedish School of Social Science that functions under the auspices of the Faculty.

The Faculty expands and revitalises knowledge of social sciences by conducting basic and applied research of an international calibre. High-quality research is an important premise for academic education.

The Faculty actively supports efforts to raise the profile of expertise in the social sciences. It aims to encourage students to acquire a scientific and critical approach to the production of information and its application in expert tasks in society. Consequently, the Faculty pays particular attention to ensuring that its teaching and degrees are of such high quality and interest that the Faculty is able to attract the best and most motivated undergraduate and postgraduate students.

C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education

How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire Faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

The Faculty’s highest decision-making body is the Faculty Council, which decides on the Faculty’s target and policy programmes, degree requirements and standing orders on degrees, submits a proposal on the size of the Faculty’s annual student intake, decides the admissions criteria, and formally approves Master’s theses.

The Faculty dean has general powers: he or she deals with and decides on matters pertaining to the Faculty unless otherwise stipulated or determined. The Faculty also has three vice-deans, one of whom is in charge of academic affairs.

The responsibility for the preparation and execution of decisions falls on the representatives of the Faculty’s academic administration, namely, the head of academic affairs and the international affairs officer, who also present matters for decision at Faculty meetings (and are known in this capacity as presenting officials). In practice, the preparation of matters takes place on a broad basis in
various committees and in cooperation with both internal and external associates. Another preparatory body is the Preparatory Committee that is formed by the dean, the vice-deans and the presenting officials. At the preparatory stage prior to decision-making, departments and students are solicited for their views in the form of written statements so as to ensure that matters are well-prepared before they are presented to the Faculty Council.

**Strategic planning**

The key strategic policies in terms of the Faculty leadership are recorded in the Faculty’s target programme, which has been specified from the perspective of education in a policy programme for the development of teaching and studies from 2007 to 2009. This policy programme includes information about focus areas and areas in need of development. The focus areas include the quality of learning, student guidance and supervision, and the establishment of an international learning environment.

The Faculty’s target programme is prepared by the leadership of both the Faculty and its departments. This preparatory process begins with a meeting of the dean and the heads of departments, after which the preparatory work continues in the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Studies. The heads of departments are also asked for their comments at this stage, and all the comments are taken into account.

To support its strategic work, the Faculty organises one or two development days each year. Themes include topical issues in teaching.

In the course of each planning period, the Faculty monitors and assesses the implementation of its target and policy programmes, and reports on its actions to the University. The Faculty’s reports are written by its Preparatory Committee, which consists of the Faculty dean, vice-deans and presenting officials. The Committee for the Development of Studies, however, prepares the reports on the policy programme for the development of teaching and studies.

In recent years, the workload associated with strategic planning and operational changes has been so heavy that the Faculty has not been able to commit its teachers and students to the work associated with changes and further development as much as it had wished. The staff and students do not have the time and energy required for such work, especially now that teaching is more demanding than ever before. The tasks involved in strategic planning tend to be borne by certain teachers and students, which may hinder them from completing their other tasks and which also means that only a small group of people exchange ideas about strategic planning.
Agreement on quantitative objectives
The Faculty and its departments conduct annual target negotiations. For this purpose, all departments must write a human resources policy with information about discipline-specific degree objectives.

The Preparatory Committee, consisting of the Faculty dean, vice-deans and presenting officials, examines departmental proposals before it puts forward a proposal for the Faculty’s degree objectives. This proposal is submitted for target negotiations between the University and the Faculty. The Preparatory Committee also prepares other documents for the target negotiations, and ranks in an order of preference those Faculty projects that aim to develop teaching.

The Faculty has surpassed its degree objectives for several years now. The Faculty has also achieved the quantitative objectives set for student exchange programmes.

The Committee for the Development of Studies
The Committee for the Development of Studies plays a central role in strategic planning at the Faculty level. The chair of this Committee is the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, and members include one teacher representative from each of the Faculty’s departments, as well as student representatives and support service representatives. The preparatory process thus takes into account various parties’ views and also promotes the interdepartmental dissemination of information and experiences. Discussions in the Committee are open, lively and positive towards the development of studies. The challenge is, however, to ensure that information about matters that are being prepared is distributed to a wider circle of people within the Faculty.

In recent years, the Committee for the Development of Studies has focused on the implementation of the Bologna process in the Faculty. This task was more demanding in the Faculty of Social Sciences than in other faculties at the University of Helsinki, since the Bachelor’s degree was practically non-existent in the Faculty. Because the Faculty has also had to issue other standing orders on degrees, it has not had as much time for independent development work as it did a few years ago. Some development work has, nevertheless, taken place. The Committee for the Development of Studies created a “methodology basket” for the Faculty: each department offers at least one methodological course for the basket, which entitles the students of the department to take any of the courses in the methodology basket. In 2008 a similar “basket” was created for women’s and gender studies.

The Faculty’s head of academic affairs has compiled information about all the reforms and the Faculty’s standing orders into a leaflet entitled Toimintatavat tutuiksi (Getting to know practices and procedures). This publication has been distributed to teachers at all departments. It is also useful in the induction of new teachers. In addition, the Committee for the Development of Studies initiated and created together with the departments a website called Opetuksen ja ohjauksen hyvät käytännöt (Good practices in teaching, guidance and supervision).
The tasks of the Committee for the Development of Studies include supporting the management of education and encouraging departments to develop teaching. For these purposes, the Committee grants allocations to projects for the development of teaching and awards the honorary titles of “Good teacher” and “Developer of teaching” each year. The staff and the students can propose candidates for these awards.

*Internationalisation*

The promotion of internationalisation is one of the Faculty’s areas of development. As the Faculty currently attracts many international degree and exchange students, it has established projects with University funds to promote the establishment of new English-language Master’s programmes.

The Faculty also supports strategic planning by granting allocations to departments for English-language teaching. The Faculty receives the funds for such allocations from the University on the basis of various parameters that the University has defined. The allocations are distributed within the Faculty by the dean based on departmental proposals.

For a long time now, the Faculty has offered many English-language courses, but it has not been until very recently that departments have planned and established their own or joint English-language Master’s programmes. As such programmes have not received sufficient resources, teachers’ workloads have become heavier, and their opportunities to focus fully on other Master’s studies have been jeopardised. The challenge now is to share the Faculty’s scarce teaching resources equitably between Finnish- and English-language studies. The Faculty’s strengths include, however, its teachers’ wide international networks, which are also used in teaching, for example, in organising guest lectures.

*Swedish-language operations*

The Faculty staff and most students are native speakers of Finnish. The language of teaching and services is primarily Finnish and increasingly also English. The Faculty has three Swedish-language professorships: Social Work, Social Psychology and Political Science. The Faculty has no other permanent members of teaching staff who focus on teaching in Swedish. Swedish-language operations are usually integrated into other activities.

The Faculty cooperates closely with the Swedish School of Social Science in both teaching and administration. The objective is to promote students’ opportunities to study in their native language and to enable students with a Bachelor’s degree from the Swedish School to continue successfully their Master’s studies in the Faculty. Cooperation with the Swedish School in curriculum design has clearly improved students’ ability to continue their Master’s studies in the Faculty.

The Faculty has devised a programme on bilingualism, which the Faculty Council approved in 2005. Although the Faculty supports Swedish-language teaching by
granting a separate allocation to departments, the Faculty has insufficient resources to promote Swedish-language communications and operations as required by its programme on bilingualism.

**The consideration of teaching qualifications**
As the Faculty wishes to emphasise teaching qualifications alongside scientific qualifications in the filling of teaching posts, it has issued instructions according to which teaching skills are to be assessed in a versatile way. Responsibility for the assessment of teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching posts has been delegated to departmental steering groups.

The Faculty has been a pioneer in the provision of pedagogical training and support to teachers and postgraduate students. Responsibility for the provision of training and onsite support has been assigned to the Faculty’s senior lecturer in university pedagogy and to specialists in web-based education.

**The coordination of curriculum design**
The Faculty’s policy programme for the development of teaching and studies defines the most important areas of development on which the Faculty will focus during the present planning period. In this programme, duties associated with curriculum design have been distributed between the Faculty and its departments so that the Faculty is responsible for the quality and consistency of degrees. The Faculty Council confirms degree requirements at the proposal of departmental steering groups for three years at a time. During the interim years, only essential changes (for example, changing set literature if a book has gone out of print) can be made. Decisions on teaching are made by the departmental steering groups. Departments are also responsible for the quality and implementation of their curricula. The Faculty’s head of academic affairs issues instructions and coordinates the curriculum design process.

**Student admissions**
The Faculty’s admissions criteria aim to ensure that the Faculty recruits the most talented and motivated students. For years now, the Faculty has been a popular choice for applicants, only 15% of whom are admitted to the Faculty each year. This has helped to guarantee the high quality of admitted students. The Faculty has monitored admissions each year and has assessed the appropriateness of admissions criteria. This information has been used to determine the next year’s criteria.

The Faculty’s Admissions Board is responsible for the preparation and implementation of admissions, as well as decisions on results and appeals. The chair of this Board is the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, and members include each department’s representative and two students. The Board secretary is the head of academic affairs, who has overall responsibility for the implementation of
admissions. Departmental steering groups are responsible for writing proposals on the size of the student intake and on admissions criteria. Practical arrangements and administration associated with admissions in the summer months are handled centrally at the Faculty level.

The preparation of admissions criteria requires the monitoring of national and University-wide policies. Development work also takes place in close cooperation with national and University networks. Centralised preparation and implementation have proved to be good solutions because they require less administrative work at the departments and also ensure that applicants’ legal rights are well-protected.

The reconciliation of job skills and studies

The degrees that the Faculty of Social Sciences offers are characterised by the broad skills that they provide for expert work, as well as by the fact that they do not qualify students for any specific profession. According to regular Faculty surveys, most graduates are employed in posts that correspond quite well to their education.

Students often mention their lack of knowledge about employment opportunities and ask for more information about career prospects in their field. The Faculty has addressed this problem by disseminating information about employment opportunities in courses that the Faculty and the University’s Career Services have designed especially for new students. A similar English-language course has been offered to international students.

Student transition to the job market is also supported with practical training. The Faculty provides the departments with grants that the University has allocated for practical training, and also coordinates a training scheme and contributes towards the costs of practical training. The Faculty also employs a part-time careers contact person who is responsible for communications and the further development of the training scheme together with departmental contact persons for training.

The Faculty has encouraged its departments to arrange activities for alumni. The consolidation of such activities is one of the Faculty’s development challenges. Another development challenge is to reconcile studies and job skills so as to support graduates’ opportunities to find employment in posts that correspond to their education.

The collection and application of feedback

The Faculty allows its departments to plan and implement their teaching as they see fit. Similarly, the Faculty does not require its departments to adopt a single feedback scheme, but rather has allowed them to collect feedback in a way that best suits each department. The only requirement is that feedback is indeed collected and put to good use. The Faculty also supports departments in the planning
and introduction of electronic feedback systems. The consolidation of feedback schemes and the application of feedback are central development challenges for the Faculty, because despite long-term development work the feedback scheme is not functioning appropriately.

The Faculty supports curriculum design by producing information for departments about various issues, including student progress, feedback from new students, assessments on tutoring, employer experiences of practical training and feedback from Master’s graduates. The Faculty also conducts regular employment surveys. Information from the different disciplines provides interesting points of comparison for the departments, as this information highlights potential problems but also demonstrates positive achievements that the departments can and do apply in curriculum design.

Support services for teaching

Both the Faculty’s academic administration and its Team for the Development of Web-based Education play a central role in the management of education.

The Faculty’s support services have received extremely high marks from users for their high quality and personal interaction. The support service staff and their special expertise are widely known within the Faculty. Continuous contacts and the physical placement of the services in a single location lower the threshold to asking for assistance. The Faculty must deal, however, with the development challenge of disseminating information about academic affairs more efficiently to its departments and vice versa.

Academic administration

Competent and successful academic administration is one of the cornerstones of the management of education. The induction and continuous training of staff working in academic administration both at the Faculty level and at the departments are a major challenge now that the Finnish university system is undergoing a process of change. Especially within the area of academic affairs, several reforms have already taken place and will continue to be implemented at a fast pace. The staff’s expertise cannot be maintained unless new practices and procedures are adopted and consolidated.

Academic administration in the Faculty is characterised by the centralised preparation, implementation and communication of academic affairs at the Faculty level when appropriate and possible. Standard practices and new instructions aim to ensure the transparency of procedures and the equitable treatment of all students, while minimising administrative tasks at the departmental level. The Faculty has also delegated decision-making powers to the staff working in academic administration.
The head of academic affairs is in charge of staff working in the Faculty's academic administration. He or she is also responsible for the quality and development of services in academic administration, including the implementation of Faculty-level projects for the development of teaching, but excluding international undergraduate degrees, for which the international affairs officer is responsible.

The above tasks are completed in close cooperation with various associates and networks. Key preparatory forums include regular meetings between the Faculty’s academic administration and the departments’ administrative staff, as well as meetings between the Faculty’s academic administration and the representatives of student organisations. At the preparatory stage, heads of departments, the staff and the students are asked to comment on important issues.

Appropriate communications are vitally important for leadership and management. The Faculty staff working in academic administration is responsible for further developing communications on academic affairs together with the departments. The Faculty has been a pioneer in the introduction and use of electronic systems both in communications (for example, the publication of the Faculty's course catalogue as an online version only) and in services (for example, the sign-ups for examinations and courses).

*The Team for the Development of Web-based Education*

The Faculty has experimented with using online environments to diversify methods of contact teaching and assessment. The integration of online teaching and contact teaching in a pedagogically appropriate manner is known as blended learning. The Faculty's Team for the Development of Web-based Education includes a senior lecturer in university pedagogy, who is responsible for pedagogical training and for research on Faculty teaching. The Team's specialists in web-based education provide onsite support for teachers and help teachers to adopt web-based teaching methods. The Team organises seminars at Faculty departments and elsewhere in Finland, provides training in university-level teaching and learning to teachers and postgraduate students, and familiarises new teachers with the required pedagogical methods. The Team also cooperates closely with the University’s senior lecturers in university pedagogy and with networks of specialists in web-based education. In addition, the Team participates in the further development of online environments at the University.

Each year, the Faculty's Team for the Development of Web-based Education, the dean, vice-deans and presenting officials meet to discuss the Team’s activities for the following year and to report on the past year’s activities.

*The departmental level*

The Faculty departments are fairly autonomous: they can plan their operations and the implementation of their teaching in line with the Faculty’s strategic policies.
The departments’ operating cultures vary according to each department’s size, for example. Small departments are able to interact and implement informal decision-making processes both among the staff and among students.

Departmental operations are the responsibility of the head and the steering group of each department. The meetings and development seminars of the departmental staff, as well as the meetings of student organisations, are key discussion forums and part of the decision-making process. As is the case at the Faculty level, the departments’ leadership culture is characterised by an open atmosphere conducive to discussion and debate. The management of education at the departments takes into account the perspectives of equality and the equitable treatment of all students.

How does the unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

The contents of teaching are based on research. This policy, which was mentioned in the Faculty-level description, is concretised at the departmental level in various ways that depend on the nature of each discipline. Teaching differs depending on whether it is given in a discipline based on abstract and hierarchical theory and cumulative learning or in a discipline which functions as an intersection for multidisciplinary research traditions. In addition to being research based, teaching is also strongly founded on individual teachers’ abilities, motivation and accountability. An important part of the contents of teaching continues to be created when a teacher plans, implements and assesses his or her course. This means constant challenges for the continuity and progression of teaching or, in other words, for ensuring that teaching is based on what has been learned previously and that the contents of teaching are coherent.

By maintaining their research and teaching networks, teachers link the departmental teaching with teaching at other Faculty departments, as well as in other faculties at the University of Helsinki and within the Finnish and international scientific communities. The creation of an international learning environment has meant that English-language teaching is now a regular part of the departmental teaching programmes. Despite the differences between the departments, many processes are similar in the management of education, and many tools can be used at all departments when they agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching.

With regard to teaching methods, the departments engage in continuous discussion and debate. Most departments have cut down on the number of book examinations in favour of course-based teaching. Small group and seminar teaching, as well as the supervision of seminar work and individually submitted theses and other written work, have been particular areas of development. The Internet is used
extensively to support contact teaching. Many departments discuss the methods and transparency of assessing teaching. Some departments also encourage and systematically support students’ own study groups.

The overriding principle is that teachers are at liberty to use any teaching methods that they have found to be successful and to further develop the contents of their courses. Some departments also support new teaching experiments financially. When necessary, teachers consult the Faculty’s Team for the Development of Web-based Education, which also provides teachers with information about new teaching methods and successful teaching practices.

The Master’s thesis plays a central role in Master’s studies. To ensure the high quality of Master’s theses, supervision must be put at the top of the agenda. For a long time the Faculty has been seeking the means to do so, for example, by developing thesis seminars. Many teachers who offer such seminars already discuss and compare their experiences with each other so as to improve their seminar practices. But the Faculty must still deal with the challenge of students writing their Master’s theses at different paces even in seminars.

Lately versatile teaching methods have proved to be popular. Thus a single course may include lectures, a book examination, seminar work and various written assignments. Such courses are good for learning, but they require more preparation from the teacher. This should be taken into account when departments agree on the distribution of teaching duties.

The development of teaching at departments is characterised by an ethos that one department formulated as follows: “All the members of the work community participate; operations are not seen as separate from each other; development work is continuous and a natural part of operations.” The threads that run through all development work include the regular monitoring and assessment of previous solutions. This requires versatile feedback schemes, which the departments have been developing with support from the Faculty for the past two decades.

The forums for agreement on the contents, methods and development of teaching are, on the one hand, formal decision-making bodies (the head and the steering group of departments) and, on the other hand, the preparatory working groups and meetings that promote thorough discussion. All steering groups and academic development groups, which function at most departments, have student representatives. Some departments also hold department meetings that are open to students. All departments also hold regular meetings for the teachers or the staff. In addition, the departments organise development days and seminars, which now take place outside the departments’ own facilities to ensure that everyone concentrates on the assessment and development of teaching for a sufficiently long time (one day or two days). Development seminars are currently the most important forums for the development of teaching at the departments. In some
seminars, student organisations’ representatives are present, but more usually the organisations play a central role in the election of student representatives and in conveying student views to the departmental staff. Regardless of the concrete way in which meetings are organised, all meetings have the same goal: development work in which all members of the departmental community can express their views.

One department (Sociology) has systematised the development of teaching by linking a joint development day for teachers and students with a development seminar for teachers that is held later in the spring term. The joint meeting for students and teachers is an opportunity to discuss development issues that have arisen in teaching or are otherwise of topical interest. Students play a central role in this meeting. The subsequent two-day seminar for the teaching staff continues to address the same development issues. This link has proven to be highly successful, and the department has undertaken several reforms in teaching and other practices as a result. The positive attitude of the Department of Sociology towards the further development of teaching is mostly due to the Tuella ja taidolla (With support and skill) development project, which was implemented from 2000 to 2004 with funds from the Finnish Ministry of Education. That project led to the publication of five research reports based on interviews with students and graduates, and on statistics. Based on the project results, the Department increased small group teaching, developed thesis seminars and improved the supervision of theses.

A few years ago, another department (Social Psychology) found that its Master’s thesis supervision had not been assessed. As a result, the Department conducted a separate survey and discussed in its weekly meeting what measures it should take on the basis of the survey outcomes. The Department went on to issue instructions for thesis assessors. In addition, all teachers received personal written feedback on how the graduates that they had supervised had rated the supervision in comparison with the average rating of all supervisors. A few years from now, the Department intends to conduct a new survey to see how supervision has developed.

Up to now, responsibility for English-language teaching has been primarily delegated to individual teachers. But now most departments have decided to focus on it as a special area of development. Many departments are currently developing new English-language Master’s programmes, some in cooperation with other departments (for example, Sociology, Social Psychology and Social Policy).

A Swedish-language unit, the Swedish School of Social Science, functions independently under the Faculty’s auspices. Swedish-language teaching is also offered in cooperation across departmental and faculty boundaries.

Cooperation between the Open University and the Faculty of Social Sciences goes back a long way. All the teaching and teachers of the Open University are approved
annually by the Faculty departments, after which the teaching is accepted into the departmental degree requirements. The departments also cooperate with many other departments at the University of Helsinki and at other universities, including the Department of Economics and Management in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, the Department of Geography in the Faculty of Science, the Department of Philosophy in the Faculty of Arts and the Department of Economics at the Helsinki School of Economics.

One problem currently affecting departmental teaching is the high turnover of teachers. In many cases, when the next year's curriculum is being designed in the spring, no one knows which teachers will remain in their posts the following academic year. The challenge is thus to transfer the tacit knowledge of each course teacher to his or her replacement. Some departments have solved this problem by collecting teaching materials (course programmes, completed assignments, feedback forms and examination questions) into lecture folders which are supplied to teachers who take over a course. Some departments store such folders in the department office, which allows any teacher to view the materials. This helps the teachers to plan the contents of their own courses.

Some departments have delegated responsibility for a large part of their teaching to fee-paid teachers. This is a major problem of principle which particularly plagues small departments. At one department (Social and Moral Philosophy), the problem has resulted in the course contents of one study unit – particularly the emphasis given to different areas – varying considerably according to the teachers’ own interests. The same department has also tried to improve the coordination of the content of successive courses by creating a course description folder, which is kept in the department office where it is readily available and can be used to support course planning. The department in question believes that such coordination is also required from the teachers who offer courses during the same term to improve the progression of teaching.

How does the unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?

Departmental steering groups submit proposals on degree requirements for the approval of the Faculty Council. Decisions on teaching have been delegated to individual departments. Once every three years, a thorough reform of degree requirements is carried out, while in the interim years, only small, immediate needs for change are addressed. The network of working groups and meetings described in the previous section participates not only in the further development of teaching, but also in the preparation of degree requirements. A key role is played by the department amanuensis (administrator), who coordinates the administrative side of the process.
The Bologna process forced departments to consider their degree requirements especially carefully for the years 2005–2008. The departments are currently preparing the first degree requirements that will enter into force after the transition period. Departmental practices and procedures vary to some extent, but in most cases the preparation of degree requirements has been assigned to working groups, one of which is responsible for the Bachelor’s degree requirements, one for the Master’s degree requirements and one for the requirements of methodological studies. In the case of individual study units, the coordinator of each unit bears a major responsibility in encouraging discussion on the contents of that study unit.

Each department has established its own practices for the preparation of degree requirements. The preparatory process starts at departments in the autumn term, but even before that, the departments often conduct preliminary discussions about the need for curriculum reforms. The departmental staff agrees on the needs for development and change in their meetings and development seminars. The preparatory work is based on teachers’ experiences of the existing degree requirements and on feedback from students and associates. The requirements of other universities are also taken into account to some extent.

The coordinator of each area of study submits proposals for changes in that area and is responsible for their appropriateness. Many departments have organised the preparatory process so that the coordinators of study units coordinate the initial stage. The department amanuensis or some other designated individual is responsible for administering the process at the departmental level. He or she coordinates the whole process, summarises the teachers’ proposals for changes and forwards this information to the Undergraduate Library, which checks the availability of suggested course literature.

On the basis of this preparatory work, the departmental steering group submits its proposal on the degree requirements to the Faculty Council by the end of March. The steering group is responsible for the appropriateness of the degree requirements and for ensuring that the study unit descriptions comply with their objectives.

The basic idea behind the preparation of degree requirements was thus summarised by the Department of Social Psychology: preparations must take into account “teachers’ experiences of existing requirements, students’ experiences of existing requirements, developments both in the discipline and in its teaching, new research on university-level education, the results of surveys in the Faculty and the Department, the feedback by the departmental advisory board, as well as the recommendations and requirements of the University of Helsinki and the Faculty”. The Department of Communication also takes into account the views expressed by alumni and part-time, fee-paid teachers on the requirements and needs of the job market.
The Faculty of Social Sciences offers a joint “methodology basket” for methodological studies at the Master’s level. Each department decides which of its methodology courses are included in the methodology basket. The department’s participation in the basket means that its students can take any of the methodology courses in the basket. Each department decides which of the courses in the basket it approves for the discipline’s Master’s syllabus. The basic principle is that students can include in their major studies those methodology courses that any department offers in the basket. All the departments participating in the methodology basket inform their students of the existence of the basket in the degree requirements, as well as providing information about the courses in the basket that the students can include in the methodological studies in their Master’s programme. A similar basket has recently been created for teaching in women’s and gender studies.

How does the unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

As the Department of Political Science writes: “Two sides must be taken into account to ensure the appropriate distribution of teaching duties: the distribution of duties in relation to teaching contents and the fair distribution of workloads. Teaching duties are primarily distributed on the basis of expertise.”

The scarcity of resources, meaning the small number of permanent teachers in comparison with student numbers, is a major problem affecting the appropriate distribution of duties at all departments. Another challenge for academic leaders is how to take into account in an equitable way the fact that teaching is only one of the duties of permanent staff alongside with research, administration and societal interaction. A third major challenge is to ensure the continuity of teaching despite the high turnover of teachers for various reasons.

In the case of some courses, the scarcity of resources can be alleviated by resorting to teaching by externally funded docents, but often this does not solve the problem of offering a wide variety of compulsory courses. Using researchers (starting with doctoral students) as teachers is one solution, which has been successfully tried by most departments, but this solution also requires further development, especially with regard to the number of hours that researchers teach and the fee that they are paid for this teaching.

Of key importance for the appropriate distribution of duties among teachers and for ensuring the equitable workload of individual teachers are review discussions and the work plans devised as part of such discussions. Most departments also apply collective procedures for the distribution of duties. The Department of Sociology, for instance, has developed the “teaching unit” as a measurement unit and has agreed that five teaching units per academic year is an appropriate teaching workload for professors and university lecturers. Each teaching unit can
consist of traditional lecture-based courses, seminar work, the supervision of a higher than average number of students or the marking of many examinations. Another department (Social Policy) has found that the workload associated with Master’s thesis and postgraduate supervision is inequitably distributed among teachers, which hinders supervision as the supervisors do not have sufficient time for all the students. The Department of Social Psychology has resolved this problem by maintaining a list of Master’s thesis writers and their supervisors, which shows if certain teachers have more than their fair share of supervisees. Supervision is thus seen as one form of teaching, which can unfairly burden some teachers if not carefully monitored.

Some departments have recently put equality at the top of their agenda. The Department of Social Science History established a working group on equality with representatives of the various staff groups. This group conducted an equality survey in autumn 2006. In a plan based on the survey, concrete measures were suggested to promote equality at the Department. One of these measures was that the head of the department should encourage both female and male teachers to carry out research and teaching and to apply for vacancies. All members of the departmental community should also be informed of the schedule for designing the departmental curriculum and the deadlines for submitting proposals for the curriculum. The head of the department should ensure that the expertise of both women and men is used equitably, for example, as examiners and supervisors of theses and dissertations. In addition, the departmental contact person for equality is to promote the principles of equality.

Departments aim to follow the Faculty’s recommendation of providing all teachers with the opportunity to devote one period per academic year solely to research. The equitable distribution of such periods among teachers is important, as is the fact that teaching must be offered throughout the academic year. The heads of departments play a central role in this respect. They can use review discussions and staff meetings as tools to agree openly on the distribution of duties. For example, the Department of Sociology has started to use a practice in which two teachers agree on the reciprocal marking of each other’s examinations.

**How does the unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?**

A key solution at the departmental level which enables teachers to carry out research is the assignment of one period for research. Various practices have been tried in the past few years at different departments. At some departments, even the head of the department devotes one period to research, although this is not the case at most departments. Teachers do not give lectures or teach seminars during their research period, but they may have to provide plenty of supervision.
At some departments, teachers have been exempted from marking examinations during their research period. This has been made possible by the principle of reciprocity: two teachers agree on marking each other’s examinations during the other’s research period. The arrangements required by the research period are not always simple or even possible, but many departments see the research period as an important means of providing teachers with the opportunity to conduct research. Experience has shown that even a short release from teaching during one period per academic year increases opportunities for research.

Teachers are also encouraged to apply for longer research periods funded by, among others, the Academy of Finland and the Helsinki Collegium for Advanced Studies. Moreover, they are encouraged to publish in their discipline’s top forums and to participate in international meetings and interaction, including the Erasmus teacher exchange programme. Some departments allocate a small annual grant to each teacher for participation in an international or Finnish conference. A few departments also improve research opportunities by providing professors and university lecturers with a small grant to employ a research assistant.

Departments have encouraged their teachers to participate in the University’s and the Faculty’s pedagogical training and to acquaint themselves with the web-based tools and audiovisual equipment available for teaching. The Faculty has been able to offer well-targeted and prompt support in this respect. Studies in university-level teaching and learning can be included in a postgraduate degree, which ensures that future teachers will be acquainted with the topic.

A self-evident goal for university departments is to recruit the best talent for their teaching staff, increasingly also from the international academic community. Not only research merits, but also teaching merits are given due attention. Teacher recruitment involves many difficult challenges. The recruitment of permanent post-holders is governed by clear guidelines, but the process is slow, which means that substitute teachers must be hired under fixed-term contracts. In addition, the practices applying to short-term substitute posts and the recruitment of fee-paid teachers are not always as clear as when filling vacant posts or longer substitute contracts.

The Department of Economics pays attention to the infrastructure necessary for staff expertise and knowledge: “To ensure that the staff can work effectively, the Department aims to provide its staff with sufficient and appropriate work facilities, Internet connections, modern IT equipment and the software necessary for research work.”
Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the entire Faculty

The Faculty of Social Sciences has focused on the management of education for several years now by developing practices that support it. In many cases, however, considerable efforts have not led to the implementation of sound plans. This may reflect a more general problem at the University: its vision and strategic plans are not implemented at the grassroots level. As a result, the focus in the future should not be to create new plans, but rather to establish what prevents the thorough implementation of sound plans.

The strengths and development areas associated with the management of education in the Faculty are examined below precisely from this perspective. The choice of perspective has led to the fact that many of the Faculty’s strengths also appear as weaknesses. This paradox can be explained: some of the strengths are also areas in need of development because the Faculty has not yet achieved the level it wishes to achieve. These areas are also deemed so important that the Faculty wishes to continue its development work, although many would consider the areas to be in quite good shape at present.

Strengths

- The premise for decision-making is democracy: decision-making is founded on broad-based preparatory work, in the course of which ideas are exchanged as openly as possible. Both the staff and students can participate in this work. When the focus of decision-making is on broad-based preparatory work, decision-making is efficient and democratic.
- The role of the Committee for the Development of Studies as a democratic preparatory body has received positive feedback in the Faculty.
- Academic administration offers centralised services to the departments, thus relieving the administrative burden on the departmental staff. Academic administration also produces many documents (for example, statistics, reports, instructions) to support the management of education.
- The Faculty of Social Sciences has been a pioneer in providing teachers with support for web-based education in the form of both training and onsite support. Teachers use this support actively in curriculum design.
• The Faculty of Social Sciences has actively developed cooperation with its students. Student organisations are asked to appoint their representatives in numerous Faculty and departmental bodies.

• Most departments have made great efforts to allow their teachers to devote one period solely to research, but practical arrangements vary. This system must be maintained, however, as teachers’ experiences of the research period have been mostly positive, at least when they have had the opportunity to take such a period in the first place.

• The Faculty has especially focused on the further development of methodological teaching, while also complying with the policy of closer departmental cooperation in teaching. One example is the “methodology basket” created in interdepartmental cooperation. A new “basket” has now been created in women’s and gender studies. Cooperation has also been increased to provide more English-language teaching, such as English-language Master’s programmes.

Areas of development

• Although decision-making is founded on broad-based preparatory work, teachers and students do not always participate in such work as actively as the Faculty wishes. It would be interesting to try new practices, for the existing ones have not produced the desired outcome. The goal is to attract more teachers and students to the joint development of teaching.

• As the distribution of information is of key importance for the management of education, communications must be improved. Plenty of useful information is offered in various folders and publications, but this information does not seem to spread to as many teachers as it should. New practices should be developed in this area as well, and they should apply to both communications between the Faculty and its departments and to intra- and inter-departmental communications.

• The practice of enabling teachers to devote one period per academic year solely to research must be standardised at the departments. All teachers should be allowed to devote one period to research every year. It is currently the only opportunity for teachers to conduct research during the academic year.

• Although the Faculty has recently focused on interdepartmental cooperation in teaching, this must be further developed. Teacher resources are insufficient, as the requirements of teaching and supervision continue to increase. A survey should thus be conducted to chart the areas of teaching in which the Faculty departments could cooperate.

• Although feedback schemes have been under development for several years now, the collection and application of feedback in teaching still do not function as well as they should. The systematisation of feedback
schemes should thus proceed more efficiently than at present, but the Faculty must also consider how to commit all parties to giving and using feedback. Another topic that should be discussed is how to develop the practices associated with the feedback that teachers give to students.

- New methods should be developed to ensure the transfer of important information to teachers who take over a course. Moreover, the contents of courses in a given study unit should not vary significantly, and the progression of teaching should be guaranteed. These methods should also apply to fee-paid teaching.

- Because the Finnish university system continues to evolve and teaching is becoming more and more demanding, teachers’ knowledge and coping skills have become increasingly important. This also makes the leadership and management of the Faculty and its departments an ever more demanding task. What is needed is not only leadership training, but also solutions at the departmental and Faculty level that facilitate the teachers’ and other staff’s work.

- The Faculty of Social Sciences currently implements the principle of internationalisation fairly successfully, but it must invest more heavily in this area. One solution is the joint establishment of English-language Master’s programmes by several departments. The Faculty needs more such programmes.
12.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Social Sciences is a large, complex Faculty covering a wide range of social science disciplines. This breadth is both a strength and opportunity and a problem because it makes coordination and the development of a unitary vision and purpose difficult to achieve. We were very impressed with the staff and students that we met, all of whom shared their thoughts with us very openly. In the years ahead, the University will need to discuss structural and organisational changes as it adjusts both to national reforms and to the global changes facing higher education. Experience in other countries suggests that such changes are often least welcome in the social sciences (and in the arts and humanities). However, we believe that the Faculty can face the future from a position of strength, and should not be afraid of change. On the contrary, it is well placed to take advantage of such changes and to reinforce its position as a leader in the field.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty of Social Sciences is a large, complex organisation, with 10 departments and 13 disciplines. Departments vary from the large to the very small. There are over 5000 students, many of whom are taking courses in other Faculties. The Faculty of Social Sciences has a similar structure to other faculties, with a Faculty Council and a Dean (as well as Vice-Deans, one of whom is in charge of academic affairs). Furthermore, there is a variety of committees: an Admissions Board, an International Admissions Board, a Committee for the Development of Studies, an International Affairs Committee, a Working Committee and a Meeting of the Heads of Department; there is no Academic Affairs Committee, unlike at the University level and in other faculties. There are also a Meeting of the Heads of Department, a Steering Group and a Group for the Development of Teaching. This latter group corresponds with the team around the Senior Lecturer of Pedagogy, for the development of teaching.

The structure of the Faculty poses a number of questions:

1. In the Faculty of Social Sciences, the equivalent of the Academic Affairs Committee in other Faculties is the Committee for the Development of Studies. This Committee is responsible for the development of overall strategy for education within the Faculty. However, we formed the
opinion that quality assurance and the development of teaching were primarily undertaken at the departmental level. Departments are expected to follow Faculty strategy. Nevertheless, we were concerned about the level of Faculty oversight. There seems to be an absence of critical (constructive) peer review from cognate, related departments. We do not believe that the monitoring of quality and standards in degree programmes can be left to departments. Constructive questioning and criticism from other, related departments is an essential part of any effective system for quality assurance.

2. It is not clear how the committees and meetings relate to one another. This was a concern from the Evaluation Report and was confirmed by our interviews. From our conversations with the different groups, we certainly formed the impression that within the Faculty there is also a lack of clarity about “who is doing what” and about “who should be doing what”. This causes a vacuum in leadership and management. To fill this vacuum, many individuals take initiatives. Whilst such initiative is to be commended, the overall result is a lack of coordination and responsibility, and, most seriously, the risk of gaps in provision. We understand that targets are set for departments following discussion with the Dean and that targets are discussed between Heads of Department. This is to be commended. Nevertheless, we hope that further consideration will be given to enhancing leadership in formulating a Faculty strategy, in setting Faculty-wide goals and organising Faculty-wide quality assurance schemes, and possibly most significant, in monitoring implementation.

The Faculty operates effectively as a loose (con)federation of departments. They operate as relative independent entities, each with specific degree programmes, evaluation procedures and focus. The question is, crucially, whether the Faculty is a visible entity which establishes and takes forward shared objectives for staff and students, with a common shared strategic vision, with a shared didactical profile and with shared evaluation and quality control mechanisms. The Faculty is attempting to address this question, and the Vice-Dean is leading the development of strategy. We urge that this process be reinforced in order to provide further strengthening of the role of the Faculty in shaping and leading policy. We were in this respect informed that the students in some instances organised the evaluation of courses; we also learned that there was an absence of Faculty information made available to them on a regular basis. In such cases, no clear chain of responsibility was apparent (an example of the gaps in provision mentioned above).

We have been informed that the Faculty is currently discussing fundamental changes in its departmental structure as part of wider University developments. We believe that the present range of disciplines is a major strength and opportunity for the Faculty. However, we were not convinced that the present departmental structure is optimum. Small departments carry administrative costs and overheads
that are difficult to justify in the present financial environment. We also believe that disciplines can still thrive in larger multidisciplinary organisational units. The options appeared to be to abolish all departments or to merge the existing departments into three larger departments. Whatever model is adopted, it is vital that clear leadership and lines of responsibility are established. Moreover, responsibility must include control over relevant resources (including staff).

Decision making in the Faculty is organised on a largely consensual basis in a variety of committees and meetings. Collegiality is important in any university. However, the interviews led us to believe that this consensual decision making also leads to an obscurity in responsibilities for the outcome of discussions and creates uncertainty in implementation, thereby creating room for the departments to, more or less, go their own way.

There are strong traditions of academic freedom within the Faculty, with academic staff free to teach and research within their own academic interests. Academic freedom is important within any university, but this does not mean that the work of staff is beyond oversight within departments or at the Faculty level. We were concerned that the performance of staff, in both teaching and research, was not effectively managed in all departments, or that there were effective reporting mechanisms to the Faculty level.

The Faculty has an International Affairs Committee at the Faculty level and also a very active officer for international affairs in the administration. In the Committee, the members are teachers, international affairs coordinators and students. It is emphasised by both the University and the Faculty that internationalisation is of great importance. There is, however, no Faculty level strategy for internationalisation apart from the quantitative targets (for exchange students etc.) set in the negotiations between the University and the Faculty. Some departments do not always see the question of internationalisation as being that important. Nevertheless, the achievements in this area are impressive. The Faculty has achieved the targets set in many areas (e.g. 8 international MA programmes, an increasing interest in designing courses taught in English etc.). The departments see the further development as depending on the resources which are provided. With regard to the students spending time abroad, the Faculty is very supportive and information is given, but student initiative is also essential, especially outside Erasmus programmes. An international approach within the curriculum is partly addressed, but in some areas the students hoped for guest lecturers or more orientation in the international context of the discipline. Exchange students and foreign degree students should be integrated more fully within the community to create a more international study environment.

We were very impressed by the Faculty’s commitment to interdisciplinary programmes, both within the Faculty and with other Faculties (e.g. Environmental Studies). We were also informed about the development of a “basket” of methods
courses that could be taken by students from across the Faculty, and a similar development in Women’s Studies. This is highly commended, both as a means to enrich degree programmes and as an efficient method of delivery.

The University is keen to develop its commitment to “research-based teaching”. However, when we tried to test what this meant in practice, there was much uncertainty, beyond the recognition that teachers were also active researchers. The Faculty has much to offer in this respect, and we urge the Faculty to consider new approaches to teaching that take advantage of the Faculty’s research expertise. For example, staff might be asked to reflect on their use of research in teaching, and possible incentives offered for good practice.

There were noticeable variations in the attention that was paid to quantitative data. We also observed differing understandings and interpretations of the detailed statistics. There was, however, a shared notion that very few students would complete their Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees within the five years (three plus two) for which the curriculum was now designed. We were concerned to hear that some teachers reduced their expectations of their students (e.g. in background reading) to reflect their external work commitments; potentially, this could have serious adverse effects on academic standards. Such examples are, we are sure, very rare, but it is important that the Faculty’s quality procedures are alert to this issue. Similarly, there was widespread agreement that teacher-student ratios were very unfavourable. However, when pressed to provide hard statistical evidence, including time series and comparative data, or when asked to discuss approaches to the management of staff teaching loads, there was less clarity or unanimity of response. It was clear that much attention was dedicated to the number of completed Master’s degrees and doctorates, because funding was (in part) dependent on this.

The practice of getting feedback from students was more varied than expected. Some Heads of Department advocated the idea that teachers should collect feedback data, but they would not instruct their teachers to do so. Feedback data were, on the whole, seen as the property of the individual teacher - or in some cases - of a department. Findings were not reported to the Faculty level. Such feedback data (when they were collected) were not systematically used along with reports from teachers in curriculum review.

Variations in statistics can be a valuable source of information on the effects of new policies and practices, and they can be used to argue, for instance, for additional funding or to evaluate current or prospective programmes. This is commonplace in most universities, but we did not identify that this was being done on a regular basis across the Faculty. We searched for examples of how student feedback had been used to shape changes in course provision. We do not doubt that there are such examples, but they were not forthcoming during our visit, which suggests that such practice is not as well established as would be desirable.
The work of the University Senior Lecturer in Pedagogy was widely appreciated within the Faculty, and staff were actively encouraged to participate in these programmes. However, we formed the opinion that there was little staff development relating to teaching beyond these programmes. The work of the Senior Lecturers is highly commended, but it should not be seen as the end of the story; rather, it should be used as a catalyst for a wider programme of activities, within the Faculty and within departments.

We heard many comments about teaching loads. We do not doubt that loads are high and may be excessive in some cases. Similarly, there were concerns expressed about high staff turnover. However, there is an urgent need for more factual data and comparative analysis. We heard conflicting data from different people and different methodologies for calculating student:staff ratios. These are familiar issues in many universities. A full review is needed. This should include detailed consideration of individual workloads, including the expected balance between teaching, research and service, and the use of workload management systems, and should also cover recruitment procedures, staff retention and reward structures. Once a strong factual base can be established, the Faculty will be in a much stronger position from which to argue for additional resources.

Conclusions

We found the Faculty to be a stimulating environment for both teaching and research. At the same time, we were concerned by a reluctance to engage in overall Faculty strategy and an apparent lack of ambition. The Faculty is strong, but it could be even stronger. Teaching loads are high, but we wondered whether this had become a pre-occupation that had distracted staff and leadership from wider developments. There are also efficiencies to be gained by looking at departmental structure, especially with regard to administrative operations, and from the development of more shared teaching. The Faculty has excellent, talented students who are generally content with their programmes.

Strengths

- The broad disciplinary base is a major strength and opportunity for the Faculty. Such breadth, including many subjects underrepresented in other leading international universities, provides much scope for further development. (It is stressed that it is not necessary to retain the present departmental structure in order to exploit this breadth.) We urge the Faculty to engage actively with other Faculties in order to build upon the University’s wider presence in the Social Sciences, especially Behavioural Sciences, Law and the Swedish School of Social Sciences. There is huge scope for further development; this must not be held back by territorial issues at Faculty or departmental levels.
The Faculty has a strong tradition of involvement in decision making by staff and students. This has served the Faculty well. We are urging the Faculty to develop more streamlined decision making, with flatter structures, more devolved responsibility and accountability, and extended use of performance indicators. However, this need not be at the expense of appropriate methods of consultation. The Dean is at the heart of this process. Every member of staff should have a clear route whereby their views can be expressed to the Dean.

**Good practices**

- The strong commitment to internationalisation is highly commended. New MA programmes have been developed, and students are given good support in taking forward international studies.
- The development of a “basket” of methods courses available for students from across the Faculty is an excellent initiative.
- The high level of staff participation in pedagogical programmes is commended.
- The Faculty is very active in the leadership and development of interdisciplinary programmes.
- Whilst it is clear that views have varied (and continue to vary), the Faculty has responded positively to the Bologna Process.

**Recommendations**

- We recommend that the Faculty undertake a full review of its arrangements for strategic and operational planning, including arrangements for decision making and policy implementation. The aim is both to simplify the present structures and to establish clearer lines of responsibility and accountability. It is important to establish a stronger Faculty vision for the future, supported by effective strategy and implementation. This should be both a “top-down” and a “bottom-up” process, but the clear focus for leading the process rests with the Dean. We also commend the more systematic, open use of performance indicators.

- We recommend that the Faculty initiate a detailed review of arrangements for academic staffing. This review should establish clear, authoritative data on staff loads, including the balance between teaching, research and service, and on student:staff ratios. We also urge the Faculty to engage in active benchmarking with other Faculties of Social Science in other countries. We believe that stronger factual data of this kind will strengthen the position of the Faculty in its arguments for additional resources.
- We recommend that the Faculty continue to review its departmental structure, in line with overall University policy. The aim should be to establish organisational units that provide both academic coherence and operational efficiency.

- We recommend the further development of internationalisation within the Faculty, including internationalisation of the curriculum and further use of visiting academic staff.

- We recommend that the Faculty undertake a review of the application of “research-based teaching” within its degree programmes. This might include the identification of good practice and also methods of evaluating such practice.
13 Swedish School of Social Science
13.1  Self-evaluation report

Swedish School of Social Science, University of Helsinki
A Introduction

The Swedish School of Social Science is an autonomous Swedish-language unit of the University of Helsinki. Its basic financing is provided directly by the Ministry of Education, and the School is not included in the University of Helsinki financing model, which is based on degrees obtained. The School has a rector, a Board, an Academic Affairs Committee and six disciplinary committees, one for each subject taught. It admits its own students.

The head of academic affairs acted as the coordinator of the international evaluation of education. The Academic Affairs Committee, consisting of student and teacher representatives from all disciplines, acted as the coordinating body. It discussed the evaluation at three meetings.

The School's six disciplines conducted their self-evaluations within the framework of the disciplinary committee meetings. The head of academic affairs compiled the evaluation of the management of education at the School level. The workshop, comprising stage two of the process, was held on 10 March 2008. It was attended by a total of 15 persons: teaching-staff representatives, members of the School's leadership and student members of the Academic Affairs Committee and the disciplinary committees. The workshop took the form of a joint discussion, in which the strengths and areas in need of development at the School were identified on the basis of the self-evaluation reports.

Alongside the self-evaluations, the School's strategy for the years 2007–2009, the operations manual and the matrices devised for the audit of the quality-assurance systems were used in the compilation of the report.

B Description of the management of education at the school

The mission of the Swedish School of Social Science is to provide scientific and professionally oriented education in the social sciences and to engage in scientific research in these fields. Within its fields, the School is committed to ensuring that a sufficient number of people with knowledge of Swedish are educated to meet the country's requirements. Jointly with the University of Helsinki, it shoulders the nationwide responsibility for Swedish-language education in social work,
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journalism and other social sciences. The School confers the Bachelor’s degree, and graduates have the right to continue for a Master’s degree in social sciences at the University of Helsinki without having to go through any admission procedures.

The total number of students at the School is about 500. Teaching staff amounts to 28.5 person-years, research staff to 21 person-years and other staff to 21 person-years. The language of teaching and examination is Swedish. Applicants for admission as degree students who are educated in a language other than Swedish are required to pass a Swedish test. The School admits about 95 students annually, together with a number of international exchange students for a limited term of study.

The rector and the Board have the overall responsibility for the School’s activities. The rector’s duties include employing or appointing staff and admitting students. The Board is charged with tasks such as developing activities, presenting proposals and expressing opinions in matters concerning the School, approving strategies, and deciding about the curriculum and permanent regulations for degrees. The rector is the chair of the Board and is supported by a managerial body consisting of the vice-rector, the director of academic affairs, a position introduced in 2002, and the leading administrative officers. The director of academic affairs, whose duties include coordinating teaching and acting as the chair of the Academic Affairs Committee, is appointed by the Board from among the holders of teaching posts at the School for the duration of the rector’s term of office. The division of labour between the rector, the vice-rector and the director of academic affairs is as follows:

- Rector: strategic management, general administration and decision-making
- Vice-rector: research, international affairs, the library
- Director of academic affairs: academic affairs

The Academic Affairs Committee’s duties include developing and evaluating teaching and examinations, drawing up proposals for the curriculum, examination schedules and standing orders for degrees, as well as coordinating the planning of teaching between the various major subjects at the School. It consists of one member of the teaching staff and one student representative for each subject. The director of academic affairs chairs the Committee, and the head of academic affairs acts as secretary.

The duties of the disciplinary committees comprise developing and evaluating the teaching of the respective subjects. The committees consist of all the teachers of the subject in question and the same number of student representatives, and are chaired by the respective disciplinary heads. In addition to the Academic Affairs Committee and the disciplinary committees, there are an Admissions Board and an International Affairs Committee. The former consists of teachers from all the
disciplines and one student member. One of the teaching-staff representatives acts as chair and the planning officer for academic affairs as secretary. The International Affairs Committee consists of one member from each discipline, two representatives of the School’s research institute (FISS) and two student members. It is chaired by the vice-rector, and the international affairs coordinator acts as secretary.

The management of education is based on collegial cooperation involving all the teachers, the administrative staff and the students. Educational issues are discussed and analysed by the disciplinary committees, the Academic Affairs Committee and the Board, as well as at staff meetings and regular get-togethers between the management and the student organisation of the Swedish School of Social Science (StudOrg). The School stages two annual planning days during which the entire staff and representatives of the student organisation meet to discuss and summarise the past academic year and plan for the next one.

The education implements the guidelines of the School’s strategy, which is devised every three years. As a unit of the University of Helsinki, the School in its education supports the targets formulated in the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. Guidelines for the development of education are also provided in the strategy for Swedish-language university education in Finland, published in 2005 by Samordningsdelegationen för den svenskspråkiga högskoleutbildningen (Coordinating Body for Tertiary Education in Swedish). In the Helsinki region, Rektorsdelegationen för högskoleutbildning i Helsingfors (Cooperation Body of Rectors for Tertiary Education in Swedish in the Helsinki Area) is a forum for cooperation between universities. The rector of the School is a member of these two bodies.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

The school level

- How does the School support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire School? How is this support managed?

Recruitment

The School develops its recruitment of students by involvement in several cooperation bodies, such as the joint ventures by the University of Helsinki and the national working group on cooperation in selection in the field of social science. Furthermore, the School is participating in the development of a uniform application for university education in 2009. Through Rektorsdelegationen för högskoleutbildning i Helsingfors, the School maintains active cooperation with other Swedish-language and bilingual universities and higher-education institutions concerning joint recruitment and the marketing of the Helsinki region as a study environment. The School is developing the recruitment of students by means of electronic marketing and has been using an electronic application form since 2005.

The selection criteria and the number of students to be admitted are discussed by the Admission Board and submitted to the Board by the planning officer for academic affairs, who also submits the selection decisions to the rector for confirmation of the right to pursue studies.

International affairs

The School's strategy stresses the importance of extended and intensified cooperation in both research and education. International exchange agreements (with the School, the Faculty or the University of Helsinki) introduce foreign students into the School study environment and allow the School's own students the
possibility to pursue part of their studies at a foreign university or higher-education institution. The School offers about 10–15 courses in English each academic year and has a five-year (2006–2011) pool professorship in ethnic relations. Activities include the planning of an English-language Master’s degree programme, “Master’s Degree Programme in Ethnic Relations, Cultural Diversity and Integration” (ERI), jointly with three departments in the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Helsinki. The programme will be launched in the autumn of 2008 and will increase the number of international students involved with the School.

Preparation of course requirements

Every year in January-February, a letter detailing the timetable for the teaching and work planning for the next academic year is sent to all teaching staff. The work plans are used partly as a basis for the review discussions between the disciplinary heads and teachers, and partly in the Academic Affairs Office’s coordination of the timetable for all courses. The course requirements are planned for each subject in the disciplinary committees and coordinated by the Academic Affairs Committee, and subsequently submitted to the Board by the head of academic affairs. The curriculum is approved for three years at a time, but minor changes may be made during the three-year period.

Teachers attached to one of the School’s disciplines participate actively in the planning of teaching, especially through the disciplinary committees. Teachers of the common subjects (such as languages, information and communications technology (ICT), statistics, the philosophy of science) are not involved in the planning to the same extent, since they are members neither of the disciplinary committees, nor of the Academic Affairs Committee, but are invited to these bodies when necessary. These teachers are either employed by the School or paid on an hourly basis. The need is felt to involve them more closely in the disciplinary committees and the Academic Affairs Committee for the preparation of the course requirements.

The Academic Affairs Committee’s role in the planning of teaching comes across as partly diffuse since the disciplinary committees have such a prominent say in the preparation of course requirements. The disciplinary committees and the Academic Affairs Committee do not always communicate very well, partly because the same people do not represent the subject in both bodies. The disciplinary heads are the teachers with the best overall view of their subject, and their role in the Academic Affairs Committee should be enhanced. They are sometimes called to meetings concerning issues pertaining to all the subjects, which often provide information more successfully than the Academic Affairs Committee sessions. On the whole, there is a feeling at the School that there is scope for interdisciplinary coordination.
The Academic Affairs Committee’s term of office is three years, and that of the disciplinary committees is two years. The student representatives thus participate in the work for a fairly short time and are then replaced. There is a need for better documentation of the students’ experiences of involvement in the School’s drafting and decision-making bodies with a view to passing them on to coming generations. The student organisation has taken steps aimed at improved documentation and communication between the student representatives in the various bodies.

**Pedagogical competence**

When teaching posts are filled, pedagogical qualifications come into consideration according to criteria approved by the Board in December 2006. For professorial appointments a working group nominated by the Faculty of Social Sciences delivers an opinion on the applicants’ qualifications, which includes their scientific competence and a comprehensive assessment of their teaching skills. The procedure used for the appointment of other teachers and docents is that a working group consisting of the director of academic affairs and a teacher and a student representative nominated by the respective disciplinary committee delivers an opinion on the teaching qualifications. The group is chaired by the director of academic affairs, and the head of academic affairs acts as secretary. The School’s Board evaluates a test lecture and establishes a comprehensive assessment of the applicant’s teaching skills on the basis of the lecture and the working group’s opinion.

**Societal interaction**

All the disciplines at the School include one or several compulsory trainee periods providing the students with valuable connections to the labour market during their studies. The School has a yearly amount budgeted for the financing of student trainee posts. A trainee tutor is nominated for the student in the workplace. At the end of the trainee period the student writes a report, which is discussed at the disciplinary training seminars early in the autumn term. In social work, the ten-week tutored trainee period is regularly evaluated during the period, in the presence of the tutors.

The School maintains a cooperation body including representatives of external interest groups, such as local authorities, the media and Finlands Svenska Socialförbund (Swedish Association for Social Welfare in Finland). Its task is to provide a contact link between the School and the Swedish-speaking regions in Finland and the fields connected with the School curriculum, to support the School in its activities, and to provide incentives to improve its performance. The rector chairs the cooperation body, which convenes once a year in the autumn to discuss current educational issues. It constitutes a forum providing the School with direct
input on education from relevant interest groups, and in recent years the meetings have gradually become more interactive in order to give members scope to present their views. The school also organises the yearly “Soc&kom day” around a relevant current theme related to research and education.

**Evaluation of education**

In line with the results of the latest international evaluation of education and degrees at the University of Helsinki carried out in 2001–2002, the School has striven to develop its feedback system. Students have been able to evaluate all courses involving teaching electronically via the WebOodi system since the autumn of 2005. Moreover, some disciplines have their own evaluation systems. The results of the course evaluations are used for the improvement of disciplinary teaching, for instance. The School arranges regular joint meetings on course evaluation for teachers and students. The evaluation results are also utilised in the Rector’s yearly review discussions with the disciplinary heads.

Response percentages in the electronic WebOodi evaluation vary considerably between the various subjects. Although both students and teachers agree that evaluation may trigger improvement, many find the process excessively standardised and strenuous.

**Management of academic affairs and administrative support**

Staff at the School's Academic Affairs Office includes the head of academic affairs, a planning officer and the secretary for academic affairs. There are no administrative posts at the disciplinary level. The Academic Affairs Office handles student guidance, administrative matters relating to examinations, trainee posts, the flexible right to study scheme (the JOO scheme), the registration of completed courses and degrees, and the issuing of certificates. It develops and maintains the course catalogue, various functions of the WebOodi system, and information about studies on the School's website and the University of Helsinki intranet (Alma), and provides administrative support for the teachers. Moreover, it coordinates and produces material for student recruitment jointly with the rector and the information officer, and acts as the contact agency of the School's peer tutors. The international affairs coordinator provides administrative support for teachers on international issues. The School earmarks a certain amount of money each year for development projects in disciplinary teaching.

The School's administrative staff are organised in unofficial teams, such as the Academic Affairs Team, the IT Team and the Virtual Team. The School's Virtual Team, consisting of members of the IT Team, the Academic Affairs Team, Continuing Education and the Library, has devised a system for the introduction
of web-based tools and learning environments to all newly employed staff, which is aimed at familiarising them with their working environment in a smooth way. Some members of the administrative staff also participate in an unofficial network around ICT cooperation in Swedish with other Swedish-language and bilingual higher-education institutions in the Helsinki region. The network offers joint courses in ICT in Swedish to all teachers at all higher education institutions.

The disciplinary level

How do the disciplines agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

Prior to the degree reform in the autumn of 2005, each discipline at the School undertook a “substance analysis”, i.e., examined what skills students should have after completion of their education. On the basis of this analysis, the disciplines compiled their course requirements.

The disciplinary committees, to which all the teachers of the respective subjects and some student representatives belong, have a central role in the planning of teaching. The general guidelines for teaching methods, pedagogical methods and the development of teaching are agreed at the meetings of the disciplinary committees. The contributions of the student members are considered important. In the disciplinary self-evaluations, the disciplines on the whole are considered to play a very independent part in the planning and development of teaching. Within some disciplines, the teachers meet separately to discuss individual courses. Communication between students and teachers is considered to function well even outside the more formal bodies, the School being a small unit.

Through constant contact with the department in the Faculty of Social Sciences where students will continue their studies for a Master’s degree, the disciplines ensure that the studies are coordinated at the Bachelor’s and Master’s levels. Some disciplines hold joint Bachelor’s and Master’s seminars, and the School’s professors supervise and examine Master’s theses. Teachers from the departments regularly take part in teaching at the School.

Teaching is also developed through forging contacts with other disciplinary departments, both in Finland and abroad. The discipline of political science and public administration maintains close cooperation with other disciplinary departments in the Swedish-speaking regions of Finland through docentships, joint research projects and “Finlandssvenska forskarskolan” (a contact forum for Swedish-speaking postgraduate students of political science at the universities of Vaasa, Helsinki and Turku), which creates a solid foundation for moulding the teaching programmes according to linguistic and social requirements. Education in social work follows the comprehensive guidelines established in the national
university network for social work (SOSNET), but at the same time maintains its own profile and Nordic roots. Education in journalism, too, compares the content of teaching with related study programmes in Finland, the Nordic countries and Europe. The last two disciplines in particular maintain close contacts with the labour market.

Previous evaluations are also taken into account when disciplinary study programmes are developed. The degree programme in social work, for instance, has undergone three national evaluations or investigations in recent years. The School has applied the results of the latest international evaluation of education and degrees at the University of Helsinki (2001–2002) in its disciplinary development efforts, and has also taken into account investigations of how graduates have fared in the labour market and how, with hindsight, they have felt about their studies.

Student feedback is taken into account in the development of teaching, both in the form of electronic course evaluation over the WebOodi system and through direct contacts with students, for example during discussions about their personal study plans. Many disciplines felt that evaluations tailored to individual courses, lecture diaries, other written pieces of work and discussions with students are of greater value for continuous development work than electronic evaluation. The existence of the WebOodi evaluation option was appreciated, but the form is considered too standardised. Various forms of evaluation discussion should therefore be further refined.

Meetings of the disciplinary committees of sociology, social psychology and psychology are held at an early stage of each term in order to assess how the teaching is going and how the courses have worked with regard to content and methods. A similar follow-up procedure is followed at the end of term when each study module is subjected to performance assessment.

One of the special development projects in progress is the cooperation between the journalism discipline and the statistics teacher, the aim of which is to link the teaching of statistics and the journalism study programme, and to strengthen the link between statistics and the disciplinary teaching of methodology.

How do the disciplines prepare and decide on degree requirements?

The disciplinary committees discuss possible modifications to the course requirements before every academic year. All teachers have the right to refine and practise their teaching according to their visions. At the same time, however, they are required to justify their decisions bearing in mind the targets of education at the School and at the receiving Faculty department, other teachers’ ideas, and student feedback.
More substantial modifications of course requirements can be implemented every three years. These are preceded by a more comprehensive planning process, and coming changes are discussed at several disciplinary committee meetings during the spring. The meeting examines the objectives of each course and decides whether it is to remain or to be cancelled. In the face of more significant changes in the study programme in journalism, the discipline has formed working groups in which both teachers and students are included and the disciplinary committee, the Academic Affairs Committee and the Board then discuss the proposals. During the three-year periods the disciplines may initiate minor adjustments to the course requirements. The Academic Affairs Committee recommends them for approval, and the Board then sanctions them annually at the end of the spring term. The Board has moreover authorised the rector to decide about minor modifications during the academic year.

The disciplinary committees endeavour to invite the teachers of the common subjects (such as languages, information and communications technology (ICT), statistics, and philosophy of science) to their meetings when it is necessary to discuss their courses. There is general awareness of the need to integrate researchers and untenured teachers more closely into the work of the disciplinary committees and the Academic Affairs Committee. At the disciplinary level, the feeling is that the Academic Affairs Committee’s role as a coordinating body and an instrumental agent in the development of matters concerning pedagogy and educational technology should be enhanced.

**How do the disciplines ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?**

Although the disciplinary committees act as coordinators in the planning of teaching programmes, individual teachers have ample scope for planning and implementing their courses according to their own special qualifications. There are disciplinary teaching posts with a certain focus, such as a university lectureship in social work with the main emphasis on developing established practices in the field, and another in sociology focusing on ethnicity. As far as possible, teaching tasks are allocated according to individual expertise and declared interests. The assignment of work is debated every year in connection with the review discussions between disciplinary heads and teachers, as well as at the disciplinary committee meetings. The fact that the disciplines with their few teaching posts (2–4 teachers per subject) are rather vulnerable since specialist knowledge is often linked to one specific teacher is seen as a problem. It is the feeling of the disciplines that it ought to be possible to ensure the continuity of teaching in connection with changes in the teaching staff.
How do the disciplines promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?

When the teaching year at the University of Helsinki was divided into four periods in the autumn of 2005, one objective was to make it easier for teachers to keep one period free of teaching every year. The disciplines at the Swedish School of Social Science endeavour to grant each and every teacher this opportunity to have time off for research. In practice, however, teachers in a small unit find it difficult to make themselves entirely free for a seven-week period, so even then they conduct seminars and examinations and handle teaching-related administration. From the disciplinary point of view it is emphasised that School-level efforts are also necessary in order to make research-leave periods a realistic option.

The discipline of political science and public administration has continuously engaged research students in teaching. At the same time as younger researchers gain pedagogical experience, they constitute a significant additional resource for the permanent teachers and strengthen the basis for future recruitment. Hourly paid teachers, visiting lecturers, international readers and docents contribute additional capacity in several subjects. The disciplines are working systematically on expanding the recruitment basis for teachers with knowledge of Swedish. Even so, it may often prove difficult to find qualified Swedish-speaking teachers for permanent and hourly paid posts. The availability of future generations of teachers depends to a large extent on the School’s own education and further-training programmes. Through its Research Institute (FISS) the School supports former students’ academic continuing education and qualifications, nowadays mainly within the scope of projects with outside financing.

The sociology discipline has initiated an interdisciplinary theme seminar on gender studies that brings together teachers and researchers engaged in gender research at the School. It is also intended as a form of continuing education in theoretical and methodological aspects of research.

The University of Helsinki offers courses in university pedagogy in Swedish. The teachers at the School receive information about them and have attended them. Within the School, disciplines have opted for new web-based teaching methods in several courses, in cooperation with the IT Team.
D  Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education at the entire School

Strengths

- Disciplinary autonomy – in practice, the disciplinary committees play the leading part in the planning of teaching
- All subject teachers take part in the respective disciplinary committee meetings
- Active involvement by the students in the disciplinary committees
- Being a small unit facilitates functioning communication between students and teachers
- Horizontal leadership
- Close external contacts at the disciplinary level – internationally, nationally and with the labour market
- Flexibility in the division of labour between the meetings of the disciplinary heads and those of the Academic Affairs Committee
- Adaptable models for the transition from Bachelor’s to Master’s studies
- Varying forms of course evaluation

Areas in need of development

- Researchers and hourly paid teachers should be more closely involved in the work of the disciplinary committees and the Academic Affairs Committee
- Opportunities for teachers’ research leave should be improved
• The Academic Affairs Committee’s role as a coordinating body and instrumental agent in the development of matters relating to pedagogy and educational technology should be enhanced

• The same questions are discussed in too many bodies

• The integration of the disciplinary heads into the Academic Affairs Committee should be improved

• Communication between the disciplinary committees and the Academic Affairs Committee should be improved

• Sufficient continuity of teaching in connection with changes in the teaching staff should be ensured

• Oral evaluation in the form of discussions at the end of courses should be further developed

• Response percentages in the WebOodi evaluations should be improved

• Students’ experiences of involvement in various School bodies should be documented with a view to being passed on to coming generations
13.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Swedish School of Social Sciences has a particular mission to deliver social science programmes through the medium of the Swedish language. The School is a small, tightknit organisation which enjoys fierce loyalty from both staff and students. We were very impressed by the supportive environment for teaching and research. Many links also exist with other parts of the University. At the same time, however, we do not believe that it is always healthy for the School to exist separate from the rigour and challenge elsewhere in the University. A balance has to be struck that enables the School to maintain its unique identity and to fulfil its particular mission, while at the same time ensuring that staff and students are fully integrated within the University.

Management and leadership in education

The Swedish School of Social Sciences is a small, independent entity offering six Bachelor’s degree programmes. The School is part of the University of Helsinki, but has a distinctive mission to deliver programmes in the social sciences in the medium of the Swedish language. It is funded separately from the rest of the University. The School does not have a formal departmental structure, but is organised in small subject groups. Leadership in the School revolves around the rector and is both active and widely respected.

We were highly impressed by the level of interaction within the School between staff and students; all the staff and students that we met, without exception, expressed a strong personal commitment to the School and emphasised their appreciation of the very special and distinctive atmosphere of the School. This is a major strength. The position of the School is strong in the sense that it is a relatively small entity where the students and staff are very much involved in decision making and know each other well. Staff are very open to discussions with students, and this is much appreciated by the student body.

The downside is that a relatively small group of staff must ensure the academic viability of a range of degree programmes, with all the full range of constituent courses. The School is very vulnerable to staff sickness or turnover. It also means that a proportion of courses cannot be truly research led, since each member of staff teaches many courses and can only be an expert with a research background in a few of them.
We were informed about a range of examples of interaction between the School and the Faculty of Social Sciences. Indeed, the relationship was described at one stage as “seamless”. Many staff contribute to programmes in the Faculty and work in collaborative research activities. Similarly, many students take courses in the Faculty as well as at the School. This is very much to be commended, and can form the basis for further developments in the future. The School will be moving to new accommodation close to the Faculty, and this will further strengthen links in both teaching and research.

We also believe that academic programmes in the School should be subject to wider scrutiny in association with the Faculty of Social Sciences. It should be stressed that we saw no evidence that quality was below expectations. However, we also believe that all programmes can benefit from wider scrutiny within a constructively critical community of cognate disciplines.

Students were very enthusiastic about their programmes. Time did not allow detailed inquiry, but we formed an impression that teaching methods in the School were very “traditional” and lacked an innovative edge. This may reflect the School’s relatively small academic community. Our concerns were reinforced by some suggestions from the students that courses taken outside the School were more demanding than courses within the School. There are many possible explanations for these comments. However, it is important for the School to ensure that its academic standards are at the same level as the Faculty of Social Sciences. Student:staff ratios are relatively favourable and staff turnover is low, but we were not convinced that the School took the maximum benefit from these advantages.

The School has an International Affairs Committee and also possesses an active officer for international affairs in the administration. The Committee meets approximately two times a year. The importance of internationalisation is a shared vision of the School. The quantitative targets (for exchange students etc.) in this area are set in negotiations between the University and the School.

The School sees itself as an international community partly as a result of its particular language policy and the long tradition behind that. Networks for staff and students in the Nordic countries are, as a result, very good. There is also increasing interest in designing courses taught in English, which the School offers, to some extent, to international students in the other faculties as well. With regard to students spending time abroad, the School is very supportive, and information is given regularly by email by the International Affairs Officer.

Bearing in mind the special mission of promoting Swedish language education, we are aware that there is a limit to what extent the School can promote teaching in English.
Conclusions

We were very impressed by the enthusiasm of staff and students in the Swedish School. However, we were also concerned about the relative isolation of the School within the University; this could have consequences regarding vulnerability to staff changes and about the critical review of courses and teaching arrangements. The School has a particular mission and succeeds fully in meeting this requirement.

Strengths

- The distinctive mission and funding arrangements for the School represent a major strength and the opportunity to offer a highly distinctive higher education experience for both staff and students. The “bond” represented by the Swedish language offers a distinctive opportunity for teachers and students to work together in creating an innovative approach to higher education.

- The School will soon be moving to a new building. This will offer excellent facilities and will also provide further opportunities for interaction with the Faculty of Social Sciences.

Good practices

- The School provides an outstanding supportive working environment for both staff and students.
- The School is able to provide a high level of contact between staff and students.
- The School has a strong commitment to internationalisation.
- The School is very supportive of interdisciplinary study.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the School enter into further discussions with the Faculty of Social Sciences regarding further collaboration. This would help to ensure critical mass in key subject areas and would strengthen staff interaction in both teaching and research. Such collaboration should also include quality assurance of degree programmes.

- We recommend that the School undertake a detailed review of teaching methods. This would also involve further consideration of pedagogic developments, including the practice of research-based teaching and the use of new forms of educational technology.
14 Faculty of Theology
14.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Theology
A Introduction

Compilation of evaluation materials

After the first information about the evaluation was received, a discussion took place under the dean’s leadership in a working committee comprising the dean, the vice-deans and the presenting officials. It was agreed in this discussion that the coordinating group for the Faculty’s self-evaluation of education would be the pedagogical unit led by the senior lecturer specialised in university pedagogy. This unit comprises teacher representatives from all five departments, the head of academic affairs, a student representative, fixed-term planning officers, the specialist in web-based education and the tutorial project secretary. The degree-reform planning officer served as evaluation coordinator. It was also agreed that the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the head of academic affairs and the coordinator would plan how the evaluation was to be implemented in the Faculty.

The evaluation has since proceeded in the Faculty according to the agreed-upon guidelines. Evaluation instructions were sent to the departments in December 2007. The coordinator and the head of academic affairs provided information on the evaluation in departmental meetings and in meetings of the heads of the departments.

The departments completed their self-evaluations by 25 February 2008. The evaluation was implemented differently in different departments, e.g., in departmental standing working groups on teaching, in ad hoc working groups on the evaluation and in groups organised by a departmental appointee. The self-evaluation report on the Faculty’s administrative management and academic leadership was produced by a meeting of the Faculty’s administrative services and the working committee led by the dean.

A workshop on the Faculty evaluation was held 12 March 2008. Invitees included the dean, the vice-deans, the heads of the departments, the pedagogical unit with the members of its steering group, student advisers and representatives of the Faculty Organisation of Theological Students. A workgroup area was set up on the University’s intranet. The workgroup area made it possible to get acquainted in advance with the reports produced by the departments and Faculty administration to be discussed in the workshop. The workshop was led by an outside consultant.

The coordinator and a theology student assisting in the project prepared a draft report based on the workshop discussion and the self-evaluation reports. The pedagogical unit commented on the draft report. The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, the dean, the head of academic affairs and the senior lecturer in university pedagogy also participated in producing the report.
STRUCTURE OF THE MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION

Faculty of Theology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STRATEGIC STARTING POINTS</th>
<th>ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND SERVICES</th>
<th>NETWORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faculty target programme</td>
<td>FACULTY COUNCIL Dean</td>
<td>ADMISSIONS BOARD Secretary: academic advisor</td>
<td>Faculty-specific student organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action plan for the development of teaching and studies</td>
<td>PEDAGOGICAL UNIT STEERING GROUP Vice-dean in charge of teaching (chair)</td>
<td>Teaching skills assessment committee</td>
<td>Network of heads of academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Departmental strategic plans</td>
<td>STEERING GROUP Head of the department</td>
<td>Department meeting</td>
<td>Network of lecturers of university pedagogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic policies for the development of teaching</td>
<td>TEACHING DEVELOPMENT GROUP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICE Head of academic affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACADEMIC LEADERSHIP</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FACULTY COUNCIL Dean</td>
<td>ADMISSIONS BOARD Secretary: academic advisor</td>
<td>Teaching skills assessment committee</td>
<td>Faculty-specific student organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEDAGOGICAL UNIT STEERING GROUP Vice-dean in charge of teaching (chair)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Network of heads of academic affairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICE Head of academic affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE UNITS AND SERVICES</th>
<th>NETWORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES/ACADEMIC AFFAIRS OFFICE Head of academic affairs</td>
<td>Faculty-specific student organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network of heads of academic affairs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NETWORKS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amanuensis meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPARTMENT OFFICE Amanuensis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Amanuensis meetings
Special characteristics of the Faculty

The Faculty’s special characteristics include its scarcity of teacher resources in relation to the number of students, which poses particular challenges for the management of education. The ratio of basic degree students per teacher is 26.4. This is the highest at the University, where the average is 14.7. The highest ratio at the other faculties of City Centre Campus is 21.0 basic degree students per teacher.

The Faculty of Theology is an academic community that is not tied to any single religious viewpoint and its teachers and students include members of a variety of denominations and religions as well as those without any religious affiliation. Theological research and training produce an extensive range of religious expertise, which is needed for a variety of employments, including positions in churches, educational institutions and research work. Individuals with a theological education also work in a variety of international and intercultural capacities. About one-half of Master’s degree graduates are employed in the service of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland and about one-fifth in the school system. The employment of Master of Theology graduates and the experiences of graduates regarding how well their University training corresponded to working life are rated good in survey reports.

B A description of the management of education at the department and Faculty levels

The Faculty

The management of education refers to the management of educational planning, implementation, evaluation and development. The management of education incorporates educational strategic planning, the planning of educational resources and the management of academic administration and teaching activities.

The Faculty Council makes decisions on the Faculty’s most important educational policy guidelines and approves the three-year target programme along with its action plan. The Faculty Council also makes decisions on resource-allocation principles (approval of human resources policy plans, the establishment of new posts, the principles for distributing funds etc.) as well as on standing
regulations related to education and on the principles for student admissions. The Faculty Council has delegated the task of selecting undergraduate students to the Admissions Board and the selection of postgraduates to the Postgraduate Admissions Board. The Faculty Council confirms the annual teaching programme and degree requirements based on the departmental steering groups’ proposals. The Faculty Council is responsible for academic degree quality, for achieving the target results and for more specific allocation and prioritisation of resources.

The dean grants degrees and makes decisions, based on presentations, on academic administrative matters (relating to, e.g., minor subject studies, restoration of the right to pursue studies, tutorial activities and international exchange students and agreements). The dean also decides on annual allocations of funding.

The vice-dean in charge of academic affairs serves as the chair of the pedagogical unit’s steering group and represents the Faculty in the network of vice-deans in charge of academic affairs.

The pedagogical unit steering group, set up by the Faculty Council, is a strategic support group for the development of the Faculty’s academic affairs while being at the same time a drafting body that prepares matters for Faculty decision. The steering group discusses basic questions concerning teaching, learning and the learning environment; it also prepares proposals concerning the allocation of any performance-based funding received for teaching and the allocation of teaching development project funds. The chair of the steering committee is the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs. In addition, the steering group comprises a senior lecturer in university pedagogy, the head of academic affairs, two professor representatives from the departments, one centre group member and a student representative.

The Faculty’s pedagogical unit comprises representatives of each department’s teaching staff and officials involved in preparing academic affairs for the Faculty. The lecturer specialised in university pedagogy serves as chair. The mission of the pedagogical unit is:

- Prepare the target programme and its action plan
- Prepare Faculty-wide teaching development projects
- Promote cooperation between the departments

The Peda Team comprises the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy, the degree-reform planning officer supported by Ministry of Education project funds, the coordinator of teaching development projects and the specialist in web-based education. The Team coordinates teaching development projects and operations, and provides support for educational planning. The Peda Team is located in the Faculty’s administrative services.
The teaching skills assessment committee evaluates the qualifications of applicants for teaching and research posts as well as the teaching qualifications of docentship applicants.

Presenting officials are responsible for the legality of their presented matters. Faculty officials in administrative services and in the departments of the Faculty are responsible for the practical arrangements of teaching (e.g., framework planning, recommended timetables, lecture room reservations, the study guide and academic advising) so that students will be able to complete their degrees within the time constraints provided by the Decree on Degrees.

Meetings between amanuenses. The head of academic affairs arranges meetings between the faculty’s academic administration and amanuenses (departmental coordinators) at least twice per term to discuss practical arrangements related to the planning of studies, curriculum compilation and other administrative matters.

The departments

The departmental steering groups prepare and approve the teaching programme as well as departmental decisions on posts and teaching staff. The steering groups are responsible for passing the department teaching budgets. Departments are responsible for the teaching in their disciplines and the quality of completed studies as well as for designing the curriculum, for setting learning objectives, for assessing learning outcomes, and for teacher qualifications and competencies.

The heads of departments approve of departmental work plans and also make recommendations to the dean concerning the recruitment of teaching staff within the framework of the administrative regulations.

The teaching staff is responsible for the implementation of teaching, the quality of learning situations and the assessment of learning outcomes. The professors are in charge of the general development of education in their respective fields.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

Educational planning, follow-up and development

How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

The long-term development of Faculty of Theology teaching is based on University educational guidelines, feedback from a variety of sources, self-evaluation and the practical experiences of teachers. The content of degrees was thoroughly evaluated by core content analysis when implementing the Bologna process degree reforms. It was based on the components of an academic degree of a high quality as defined in the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies as well as on the Faculty Council decision concerning the objectives of basic degrees in theology. The latter decision was prepared by a working group comprising four professors of the Faculty and one representative of the profession.

The direction of teaching and its development is determined by the three-year teaching and studies action plan, which is prepared by the pedagogical unit steering group led by the vice-dean in accordance with the Faculty target programme and the University’s Strategic Plan. Some of the departments have produced their own teaching development programmes based on the action plan.

The head of academic affairs serves as the official in charge of academic affairs planning and development. The work of the Faculty lecturer specialised in university pedagogy includes pedagogical development and research activities. Support for development is also provided by cooperation with networks outside the Faculty (e.g., the network of vice-deans, the network of lecturers specialised in university pedagogy and the W5W² project) and networks connected with working life (e.g., the theology education committee).

The strategic work of the Faculty is robust, but directing scarce resources to achieve optimal outcomes requires extra planning and reductions. The Faculty has already
made attempts to prioritise its areas in need of development, for example, by setting up the three-year teaching development programme, “Quality teaching and supervision in an international learning environment”, which is divided into five departmental spearhead projects and a joint spearhead project of the Faculty. The departmental projects are based on the Faculty self-evaluation as well as on the University's performance programme. Internationalisation and the construction of an international learning environment is a joint spearhead project of the Faculty, as international matters at the Faculty are managed jointly. A common theme of the project is benchmarking, or developing by a comparison of best practices.

In recent years the University has carried out reform projects (including the Bologna process, the quality assurance system, self-evaluation development, educational management processes) requiring great amounts of time and resources. The goal of the prioritisation is to stabilise the process of teaching and studies development and decelerate the swift pace of renewal in order for teachers to have more time to plan and develop their own teaching.

The planning, development and monitoring of teaching is organised somewhat differently in different departments, but the practices have become accepted and established in all. The Departments of Biblical Studies and Church History have a working committee on development appointed by the steering group. These departments have formed their own target programme based on the Faculty's teaching and studies action plan. Teaching staff of the Department of Systematic Theology hold regular weekly meetings. Teacher meetings in the Department of Practical Theology are held twice per term. The Department of Comparative Religion discusses teaching-related matters at their monthly meetings when necessary. In addition, all of the departments have discussions of teaching content, methods and development during teaching development days and thematic departmental meetings as well as during meetings of the teachers in charge of basic, intermediate and advanced studies. Docents are also invited to these in order to better integrate their teaching into the departmental teaching programme. Depending on the situation, students may also participate in planning meetings.

At the Faculty level, teaching is prominent in the annual negotiations between the dean and the departments. In these talks the Faculty leadership gives recommendations and advice on organising and carrying out teaching and receives feedback from the departments. Matters for consideration in educational planning and current development needs are also regularly discussed in meetings of the pedagogical unit as well as in academic administration meetings with amanuenses. Important developmental needs may be brought up for discussion by the Faculty Council. Informal evening sessions, where the whole Faculty staff and student representatives are invited, are held periodically. These consist of 4- to 6-hour seminars, and teaching development is often an important theme. The evening sessions have proven particularly rewarding in formulating common developmental goals and in creating a community spirit in the Faculty. However,
the sessions have not been regularly held, but have been organised mainly in response to specific emerging needs.

There is a constant need for joint educational planning and for coordinating study content and methods. An annual teaching development day is planned by the Faculty as a natural part of educational planning. In addition, the pedagogical unit has held coffee-break discussions for teachers once a month since autumn 2007. In these, teachers have a forum for discussing matters related to teaching development. In spring 2008 these are being hosted alternately by different departments, which present their own current development projects. The tutorial project secretary as well as the planning officers for the personal study plan (HOPS) and the ETAPPI study progress monitoring system arrange meetings between teacher tutors. In addition, the Peda Team has invited teachers of the different study stages (basic, intermediate and advanced studies) from all departments to plan coordination and collaborative work. However, these meetings have not been held regularly.

Educational planning and development is affected by the feedback it receives in various ways. Student feedback is generally collected in the departments on a course-specific basis. Feedback utilisation has been developed over both current and previous strategy periods. In the Department of Church History, feedback on courses and on supervision is discussed in departmental meetings and steering group meetings. In the Department of Comparative Religion, teachers write up a summary of their collected feedback for use in planning teaching. Feedback is also collected and utilised in other departments’ planning.

During the current strategy period, the emphasis is on collecting and systematising course feedback. Degree monitoring makes use of quantitative indicators, but there is a need to develop a collection and utilisation system for qualitative feedback on student study paths. Qualitative indicators are also involved in the feedback received in the Faculty’s self-evaluations of teaching quality, but these do not apply to the entire study path towards a degree as seen from a student perspective.

The Faculty’s lecturer specialised in university pedagogy has been involved in developing the City Centre Campus “Student learning and the learning environment” inquiry for first and third year students. The inquiry was piloted in ten faculties in spring 2006. One consideration in developing the inquiry was to develop a University-wide quality assurance system to enable comparisons of student views of the various learning environments offered by the different faculties. A strength of the inquiry was that it was research based; its potential for use in the Faculty’s feedback system should be considered.

Academic advising and communications are tools of academic supervision. These can also provide information useful for monitoring teaching and degrees. Academic
advising is systematically planned, and it aims to ensure that progress in studies continues smoothly forward. Academic advising is divided between the Faculty, which offers advice on questions on degree structure, and the departments, which address questions on departmental study subjects. In practice, however, the questions are often intertwined. The goal is to better utilise the departments in academic advising. There is therefore still room for improvement on the information flow concerning degrees. The head of academic affairs convenes meetings of amanuenses and the academic administration at least twice per term to discuss study-related matters. The head of academic affairs serves as chairperson and adds items to the agenda for discussion as necessary. The clarification of academic advising responsibilities and information flow are also taken into consideration in the Faculty's current administrative reform process. Updating of the Faculty's teaching-related information is currently concentrated mostly on the Faculty's intranet site, where it can be easily found and updated. A current challenge is to get students to actively follow these intranet pages and to search for information in the right places.

Academic administration and the Peda Team follow teaching activities and the functionality of the degree studies by monitoring the target figures for degrees and study progress through the different stages. Student planning and selection of studies is supported by the personal study plan (HOPS), which is integrated with the student's study path and is also used as an academic advising tool. Teacher tutoring is an important part of the devising of the personal study plans. The courses on the personal study plan are coordinated at the Faculty level.

The Peda Team, located in administrative services and led by the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy, supports teaching development. The Peda Team works in close cooperation with the academic administration. The degree-reform planning officer participates in academic administration meetings and amanuensis meetings. At departmental request, Peda Team members also participate in departmental planning groups on teaching. The Peda Team conducts follow-up studies of the study and learning processes of Theology students.

The objective of the above mentioned teaching development project is to share with the whole Faculty the departmental practices that have proven to be successful, as was done during the previous period.

**Strengths**

- Strategic work extends from the Faculty to departmental level.
- The Faculty holds broad-based discussions in, for example, its informal evening sessions and seminars on teaching to find common objectives and guidelines and to identify common problems.
• Persistent work has been done to direct greater attention to developmental matters.
• Teaching development has a long tradition at the departmental and Faculty levels, and teachers are committed to their teaching.
• Degrees include studies from different departments, and the departments continually carry out cooperative work.
• A great amount of feedback on teaching is collected in the Faculty, and there is a follow-up study underway on the study and learning processes of Theology students. The information and insights yielded by the study have already been used to develop teaching and supervision.
• The administrative and communications reforms have focused attention on the distribution of academic advising responsibilities and the communication of academic affairs information.
• The personal study plan is integrated into those points in the students’ study paths where they make significant choices.

Developmental challenges

• There is a need for greater attention to developmental prioritisation and the selection of developmental focus. Teaching and studies development should be stabilised, and the pace of reform should decelerate.
• The activities of pedagogical unit members must be developed; the possibilities for acting and having an effect in their own departments need to be considered, and their role must be clarified.
• Teachers’ meetings should be further coordinated and scheduled at regular, appropriate intervals.
• The planning of course and study units that are common across departments must be given support and guidelines (for example, by offering workable models) in order to achieve a more up-to-date, higher quality of teaching.
• Closer cooperation is needed between the teaching staff and academic administrators and support staff for the development of teaching. Development work requires a greater adherence to practical considerations, an improved information flow and systematic follow-up of educational functionality.
• Feedback utilisation must be systematised so as to take account of the entire path of studies towards a degree. There is a need for clearer overall planning of the annual feedback process.
• Supervision of students must be optimised by using information on the intranet on student planning of their own studies and by the use of electronic resources such as e-HOPS.
A centralised process of curriculum design

How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching? How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?

Theological degrees are formed on the basis of degree programmes. At the beginning of studies, students complete basic studies in all five departments (12 credits per department), at least one classical language module (Greek, Hebrew or Latin) and the general compulsory studies. The curriculum is coordinated at the Faculty level. The degree requirements for Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees are based on core content analysis. The degree structure as a whole is considered when forming the annual curriculum.

The head of academic affairs and the student adviser determine the schedule for planning the teaching programme (the degree requirements and the teaching for the next academic year). The student adviser then informs the amanuenses of the schedule. The teaching offered during the first two years of studies is scheduled in such a way that students will be able to complete 60 credits per academic year. The recommended studies for the third year of studies are also arranged to enable students to complete their studies on schedule. However, there are more options available at that stage since students are then choosing their own majors and degree programmes. The student adviser confers with departmental amanuenses and teaching staff on the course and examination schedule, then prepares a framework plan of the first three years of studies based on the scheduling preferences presented by the departments. The framework plan is sent to the departments for comment before Faculty Council approves the curriculum and the degree requirements of the general, basic and language studies.

Amanuenses coordinate the planning of degree requirements in the departments. In some departments, recommendations on degree requirements are prepared by a special working group appointed by the steering group; in other departments, the planning is done in groups led by teachers in charge. The plans are discussed in departmental meetings, or feedback is received by other means from teaching staff before the steering group decides on the matter. The head of academic affairs presents the steering groups’ degree-requirement proposals to the Faculty Council, whose decisions are effective for one year at a time.

The Language Centre teachers in charge of English and Swedish studies are informed of the framework plan in order to avoid schedule overlaps with, e.g., lecture courses in basic studies.

Faculty recommendations are provided regarding the scheduling of seminars at the intermediate studies level and methodology studies and thesis seminars at
the advanced studies level. The planning officer in charge of international affairs coordinates departmental teaching provided in English. The departments notify the head of academic affairs about the teaching programme and degree requirement recommendations, which have been approved by the steering groups, concerning intermediate, advance and applied (professional orientation) studies. The head of academic affairs presents the matter to the Faculty Council. After approval of the curriculum, the Faculty’s study guide is compiled centrally but with departmental cooperation.

The degree programme-based degree structures require broad-based cooperation and coordination. In practice, however, there could be even more cooperation and coordination. Compiling the curriculum is on a tight schedule, and any delay could result in problems. A challenge concerning general, basic and language studies is to compatibly schedule the large lecture classes with the numerous small-group activities. After the coordination efforts, however, the final responsibility for selecting compatibly scheduled groups lies with the student. At present the degree requirements are decided on anew each year, but after the transition stage for the degree reform has concluded, a goal is for the decisions to remain effective for several years at a time, which would free up time to focus on developing study content and methodology.

**Strengths**

- The organisation and delegation of responsibilities for planning degree requirements has been relatively well-achieved at the Faculty and departmental levels.

**Development challenges**

- Better integration of teaching development measures with the planning of teaching and with academic administrative processes. Delegation of responsibilities for putting joint development ideas into effect.

- Continuous development of the curriculum for the first three study years.
Distributing teaching duties appropriately and promoting the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff

How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching? How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?

The Faculty makes an internal decision on the allocation of funds, thus ensuring the necessary conditions for research and education. The dean is in charge of confirming allocations based on the model for a three-year period. The educational responsibilities of the Faculty are factored into resource allocation. The dean is responsible for overseeing that the human resources management of the Faculty is in conformity with both the Faculty’s own and the University’s joint human resources policy.

The Faculty ensures that post appointees have the teaching skills required by the relevant Decree. The Faculty Council appoints a teaching skills assessment committee to a three-year term to evaluate the teaching skills of docent and teaching-post applicants. The committee comprises professors, university lecturers, a student representative and the lecturer specialised in university pedagogy. Each evaluation includes a representative of the department that is recruiting for the post or docentship. The committee is assisted in its work by the teaching skills matrix approved by the Faculty Council. This practice has been in effect since 2004, and the teaching skills assessment committee has become an established part of the appointment process. The teaching skills evaluation also motivates teachers to participate in pedagogical training.

A challenge for the Faculty of Theology is the great number of students relative to the number of teachers (26.4 basic degree students per teacher). Basic degree students totalled 1,809 in 2007. The Faculty admits about 200 students annually. Professors, university lecturers and docents teach and supervise both under- and postgraduate students. Bachelor’s and Master’s studies often include small group instruction, so the amount of teaching lessons given is considerable. Some courses take up the entire academic year (e.g., classical language courses).

The main responsibility for distributing departmental teaching duties in an appropriate manner lies with the head of the department, who must have a clear, overall grasp of the matter. The distribution of teaching duties is collectively planned in, e.g., departmental, development-day or university-lecturer meetings in connection with compiling the degree requirements. Coordination between the various groups is usually the responsibility of the amanuensis.

The head of the department holds annual review discussions with his or her subordinates. The discussions include arrangements for the distribution of
teachers’ annual work load (1,600 hours/year) between teaching, research and administrative duties. The review discussions may also include analysis of student feedback on the teacher.

Potential research leaves may also be included in review discussions. Using the period divisions of the academic year, which came into effect in autumn 2005, a goal is to arrange one period completely free of teaching duties or containing only light teaching duties. However, this has not yet been achieved in all departments. A challenge to this is posed by the scarcity of teaching resources relative to the number of students, as well as the long, four-period duration of some course subjects. This problem is particularly acute in the Department of Biblical Studies, where students are offered year-long courses in Greek and Hebrew. In order to resolve the matter, the department is organising shorter, more intensive language courses on a trial basis alongside the traditional long courses. Organising research leaves is also complicated by the great amount of administrative tasks.

The distribution of teaching duties in the Faculty faces several developmental challenges. On the one hand, it is important to distribute the teaching load evenly between posts of the same rank and to achieve optimal utilisation of teachers’ particular research and pedagogical strengths. On the other hand, it is important for teaching duties to be rotated so that, for example, professors can also take care of teaching basic courses with large numbers of students. The expertise of docents adds to the diversity of a well-rounded curriculum, but their teaching should be better integrated into the overall teaching offered by the department.

In typical university fashion, Faculty professorship and university lecturer posts are often filled by locums while the tenured post-holders spend longer periods on research. When there is a changeover of teachers, the ideas and content of the previous course should be carried forward, that is, a “collegial memory” is needed in the department. Some departments have already tackled the issue: the Department of Biblical Studies has established a teaching knowledge bank in the department’s Moodle learning environment, and the Department of Comparative Religion is compiling an orientation guide for new teachers.

Faculty teachers are highly motivated to participate in the pedagogical training offered by the University and to apply the training in the departments. The departments encourage their teachers to participate in pedagogical training by, e.g., making special work arrangements, although this is constrained by resource limitations. Pedagogical training is taken into consideration when preparing work plans in the departments’ review discussions. The Faculty’s pedagogical unit offers training and consultation to the departments as well as to individual teachers.
Strengths

- Teacher commitment to teaching in spite of the scarcity of resources.
- In the filling of posts, teaching skills are systematically evaluated by common criteria. Teachers are enrolling in pedagogical training and are encouraged to do so.
- The expertise of docents is put to use in teaching, and their teaching is being integrated into the department’s teaching programme.

Development challenges

- A fair distribution of the teaching load among equivalently ranked posts should be guaranteed within the department as well as in comparisons of teachers’ work plans interdepartmentally.
- Optimal pedagogical use must be made of teachers’ particular educational and research strengths; however, it is also necessary to rotate teaching duties.
- The connections between the overall planning of departmental teaching, the curriculum and review discussions must be developed.
- Development is needed regarding the orientation of new teachers and locum teachers, and the “collegial memory” of the departments.

A summary of the strengths and development challenges of the management of education at the Faculty of Theology

Strengths

- Strategy work extends from the Faculty to the departmental level, and work has been initiated on the prioritisation of development targets.
- The Faculty holds broad-based discussions in, for example, its informal evening sessions and seminars on teaching to find common objectives and guidelines and to identify common problems.
• Teaching development has a long tradition at the departmental and Faculty levels, and teachers are committed to their teaching despite the scarcity of resources. Using studies from different departments in the composition of degrees presents opportunities for cooperation.
• The organisation and delegation of responsibilities for planning degree requirements has been relatively well achieved at the Faculty and departmental levels.
• A great amount of feedback on teaching is collected in the Faculty, and there is a follow-up study underway on the study and learning processes of Theology students. The information and insights yielded by the study have already been used to develop teaching and supervision.
• The administrative and communications reforms have focused attention on the distribution of academic advising responsibilities and on the communication of academic affairs information. The personal study plan has been integrated into those points in the students’ study paths where they make choices affecting their degrees.
• Teaching skills are systematically evaluated by common criteria when filling posts. Teachers are enrolling in pedagogical training and are encouraged to do so.
• The expertise of docents is being beneficially applied to teaching, and docent teaching is being integrated into departmental teaching programmes.

Development challenges

• There is a need for greater attention to developmental prioritisation and the selection of development foci. Teaching and studies development should be stabilised, and the pace of reform should decelerate.
• Teachers’ meetings must be better coordinated and scheduled at regular and suitable intervals.
• The planning of joint departmental course and study units must be supported and guided in order to achieve a more up-to-date and higher quality of teaching.
• Closer cooperation is needed between the teachers, academic administration and teaching development supportive staff. Development work demands a greater consideration of practical matters, improved information flow and systematic follow-up of the functionality of teaching.
• Feedback utilisation must be systematised so as to take into account the entire study path towards a degree. There is a need for clearer overall planning of the annual feedback process.
• Teaching development measures should be better integrated into educational planning and academic administrative processes. Responsibilities should be delegated for putting joint development ideas into effect.
• The activities of pedagogical unit members must be developed; the possibilities for acting and having an impact in their own departments must be considered, and their role must be clarified.

• Students must be advised to take better advantage of the information available on the intranet for planning their studies and to avail themselves of electronic resources, such as e-HOPS.

• A fair distribution of the teaching load between posts of equivalent rank should be guaranteed within the department as well as when comparing the work plans of teachers from different departments.

• Teachers’ particular educational and research strengths must be optimally utilised in teaching; however, it is also necessary to rotate teaching duties.

• The connections between the overall planning of departmental teaching, operational planning and review discussions must be developed.

• The orientation of new and acting teachers as well as the departments’ “collegial memory” must be developed.
14.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

Staff in the Faculty of Theology engaged very positively with the self-evaluation exercise and provided the evaluation panel with informative documentation. During the site visit, the panel were impressed with the clear sense of management and leadership within the Faculty, the shared vision, and the strong sense of mission, particularly with respect to teaching. The diversity of expertise and individual strengths of the staff are recognised within the Faculty and are utilised effectively within team situations. The students are articulate, and there are mechanisms through which they can be actively engaged in the organisation and management of the Faculty. The Faculty recognise the importance of intellectual traditions within the contributing disciplines and have found ways of building on these traditions in staff induction and staff development. A noteworthy feature in this Faculty is the way they have initiated a number of small managerial and leadership processes, which taken together have a profound and positive influence on the running of the Faculty, thus demonstrating that strategic management is not only about dealing with the big issues.

Management and leadership in education

Observations on the Faculty level

This overview is a combination of the preliminary evaluative comments and outcomes of the discussions with Faculty, Departmental, teacher and student groups.

The Faculty of Theology comprises five departments. Structures for management and leadership exist at Faculty and Departmental levels. At the Faculty level, a Pedagogical Unit and its Steering Committee appear to have a pivotal role in education. At the level of Departments there are Teaching Development Groups.

The Faculty’s self-evaluation of education was coordinated by the Pedagogical Unit. Each Department conducted the evaluation differently. Collectively, the evaluation was addressed through a Faculty workshop (chaired by an external consultant) and an intranet workgroup. The evaluation coordinator drafted a report. Senior staff read the draft before a final report was prepared.

The Faculty Council is the major decision-making body in the management and leadership of education. The Pedagogical Unit’s Steering Group provides strategic
support. The Pedagogical Unit is concerned with the details of teaching, learning and the learning environment. The ‘Peda Team’ deals with the practicalities of support for teaching, learning and the learning environment.

A lot of basic structural work has been done on the Faculty strategy. For example, educational developments to meet targets at the university level were worked out in the Pedagogical Unit and its Steering Group. The University of Helsinki emphasises pedagogical affairs; it provides funding for pedagogic developments such as the ‘Spearhead projects’ in the Faculty. One of the goals in the strategic period is management and leadership of education. Constructive alignment with this goal was worked out in meetings and in the Pedagogical Unit.

The staff-student ratio in the Faculty of Theology is significantly higher than elsewhere in the university. The background to this was discussed, and was said to be primarily the financial model of the University, which is very unfavourable for Theology due to the small size of the Faculty and a lower unit of funding than for comparable programmes in, for example, the Faculty of Arts, and the relative seniority of staff in the Faculty and the correspondingly higher salary costs.

The notion of ‘collegial memory’ mentioned in the documentation was discussed. It is a form of departmentally based orientation for new teachers, introducing them to the traditions of the Department, curriculum planning and the targets of the courses they have to teach. The form of orientation depends on the Department but may include work with a web-based platform and mentoring. It is valued very much by Departments and individuals.

Other observations
- The financial model for teaching is very unfavourable for Theology, and there is little time for research and for small group teaching.
- The students were very engaged with discussions about the work of the Faculty.
- Pedagogical support is satisfactory, but many think the subject rather than methods should be the starting point; ‘we need to learn from each other’, therefore an emphasis on team teaching, joint seminars, dialogue teaching.

Observations at the Departmental level
This overview is a combination of the preliminary evaluative comments and outcomes of the discussions with Faculty, Departmental, teacher and student groups.

The Faculty of Theology comprises five departments. Departmental steering groups prepare and approve teaching programmes before the Faculty Council confirms them. There are three-year action plans for the direction and development of teaching. There are established procedures for collecting and acting on feedback from various sources. There are established procedures for academic advising.
Every Department has a three-year project (a Spearhead project) as a focus for its developmental work. For example, in Comparative Religion it is on feedback processes; in Practical Theology leadership it is on creating common procedures in pedagogical matters. The student feedback project engages students in formal planning. The projects are coordinated at the Faculty level. Some teachers take these projects more seriously than others.

At the Faculty level there is an action plan for the development of teaching and studies. At the Departmental level there are strategic plans and strategic policies for the development of teaching. At the meeting with Faculty members the question was posed: What are the practical ramifications of this relationship? In other words, how are strategic plans at the Faculty level reconciled with the expertise and aspirations of teaching staff at the Departmental level? This question is partly answered in the ‘responses’ section of the self-evaluation report, but the discussion focussed on the relationship between personal autonomy at the level of teachers and compliance with strategic policies. All Departments have their own working groups who, with the assistance of the Peda Team and Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy, deal with plans. Teaching is also prominent in the annual negotiations between the dean and the Departments. There was a great deal of discussion when implementing Bologna. A working group comprising four professors of the Faculty and one representative of the profession prepared the decision for the Faculty Council concerning the objectives of basic degrees in Theology. Core content analysis is used to arrive at what staff teach in order to reach the objectives.

There are discussions with outside agencies, for example, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Finland, the school networks and other Faculties of Theology. This is not a confessional Faculty, although half of the students will be employed by the Church.

Research-based teaching is a strategic objective of the university. The documentation provides much detail about the structure and management of education but very little about the structures that enable teaching to be related to research. The mechanisms by which research-based teaching is achieved and monitored were discussed. All teachers can take time off for research if they receive funding for that from the Academy of Finland or other sources. There is not any sabbatical system available.

Focus on learning is a strategic objective of the university, and it is the leading point also in the three-year teaching and studies action plan of the Faculty. The documentation provides much detail about the management of teaching but less about the management of learning. The mechanisms by which a focus on learning is achieved were discussed.
Other observations

- There is much more feedback from the field of practice (i.e. potential employers of graduates) that is taken into consideration in course planning than the report mentions: e.g. from church committees and teachers’ groups.
- All teachers collect feedback; they use their own system; not all take it seriously.
- Students can ‘avoid’ student-centred learning methods by opting to undertake much of their studying at home, attending only a few formal sessions. Thus the investment in pedagogical development may not benefit all. If studying at home is an acceptable way to get a degree in theology, then perhaps the Faculty should consider developing self-study and distance education pedagogies.
- There is a great variety of teaching methods; students see improvements in teaching skills but are also selective about the lectures they attend. Their decisions are based as much on what they know about the style of the teacher as they are about content.
- Students see study plans as generally worthwhile, but the self-reflection sections they see as repetitious.
- Students claim that the Etappi tracking and checking system is only good for some students.
- Students recognise the value of student services.
- Students are sometimes unsure about career possibilities and feel that there is not enough advice about this.
- Teachers find large group teaching difficult (rotation of ‘duty’).
- There is a generation gap: some staff see teaching as ‘information provision’ (giving students the facts), others use teaching to engage the students in learning experiences; everyone has to find his or her own style.
- Some teachers are critical about evaluation sheets and find their own way of evaluating (informal; qualitative; during the course).
Conclusions

Strengths

Faculty level

- Strong mission/shared vision for the whole Faculty - to create experts in religion.
- Strong commitment to quality teaching despite all odds (cf. teacher/student ratio).
- Leaders are all teachers.
- No stress on uniformity of approach, but individual strengths of staff appreciated.

Departments

- Strong intellectual and academic traditions.
- Attention to managerial detail.
- The whole staff involved in teaching. Rotation of teaching core content courses at regular intervals.

Good practices

Faculty level

- Student participation in Faculty committees, the union of theology students.
- The collegial memory style of orientation and mentoring for new staff.
- The student feedback project, which engages students in formal planning.

Departments

- ‘Spearhead projects’ in all Departments.
- Staff learning from each other (team teaching, joint seminars, dialogue teaching).
- Dedicated section of website for teachers to exchange experiences.
- Bioethics as an example of multidisciplinary teaching.
- Lecture and reading diaries to help students understand content.
- Room for inclusion of specific research interests in the courses motivates teachers.
- Some Departments strengthen research through efforts to find common research areas. Top-level research should result in top-level teaching. Success with external funding gives incentives to research-based teaching.
- Innovative pedagogy (reading groups, student peer group cooperation).
Recommendations

Faculty level

- The collegial memory style of orientation and mentoring for new staff could be developed and refined and, in a generalised form, introduced to other Faculties through the work of the Senior Lecturers in Pedagogical Studies.
- The student feedback project which engages students in formal planning needs further refining so that the system and thinking behind it are more widely understood by students (not just those involved in the planning) and it takes account of the entire study path.
- Further development of the annual discussion meeting, particularly to address the developmental challenges identified by the Faculty in their self-evaluation.

Departments

- The ‘Spearhead’ concept could be a focus for prioritising, specifying, developing and disseminating the alignment of the university’s strategic aim of focussing on learning with good practices in teaching within the Faculty.
- [Linked to the above] The development of innovative methods for large group teaching.
Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
15.1 Self-evaluation report of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
A Introduction

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine at the University of Helsinki is responsible for education in veterinary medicine in Finland. The Faculty is the only Finnish unit that provides undergraduate education in veterinary medicine, offers research-oriented and vocational postgraduate and continuing education, and develops the practice of veterinary medicine and related services so as to ensure the health and well-being of both animals and humans. The Faculty also conducts high-quality research in veterinary medicine.

The Faculty’s undergraduate degrees are the three-year Bachelor of Veterinary Medicine degree (180 credits) and the three-year Licentiate of Veterinary Medicine degree (180 credits). The Faculty has about 280 staff members and some 450 students, of whom 380 students are pursuing an undergraduate degree. Since 2008, the Faculty has admitted 70 new students per year (previously 55).

The Faculty has four departments: Basic Veterinary Sciences, Equine and Small Animal Medicine, Production Animal Medicine and Food and Environmental Hygiene. In addition, the Veterinary Teaching Hospital operates under the Faculty’s auspices, treating some 17,500 patients (small animals, horses and production animals) every year. The Hospital functions as a teaching hospital for Faculty students, whose studies include training at the Hospital’s clinics. All four Faculty departments and the Veterinary Teaching Hospital together provide the degree programme leading to the completion of the Licentiate of Veterinary Medicine degree. The contents and quality of teaching are governed not only by Finnish legislation, but also by an EU directive.

To conduct the present self-evaluation, the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine designated its Academic Planning Committee as the Faculty steering group for the self-evaluation and named the Faculty head of academic affairs as the evaluation contact person. The chair of the evaluation steering group was the Faculty vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education, and the group secretary was the head of academic affairs. The steering group also included the Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy, representatives of all the departments and the students, and a representative of the Viikki Science Library. The steering group carried out the part of the self-evaluation that related to the Academic Planning Committee.

The Faculty asked its departments to respond to the University’s self-evaluation questions. The departments were also asked to consider the role of the Academic Planning Committee in the management of education. In addition, the Faculty held a workshop, which was planned cooperatively by an external consultant, Dr Maaret Wager, the Faculty’s head of administration, its senior lecturer in university pedagogy, and its head of academic affairs. The participants of this
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workshop included the members of the Faculty Council and the Academic Planning Committee, the heads of departments, the heads of disciplines, the coordinators of study units and representatives of the academic administration from the Faculty Office and the department offices. Those registered for the workshop were able to read in advance the departments’ and the Faculty’s responses to the self-evaluation questions in an online learning environment. The workshop participants represented a comprehensive range of teaching and administrative staff from all the departments, and also included two students and a representative of the Viikki Science Library. The total number of participants was about 30. After the workshop, the Faculty’s evaluation contact person drew up a draft report on the basis of the workshop discussions. The Faculty’s evaluation steering group then wrote the present self-evaluation report based on that draft.

B Description of the management of education in the Faculty and its departments

The Faculty

The management of undergraduate education is the responsibility of the Faculty dean and the vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education. They are also responsible for the implementation of measures and the distribution of workloads as specified in the University’s Strategic Plan and its Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. The Faculty dean and vice-deans meet regularly, and the dean conducts annual discussions with the departments concerning the Faculty’s operations management process. The Faculty writes a target programme for each three-year planning period to implement the University’s Strategic Plan and the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. The Faculty leadership and key officials ensure the implementation of the target programme in their areas of responsibility.

Strategic decisions on education are taken by the Faculty Council, which is led by the dean. The Faculty Council’s duties are determined in the Finnish Universities Act and in the Administrative Regulations of the University of Helsinki.

The Faculty’s Admissions Board develops the admission of students to the degree programme in veterinary medicine and prepares admissions criteria. The chair of
this Board is the vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education, and its secretary is the head of academic affairs. The Board members include representatives of all the Faculty departments and the students, as well as the Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy.

The Faculty's Academic Planning Committee develops the degree programme in veterinary medicine and prepares the curriculum. This Committee is chaired by the vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education, and its secretary is the head of academic affairs. The Committee includes representatives of all the departments, the students and, as an expert member, a representative of the Viikki Science Library. The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy is also a member. In curriculum design, the Committee is responsible for the degree as a whole, the degree structure and the degree objectives. The Academic Planning Committee also participates in the preparation of the Faculty's target programme and action plan, and monitors their execution with regard to academic affairs. In addition, the Committee discusses the feedback collected from students at the end of each academic year and the students' feedback on degrees. Figure 1 shows the Committee's role in the development of education in the Faculty.

Where possible, the Faculty has centralised the duties associated with academic administration to the Faculty Office. The student affairs officials of the Faculty
Office are responsible for the preparation, presentation and implementation of duties relating to the academic administration of undergraduate and postgraduate education. Such duties include student recruitment and admissions, the right to study in the Faculty, degree diplomas and other certificates, the coordination of curriculum design (course and examination schedules and degree requirements), the editing of course catalogues, application guides and other similar documents, and the administrative services relating to international teacher and student exchange programmes. The student affairs officials are also responsible for student guidance and advice, the provision of information to new students, the protection of students’ legal rights, the registration of completed studies (general studies and the recognition of studies completed elsewhere), retakes of Faculty examinations and communications on academic affairs. The student affairs officials of the Faculty Office include an academic affairs secretary, an international affairs officer (part-time), a planning officer in charge of postgraduate education, a planning officer in charge of web-based education and the head of academic affairs.

The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy works in close cooperation with the staff who deal with academic administration. This lecturer is responsible for the development of teaching and learning and for related research. The lecturer also cooperates with the staff working in academic administration in supervising students whose graduation has been delayed. Moreover, the lecturer supervises the writing of personal study plans, which were introduced in conjunction with a reform of degree structures at the University. The lecturer participates in all of the Faculty’s major projects for the development of teaching and supervises the work of the planning officer, who was employed with project funds allocated for the development of teaching (the “W5W2” project).

The departments

The head of each department is responsible for the management of education at that department, while the head of each discipline is responsible for the management of education in that discipline. In addition, a coordinator is named for each study unit. The content of study units, teaching duties, the assessment of learning, detailed schedules and other matters relating to the provision and development of teaching are discussed in departmental teacher meetings. Student feedback on individual study units is also discussed in these meetings.

The departmental curriculum (the degree requirements and the teaching programme) is discussed each year in the departmental steering group. The departments are responsible for the provision of teaching and the registration of completed studies. The department secretaries register completed studies and aid in practical arrangements for teaching. All departments are represented on the Faculty’s Academic Planning Committee and Admissions Board.
C Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development

How does the Faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire Faculty and its departments? How is this support managed? What role does the Academic Planning Committee play in the management of education?

Because the operations management process of the University of Helsinki includes the faculties, each faculty must draw up a target programme for three years at a time. This programme must define the faculty’s objectives, its strategic vision of its mission and prospects, and its operational targets. The target programme must also cover the faculty’s focus areas as defined in the University’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies. The operations manual of the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine describes the annual cycle of financial and operational planning in the Faculty. The objectives for education are set at the Faculty level. The dean conducts annual discussions with the departments on the implementation of the target programme, including, for example, degree objectives. Education could be managed more efficiently if such objectives were brought to bear on the departments as well.

The Faculty dean and vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education play a key role in the management of education. The vice-dean in charge of undergraduate education is the chair of the Academic Planning Committee, which is also the vice-dean’s most important means for managing education. The head of academic affairs is the secretary of this Committee and prepares matters for discussion in the Committee, as agreed with the vice-dean. The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy, who works under the supervision of the dean, is responsible for the development of teaching in the Faculty. This lecturer and the head of academic affairs cooperate closely with each other and also exchange information efficiently with the dean and the vice-dean.

The Faculty considers it important that its departments participate in the University’s performance evaluations. Each of the Faculty departments must complete the University’s Teaching Evaluation Matrix once a year. The Faculty senior lecturer in
university pedagogy and the departmental staff have cooperated in submitting an application to be designated as one of the University’s centres of excellence in teaching twice in the case of the Department of Food and Environmental Hygiene and once in the case of the Department of Production Animal Medicine.

One of the strengths of academic administration in the Faculty Office and at the departments is cooperation. As part of quality assurance in the Faculty, the processes of academic administration have been described with the objectives of harmonising departmental practices and procedures and of ensuring an appropriate distribution of workloads. As a result of this work, the staff working in academic administration in the Faculty Office and at the departments have started to meet regularly. There is still, however, considerable variation in departmental practices which will be difficult to harmonise because of, for example, the different duties of the department secretaries who deal with academic affairs. Another separate challenge is related to the fact that the superior of the person who deals with academic administration at most departments is the head of department, not the Faculty head of academic affairs.
The role of the Academic Planning Committee has been strengthened in recent years. This Committee is responsible for the development of the degree programme in veterinary medicine and for preparatory work associated with curriculum design. In addition to preparing the curriculum and any changes and additions to it, the Academic Planning Committee prepares standing orders on degrees for the Faculty Council’s decision. In curriculum design, the Committee is responsible for the degree as a whole, the degree structure and the degree objectives. Curriculum design consists of several stages, numerous associates and various activities that take place at different times. The management and coordination of this whole process are thus highly important (Figure 2, see page 413).

The Academic Planning Committee also prepares various instructions and recommendations relating to, for example, theses, dissertations and evaluation matrices. Thanks to cooperation between the Academic Planning Committee and the Viikki Science Library, theses and dissertations are now published in an open online environment (dViikki). The Faculty publishes its instructions to students and teachers on the intranet (under Ajankohtaista opiskelijoille ja opettajille, “Current information to students and teachers”). The Faculty teachers have also created their own mailing list to distribute current information.

The Faculty’s feedback scheme for undergraduate students was created by a working group that the Academic Planning Committee had appointed. The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy was the chair of this working group. The students are now asked for feedback on issues that range from individual study units to the degree as a whole. The University-wide survey on education and employment is also part of the Faculty feedback scheme. The Faculty has appointed the persons in charge of collecting and processing feedback. Other essential elements of the Faculty’s feedback scheme include collective discussion on feedback at teacher meetings and meetings of the Academic Planning Committee, and the provision of feedback to students on the feedback that they have given. The Faculty planning officer specialised in web-based education plays an important role in developing the feedback scheme, for feedback is collected electronically.

It emerged in the self-evaluation that one of the Academic Planning Committee’s strengths is its strong status in the management of the Faculty's operations. Another positive aspect relating to the Committee is the wide range of people and organisations represented on it (all the departments, the Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy, the students and the Viikki Science Library), the active participation of students and the Committee’s open atmosphere, which encourages discussion and debate. Information is distributed successfully from the University and various networks (vice-deans, senior lecturers in university pedagogy, heads of academic affairs) to the Academic Planning Committee and vice versa. In contrast, the distribution of information from the Committee to the departments, individual teachers and the students must be improved. Decisions on major issues are taken by the Faculty Council, but smaller matters, such as the issuance and implementation
of instructions and recommendations, are not handled as efficiently as they should be, despite the existence of a mailing list and an intranet information list. The Academic Planning Committee has suggested that in order to improve the distribution of information, the Faculty should organise joint teacher meetings and should specify the Committee members’ duties so that they would also include the provision of information about Committee decisions at departmental teacher meetings. In addition, the Faculty has established an administrative development group, which consists of the deans, the heads of departments, the deputy heads of departments and the representatives of administration. This group is one possible channel for communications, although the group already has to discuss many other issues at its meetings. Since the improvement of communications must be seen as part of quality assurance at the departments, each department should be able to decide the most effective means of communication for it.

One of the central areas in need of development to emerge in the evaluation workshop was the establishment of a Faculty-wide view on what should be taught and the scope of what is taught. The departments have already made efforts to agree on these matters (for example, by creating both study modules in clinical subjects and the “healthy animal” module), but coordination is still necessary, not only at the level of individual study units and departments, but also at the degree programme level. New information continues to be produced in various areas of veterinary medicine, and in order not to unreasonably increase the workload associated with the degree programme, the scope and contents of teaching must be revised regularly, and the scope of teaching in various disciplines must occasionally be examined in the degree programme. The Faculty’s core principle is that the degree programme and the degree in veterinary medicine should continue to provide the same knowledge and skills as before for research-oriented and vocational postgraduate education and for work as a veterinary surgeon in various areas of veterinary medicine, as stipulated in EU regulations.

The workshop participants felt that the distribution of duties associated with the management of education is clearly defined at the Faculty level. The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy, who holds a doctoral degree, is considered to be one of the Faculty’s strengths, as are the Faculty’s efficient support services for teaching (academic affairs secretaries).

At the departmental level, the strengthening of curriculum design is one development challenge. Education is the departments’ core mission, and the heads of departments are also responsible for managing education. The participants of the evaluation workshop discussed whether the head of department has an excessive workload and whether the role of the deputy head could be strengthened by transferring duties related to the management of education to him or her. In addition, each department needs to appoint a teacher in charge of academic affairs to coordinate the departmental sections of the curriculum, which the steering group then discusses. One department currently employs a part-time
university lecturer who supervises both the students writing their personal study plans and the students whose graduation has been delayed, and also ensures that the department completes the curriculum design process in good time. Curriculum design would be more efficient if each department allocated some of the working hours of one of its teachers to student guidance and supervision. Such teachers would also participate in the operations of the Academic Planning Committee and would deal with communications and implementation.

A major challenge for curriculum design is the high turnover of teachers at all departments. The commitment of staff especially at the departmental level requires action. Although interdepartmental cooperation has been established, the harmonisation of departmental practices and instructions remains a development challenge.

### How do the departments agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

All departments cited regular teacher meetings in their responses. Such meetings involve discussion on, for example, feedback on teaching, quality assurance, the assessment of learning, and teaching methods and their further development. In addition to regular teacher meetings, the departments’ strengths include an atmosphere open to discussion and debate. Teachers are competent, motivated and highly professional. Teachers are also well aware of what needs to be taught and have good relations with various employers. The staff of each discipline knows what needs to be taught, also from an international perspective.

Another strength of the departments is the advanced way in which they collect feedback on courses and use it. Professors and experienced teachers also participate in discussion on course feedback at departmental teacher meetings.

As mentioned before, the departments and disciplines should cooperate more in curriculum design. The Faculty senior lecturer in university pedagogy assists individual departments and teachers in the planning and development of teaching. Moreover, when necessary, the Faculty’s Academic Planning Committee establishes working groups consisting of the best experts in each issue. In conjunction with the degree reform at the University of Helsinki, the Faculty established a successful practice in which the senior lecturer in university pedagogy and the head of academic affairs invite all the teachers to a “roundtable discussion”.

The high number and turnover of teachers working on fixed-term contracts is a challenge for the management of education. The frequent induction of new teachers requires that the departments carefully document their decisions. The departments could also support induction by compiling an operations manual.
How do the departments prepare and decide on degree requirements?

The strength of the Faculty departments is joint curriculum design. The departments’ responses indicate that curriculum design takes place cooperatively at teacher meetings. For example, the Department of Food and Environmental Hygiene describes the curriculum design process in the form of an annual timetable: “We discuss the students’ feedback, the teachers’ comments on teaching and the numerical data on teaching (“hard data”), and complete the Teaching Evaluation Matrix. Based on this information, we begin the process of curriculum design for the next year, and we also work on any areas in need of development.”

The challenge for the Faculty is that it has a single degree programme and a single curriculum which is implemented by all the departments. The most important development challenges for curriculum design are to increase interdepartmental dialogue and to find a common view. Another development challenge for the departments is the clarification of their basic mission.

How do the departments ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

The head of each department is responsible for an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching at that department. The head of each discipline (professor) decides on the distribution of teaching duties in his or her discipline, or departmental teachers agree on this issue at their meetings.

The University of Helsinki applies the basic principle that “all teachers conduct research, and all researchers teach”. The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine applies this principle with varying degrees of success. The head of each department is also responsible for committing and motivating the staff to follow the University’s Strategic Plan in this respect. Ideally, researchers should supervise thesis and dissertation work, offer optional studies, give lectures and participate in laboratory work which is part of undergraduate education. Some departments’ researchers, however, contribute poorly to teaching. In contrast, the technical staff assists in teaching and its organisation at all departments (for example, in laboratory work).

At the Department of Production Animal Medicine, an experienced teacher is in charge of practical demonstrations and exercises which are carried out together with either a veterinary surgeon in training or a young researcher, until that trainee can complete them independently. This helps to train new teachers, while providing an experienced teacher with new perspectives.

The development of the curriculum to comply with higher pedagogical standards (for example, a reform of clinical study modules) clarifies and facilitates curriculum
design and teaching, and thereby also reduces the teachers’ workload. One remaining development challenge for the Faculty after the reform of its clinical study modules is the introduction of interdepartmental curriculum design.

The development of the structure of posts in the Faculty is an ongoing project, and teacher resources are still inadequate, as was noted in the evaluation workshop. The Faculty also employs many teachers on fixed-term contracts, and the turnover of such teachers is high, which causes heavy workloads for experienced teachers. Other development challenges thus relate to the recruitment and retention of experienced teachers. In addition, external experts and especially the Faculty's docents should be used more efficiently in teaching.

With regard to the Veterinary Teaching Hospital, it was noted that the veterinary surgeons employed at the Hospital participate in teaching only as part of clinical work. They do not usually give lectures, which increases the other teachers’ workload and also means that the veterinary surgeons’ expertise is underused.

How do the departments promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff?

All the departments encourage their teachers to participate in both pedagogical training and training in their field of expertise, and most superiors also raise the issue of teaching in review discussions. Teaching qualifications are also taken into account in the recruitment of teachers and are discussed in job interviews. Although excellent teaching skills are currently reflected to some extent in salaries, the provision of rewards for teaching qualifications remains a development challenge for the Faculty.

Another challenge is to allow for sufficient time for research. The Department of Food and Environmental Hygiene and the Department of Production Animal Medicine note in their responses that they currently allocate time for research. The Department of Equine and Small Animal Medicine, in contrast, writes in its response that it cannot allocate sufficient time for research by clinical teachers because their job description includes not only research and teaching, but also clinical patient work. Using external experts and the Faculty docents more widely in teaching could be one solution to this problem.
D Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the entire Faculty

Strengths

A single degree programme administered by a professional Academic Planning Committee

Professional and pedagogical competence
- Pedagogical development reflected in the curriculum

Excellent support services
- A senior lecturer in university pedagogy, who also holds a doctorate
- Broad use of ICT
- Improved cooperation in academic administration

Effective teacher meetings and teacher expertise
- Professors and experienced teachers participate in all teaching and in student guidance and supervision
- Joint curriculum design (teacher meetings)
- Motivated teachers
- Positive attitude towards pedagogical training
- Close connections with employers

Feedback scheme
- Feedback is collected on study units, the academic year and the degrees
- Feedback is discussed collectively and used systematically in the development of teaching

Areas in need of development

Clarification of responsibilities and powers
- Charting the relations (scope) between disciplines
- Establishing a shared view of what graduates need in their work as veterinary surgeons,
- what makes a good veterinary surgeon and what makes a high-quality veterinary surgeon from the perspective of society
- Methodical organisation of interdepartmental cooperation
- Faculty-level teacher meetings
• Strengthening strategic operations management at the departments

Communications
• Improving the distribution of information from the Academic Planning Committee to the departments
• Improving the dialogue between the disciplines and the departments
• Developing and transferring good practices

Management of education at the departmental level
• Committing departments to operations management, setting objectives (and duties) for the departments, implementing the strategic plan at a practical level
• Adopting an annual schedule in operations management at all departments
• Departmental operating cultures (e.g., do all researchers teach?)
• Appointing a teacher in charge of academic affairs at each department
• Distributing the duties of the department head (discipline head), e.g., strengthening the role of the deputy head in the management of education at the departmental level

Recruitment and retention of experienced teacher
15.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

The Faculty of Veterinary Medicine is a relatively small, highly specialised Faculty of the University. The leadership of the Faculty has a clear vision for the future, supported by staff and students. We were enormously impressed by the constructive, enthusiastic, passionate views that were expressed during our visit. As the only Faculty of its kind in Finland, the Faculty is the sole provider of veterinary training. This could lead to complacency. On the contrary, however, we found a forward looking, ambitious Faculty, keen to build on its considerable successes in both teaching and research.

Management and leadership in education

The Faculty runs a Bachelor’s programme (three years) and a Licentiate of Veterinary Medicine programme (another three years). The Faculty has four departments (Basic Veterinary Science, Equine and Small Animal Medicine, Production Animal Medicine, and Food and Environmental Hygiene) and a veterinary teaching hospital. The Faculty has 280 staff members (74 teaching staff) and 583 students (395+188). Student admission has now been raised from 55 to 70 a year.

The Faculty used to be an independent school, outside the University. The integration into the University in 1995 is considered to have been successful despite a view that there have been cuts in the budget. The Faculty believes that there is sympathetic understanding at the University level for particular aspects of Veterinary Medicine, such as the applied nature of this science and the essential links with a veterinary clinic.

We were very impressed by the highly committed, dedicated staff and leadership of the Faculty, and with the students who were actively engaged in their studies and very positive in their comments.

The Faculty ensured broad participation among staff and students in the self-evaluation. The evaluation report gives a good description of how the management of education is designed at the Faculty. Figures 1 and 2 are illustrative and give a good overview of the role of the Academic Planning Committee and the administration of the curriculum planning process over the year. Our interviews indicated that the description presented corresponds with the perceptions of the interviewees.
The Academic Planning Committee appears to be a well-developed forum for discussions about curriculum and other educational matters. It gives a forum to raise and discuss all matters of common concern. Students and teachers had a very positive experience from participating in the work of this Committee. Matters that had been discussed in the Committee were decided on in the Faculty Council. The Faculty leadership would like the Committee to have a stronger role in the implementation of its decisions. However, members of the Committee felt that, in practice, most issues that had been decided on were enacted.

The departmental structure was said to work well in the organisation of teaching. However, we formed a view that more could be done to diminish the borders between the departments and provide overall coordination and leadership in teaching matters, especially given the common degree programmes spanning all four departments. There was, for instance, a felt need to have a thorough review of the curriculum as a whole, to ensure that it is updated and to balance the weight and place of different subject areas. The departmental structure tends to encourage the preservation of teaching material that may be less appropriate for the overall balance of the programme. Similarly, greater Faculty overview may help to encourage the introduction of new teaching methods and more active teaching by students.

The Faculty feels that it is on a very tight budget. It seems to have been understaffed with positions that have been “frozen”. When the student admissions were raised from 55 to 70 students per annum, there was not a proportionate increase in resources for new teachers. We support this view, but also believe that a review of the curriculum and a greater Faculty overview might release some resources for redeployment. The departments have their own budgets, but it is clear that there is very little scope for strategic purposes.

The Faculty uses a feedback system for undergraduate students and takes the findings into account in curriculum planning. The students also report that they felt free to take up issues at the Academic Planning Committee, with teachers or with the Faculty's Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy. The students’ experience was that management and teachers responded well to their comments and complaints, and took action to remedy faults. For example, the students told us about their concerns regarding the second year of studies, which was seen to be overloaded, but this had been dealt with in a manner that the students were very satisfied with.

The Head of each department is responsible for the management of the education offered by that department. A coordinator is named for each study unit. The role of the Heads of Department seems to vary. The general picture that we formed is that the teachers are very independent in their choice of teaching content and teaching methods as long as they filled their allotted time. The teachers in each department reach an agreement on matters such as the distribution of teaching
and curriculum content at teachers’ meetings, but we believe that this process could be strengthened and coordinated better at Faculty level.

Our impression is that the role of the departments is at present limited to arranging the meetings and, to a certain extent, to checking that the agreements are followed up, but, significantly, not to spearheading new initiatives. Coordination across departments was therefore expected either from the Faculty or the teachers themselves, rather than by collaboration between the department heads. From the teachers’ point of view, some change was needed; either the role of the Faculty or the role of the Head of Department should be strengthened.

Meetings of teachers were arranged at the departmental level (2 - 4 times a year). Teachers thought it would be useful to arrange meetings for all teachers at the Faculty level to work better and improve links across departments. Even with representation in the Academic Development Committee and teachers’ meetings, it appears that the information flow to departments, individual teachers and students is lacking in efficiency. The students were able to use the web to access updated information; we would like to see this system extended and used by teachers as well.

The teachers had a high degree of autonomy, and they appeared highly engaged in their teaching. The panel also noted that the teachers were engaged in the learning as well as in the welfare of their students. The strong “ownership” of teaching which this created is probably also a reason for the very positive feedback from students. They know teachers have other things to do, but feel “they are there for me”! On the other hand, this ownership may be an obstacle in getting a comprehensive overview of the content of the programmes and create difficulties in revising content in particular parts of the programmes. The approach to “joint curriculum design” (Self-evaluation, page 417) needs to be further pursued. The Faculty leadership will need to develop a strategy to improve this situation.

According to the Dean, the teachers worked too much, especially bearing in mind their clinical loads. There is a high turnover of teachers. The high workload and better paid jobs outside were the main reasons given for this situation. The Faculty leadership did not seem to have tools available to address this problem, and there was a feeling of powerlessness. Unlike some other Faculties that we visited, there did not seem to be a problem with uneven workloads. As far as possible, the process was well managed. Teaching loads were distributed between colleagues in the same department, and this was regarded as a fair process.

The students in the Faculty each year form a very close-knit group of students, who work together and get to know each other well. This creates a feeling of communality and cooperation; on the other hand, we also noted a sense of isolation from the rest of the University and a reluctance to engage in wider aspects of the University experience. This might be considered further by the Faculty.
Students work long hours, partly due to an intensive teaching schedule, partly caused by heavy study and teaching loads, and partly by their clinical training commitments. They also seemed to be highly dedicated to their work and thought that it was important to learn as much as possible in view of their future profession. The Faculty seems to have managed to overcome the fact that students, due to part-time jobs, study less than might normally be expected. In this Faculty, part-time jobs do not seem to interfere with the students’ studies. In part, this was because many students worked on research projects in the Faculty or on other professionally related activities. The tendency is to graduate (licentiate) in six years. The students do not worry as much as students elsewhere in the University about study loans since the work market is exceptionally good for veterinarians, giving a reasonable expectation that any loans can be repaid.

The students’ experience is that their voice is heard and that they are well informed about plans and activities at different levels of the Faculty. The students have monthly meetings with the Dean where particular problems and broader policy issues are discussed. They participate in the Academic Planning Committee and find this a good forum for their views, and they feel free to discuss matters with the Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy and - in particular - with their teachers.

Research-based teaching and learning has strong expression within the Faculty. The teachers are active researchers and their teaching is strongly informed by insights from their research in the field. In addition, there are opportunities for students to participate in the research of their teachers. An annual summer school offers approximately ten students (by application) the opportunity to participate in research groups at the Faculty and to do their own independent research within this group. Successful projects are written up as articles for publication. This work also counts as the students’ Master’s thesis. We strongly commend this practice.

From a student perspective, the objective of internationalisation in the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine is mostly related to foreign students coming to the Faculty (about 20 in 2007), rather than by the provision of personal opportunities to go abroad (about 10 in 2007). The students think that their programme, and especially the clinical parts, is better than foreign programmes that they know about; the highly collegial approach also means that students are reluctant to leave their classmates, even for relatively short periods. The students also noted that, as they mostly read English textbooks, have some English-speaking guest professors and have some contact with foreign students, internationalisation was in some ways taken care of. The teachers appear to support the students’ views. For their own part, teachers found that their “internationalisation” was related to their research where international networks, contacts and visits of varying length are an absolute necessity. Whilst understanding these views, we also believe that the benefits of internationalisation might still be realised by a more flexible and imaginative approach to the opportunities for international study; for example, a partnership with another international Faculty could lead to group exchanges.
Despite the considerations already discussed related to the curriculum planning process and references to the need for constructive alignment, we believe that this process might well be brought forward with greater urgency. The panel’s understanding is that some aspects of the curriculum process are taken care of within each department and that the further concretisation is undertaken by the teacher in question. However, there appears to be a clear need to revise the curriculum as a whole, and this cannot be undertaken by this rather ad hoc, random way of organising the discussion process.

Conclusions

Strengths

- The Faculty has a strong shared vision and clear strategies for future development. We were very impressed with the quality of Faculty leadership; the vision and strategies are in tune with staff and students, and therefore stand a good chance of being implemented.

- The Faculty enjoys excellent teacher-student relations. Teaching standards are high, with varied teaching approaches and learning experiences. Teachers were personally very caring and committed to the welfare of their students. There are frequent teacher-student interactions in various situations.

Good practice

- The Faculty actively promotes research-based teaching and learning. In addition to meeting the usual indicators for research-based teaching and learning, many students are involved in research projects, sometimes leading to a contribution to internationally published papers; also, one department organises an annual summer school which admits a number of students who then participate in the research of that department.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the Faculty initiate a full Faculty-wide review of the curriculum, including content and teaching arrangements.

The Faculty leadership must devise ways to review and revise the curriculum as a whole, addressing such problems as overload, updating and possible places to cut down on face-to-face teaching. The Faculty has a strong need of leadership to reflect upon the overall curriculum. Many new demands have been faced in developing the present curriculum, and so many changes in science and skill have been realised that an integral rethinking and, possibly, an overhaul of the already overloaded curriculum is strongly needed. This requires a reordering of the presence of disciplines and departments in the curriculum, which will also bring about changes in resource allocation, and is therefore an extremely complicated
matter. However, many people we met expressed the need for such an operation. This will require the Dean personally to take the lead, with due regard for a full consultation within the Faculty; it will also mean that the Dean will need to have the powers and instruments available to ensure that such rethinking and restructuring is effectively implemented, to the long-term benefit of staff and students.

- We recommend a full review of the functions of the departments within the Faculty.

The need to review the functions and roles of the departments came up in different ways in all the interviews we undertook. We would go further and urge that the review considers whether there are other models for internal organisation within the Faculty that may offer a better, more effective form of delivery than the current departmental structure. In a Faculty that is concerned with common degree programmes, it is not clear that the departmental structure is the most efficient form of organisation.

- We recommend that the Faculty review the arrangements available for student and staff exchange programmes.

We believe that it is important to make student exchanges more appealing to students. Experiences from other veterinary schools and cultures will enhance student learning and - over time - will strengthen the discipline itself. It is important to change some attitudes in this respect.

The Faculty has a very coherent class system of students who intensively study together and act to assist and stimulate each other in progressing and doing all the work necessary. This also leads to a highly motivated, closely knit group of students, carefully selected and self-reinforcing; however, there is a possible downside from group pressure, isolation from the University and reduced input from the curriculum of other academic disciplines. We would therefore suggest to the Faculty that it looks at ways to guide and supervise the students in order to prevent problems before they arise. The creation of some electives to be taken outside the Faculty might help solve this issue, or more incentives to study abroad and obtain a transfer of credits, or bringing in students from other Faculties doing an elective at the Faculty of Veterinary Medicine. Students in the Faculty are under considerable pressure, and we urge that staff are all trained to detect potential problems, both study-related and personal, at an early stage.
16 Language Centre
16.1 Self-evaluation report of the Language Centre
A Introduction

The Language Centre is an independent institute operating under the auspices of the Senate of the University of Helsinki. The Language Centre organises all the language studies required for the degrees awarded by the University of Helsinki and attends to its other duties specified in its regulations in cooperation with the University’s faculties and other units.

The Language Centre has no student admission system of its own, for it provides teaching in accordance with each faculty’s degree requirements. All degrees include compulsory language studies, and language courses or modules may also be chosen as the elective studies to be contained in a degree. Consequently, the Language Centre has an extremely extensive network of interest groups and cooperation partners at the University.

The Language Centre is a large multilingual and multicultural institute (with some 140 employees). Teaching is offered in 16 languages on all four of the University’s campuses. Teaching is provided by language units formed in accordance with the University’s degree languages (i.e., languages that can be incorporated into a degree as compulsory language studies), namely English, French, German, Russian, Spanish and Italian, and Swedish. Other languages on the teaching programme do not involve full-time staff or a language unit; they are taught by part-time teachers. The annual number of students totals about 15,000, and the completed number of credits is approximately 40,000. The extensiveness of the institute’s teaching activities presents great challenges for the efficiency of academic affairs administration and the management of teaching.

Language Services is the Language Centre’s paid services unit, which offers language training, testing, language revision and translation services to clients within and without the University. The unit has 20 full-time employees and hires some 120 language experts on a part-time basis.

The language requirement for all Bachelor’s / Master’s degrees at the University is studies in the other national language of Finland (Finnish or Swedish, depending which is the student’s native language), as well as in at least one foreign language. A typical student admitted to the University is on level B1 of the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (a European framework developed by the Council of Europe for the learning, teaching and assessment of languages; six levels of language attainment from A1 at the Basic User level to C2 at the Proficient User level) in his or her second national language and on level B2 in his or her strongest foreign language (usually English). In recent years, the number of languages studied in secondary education has decreased. In order to provide graduates with the
versatile language skills required by the labour market, the Language Centre offers elementary courses starting from the elementary level in a number of languages.

**Implementation of the self-evaluation in the Language Centre**

The self-evaluation was carried in accordance with the instructions provided by the University. The institute’s quality coordinator was appointed to act as the evaluation contact person. In December 2007 the Language Centre director invited the unit superiors, the faculty coordinators from the English and Swedish language units, one teacher from each language unit and two students (student representatives on the Language Centre Board), a total of 20 persons, to form a working group to coordinate the self-evaluation. The coordination group held two meetings, a planning meeting focusing on the practicalities of the self-evaluation in January 2008 and a review meeting focusing on the self-evaluation report in March 2008.

The planning meeting edited one of the questions concerning the management of education to better suit the circumstances of the Language Centre, in other words, the focus of the question on the preparation of and decision-making about degree requirements was shifted to the curriculum. A new question on how the coordination of curriculum design should be implemented at the Language Centre was added to the list of questions. The meeting also chose a team to write the description of the management of education, made detailed decisions on how the units would conduct the self-evaluation and agreed on the arrangement of the evaluation workshop.

During the first stage of the self-evaluation, the language units, the Academic Affairs Unit and the Self-Access Centre answered the questions concerning the management of education in their respective units. The management of education in the entire Language Centre was described by the director and unit supervisors (academic leadership). As the evaluation project focuses on degree-oriented education, the Language Services unit did not participate in the evaluation. The superior of each unit was responsible for the unit’s self-evaluation, and each unit decided independently on its practical implementation. Some units answered the questions jointly in a meeting, while some unit superiors wrote draft answers which were then commented on by the unit members.

During the second stage of the self-evaluation, the institute convened in a workshop to investigate and analyse the unit-specific evaluations and to discuss them jointly. The workshop was led by a consultant hired by the University, and it was open to all Language Centre employees. Including the working group coordinating the self-evaluation, the workshop participants numbered 30 teachers and administrators, plus the three student representatives on the Language Centre Board.
The present self-evaluation report was written in cooperation between the institute’s evaluation contact person and the director on the basis of the unit-specific self-evaluations and the workshop. The report was edited by the coordination group in its meeting in March, and then submitted for comments by the Language Centre staff. The director of the Language Centre approved the final version of this self-evaluation report on 31 March 2008.

Information on the self-evaluation was disseminated in staff meetings and via e-mail. All evaluation materials (unit-specific self-evaluations, workshop materials, meeting minutes of the coordination group, self-evaluation report) were available to the staff on the University’s Alma intranet pages, in the workgroup area for the development of teaching at the Language Centre.

B Description of the management of education

The Language Centre

The Language Centre is managed by a board and a director. The Board is appointed by the University Senate and consists of representatives of University faculties, students and Language Centre staff. The Senate also appoints a chair for the Board.

According to the regulations of the Language Centre, its academic activities are managed by a permanently appointed full-time director, who is also responsible for the institute’s activities as a whole. The deputy director is the Language Centre's head of administration, who is responsible for general administration and finances. The superiors of the language units direct the operations of their units. Each teacher is responsible for his or her own instruction.

The superiors (of language units, other units, Language Services) meet regularly under the leadership of the director. The meetings between superiors plan and prepare matters related to teaching and its management.

The Language Centre has a Committee for the Development of Teaching, which develops teaching and learning at the Language Centre by focusing on teaching and assessment methods, pedagogical training as part of in-house training, curriculum design and practices in academic affairs administration. The Committee takes initiatives and coordinates the cooperation between representatives from
all the Language Centre units. The Committee for the Development of Teaching serves as an important discussion forum between academic affairs administration and the teaching staff.

**Staff meetings** and the **Cooperative Committee** deal with current issues involving the operations of the institute.

The Language Centre also has a **Student Council** elected by the University of Helsinki Student Union (one member and deputy member from each faculty), which meets once or twice a term to discuss topical issues related to language studies and their development. The Student Council is chaired by the Language Centre head of academic affairs.

The duty of the Language Centre **Academic Affairs Unit** (=**Student Affairs Office**) is to offer the students and their faculties advice, information and support services relevant to language studies and to develop these services further. The Student Affairs Office assists teachers with matters relating to the planning of teaching and testing, registrations and other practicalities. The **head of academic affairs** participates in the planning and development of teaching and is a member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching.

The Language Centre **Self-Access Centre** offers students opportunities for independent language study and provides teachers with support pertaining to educational technology and learning materials. The unit cooperates with the Student Affairs Office and the teaching staff in disseminating information to new students and in the development of audio-visual learning materials. Representatives of this unit participate in the work of the Committee for the Development of Teaching and other Language Centre working groups and committees.

The Academic Affairs Unit and the Self-Access Centre conduct annual target negotiations and review discussions with the director.

**Language units**

The Language Centre has six language units: English (17 positions), French (7 positions), German (4 positions), Russian (3 positions), Spanish and Italian (6 positions), and Swedish (19 positions). In addition, there are part-time teachers whose number varies every year. The primary duty of the language units is to provide students at the University of Helsinki with language instruction and testing in accordance with faculty-specific degree requirements.

The Language Centre director appoints superiors for the language units at the units’ proposal for a term of three years. The superiors are responsible for their unit’s curriculum planning, the implementation of teaching and faculty-specific
allocation of teaching resources in those languages where faculty-specific teaching is offered. In the English and Swedish units some teachers act as faculty coordinators, who share the responsibility for faculty-specific curriculum planning with the superior. The Language Centre director conducts annual target negotiations and review discussions with the language units and the superiors with the teachers in their units.

**Part-time teachers in languages with no language unit**

Languages with no full-time positions have no language unit. The academic superior of part-time teachers is the Language Centre director, who conducts annual target negotiations and review discussions with them and supervises curriculum planning.

**Networks**

Matters related to the management and development of education and teaching are discussed in various networks. Presently, the Language Centre participates, for example, in the following networks: University of Helsinki Academic Affairs Committee, network of heads of academic affairs at the University of Helsinki, the Council of Finnish Language Centre Directors, the Network of Finnish University Language Centres (FINELC) and the European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education (CercleS).

**Partnerships and interest groups**

*Faculties and students*

The Language Centre’s most important cooperation partners are the University of Helsinki faculties and their students. As modern language instruction is based on cooperation between the teacher and student, students participate in the planning of courses and often produce part of the teaching material by bringing in texts in their own fields for discussion. Faculties, on the one hand, set limits on the Language Centre’s teaching programme through their degree requirements and, on the other hand, participate in the planning and sometimes also in the implementation of language teaching, for example in connection with courses which integrate content and language learning (CLIL, Content and Language Integrated Learning). The Language Centre meets all faculties in annual curriculum planning meetings. Furthermore, the Student Affairs Office and teachers continuously maintain contacts with the various levels of the faculty organisation, including departments and programmes (e.g. English-language Master’s programmes), academic administration and individual teachers.
Cooperation between the various sectors of education

As some Language Centre teachers also teach in other universities and institutes of upper secondary education, the Language Centre obtains information about language teaching in different levels of education. Members of the Language Centre staff serve as examiners for the Finnish Matriculation Examination Board, the Board of the National Certificate of Language Proficiency and the State Board of Language Examinations. Language Centre teachers have also produced learning materials for various educational levels and for liberal adult education (textbooks, televised courses).

Other cooperation partners and interest groups include the University of Helsinki Open University and the Helsinki Summer University, which organise language courses in accordance with the requirements of the Language Centre, and the University of Helsinki Student Union, which elects the Language Centre’s Student Council.

C  Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education

Following questions were answered by the Language Centre language units.

■  How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?

The contents, methods and development of teaching are jointly agreed on in unit-specific meetings, with the participation of all the teachers of the unit. Curriculum design meetings take place at the beginning of the year, when teaching for the following academic year is being planned. Generally, the meetings are prepared and chaired by the unit superior. Part-time teachers in languages with no language unit plan their teaching in cooperation with the director.

Planning is based on feedback obtained from the faculties and students and on the experiences of individual teachers. Every year, the Language Centre meets with each faculty for a feedback and planning session. The participants from the Language Centre include the superiors of the language units and teachers. Individual teachers also maintain their own contacts with the faculties, especially in the English and Swedish units. Student evaluations and course feedback forms
from the previous year are jointly discussed in the unit meetings, and they have great impact on the contents of future teaching. In recent years, the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages has become a general starting point. Planning is also influenced by the Decree on University Degrees, the statutory language requirements for employees in the public sector, University-wide guidelines for teaching and the Language Centre target programme.

Unit meetings decide on the basic guidelines for teaching. Individual teachers have great freedom as to the methods used in individual courses, and depending on the course, also as to the contents of teaching. In some courses the textbook used may greatly determine the direction of the teaching, while in other courses the contents of teaching are moulded by cooperation between the students and the teacher. Within a language unit, the teachers of similar courses or parallel groups or of the same faculty usually discuss contents and methods and also produce or edit learning materials together. Some language groups hold seminars to deal with the contents and methods of teaching.

**Strengths**

The joint planning of teaching within the language units is considered a great strength. Its organisation and implementation has apparently succeeded well (e.g., joint meetings of units), for teachers feel that planning is collegial and encourages various points of views.

The needs of the Language Centre’s cooperation partners (faculties, students) are taken into consideration very carefully as well as the teachers’ various competences and interests.

Teaching is characterised by flexibility and active development measures (including in-house pedagogical training and research seminars). The teachers wish to stay abreast of developments and are motivated to tailor and develop their courses according to the students’ and faculties’ needs, and in some languages even according to the needs of the students’ major subject.

**Development challenges**

Cooperation between language units emerged clearly as an area in need of development. Ties between the language units could be closer, and the units could make efforts to engage in the joint planning of study paths in different languages to ensure consistent teaching carried out in accordance with constructive alignment.

The teaching staff should also meet more frequently to exchange personal experiences and information about their teaching and methods. To some extent,
such exchanges take place in in-house training sessions, but all in all, the teachers feel that the collegial development of teaching methods could be improved. One individual development challenge that can be cited is how to take special-needs learners into consideration. In fact, the Language Centre has recently established a support group which provides tutoring and training for such learners.

There are too little time and too few opportunities to follow developments in education and to discuss these developments collegially.

The pedagogical starting points and a common conception of learning for the Language Centre need to be discussed in greater detail, although the issue of a common conception of learning is controversial and even seems to be constraining for some teachers.

There is still room for development in the acquisition of student feedback, responding to this feedback, as well as in the system of collecting feedback from students. This matter has already been discussed by the Committee for the Development of Teaching and with University level academic administration.

**How does your unit prepare and decide on the curriculum?**

Each language unit has its own curriculum, which is prepared on the basis of extensive background material available to the unit:

- The Government Decree on University Degrees and statutory language requirements for personnel in the public sector
- The University’s and Language Centre’s strategic guidelines and instructions (the University of Helsinki Development Programme for Teaching and Studies, the Language Centre target programme, instructions by the Language Centre Academic Affairs Unit for the preparation and publishing of the teaching programme), faculty-specific degree requirements
- Statistics and feedback on the previous year’s or years’ teaching (statistics on registration, course participants and completed credits, group sizes, feedback from faculties and students, feedback from the labour market, teachers’ experiences of courses and groups)
- Resources (money, facilities, teaching hours and teachers available and their fields of specialities and wishes)
- Research information on language learning and teaching, and on professional language needs

The curriculum is discussed by the language units in the various stages of its preparation and decision-making. In these meetings teachers may present their views and wishes, as they also may in the annual target and review discussions with
their own superior. The unit superior devises a basic framework for the curriculum; the superior of the English and Swedish units does this in cooperation with the faculty-specific coordinators. The superior will also decide on the final structure of the courses, if necessary in cooperation with the other unit superiors, the director, the head of academic affairs and the head of administration. The Language Centre director decides on the programme for part-time teaching in languages with no language unit.

**Strengths**

The curriculum design process is well structured and functional. It is of essential importance that decision-making on the curriculum is based on extensive background material, the professional skills of the teaching staff and the active and willing development of teaching.

The instructions and coordination provided by the Academic Affairs Unit for the devising of the curriculum and the collection of data on teaching (the Study Guide, room bookings, timetables etc.) are highly useful. Cooperation between the Academic Affairs Unit, the language units and teachers has been the focus of target-oriented development in recent years, and development efforts continue under a quality assurance and benchmarking project between Finnish language centres (project on quality, development and assessment in language, culture and communication studies designed for all university students known as the LAAKEA project). A team of staff from the Academic Affairs Unit and teachers is participating in the LAAKEA project.

**Development challenges**

The most evident development challenge in curriculum design is the need for further pedagogical support and coordination. The Language Centre has no specialised pedagogical advisor in charge of support and coordination of teaching and learning.

The concept of ‘curriculum’ is manifold. The teachers and the academic affairs administration both feel that there is a need to clarify this concept and create a common understanding of it. The development of curriculum design is one of the key issues to be dealt with by the Committee for the Development of Teaching in 2008.

There is a need to firm up communication concerning the curriculum and teaching by taking into consideration the varying needs of different target groups (such as students, faculty administration, Language Centre personnel).
Language units should also increase coordination in the planning of campus-specific teaching programmes.

How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

A teacher’s annual workload is 1,600 hours, of which classroom teaching accounts for a maximum of 392 hours. The superior of a language unit is responsible for the distribution of teaching duties. The distribution of teaching hours is discussed in unit meetings and in the annual review discussions between individual teachers and their superior. Teachers may also come forward with their own wishes. Efforts are made to take into consideration each teacher’s special skills, experience and areas of interest in the distribution of teaching duties. The superior ensures that there is a balance between challenging and easier courses as well as between large and small groups in each teacher’s teaching schedule. Some language units assign parallel groups or groups from the same faculty to the same teacher because the teachers themselves feel that experience accumulated in this manner raises the quality of teaching.

In the distribution of teaching duties, attention is also paid to the amount of other activities each teacher is engaged in, for example, in the Language Centre’s working groups, in extensive professional training or in research. Such activities may entitle the teacher to a reduction in his or her teaching duties; the superiors of language units have jointly agreed on the conditions of such reductions.

Strengths

The teaching staff is satisfied with the distribution of teaching duties and feel that their special skills are well taken into account. This is evidence of the fact that the language unit superiors know the teachers in their unit well and are capable of exploiting review discussions in the planning of operations. It also became evident that the staff in the language units believes that the distribution of duties takes place in a collegial and transparent manner.

The teachers are flexible with regard to course and teaching arrangements, which facilitates the distribution of duties as a whole. In their daily work, the teachers interact with each other quite frequently (by sharing offices and holding meetings), which means that they have a realistic picture of their colleagues’ work and skills, which in turn facilitates the distribution of duties within the unit.

Development challenges

The annual workload should be put to use more efficiently. More consideration should be given to the fact that especially in the smaller language units membership
in working groups tend to fall on the same persons. The evaluation of working hours is complicated by the fact that some teachers travel between several campuses within a single day. Intensive target-oriented and collegial exploitation of the annual workload and teaching periods would better enable the teachers to develop new teaching materials or to engage in research.

The orientation of new teachers was seen as partly deficient. The unit superior is responsible for the orientation of new staff members, but it was felt that each individual teacher could also take greater responsibility in this matter. The Language Centre is in the process of developing an orientation programme, which should be ready to be posted on the intranet in May 2008.

The teaching schedules of part-time teachers are often very eclectic, for they are mostly hired to fill in the need for teaching resources in several faculties. The language units should consider the position of part-time teachers in the distribution of teaching duties more closely.

In recent years, a number of teachers in several languages, as well as financial and academic administrators, have retired, and this trend will continue in the years to come. It is of the utmost importance that the tacit knowledge of these professionals is collected and preserved to ensure continuity, smooth cooperation between units and possible reallocation of duties within a unit. The current practices of pair work and mentoring (including the retiring teacher and his or her successor) should be disseminated widely.

**How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff?**

The teachers in each language unit upgrade their professional skills according to need and in the manner best suited to them, after first consulting their superior. The Language Centre encourages its staff to develop their professional skills and makes efforts to provide opportunities for it by special arrangements in teaching duties. Some language units organise their own seminars on specific topics. Many teachers participate in national and international projects, networks and conferences in the field, such as the FINELC Network of Finnish University Language Centres and the European Confederation of Language Centres in Higher Education (CercleS).

In addition to training in the strict sense of the term, workdays in the language units contain a great deal of interaction and exchanges which contribute to the enhancement of professional skills.
Strengths

The Language Centre views the enhancement of professional skills positively, encourages its staff to engage in professional development and, when possible, provides financial support for conference trips. The teachers are open to new influences and are willing to participate in professional training. They also feel that there are ample opportunities available for this (offered by the Language Centre and the University) for active participants. From time to time, the Language Centre also conducts surveys on training needs among its staff.

The Language Centre has its own internal training programme in pedagogy (the University of Helsinki In-Service Training for Language Centre Teachers, HILC). Based on a common agreement, the training takes place at a time when there are no classes on the teaching schedule. The training is open to the entire staff, as well as to part-time teachers and members of the Language Centre Student Council, who may obtain academic credits for active participation. The full-time language teachers of the Open University are also welcome to attend.

Cooperation between teachers within the language units complements, and in part substitutes for, professional training in the form of exchange of materials, team teaching, cooperation between teachers teaching the same course and so on.

The qualification criteria for teaching positions are public. The language units have had the opportunity to participate in the determination of the qualification criteria for vacant positions. Pedagogical skills play a decisive role in recruitments.

Development challenges

The teaching staff identified the lack of time and inconveniently scheduled training (offered outside the Language Centre) from the point of view of teaching duties as the greatest obstacles for participation in the development of professional skills. The teachers also have differences of opinion as to what extent professional training should be considered to be part of the annual workload, and to what extent and on what grounds such training may lead to reductions in teaching duties. As of yet, the Language Centre has no common work plan form for all teachers; such a form would greatly clarify the use of the annual workload including the maintenance of professional skills. In order to develop professional skills, the annual workload, teaching periods and international teacher exchanges must be exploited more efficiently.

Despite the institute’s favourable attitude towards professional training, all employees are not equally active in their participation in training. An important leadership-related issue is how the superiors can encourage everybody to take advantage of the professional training that is offered.
The teachers have limited opportunities to do research, for the Language Centre’s basic duty is to provide instruction, and consequently, it receives no allocations for research. Research cooperation with other institutes, other language centres and international partners should be developed further, and the same applies to acquiring external research funding.

How should the coordination of curriculum design be implemented at the Language Centre?

Each language unit has its own curriculum, which the unit devises rather independently on the basis of the Language Centre’s general guidelines, needs, resources and obtained feedback. However, the language units are of the opinion that there should be a fair amount of coordination at the institute level and especially between the language units. For example, there should be more discussion about the core contents of elementary level language courses. Furthermore, the scope, titles and progression of courses could be harmonised. A trend that is already emerging is that the Language Centre will increasingly have to mend the deficiencies and gaps left by secondary level language instruction; this will have unavoidable consequences for university level language instruction. On the other hand, advanced students need a wider range of course options, and there is also a growing need for language training among postgraduate students.

Strengths

The language units see a need for a re-evaluation and appropriate harmonisation of curricula at the Language Centre, and are willing to cooperate in this matter. The Language Centre is currently developing a common template for curricula.

The Language Centre has an active Committee for the Development of Teaching with members representing all the units of the institute. The Committee, being a forum for discussion and dissemination of information, has also an important role as a coordinator. The staff considers it highly important that communication runs smoothly in both directions between the Committee and the units. The Language Services’ representative provides the Committee with vital information about language training needs in the labour market.

The Language Centre’s in-house pedagogical training also serves as a tool in the development of the curriculum.

Curriculum planning is based on the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages, which improves both the national and international comparability of the curriculum and completed credits.
Development challenges

The Language Centre’s mission is defined in its regulations. However, the mission and the objectives of Language Centre teaching need to be continuously interpreted and redefined in accordance with the times and the needs of students, faculties and society at large (with consideration for the degrading language skills of new students, the language skills of students transferring from polytechnics and support of the University’s internationalisation process, among other things). This is especially relevant as the University is going through and will continue to go through changes relating to the structure of its degrees and its administration.

A wide variety of practices and forums should be established for curriculum design, especially between the language units. Such practices and forums could include workshops for the investigation and comparison of curricula, core contents and the scope of courses in different languages. Work in this field has already started with a harmonised way of graphically presenting the language provision. The unit superiors should also continue joining forces in the harmonisation of their curricula.

The connections and cooperation between the Language Centre and its interest groups need to be developed further, and experiences with other language centres should continue to be intensively shared, e.g. in the LAAKEA project. Greater advantage should also be taken of the connections between working life and the Language Services unit and the feedback it has obtained from its courses designed for professionals.

How does the Language Centre support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching? How is this support managed?

Question was answered by the academic leadership, academic affairs administration and the Self-Access Centre of the Language Centre.

Academic leadership of the Language Centre

Academic leadership at the Language Centre refers to the director and the superiors of the language units. The director’s post is a full-time position, and the language unit superiors are elected from among the teachers of each unit for a term of three years.

The Strategic Plan of the University of Helsinki and its related action programmes, and the Language Centre regulations, rules of procedure and target programme steer teaching and its development and management. The objectives and resources
of teaching are always agreed upon in meetings between the superiors before each planning period. Planning is based on information on the previous years’ teaching, completed credits and feedback as well as on statistics concerning the demand for teaching. The key figures and quality indicators of teaching are monitored, evaluated and reported. Financial follow-up systems have been developed, and the use and costs of facilities are being monitored.

**Strengths**

The prerequisites for and structures of high-quality teaching and its development are in order. The Language Centre’s administrative structure and management system support the various elements of teaching. The rules of procedure determine the duties and responsibilities of the director, superiors and teachers.

The teaching, administrative and supervisory staffs are all professional, committed and development-oriented. The working atmosphere of the institute is positive and inspiring and promotes cooperation. The management of education is also supported by the training offered to the superiors by the University and by the Language Centre itself. Meetings between the superiors, cooperation between the director and the superiors, and mutual trust create consistency in leadership and management throughout the Language Centre.

The practices followed in academic affairs administration have been radically revised in recent years, and special attention is being paid to cooperation between teachers and the administration of academic affairs.

Relationships with the University’s faculties and with other cooperation partners are active and good, and the institute is actively maintaining and building networks within the University and in the national and international arenas.

**Development challenges**

A crucial area in need of development from the point of view of the management of education is obtaining pedagogical support or coordination to support curriculum planning; this would also facilitate the systematic organisation of cooperation between the language units.

There is still room for improvement in the cooperation on curriculum design between academic affairs administration and the teaching staff. Efforts to amend the situation are being made by participating in the LAAKEA quality assurance and benchmarking project between Finnish language centres. Continuous consideration must be given to leadership training, especially for newly appointed superiors.
Academic affairs administration

The Language Centre’s academic affairs administration (the Student Affairs Office, 4 positions) defines its duties as regards the teaching staff and teaching as follows: it supports the planning of teaching (collection and announcement of information on examinations and teaching, booking of teaching facilities) and the implementation of teaching (provision of advice to students, dealing with applications for the recognition of studies), as well as its evaluation and development (compilation of statistics and reports on courses and student numbers). The Student Affairs Office also assists students in the planning of their language studies (information on the teaching programme) and in practicalities related to studies (student advice, registration for courses, registration of completed credits).

The Student Affairs Office is headed by the head of academic affairs. The Office has its own annual plan of operations and conducts annual target and review discussions with the director. The Student Affairs Office is active in a number of networks, such as the University of Helsinki networks of heads of academic affairs, academic advisers and planning officers for international affairs, the working group for the Oodi student information system, the University of Helsinki net forum, Language Centre working groups and the Student Council, and the Network of Finnish University Language Centres (LAAKEA project).

Strengths

The Student Affairs Office staff is professional and committed, and they have the expertise and willingness to assist the language units in the planning of teaching. The services and operational principles of the Office are well known throughout the institute.

A process model for the planning of teaching and related instructions prepared by the Office (in Finnish, Swedish and English) have proved to be functional, and their implementation has been facilitated by the introduction of advanced IT applications and their active development by the Office staff. The Student Affairs Office is an active participant in the Committee for the Development of Teaching and actively seeks cooperation with the other units of the institute.

For the most part, dissemination of information on the teaching programme functions well, and practices are being actively developed by the staff on its own initiative.

The Student Council functions as an important discussion forum which also yields feedback, as the Language Centre has no students of its own. The Student Council is chaired by the Language Centre head of academic affairs.
Development challenges

The Student Affairs Office also needs pedagogical support in the form of an advisor specialised in university level teaching and learning, for example.

A key area of development that emerged in the self-evaluation is the clarification of the division of labour in the field of student advice and guidance between the various units and position holders at the Language Centre (Student Affairs Office, language units, faculty coordinators in the English and Swedish units, language teacher tutors and individual teachers) and between the Language Centre and the faculties and their departments. The Language Centre is preparing a plan to resolve this issue.

The Student Affairs Office finds the continuous enhancement of cooperation in curriculum design and in practical matters between academic affairs administration and the language units to be of the utmost importance. The creation of a constructive and interactive feedback system between the teaching staff and the Office will be of great relevance in this matter.

The Student Council could play a more significant role in the development of academic affairs administration.

Self-Access Centre

The Language Centre Self-Access Centre, located in the Aleksandria Learning Centre, has a staff of three. It offers students opportunities for independent study (learning materials, facilities, equipment, advice, tutoring) and educational technology services to the Language Centre teaching staff.

The Centre supports the teaching activities of the Language Centre by offering services that support both classroom teaching or independent study, or a combination of both. The possibility of independent study offers flexibility and alternatives for various teaching and learning needs. The Centre cooperates with the Student Affairs Office (joint participation in the orientation sessions for new students, collaboration on the development of intra- and Internet communications), the teachers (cooperation in the development of learning materials, teachers providing tutoring) and with the university units in the Aleksandria Learning Centre.

The operations of the Self-Access Centre are overseen by the Language Centre director, who acts as the superior of the unit. The director has an overall picture of the teaching offered by the Language Centre and, consequently, of the needs and demand for the Centre’s services. The Self-Access Centre has its own plan of operations, conducts annual target and review discussions as well as regular meetings with the director.
**Strengths**

The Self-Access Centre has well-equipped and functional facilities in a central location on the City Centre Campus, and a permanently employed staff with teaching qualifications. The staff is professional and committed.

The Centre seeks cooperation with the other units of the Language Centre and contributes to the development of teaching and learning at the Language Centre. The Self-Access Centre has a representative in the Committee for the Development of Teaching and in a number of other working groups; the Centre’s representative also participates in the feedback and planning sessions between the Language Centre and the faculties.

**Development challenges**

The Centre’s activities should be advertised more effectively: more information should be disseminated to students and teachers about the opportunities and materials for independent study.

The pedagogical development of independent study into an integral part of language instruction is, in part, an unused resource. Independent study could be developed into an alternative method of studying languages and of completing the University’s language requirements. A possible future scenario is that there will be a need for self-access language study facilities on each University campus.

Cooperation and the division of labour as regards study advice need clarifying. Study guidance must be developed together with the Student Affairs Office, teachers and the teachers providing tutoring.
Summary of the strengths and development challenges of the management of education

Strengths

The Language Centre personnel are highly skilled and committed to their work. They are highly professional, collegial, value their own work and are willing to develop it further.

The structure of the management of education is clear. The Language Centre has language units and various administrative units and units providing services, each headed by a superior. The duties of the superiors are defined in the Language Centre rules of procedure.

Operations at the unit level are in line with operations at the institute level. On the whole, teachers are satisfied with the curriculum design and the division of labour in teaching and with the work of their superiors. Teaching is planned on the basis of extensive background materials and the needs of faculties and their students. Academic affairs administration and other units providing support for teaching function appropriately and flexibly.

In recent years, many aspects of the management of education at the Language Centre have been improved, and development efforts continue. Annual target and review discussions between superiors and employees are an established practice. Curriculum design will be an area of special emphasis in the Language Centre’s efforts to develop teaching in 2008. The joint curriculum design processes between academic affairs administration and the language units have been revised in a target-oriented manner. A recently completed personnel policy for 2008-2010 elucidates the system of superiors by, for example, describing the system of electing the superiors for the language units. Communications have received much attention, and as a result, a fresh communications policy defines the principles for disseminating information on course syllabi, amongst other things. Quality assurance also deals with questions pertaining to management.

The Committee for the Development of Teaching serves as an active communications and development channel in matters related to the curriculum and academic affairs administration.

The Language Centre has a positive attitude towards training. The staff is encouraged to participate in professional training offered in abundance by both
the Language Centre and the University. Participation in training offered outside the University is supported within available resources. The Language Centre has its own internal training programme in pedagogy open to the entire staff. The staff is also welcome to participate in the planning of this training.

Cooperation with the University’s central administration, faculties, the University of Helsinki Student Union and other Finnish university language centres is active and functional.

**Development challenges**

Cooperation and planning between units could be increased. This applies especially to curriculum design in the language units, but also to cooperation between language units and academic affairs administration, and between language units and the Self-Access Centre. All units should adopt an institute level perspective in their planning of operations.

Support and coordination of pedagogical development is required, both in curriculum design and academic affairs administration. Development seminars involving the entire institute should be organised more regularly. The staff considers opportunities to exchange experiences over unit boundaries to be highly important. The orientation practices of new teachers could be more systematic.

The Language Centre’s mission and objectives of teaching must be regularly reconsidered and interpreted in accordance with current developments. The Language Centre’s continuous development challenges include redefining its mission and objectives. Common practices and rules of procedure also require continuous development.

The common pedagogical starting points and a common conception of learning need to be continuously discussed. Steps have been taken in this direction in connection with ongoing curriculum design.

The development of leadership skills needs continuous attention, and the practices followed by unit superiors need to be further harmonised. The objective of the Language Centre is to further redefine and develop the role of language unit superiors so that they become true academic leaders.

The staff should be offered improved opportunities to engage in research, and research cooperation within the Language Centre and with outside partners should be increased.
16.2 Feedback provided by the evaluation panel

Summary

Language centres (LC) are essentially linguistic service organisations for the whole university. As a working environment they are demanding, with a multicultural staff with versatile backgrounds and potentially different conceptions of objectives. The management structure of the LC at the University of Helsinki, with its many cooperative structures, reflects the need to find solutions to the problems encountered in the working environment. The recruitment criteria of the staff remain somewhat vague, and the duties of the staff are basically defined in terms of annual teaching hours, although the staff would like to have more research opportunities. Despite issues of the above type, the students seem to be very satisfied with the quality of the courses offered, and the teachers seem to engage in an impressive amount of pedagogical research and development. The LC faces a number of challenges in the future because of increasing internationalisation and the linguistic needs of visiting students. The university may therefore need to revise its policy of restricting the access of foreign non-degree students to LC courses.

Management and leadership in education

This overview is a combination of the preliminary evaluative comments and outcomes of the discussions with central management, unit-level management, as well as teacher and student groups.

The management structure of a university language centre is necessarily very different from that of a faculty. Language centres (LC) are essentially linguistic service organisations for the whole university. Their organisational structure is typically that of an independent institute operating under the university senate. This is also the case in Helsinki. The Centre has a permanently appointed, full-time director who is responsible for the Centre’s academic and administrative activities to the Board. The Board members represent the university internal stakeholders, different faculties, students and the Centre staff. The deputy director is in charge of the administrative side. The organisational structure is further divided into language-based units lead by superiors (elected by their peers in the respective units), who are appointed for three-year periods. The advisory units, such as the Committee for the Development of Teaching and the Student Council, in turn, give input to the decision-making bodies. The Academic Affairs Unit of the Centre
offers advice and support services to students and faculties. The Centre has also a self-access centre for independent studies as well as a unit responsible for paid services.

There are altogether six language units, the largest of which are the units for Swedish (the second domestic language in Finland) and English. The units for French, German, Russian, Spanish and Italian are clearly smaller with between 7 to 3 permanent positions.

The size of the units reflects the primary duty of the LC, which is to provide the students with the language instruction and testing required in the faculty-specific degree requirements. It also reflects the national language policy with two official languages as well as the overwhelming importance of English in today’s academia. In addition to unit-specific teaching the LC has part-time teachers in other languages offered by the Centre on a smaller scale and on a less-permanent basis.

Comments
As a working environment the LC is very demanding. For example:

- It has a multi-cultural staff with versatile backgrounds and with potentially different conceptions of teaching and objectives, as well as a relatively high number of part-time teachers.
- It is structurally divided into units on the basis of the language taught by the teachers.
- It uses versatile, even relatively ad hoc teaching materials.
- Different conceptions may exist between teachers and students and faculties about the linguistic competences required and needed.
- It provides a service that is a compulsory part of all the degree programmes offered by the university. It also offers elective courses.
- It may be difficult to know in advance the enrolment rate for different courses.
- The dropout rate may be high in the elective courses.
- On the other hand, there may also be a lot of pressure on the LC to provide new, needs-based courses or instruction and ad hoc arrangements.
- The role and significance of the compulsory language teaching is not always fully recognised in the faculties and departments or among the students.

The management structure of the LC reflects the need to find solutions to the types of problems mentioned above. There are many cooperative structures which are intended to provide the type of information needed for the various management issues and challenges to be met. These naturally add to the administrative duties of the staff and cause new problems. One of them is how to coordinate between
the cooperative organs and how to benefit from the information that becomes available from the different sources.

At the international and national levels, the LC has excellent and supportive cooperation structures. However, it is somewhat surprising that the different language departments at the University of Helsinki, departments training language professionals such as language teachers, are not mentioned as cooperation partners.

Although it has not been specifically stated in the evaluation reports, present-day financial constraints in Finnish higher education must also affect the availability of courses, as well as innovative solutions and the way the workload of the teachers is defined and realised.

The university’s strategy emphasises research-based orientation in education and the instruction given. How this principle is implemented in the LC is an issue that is still open for interpretation. On the other hand, the LC has been developing its own pedagogical principles for student-centred learning as well as life-long learning. The LC is also working on adapting its courses for different learning styles and for students with special needs.

The staff would like to have more research opportunities but, on the other hand, the duties of a teacher are very much defined in terms of the annual contact teaching hours. The recruitment policies are also described relatively vaguely. The qualification criteria are described as public with an emphasis on pedagogical skills. In addition, the units have an opportunity to participate in the determination of the criteria for vacancies. These descriptions raise the issue of general recruitment criteria and the role research activities play in the recruitment policies.

A major issue for all development activities is naturally the challenges the future has in store for the LC. For example, the LC could analyse how well prepared it is to deal with:

- Internationalisation, increasing numbers of exchange students and degree students who are not native speakers of Swedish or English;
- The linguistic support of local Finnish teachers teaching in English in the growing number of international programmes at Master’s and doctoral levels;
- The future challenges, qualifications and recruitment processes for teaching academic writing and presentation skills (in English, mainly) at all levels from BA to post doc levels.

The teaching of Finnish as a foreign language is not integrated in the LC activities for university-internal reasons, although the Centre does have competence in this field and markets it as an external fee-based service.
The way the workload is distributed among the staff within a unit raises the question of how much of a chance newcomers to the staff have to introduce their own strengths into the teaching programme or whether they are actually given predetermined slots to fill in the curriculum. This issue will naturally be very important soon because of the high retirement rate in the coming years. It will be a challenging task to find a balance between the transfer needs of the tacit knowledge of experienced teachers to the new recruits and the renewal needs of the curriculum caused by the diversification of the student population. It remains somewhat unclear what criteria are used in curriculum planning and the selection of teaching methods.

It is clear that the teachers are offered various opportunities for professional development, but there seem to be some difficulties in engaging the whole staff wholeheartedly in these activities.

The fact that much of the planning and curriculum development takes place in the language-based units raises the issue of overall coordination and common objectives in curriculum development.

Other observations

- The importance of compulsory Swedish courses is not understood by all students. This often results in procrastination and taking the Swedish courses only at the very end of studies.
- Teachers teach on a number of campuses daily. This is a demanding exercise in logistics in curriculum planning.
- Foreign non-degree students cannot take part in LC English courses, presumably due to a lack of resources. This policy may need to be revised in the light of increasing internationalisation efforts.

Conclusions

Strengths

- Students appreciate the quality of the courses offered by the LC.
- Voluntary language modules are popular and much in demand for students planning exchange periods abroad.
- The Centre is keen on developing cooperational practices with faculties (three-year funding for MA programmes taught in English).
- Good national and international networks outside the university.

Good practices

- Impressive research and pedagogical developments are taking place.
- Close cooperation with faculties, needs-based analysis of teaching programmes and courses and matching teaching philosophies to faculty philosophies of teaching (e.g. problem-based learning).
• Innovative approaches to teaching methodologies (autonomy of learning, special needs teaching, developing the self-access centre, ICT incorporation).
• Internal in-house training and research seminars.

Recommendations
• Cooperation between language units needs to be developed and funded accordingly.
• Implement common standards and principles for teaching in different languages.
• Part-time teachers could be better integrated in curricular developments and in-house training.
• In-house training could be made more attractive in the teachers’ eyes and work plans.
• Some thought could be given to modernising the way teachers’ work plans are put together. Using the no. of contact hours may be counterproductive for curricular developments.
• Work on common policies across language lines could be increased.
• The funding of linguistic support for the MA programmes taught in English needs to be secured on a more permanent basis.
• The LC needs a strategic plan that takes into account the changing needs in the future as well as the high retirement rate in the coming years.
• Language support for post-graduate students (presentation skills, academic writing etc.) needs more attention and more funding in the future.
17 Common areas in need of development and recommendations for improvement
The University of Helsinki is a research-intensive university with a leading position in Finland. In the University Strategy it is stated that “the University of Helsinki will establish its position among the leading multidisciplinary research intensive universities in Europe”. The present evaluation focuses on the management and leadership of education at various levels within the University. Eliciting such an evaluation was a good and brave endeavour of the University that deserves due recognition. The Evaluation Panel members are all very grateful for being invited to the University of Helsinki: we have all learned a lot during the course of action. All the panellists have made a great effort to ensure the success of the evaluation; during the site visit, we had an intensive week, interviewing during the days and writing during the nights. All the panellists have academic integrity and will give you their honest view. We will offer you good advice as critical friends, and we all really hope it will be useful for the University. However, there is one severe drawback. In the evaluation, we have been given the mission to find both strengths and good practice. It has been easy to find numerous examples of good practice. Nevertheless, we must emphasise strongly that there are most certainly other strengths and good practice in the Faculties and Departments that we did not discuss during our short visit to the University. This is a very good University, with a high international standard. You have an enormous potential, in particular in your enthusiastic staff and fantastic students, not only for being a leading institution in Europe, but also for being among the leading universities in the world.

We all know universities are not easy to manage. The strength of the University originates from the relative freedom and autonomy of its academic staff to generate the unique creative environment within the University. Academic freedom is a principle that we must continue to respect and defend. The challenge for the University’s leadership, therefore, is to develop and implement strategies needed to face the future challenges and still support the creative initiatives from within the academy, in a delicate balance and a fruitful meeting between top-down and bottom-up approaches. Good leadership and management can strengthen the academic endeavour by providing a fertile, supportive environment within which research and education can flourish. Leadership at all levels is crucial for the modern university, faced with huge challenges and expectations in society. Such leadership provides vision and direction, and will provide the institutional framework within which academic staff can work successfully. The University of Helsinki is fortunate to have good leadership throughout the organisation. However, we also believe that the University leadership has to shift its mode of operation from reactive in order to become more proactive. In the highly competitive, increasingly market-based world of higher education, such leadership must be clear and decisive.

The evaluation of leadership and management of education at the University of Helsinki was conducted with a focus on being enhancement-led. There should not be any ranking assumed or perceived between the Faculties on the basis of this report. Also, as stated in the instructions to the Evaluation Panel, no predefined criteria were provided. As a result, we assumed that a rather diverse report would
emerge with a wide range of differing and contrasting conclusions. Indeed, in our guidance, we were told to look for contradictions within the University. However, on the contrary, we were struck by a number of common themes that emerged across the University, in discussions with Deans, teachers, students and Heads of Department in many different Faculties. We therefore wish to address a number of these topics that have a more general character in this section: “Common areas in need of development and recommendations for improvement”.

**Decision making**

We are concerned about the processes in place within the University for decision making and, in particular, for implementation and monitoring of agreed strategy and policy. We have the view that some decisions are made and targets established, but that responsibility for implementation and the commitment of resources are unclear. The result is that, sometimes, implementation is taken forward by “enthusiasts”; on other occasions, nothing actually changes.

We have some suggestions that might be considered:

1. Deans could be more closely involved in University decision making by setting up a ‘Senior Management Team’ (SMT) consisting of the Rector, Vice-Rectors and all Faculty Deans. This SMT will be able to discuss all major University issues, before the final decision is to be taken by the competent University body (Rector, Senate). This guarantees Faculty input within strategy, policy making and implementation, strengthens the role of Deans and emphasises the impact of university-wide strategic decisions. In this sense, Deans should “look both ways” within the University, upwards as part of University decision making and downwards to their Faculties for implementation.

2. A similar structure could exist within Faculties with a formally constituted Executive Group. We learned of several examples where decision making within Faculties was effectively undertaken at informal meetings of Heads of Department (pre-meetings before formal Faculty committees). This is not good practice, sometimes leading to uncertainty, a lack of precision and ownership, and an absence of transparency and accountability.

3. It is important to ensure that decisions are accompanied by resources and compliance mechanisms (e.g. incentives, staff resources and rewards), ensuring effective execution of University policies and detailing how the implementation will be monitored.

4. It is important to establish that responsibility (in the sense that this concept is used throughout the University) not only means that people
are responsible for something, but also take responsibility in that they are accountable for a decision or plan and that they ensure implementation and execution of plans and decisions.

5. Publish all decisions and plans, including their implementation, monitoring and responsible persons, in a University electronic newsletter to all staff and students.

6. Involve a broad representation of Faculty in decision making, going beyond the perhaps more active volunteers who may repeatedly be the representatives.

7. Make sure that agreed upon University strategies are supported by adequate HRM policy, instruments and practices (e.g. if teaching is really important, then teaching careers should be possible).

8. We would (also) suggest that the University check whether its equal opportunities/equality plans are implemented as intended at the Faculty and Department levels, particularly in the processes and procedures applied when recruiting new academic staff and when encouraging young researchers in their career choices.

Information systems

There are a number of information systems in use at the University such as OODI, Etappi and the various systems used by departments to collect course feedback from the students. There is, however, little or no evidence that these information systems are regularly and systematically used in leadership and management to monitor the progress of the unit in terms of targets, quality of education or emerging problems.

Nor are the various systems used in an integrated manner in the planning processes or the setting of future targets. Better exploitation of the available quantitative and qualitative data would help in making the planning processes and strategies more concrete and implementable, and this use and feedback would lead to continuously improved data quality. It would also increase the level of collective realism and insights at Department and Faculty levels. At present, it seems that many ideas can only be implemented if the funding level of the unit increases.

Strategy for education

The Evaluation Panel members were intrigued by the large number of possibilities for students to compose their own degree programme; there is a wide range of
majors and minors to choose from. We understand that students see this as a big advantage of the University of Helsinki. However, at the same time, teachers complain that there is a lack of time for research because they have to teach so much and spend time on administration. Basically, the findings with respect to the workload in this evaluation (in the formal report as well as evidence from interviews) were the same as in the 2001 evaluation: a teaching overload and a lack of time for research. However, large differences were evidenced between departments; within departments, there were also significant differences in loads between different staff. Again, wide variations in management practice were evident. There is a key point to understand here. Whilst underresourcing is clearly an issue in some cases, there was also evidence that existing resources were not always being used to the optimum. Some staff did not carry a full load. Also, some units were offered with very few students; such courses are of doubtful financial viability. Thus, part of the answer lies in the hands of the University itself.

We think that there is a management task at the University level to balance the need for student choice and flexibility with teaching loads. In our opinion, a couple of things can be done here. At the University level, a strategy is needed for what (kind of) degree programmes the University wants (informed by societal demand). In particular, multidisciplinary programmes need attention. A multidisciplinary programme means much more than allowing wide choice to students. Furthermore, it should be considered whether it would be appropriate to have a set of guidelines for decisions to start or stop a degree programme (minimum number of students, minimum number of core faculty). Before new courses are introduced, careful steps must be taken to ensure that sustainable student demand and employment opportunities exist (market research). Also, guidelines for individual courses (minimum and maximum numbers of students) are needed. Of course, these guidelines should be applied at the start of a decision-making process where also other arguments (external demand, uniqueness) can play a role. They might also be applied during ongoing procedures for the academic review of individual programmes. The financial model of the University should be brought in line with such decisions. At the Faculty and Departmental levels, the problem of the balance between a large choice for students (number of majors, minors and courses) and teaching loads should be the subject of regular ongoing discussion.

The management of programmes (majors and minors) could become more transparent if a specific group of teachers is identified as the “core faculty/academic staff” or “board of studies” for that programme. This group might include staff from different departments; one of these staff should be nominated as programme leader. The group should be responsible for the programme, and the programme leader is responsible and accountable for the programme running well in all relevant aspects. This person should have the resources and authority to manage the programme, including the ‘hiring’ of teaching capacity from departments and the right to address quality issues with the teachers. Currently, course coordinators have responsibilities but lack sufficient authority. As
a consequence, departments would assume the role of capacity groups responsible for the quality of the teaching content and human resources management, and for research activities. Moreover, we suggest that consideration be given to the establishment of external advisory boards for individual programmes or groups of programmes. Such boards might be made up of academic staff from other universities, employers or alumni. This would help to ensure the relevance of programmes and that the field of practice can have an influence on the programme; such boards might also encourage innovation in teaching methods. When this is not already the case, these advisory boards should also be involved in the definition of the learning outcomes and competencies that the programme should realise. These learning outcomes and competencies should be the basis for (re)design and evaluation for the programme and individual course units.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the University consider the development of a strategy for what (kind of) degree programmes the University wants (informed by societal demand). From a marketing perspective, this will also help the University to define more precisely the special characteristics of a University of Helsinki degree.
- We recommend that the University consider the establishment of guidelines for decisions to start or stop a degree programme (minimum number of students, minimum number of core faculty). Similarly, guidelines might be established for individual courses (minimum number of students).
- We suggest that consideration be given to the establishment of external advisory boards for individual programmes or groups of programmes.

Student workloads and well-being

We heard that most “full-time” students were working outside their studies. In some cases their self-reported total study time (contact time and personal study) was less than 15 hours per week. According to the survey on student income and employment in 2007, about 60 percent of students in the University of Helsinki are employed, the median weekly workload being 15 hours. In some cases, paid work can be relevant to study programmes, as many students explained. We also understand that the recent economic history in Finland has meant that many students are reluctant to take out loans to help support their living expenses (according to the 2007 survey by the Student Union (HYY), only about one third of students have taken student loans). However, we believe that there are serious issues facing the University and, possibly, Finnish higher education more generally. There were suggestions that, in some cases, an ECTS credit could be earned for significantly less time commitment than in some other countries. It was also apparent that, recognising that students were working outside their studies, many teachers were advising students to take longer than 5 years to finish their studies (often 6-7
years); students did not feel that they were pushed or supported to complete their course of study within 5 years. We also heard reports that international students were often surprised at the low study workloads of Finnish students. There are clear issues here regarding the national “culture” of higher education and about the international standing of Finnish higher education.

Having expressed these concerns, it is important also to note that we heard many accounts of students feeling under considerable pressure in combining their studies and other work commitments. We urge the University to consider the arrangements in place to support students (at University, Faculty and Departmental levels), including study skills, personal time management and psychological support. We heard from students that they often had little guidance on the support available; better orientation programmes for new students might be considered. It is important that some training is provided for teachers and staff in academic departments so that potential problems can be recognised at an early stage and can be referred to specialist services.

Increased effectiveness of these services may reduce unwanted side effects on people’s well-being. We heard from representatives from the Student Union about cases where urgent counselling and help would have been needed. Students interviewed were very worried about this growing number of individuals who are in need of professional help and at the same time expressed their concerns about the lack of, or sometimes complications to having, timely access to sufficient student services. We urge the University to strengthen the implementation of the strategic principle of staff and student well-being.

Recommendations
- We recommend that the University conduct a detailed study of student workload, with a view to guiding internal policy but also as a contribution to national debate on this matter.
- We recommend that the University undertake a detailed review of arrangements in place to support students (at University, Faculty and Departmental levels), including study skills, personal time management and psychological support.
- We recommend that the University conduct a survey in collaboration with the Student Union on (i.) student (and staff) well-being and (ii.) opportunities to improve the current system of tutoring by integration of the planned student psychologist system to shift focus from repair to prevention.

Student influence

Students are able to have an influence in the University several ways. There are active students’ organisations at the subject level and a Student Union (HYY)
to represent all the undergraduate students of the University. Every undergraduate and graduate student enrolled in the University of Helsinki is automatically also a member of the Student Union. Their role in the community is not of a paying customer, since Finnish universities do not collect tuition fees.

In Finland, the students’ means of influence in the university community are substantial due to the fact that the students are a significant and natural part of the decision-making processes on every level. Therefore, the students have a real opportunity to contribute to improved instruction and a better study environment.

The interviews with the student representatives gave the panel an impression that in most cases the students in the University of Helsinki are seen as partners rather than opponents. Students are represented on all committees and have active input into decisions regarding education. Reasonable and well-founded ideas are taken seriously into consideration. Students who are involved in the decision-making processes gain valuable insights into the academic community as a whole.

**Recommendation**

- It was mentioned by some of the interviewees that the students are worried about how the coming university reform will affect the students’ influence. We recommend that this question be widely addressed when designing future decision-making structures.

**Ethics of teaching and studying**

In the spirit of the Bologna Process, universities in the European Higher Education Area (EHEA) are experiencing more student and teacher exchanges and also other cooperation between the universities and their staff. Transferable credits and recognised degrees are raising questions about academic integrity; in other words, concerns are growing about how reliable the credits and degrees earned in one country are for the other. European organisations dealing with higher education are therefore increasingly focusing on transparency and governance aspects when more universities and students are involved in the mobility and transfer of students and degrees.

Ethics of education is not currently explicitly included in management and leadership of education in the University of Helsinki. The Panel did not ask but did not hear of any cases where teachers or students would have been questioned for educational integrity, i.e. cheating, plagiarism, favouritism, negligence or bribery. This indicates that malpractice is low in the University, or that it is not a common practice as it is in some other countries within the EHEA. However, common trends in Europe, including Finland, suggest that violations of standards for academic integrity practices in schools and universities are increasing. For example, plagiarism
using the Internet is a more common phenomenon in Finnish schools than many expect. It is probable that the Faculties in this University will also experience more situations with their students and teachers where ethics are at stake, for instance, related to research supervision and the evaluation of examinations and papers.

The University has general ethics guidelines for research. The Faculty of Medicine has its own mandatory Code of Ethics for research, and some other Faculties have created principles of research ethics, for example, the Faculty of Behavioural Sciences. These guidelines, however, cover integrity regarding research, not teaching. Yet, ethical conduct on the part of teachers is a vital part of how ethical consciousness might be developed among students. Furthermore, it is probable that ethical issues will become more important in management and leadership of teaching and studying in the future.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the University prepare a common Code of Ethics for teaching and studying. This Code should stipulate expected behaviours by students and teachers, including attendance and absence issues, procedures for how this Code will be implemented and a description of the consequences in case of violation of the Code.
- We recommend that the University encourage each Faculty to implement the common Code of Ethics by establishing and implementing practices that would clearly describe responsibilities, rules and expectations for students and teachers regarding teaching and studying. This could include electronic signatures from students and teachers to comply with the agreed Code.
- We recommend that the Faculties consider a specific unit to follow up the implementation and to resolve possible ethics disputes.

A Student-Centred Learning Environment

The two basic principles of the educational philosophy adopted by the University of Helsinki are research-based education and student-centred teaching. The Evaluation Panel has observed that these basic ideas of the University’s strategic plan for education are taken seriously throughout the University and are reflected in the action plans of the Faculties. The implementation of a student-centred learning environment is also strongly facilitated and enhanced by the support of the University’s Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and the presence in the Faculties of lecturers of university pedagogy who are responsible for the training and guidance of teachers in the use and application of student-centred forms of teaching.

The Panel recognises that the Faculties and Departments are very different, with distinct cultures, traditions and scientific orientations. The network of senior
lecturers on university pedagogy has made remarkable headway in raising awareness of student-centred teaching and helping teachers to develop the basic skills of teaching. The number of teachers who have been trained by this network is increasing, and in some Faculties the vast majority of teaching staff have participated in some form of pedagogical training. We heard from some staff that they appreciate what has been offered, but that they find it difficult to commit themselves to longer training programmes.

However, from the visits to and the discussions in the different Faculties, the Evaluation Panel has also learned that there are still substantial differences between the Faculties in the degree and the fidelity of implementation of the learner-centred approach to teaching. In other words, there is still space for further progress and improvement. In this respect, it might be useful to organise University-wide exchanges and discussions of good practices, and sessions about specific topics such as problem-based and case-based learning, learning to learn and self-guided study. Furthermore, it is important that the University establishes a sustainable system of educational development and innovation, to maintain and stimulate continuous assessment of and reflection on the basic ideas of the institution’s educational philosophy.

**Recommendations**

- That the University consider the organisation of university-wide exchanges and discussions of good practices, and sessions about specific topics such as problem-based and case-based learning, learning to learn and self-guided study.
- In pursuit of the strategic aim of a ‘focus on learning’, the University might consider how the students’ personal study plan could be developed to allow cumulative reflection on learning linked to an inventory of learning processes and learning styles. This would enable students to engage in a two-way reflection between the study plan and content of learning.
- We recommend that the University consider diversifying the provision of professional development support to teachers who wish to improve their pedagogical knowledge and skills. This could include further encouragement to create professional learning communities in Faculties or Departments, a wider range of short courses or workshops, and an informal cross-university forum to present research and innovations.

**Education, teaching and learning**

The University has an internationally recognised reputation as a centre of research on teaching and teacher education. Over the past few years, the University has had the idea of focusing on learning as one of the key tenets in the management and leadership of education. This is often complemented with the notion of teaching that is based on student-centredness. It is easy to argue that learning should be the
key concept, not teaching. But as learning refers to an often subconscious moment, it cannot be the strategic goal of education. What we normally refer to in strategic goals and educational objectives is something after learning has occurred, that is, knowing, skills, attitudes, values and cultural considerations, among other things; in other words, outcomes of learning.

One of the enduring values in the University is ‘focus on learning’. Utilising the intellectual capacities the University has, it can move further in conceptualising its strategic foundation. Strategies often have, and should have, fashionable or even political aspects. In this case, it has become fashionable to use the term ‘learning’ to emphasise its distinction from old-fashioned ‘teaching’ as we build our knowledge society. Lifelong learning is an example of a familiar term that also refers to knowing and the competences that follow learning, not the process of learning per se.

**Recommendation**
- We recommend that the University intensifies (and depoliticises) the conceptual analysis of the terminology used in its management and leadership strategy, for example, adopting the logical set of terms ‘teaching’, ‘studying’ and ‘learning’ as a conceptual framework instead of ‘focus on learning’.

**Appreciation of good teaching: Giving the development of teaching a more prominent role at the University**

The Evaluation Panel was impressed by the network of university pedagogues with a central unit and individual pedagogues placed in the faculties. Their practical and research work was highly appreciated as useful and interesting. Furthermore, the Evaluation Panel was impressed by the work to develop and try out teaching portfolios and a system for evaluating teaching based on constructive alignment, even if it appeared to be only at the Faculty of Behavioural Science where the manual had been implemented and used.

**Recommendation**
- We recommend that the University develop its strategies to give teaching a more prominent role further with approaches that target the collective as well as the individual level.

**Examples of such approaches are**
- Pursue the idea of Centres of Excellence. This might even be helpful in bringing forth candidates for application for the national initiative for special funding to such centres.
- Set up an annual prize for good learning environments to groups of teachers who have accomplished developments in the teaching and learning activities they take responsibility for as a group.
• Create an “Academy” for excellent teachers. Combine appreciation of teaching excellence (in a broad sense) with a role in developing teaching university-wide. Teachers who demonstrate and document teaching excellence could be given status through admittance to an academy that contributes to raise the standards of teaching - and be given a noticeable raise in salary.

• Give grants/project support to teachers who have made innovations in their teaching. An innovation that is documented according to a set of criteria (first as to implementation, insight in student learning, evaluation and reflections on further development) should be given the same type of reward as a published article.

Research-based teaching

The University is strongly committed to the development of research-based teaching. However, it was clear that there was no consistent understanding about what this meant in practice. For some staff, it was sufficient that teaching was undertaken by people active in research. However, elsewhere we heard excellent examples of problem-based teaching or of students studying as part of research teams and sharing in the publication of results. What was especially clear was that no oversight existed to test how research and teaching were related by individual teachers or to disseminate good practice. We believe that the form of research-based teaching needs to be debated more openly at all levels within the University. The University Senior Lecturers in Pedagogy also have an important role to play in taking forward these issues.

Recommendation

• We recommend that the University develop a clear strategy regarding the delivery of research-based teaching, including the dissemination of good practice.

Multidisciplinarity

Multidisciplinarity is an important part of the University's identity. The term is very prominent in its documentation. The University has a good reputation for multidisciplinary research, but the idea of multidisciplinary education and the intended pedagogical benefits are not so well developed. Most of the students we interviewed, and many of the staff, had a poor conception of the term, associating it almost exclusively with the choice to combine different subjects through majors and minors. However, when we did encounter multidisciplinary education it was generally very good. We heard of examples of team teaching, where staff looked at the tensions and compatibilities between their disciplines, of courses based on multidisciplinary research, and of attempts to generate unifying perspectives. Case
studies, problem-based projects, workplace projects, and field courses all provided good opportunities for multidisciplinary education.

We have two linked recommendations concerning multidisciplinarity (i.) establishing academic clarity, and (ii.) undertaking some developmental work. In terms of academic clarity, there needs to be some agreed position in the University about use of the terms inter, multi, and transdisciplinary, and how they relate to working across and between disciplines. These are contested terms, further confused by the several possible meanings that emerge from English-Finnish translations. University-wide engagement with what the terms mean in the context of expertise in the University of Helsinki and how it is deployed in research and teaching is desirable. A University level discussion might also include establishing some understanding of the epistemological, methodological, and ‘language’ transactions involved in bringing disciplines together. In terms of developmental work, there is a need for integrating frameworks for course development and student understanding. Students must first have some understanding of the individual disciplines with which they are working before they address how disciplines work together. Careful consideration therefore needs to be given to the points at which unifying frameworks are deployed. Unifying frameworks need alternative pedagogies, such as technology supported teaching, group investigation and problem-based learning, and there is scope for developing these out of existing good practice. Frameworks and pedagogies will need ‘adapting’ to local conditions: that is, to particular combinations of disciplines. It is suggested that the Senior Lecturers in Pedagogical Studies be closely involved with these developments and their dissemination.

Recommendations
- That the University seeks to clarify the meaning of multidisciplinarity to be applied in the University in order to help achieve some common understandings and practice.
- That the University encourages further developmental work to support the extension of multidisciplinary programmes within the University.

Internationalisation

Internationalisation is stated in the Strategic Plan to be an integral part of the University's activities; student mobility is considered to be an important aspect of internationalisation. This issue is not well elaborated in the self-evaluation(s), but the Evaluation Panel considers it to be a relevant aspect to the management and leadership of pedagogy. It was striking how few non-Finnish students and staff we met in the interviews. There can be a risk of “inbreeding”. Also, many of the Finnish students gave us the impression that they were reluctant to go abroad. It was a surprise for the Evaluation Panel to find out that there were sometimes very few or even no students in the interview groups with international experience.
There were faculties that are an exception here; e.g. in the Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, according to the students, 50% of students go abroad.

Among the interviewees, they explained that there was not enough time for international travel, or they had language barriers (although we were very impressed by the command of English displayed by every one of the students we met) or other obstacles for not going abroad. From one Faculty report: “The students we encountered were reluctant to go abroad except to Nordic countries, believing that the time spent abroad would add to their total study time.” Furthermore, the Panel learned from some teachers that the introduction of the Bologna reform process has made it even more difficult for students of some Departments to participate in exchange programmes. This is an interesting remark, taking into account that Finland has not fully introduced a three-cycle system. Instead, Finnish universities have put an emphasis on the bachelor’s degree as a step towards the Master’s degree, rather than as a degree in its own right leading to employability within the labour market.

In addition, increasing the mobility of teachers is another challenge. A lack of resources and over-loaded work responsibilities were mentioned by some teachers.

We were concerned that the understanding of internationalisation was too narrow. There was an emphasis on student mobility, but it was much less clear that consideration had been given to internationalisation of the curriculum, the use of new educational technology (e.g. international video conferencing) or other forms of international input, such as the regular use of visiting lecturers. The overall impression for the Evaluation Panel is that internationalisation has not been fully explored as a possible strategy for enhancing quality in education. To overlook this opportunity can mean an absence of new and diverse ideas, and as a consequence, the full potential of the University is not realised. There may also be consequences for the international employability of Finnish students. The University should consider the development of a realistic strategy for internationalisation. Moreover, this strategy should extend beyond student mobility and should reflect in a proactive manner on how internationalisation could be utilised as a means to reach the overall goals and visions for the University.

**Recommendations**

- We recommend that the University explore internationalisation as a strategy to enhance the quality in education.
- We recommend that the University consider ways by which further recognition can be provided for studies abroad.
- We recommend that the University review its policies on languages for delivery. It may be necessary to acknowledge that the Finnish language may represent a barrier. The development of Master’s programmes taught in English is and will be a factor of improvement.
We recommend that the University aim to work with more intensity to encourage and reward teacher mobility, both inward and outward.

We recommend that the University participate more fully in national, Nordic, European and international networks for education. Such participation must be promoted in order to compare, to learn and to transfer the methods and content of teaching/learning.

Theory of change-in-action

The University is in the midst of fundamental change. The structure of the University has been reformed recently, and now the Faculties are considering their internal structures. The new legislation will bring profound changes to the governance and administration of the University in the coming few years. The push to improve teaching quality, information management, evaluation and the integration of modern technologies as part of education are just a few of the changes the University is going through.

Change will happen by itself, or it can be actively steered and led. Management and leadership literature is rich in theories and models of change in organisations in general and in universities in particular. The Panel respects the strategic work that has been done in the University and recognises the progress made in this respect in most, if not all, Faculties. During our visit, however, we heard less about change itself, i.e. how ongoing and especially the forthcoming changes will be handled. Working with change is an integral part of any contemporary leadership. The Panel got the impression that there are theories-of-action of change within the University and Faculty leadership, but that these theories are not made explicit.

Recommendations

- We recommend that the University put more emphasis on understanding change by making sure that modern change knowledge is adequately included in the leadership training offered by the University Personnel Unit.
- We recommend that the University launch an internal process that would make the University’s own theory of change-in-action explicit and shared by the entire leadership and personnel.
- We recommend that the University further support research on educational change within itself by financing initiatives in Faculties that aim at enriching change knowledge within the University.

Generating evidence of success

Management and leadership of education, as mentioned by some interviewees, can ultimately be judged by the quality of outcomes. As the University’s strategy quite
correctly indicates, education aims at knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that the University graduates need and can use in their lives. The purpose of ‘focusing on learning’ and ‘student centredness’ is exactly that same principle. Therefore, management and leadership of education should also be measured through the student learning outcomes.

The University currently invests a significant amount of staff time and financial resources in collecting feedback from the processes of education, i.e. teaching, studying and learning, quality assurance and evaluation, and strategising, assuming that these investments will pay off as improved educational and academic performance. At their best, these feedback and monitoring procedures can greatly inform the processes that are related to teaching and studying, but they are not able to provide systematic and reliable information about how students are learning, in other words, whether they are developing the knowledge, skills, attitudes and values that are described in degree programmes and curricula. Feedback from employers can be useful, but it is certainly not enough.

Research is the definite strength of the University. It is the best institution to answer the question: How do our students learn in this University? At the moment, however, this part of the evidence is missing. The Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is considering an international student assessment that would compare academic competencies of university level students. The Panel acknowledges the complexity and related risks in any exercise aiming at measuring student achievement in higher education. But at the same time, utilising the research capacity and all the knowledge of the University, the Panel thinks that answering the question above would be a relevant challenge for the University.

Recommendation

- We recommend that the University launch a cross-university research initiative to explore technical and ethical aspects of generating reliable evidence of student learning.
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Starting points of the evaluation

The strategic aim of the University of Helsinki is to reinforce its position among leading European universities both in research and teaching. To achieve this aim, the University regularly carries out an international evaluation of its education. The aim and starting point of the evaluation of education is to further develop the university community and its various units. The evaluation is a means for the University to acquire valuable feedback on the implementation of its strategic aims and to obtain support for its development work through peer assessment. The evaluation is a part of the University's quality assurance system.

The previous international evaluation of education at the University of Helsinki was carried out between 2001 and 2002. This evaluation focussed on all the fields of education represented at the University, language and communication studies, and subject teacher education. The evaluation to be carried out between 2007 and 2008 will be more limited in scope than the previous evaluation and is planned to take place along the following lines:

- The focus will be limited.
- The evaluation of under- and postgraduate education will not take place simultaneously. The evaluation of postgraduate education will be implemented in connection with the international evaluation of research in 2011.
- When compiling the evaluation materials, use will be made of the materials produced for the auditing of the University's quality assurance system.
- As far as possible, the evaluation materials will be produced centrally and will draw from the University's existing data resources.

The Helsinki University Academic Affairs Committee has drafted the overall aims and the focus of the evaluation. The implementation and the theme of the evaluation have been discussed in meetings between the vice-deans responsible for education, between heads of academic affairs in faculties and among the leadership of the University. The Rector of the University determined the focus of the evaluation (Rector's Decision No. 088/2007).

Aims and focus of the evaluation

The focus of the evaluation to be carried out between 2007 and 2008 will be the management of education on various levels, including the University as a whole, faculties, departments and the Language Centre. The aim of the evaluation is to enhance the management of education by evaluating its present state from a critical perspective, recognising strengths and areas in need of development and by receiving international feedback on the quality of operations.

The evaluation will focus on those academic and administrative leadership practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading...
to the Bachelor's and Master's degrees to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment\(^1\) and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. Thus, the management of education will be investigated from a broad perspective involving the entire academic community. Since degree-oriented education is organised differently in the various faculties, the purpose of the evaluation is that units learn from themselves, from each other and from existing good practices. Through this process, the University community will gain a deeper insight into the management of education and its significance for the quality of teaching, learning and degrees.

3 Implementation and timetable of the evaluation

The evaluation will involve self-evaluation conducted at the various organisational levels of the University as well as peer evaluation conducted by an external panel. In the self-evaluation, the present state of the management of education will be investigated, and conclusions will be drawn from this investigation. The materials produced and compiled during the self-evaluation will serve as the basis for the external evaluation. The international review panel will study the self-evaluation materials and also consider previous evaluation data and other background materials. Moreover, the panel will visit the University and its various units. The panel's conclusions and feedback, as well as the best practices discovered by the panel, will be compiled into an evaluation report covering the entire University. All materials accumulated in the evaluation will be public: by observing the principle of transparency the University wishes to encourage the dissemination of good practices and new innovations.

---

* Constructive alignment, or consistency in teaching, is defined in the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009 as follows: "In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of consistency, teaching is based on four important stages: determination of learning objectives, determination of the subject and content of teaching, determination of assessment methods, and determination of teaching methods. In curriculum design, these four stages must be mutually consistent. When the different stages support each other, teaching has a unified and consistent effect on the learner."
The language to be used in the external evaluation is English. The departments, faculties and the Language Centre will produce the self-evaluation materials in English, Finnish or Swedish. The necessary language revision and translation will be centrally organised. Departments and faculties are requested to contact the Academic Affairs Department of the Administration Office, which is charge of coordinating the evaluation in matters related to translation and language revision.

The timetable and division of labour for the evaluation is presented in the table below. The Language Centre may organise the evaluation in a manner best suitable for its administrative structure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>University</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
<th>Department</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>August–September 2007</td>
<td>Preparation of evaluation instructions and other materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November–December 2007</td>
<td>Instructions for faculties Appointment of the evaluation panel</td>
<td>Additional instructions for departments (incl. division of labour and timetable within the faculty) Appointment of a faculty-specific contact person by 30 November</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2007–March 2008</td>
<td>Compilation of background material</td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Support for the organisation of faculty-specific workshops</td>
<td>Joint workshop of the faculty and its departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Self-evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April–May 2008</td>
<td>Compilation of evaluation materials; translation and language revision of the materials if needed Preparations for the panel visit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August 2008</td>
<td>Evaluation materials to the panellists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October/November 2008</td>
<td>Panel visit and final report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December 2008</td>
<td>Evaluation results available to the University community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4 Self-evaluation

The purpose of the self-evaluation is to produce information that can be used in the improvement of the management of education. The self-evaluation involves describing and investigating the strengths and challenges of the management of education as openly and truthfully as possible. A communal learning process and useful feedback from the evaluation panel can only be achieved through an honestly conducted self-evaluation.

The self-evaluation will be implemented in two stages. During the first stage, departments and faculties (the academic leadership* of the faculty, academic administration and services) will conduct a self-evaluation. During the second stage, in the workshop organised for the faculty and its departments, the units study the self-evaluations made during the first phase and, on the basis of joint discussions, devise the faculty's self-evaluation report. The Language Centre may apply the above method in the compilation of its self-evaluation report where appropriate.

4.1 Stage 1 of the self-evaluation

During the first stage of the evaluation, departments shall

- Describe the management of education in the departments
- Respond to questions concerning the management of education, and on the basis of these responses, analyse its strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development

A similar self-evaluation process will be carried out at faculty-level (the academic leadership of the faculty, academic administration and services) and in the Language Centre (and where applicable, within its language groups). The maximum length of the self-evaluation materials (description of the management of education and responses to questions) by departments and faculties (the academic leadership of the faculty, academic administration and services) is three pages.

---

* Academic leaders include, among others, the rector, the deans and heads of department.
• Description of the management of education (structure and verbal description)

The description of the management of education is to be based on a diagram illustrating the structure of management and on a verbal description of management practices and the division of responsibilities and duties relating to management at departmental and faculty levels. The diagrams and verbal descriptions are directly based on faculty operations manuals. The faculties and departments are to make the necessary corrections and supplements to the materials. For example, it is recommended that arrows be added to the diagrams to illustrate chains of responsibilities between the different levels. The verbal descriptions should be supplemented by those practices and procedures in particular which academic leaders and administrators together in the faculties and departments resort to in the management of education (planning, implementation, evaluation and follow-up). The Language Centre is also expected to describe the management of its education using the diagram and a verbal account.

The Evaluation Steering Group has devised a general description of the management of education at the University of Helsinki (see Appendix 2) to assist faculties and departments in writing their descriptions. The Academic Affairs Department has edited the Evaluation Steering Group’s description using faculty operations manuals, Internet and intranet pages and other materials. The above description sheds light on the management of education both from the point of view of academic leadership and administrative functions and services. As the University-level description defines those duties bestowed on faculties and departments on the basis of current legislation and University regulations, these duties need not be described in the materials produced by faculties and departments.

• Questions concerning the management of education

The Evaluation Steering Group has formulated focal questions concerning the management of education to serve as a basis in the self-evaluation conducted by faculties, departments and the Language Centre. Some questions are directed at faculties and some at departments and the Language Centre. Each unit must respond to the relevant questions in writing.

Answer briefly the questions below and analyse the relevant strengths and areas in need of development:

Management of education at departments and the Language Centre

• How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?
• How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements? (The Language Centre may answer this question in a manner applicable to its operations)
• How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?
• How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?

Management of education at faculty-level

(academic leadership of the faculty, academic administration and services):

• How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and
the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed?

In addition to answering the questions above, departments and faculties may also describe other pivotal issues related to the management of education and evaluate the strengths and development challenges that emerge from these issues.

4.2 Stage 2 of the self-evaluation

It is highly recommended that the faculties (and the Language Centre) carry out the second stage of the evaluation in the form of internal cooperation. In practice this means, for example, setting up a joint workshop for the faculty and its departments (or corresponding units) to investigate and analyse the management of education from the perspectives of the the faculty and departments. In this workshop, the evaluation materials produced by the departments will be synthesised as far as possible into a faculty-specific self-evaluation report. The workshop may be constructed in the following way:

a. The departmental self-evaluations will be presented and the management-related practices and development challenges that emerged from them will be examined. On the basis of this examination, the workshop will
b. Devise a synthesis of the responses to the questions concerning the management and leadership of teaching and the related strengths, weaknesses and development challenges. Furthermore, the workshop will
c. Produce a one-page overall evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the faculty. In devising the overall evaluation, the workshop may draw from issues that emerged from the questions concerning the management of education. The main emphasis, however, should be on a comprehensive evaluation of the management of education from the entire faculty's (and Language Centre's) perspective.

In addition to convoking the workshop with the academic leadership (including department heads), the faculty will invite representatives of the teaching staff and students, as well as of other relevant personnel groups from each faculty department. The Academic Affairs Department will provide support in the planning and implementation of the workshop. Faculties may also negotiate with the Academic Affairs Department about the possibility of having an external consultant to lead the workshop. All expenses incurred from the workshops will be covered by the central administration.

In addition to the evaluations produced by the faculties and the Language Centre, the University leadership (academic leadership, academic affairs administration and services) will also devise an overall evaluation of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development in the management of education at the University.
5 **Self-evaluation report**  
(faculties and the Language Centre)

5.1 **Structure of the report**

The self-evaluation reports by the faculties (and the Language Centre) will be compiled on the basis of the materials produced by the departments, the faculty and the joint workshop. The self-evaluation reports by faculties and the Language Centre must contain the following sections:

A. **Introduction (1 page*)**

The introduction will describe how the self-evaluation was implemented and how the evaluation materials were compiled, and will also indicate who was involved in the evaluation and the production of the materials. The introduction may also elaborate on any special features of the unit which are deemed to affect the circumstances of the management of education.

B. **Description of the management of education in the faculty and its departments (2 pages)**

C. **Summary of the responses to the questions concerning the management of education and an analysis of its strengths and areas in need of development**

- The length of section C depends on the size of the faculty and the number of its departments:
  - The faculties of Theology, Law, Medicine, Veterinary Medicine, Pharmacy, Biosciences and the Language Centre: max. 10 pages
  - The Faculties of Arts, Science, Behavioural Sciences, Social Sciences, and Agriculture and Forestry: max. 20 pages

D. **A Summary of the strengths, weaknesses and areas in need of development of the management of education in the entire faculty.**

5.2 **Deadline for the report**

The faculties and the Language Centre must submit their self-evaluation reports by **31 March 2008** in doc format to the Academic Affairs Department. Alternatively, the reports may be uploaded to the wiki area of the evaluation project at http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/koulutuksenarviointi. The Academic Affairs Department will compile the materials submitted by faculties, the Language Centre and the University leadership into a comprehensive evaluation report covering the entire University.

The departmental and faculty-level self-evaluation reports shall not be enclosed as such with the faculty’s self-evaluation report. The departmental evaluations, recognised strengths and development challenges will be integrated into the faculty’s self-evaluation report in the joint workshop. The departmental self-evaluations shall, however, be stored as background material for the evaluation panel. The departments may either upload their materials directly to the wiki area or send them to the faculty’s evaluation contact person by **31 March 2008**.

* One page = approx. 2500 characters without spaces
6 Benefits offered by the Wiki area for the evaluation

The evaluation documents with background materials will be available on the evaluation wiki area at http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/koulutuksenarviointi. The faculties and the Language Centre may exploit the wiki area by consulting the available material in the writing of their self-evaluation reports and uploading their reports there. The wiki area will have faculty-specific pages (as well as pages assigned to the Language Centre) where the evaluation materials may be processed. Once the self-evaluation stage of the evaluation ends on 31 March 2008, the materials on the wiki area can no longer be edited.

The contact persons in the faculties and the Language Centre will be offered training in the use of the wiki area in the evaluation. Information on this training will be provided later.

7 External evaluation, feedback and final report

The external evaluation will be conducted by an international review panel appointed by the University of Helsinki. In the appointment of the evaluation panel, consideration will be given to an equal representation of various disciplines and versatile expertise in the management and development of education. The panellists will be chosen on the basis of consultations with various experts. The panel will consist of 12 members, including two Finnish academics and a student representative.

During the first stage of the evaluation, the panel will study the evaluation documents and background materials* provided to them. The panel will also visit the University for one week in September 2008 and will divide into smaller groups to visit various units. At the end of this week, a series of closing seminars will be organised to offer the University community opportunities to obtain instant feedback from the panellists and the preliminary results of the evaluation.

The panel’s conclusions on the strengths and development challenges of the management of education at the University of Helsinki will be compiled into a final evaluation report. This final report will include the University- and faculty-level (as well as Language Centre) evaluation and feedback materials. The editing and publishing of the final report will be the responsibility of the Academic Affairs Department.

* The background materials (including descriptions on the allocation of resources, appointment processes, regulations on education, the degree reform and the Bologna process) may be consulted on the evaluation wiki area at http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/koulutuksenarviointi. Some of the materials will be prepared during the winter 2007-2008.
8 Consequences of the evaluation

The areas in need of development that will emerge from this evaluation will receive project funding reserved for the development of teaching between 2010 and 2012. Units will not be eligible to apply for this funding unless areas in need of development have been recognised and analysed during the self-evaluation. Also, rewarding best practices indicated by the panel will be considered in the preparations for the performance negotiations for 2010-2012 between the Rector and the faculties. Furthermore, the University will exploit the results of the evaluation and the received feedback when preparing the Development Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2010–2012 as well as the performance agreements for faculties and departments in spring 2009. The preliminary evaluation results will also serve as a basis for the preparation of the University of Helsinki Strategic Plan for the period 2010–2012. Finally, use will be made of the evaluation results in the planning of support services for the management of education, such as in-house training.

9 Coordination of the evaluation

9.1 Faculties, departments and the Language Centre

It is recommended that faculties, departments and the Language Centre appoint coordination groups for the implementation of the evaluation project. These groups should consist of representatives of the academic leadership, teaching staff, students and non-academic staff of the units. This group will be responsible for ensuring large-scale participation within the unit, for the practical implementation of the evaluation and for the production of the evaluation materials. The faculty-level coordination groups and the Language Centre coordination group will also be responsible for planning the joint evaluation workshop. Some units may already have a suitable working group or team which can be assigned with the duties of a coordination group.

The faculties and the Language Centre are requested to appoint an evaluation contact person or coordinator by 30 November 2007 and provide the Academic Affairs Department with their names and contact details so that the use of the wiki area, practical arrangements for the workshop and the panel visit in September 2008 can be agreed upon.

9.2 University

For the planning of the evaluation project, the Rector of the University of Helsinki has appointed a steering group consisting of representatives of the various campuses and expert groups. The chair of the steering group is Hannele Niemi, the Vice-Rector responsible for academic affairs. The other members of the steering group are Johanna Ahola, student representative; Nina Katajavuori, University Lecturer; Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Professor; Arto Mustajoki, Professor; Jukka Paakki, Professor; Päivi Pakkanen, Head of Development and Minna Frimodig, Planning Officer (secretary).
The Academic Affairs Department of the Administration Office will coordinate the evaluation by collecting and producing materials, organising translation and language revision services, providing instructions and other support, organising the panel visit, collecting the evaluation results for the final reports, and being responsible for communications. Contact details: Planning Officer Minna Frimodig (tel. 191 21710, mobile 050-310 2711, email: minna.frimodig@helsinki.fi) and Head of Development Päivi Pakkanen (tel. 191 22240, mobile 050-356 0752, email: paivi.pakkanen@helsinki.fi). Postal and street address: Academic Affairs Department P.O.Box 4 (Vuorikatu 3, 4th floor), 00014 University of Helsinki.

10 Appendices

The appendices are available on the evaluation wiki area at http://wiki.helsinki.fi/display/koulutuksenenarviointi.

1. Faculty-specific diagrams and verbal descriptions of the management of education
2. University-level description of the management of education
3. Key figures for faculties and departments
   The evaluation will exploit the key indicators of the University’s Teaching Evaluation Matrix. The data can be found on the ILMI reporting service (valmisraportit/opintoraportit), which requires user rights for either the AdeEko, Fortime or Oodi systems.
Appendix 2

University-level description of the management of education
Management of education at the University of Helsinki

1 The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. The purpose of the management of education is to support the attainment of objectives in the development of teaching and teaching methods and in the improvement of the quality of learning. The management of education enhances the student’s profound mastery of and expertise in his or her field.

This summary is primarily based on the operations manuals of the University and its faculties, on materials on the University’s intranet and on the Internet, and on the provisions of the Universities Act and the University’s internal regulations. These have been used as direct sources in the compilation of this description.
1 The University’s management system

1.1 Strategic starting points
The University steers its operations with the help of a strategic plan devised every three years. In its strategic plan, the University defines on the basis of its values, mission and future perspectives, strategic aims for its core duties and the improvement of its operating conditions, and distinguishes those key areas of development which are pivotal for the attainment of its strategic aims.

The University implements its strategy through various policy programmes which present the concrete measures to be taken, objectives, responsibilities and resources. These policy programmes include the University’s Research Policy, the Development Programme for Teaching and Studies, the Human Resources Policy and the Development Programme for Administration and Support Services. The faculties, independent institutes and the Administration Office draw up their own target programmes on the basis of the University’s Strategic Plan and policy programmes.

The implementation of the Strategic Plan, the policy programmes and the faculty and unit-specific target programmes are evaluated in performance negotiations related to operations management, as well as in performance evaluation seminars. The faculties conduct their own performance negotiations with their departments.

1.2 The University’s organisational and administrative basis
The Universities Act provides for basic guidelines for the University’s organisation and administration, and these guidelines apply to all Finnish universities. The University of Helsinki has a tripartite organisational structure: (1) University level, (2) faculties and independent institutes (including the Language Centre), and (3) departments and corresponding units in the faculties. On each organisational level, each operational unit has organs and leaders required by legislation and internal regulations, as well as an administration with the authority to make decisions.

In the operational units, a leader has general authority: the rector at the University-level, deans in the faculties and heads of department in the departments. Each administrative level has a decision-making body; the multiple members of these bodies include professors, non-academic staff and students as provided by the Universities Act. The duties of the leaders and decision-making bodies are defined by legislation and internal regulations. Their duties are further defined in various rules of procedure and in the operations manuals of the University, faculties and departments.

The Administration Office is responsible for general University administration and support services. Faculty offices deal with faculty administration and department offices with departmental administration. Furthermore, a service centre on each campus produces administrative services and other support services for the University community.
1.3 Duties of leaders and managers
The University’s operations manual defines leadership and management as practical actions that enable the work community and its members to succeed in their basic duties. Leadership and management further the implementation of the University’s Strategic Plan and target programmes and create opportune circumstances for the work community and its members. Leadership entails the leading of people. Management entails directing administrative processes, such as planning the operations of a unit in accordance with strategic guidelines, ensuring the resources of a unit, making decisions concerning human resources and directing other development measures.

The University’s management system is further divided into academic leadership and the management of administrative services and support services, which support academic leadership. Academic leaders include, among others, the chancellor, the rector, deans and heads of department. Managers include the director of administration, heads of administration and heads of academic affairs, who are responsible for a specific branch of administrative services or support services and serve as the head of their unit.
2 Management of education

The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. The purpose of the management of education is to support the attainment of objectives in the development of teaching and teaching methods and in the improvement of the quality of learning. The management of education enhances the student’s profound mastery of and expertise in his or her field.

To a great extent, the management of education at the University means collective responsibility for the development of teaching and the enhancement of learning. The teaching staff, students and various academic administrators in the faculties and departments participate not only in collegial decision making, but also in daily academic activities and their development through their expertise. The overall responsibility for the development and objectives of field-specific education rests with academic leaders, i.e. deans, vice-deans and heads of department.

![Components of an academic degree of high quality at the University of Helsinki](image)

---

2 Constructive alignment, or consistency in teaching, is defined in the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009 as follows: “In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of consistency, teaching is based on four important stages: determination of learning objectives, determination of the subject and content of teaching, determination of assessment methods, and determination of teaching methods. In curriculum design, these four stages must be mutually consistent. When the different stages support each other, teaching has a unified and consistent effect on the learner.” (p.22)
The strategic steering and management of education is determined by the guidelines and areas of emphasis contained in the **Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies**, which is revised every three years. On the basis of this development programme, the faculties and the Language Centre draw up their own **target programmes**, which include plans for those teaching development projects that the University supports with project grants. In addition, most faculties draw up three-year **action plans for the development of teaching**. The action programmes prioritise the development challenges presented in the target programmes and define responsibilities for the implementation and monitoring of measures to be taken. Departmental strategic plans and guidelines for the development of their teaching convey in concrete terms the objectives of faculty-level target programmes and action plans. The guidelines for the development of teaching are prepared collegially, taking advantage of development seminars and the work of various working groups and networks. Students actively participate in the preparation and decision-making processes.

Education-related decisions are made by the decision-making bodies (or by the leaders or managers) of the various organisational levels of the University. Matters to be decided are prepared through cooperation between the academic leadership, preparatory organs and academic administration (and services). A number of the duties and responsibilities bestowed upon academic leaders, decision-making bodies and academic administration are directly prescribed by the Universities Act and internal regulations. These duties are further defined in various rules of procedure and in the operations manuals of the University, faculties and departments. The duties and responsibilities of decision-making bodies, academic leaders as well as academic administration and services on each organisational level are described in detail in Section 3. Various cooperation networks play a significant role in the management of education. Section 4 features the activities of such networks.

The special characteristics of the University’s general management system are clearly visible in the daily management of education. The management of education encompasses both the management of operations and the leadership of people. The management of operations can be divided into three main categories: 1) decision making related to education and its daily management, 2) leadership of the teaching staff, and 3) financial management. The table below sketches the sub-categories included in the above three categories and their relevant duties from the point of view of faculties and departments.

---

3 The division and categories are based on the description of the University’s management system in the University’s operations manual (version 1.3, 13 September 2007, Section A2.3) and on the core duties of a leader listed at https://alma.helsinki.fi/doclink/100160 on the University’s intranet.
Leadership

The duty of a leader is to promote collegiality and subsequently the quality of operations and well-being of the staff. The leadership of people entails communal leadership of strategic policies, visualising the common mission, and setting long-term objectives. Motivation of the staff and students and including them in common activities, the creation of an encouraging work culture and atmosphere, and the promotion of a system enhancing well-being at work all contribute to a community spirit and healthy atmosphere at work.

- Provision of feedback, encouragement for teaching experiments, support for common projects

Management

1. Education-related decision-making and daily management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement on the objectives of and resources for education</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The quantitative and qualitative objectives of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Overall resources for operations (human resources + finances + facilities)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination of the planning of education in accordance with the University’s Strategic Plan

- Management of the development of teaching; common visions and objectives
- Management of curriculum design (degree requirements, standing regulations concerning degrees, teaching programme)
- Interaction between teaching and research
- Student recruitment

Follow-up of and reporting on education

- Evaluation, follow-up and reporting on the results and quality of operations
- Feedback systems

Organisation of administration and support for education

- Ensuring the availability of support services for teaching (including administrative and IT support)

2. Management of the teaching staff

Decisions concerning the teaching staff

- Recruitment of teachers (ensuring academic and teaching qualifications)
- Distribution of labour (approval of teaching plans, appropriateness of the division of labour, participation by researchers in teaching)
- Support for professional development (review discussions, promotion of pedagogical development, provision of opportunities for research periods)

Meeting practices and development procedures

- Meeting practices and development procedures related to the development of teaching and the curriculum (including teaching development seminars, management of committees for the development of teaching and teaching staff meetings, ensuring the orientation of new teachers)

3. Education-related financial management

Budgeting of unit-specific allocations and monitoring of finances

- Decisions on the teaching budget
- Facilities expenses

Use of resources

- Directing project funding allocated for the development of teaching, as well as other resources, towards teaching (departmental share of external funding, funding allocated for teaching provided by docents)
3 Duties and responsibilities of the management of education

3.1. Management of education at the University level
According to the division of responsibilities pertaining to quality assurance, the University is responsible for the overall quality and resourcing of education.

3.1.1 Academic leadership

University Senate
The Senate (university board) is the highest decision-making body at the University. The Senate's duty is to:

- Develop the operations of the University
- Approve plans concerning the University’s finances, operations and other far-reaching schemes
- Decide on the guidelines for the allocation of funding
- Make statements about matters of fundamental importance concerning the University
- Approve regulations and other equivalent provisions
- Decide on the division of the University into faculties and equivalent units and their subordinate departments for the purposes of research and teaching
- Decide on the administrative structure of the University

Duties of central importance related to education include the approval of the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies, decisions on the general principles of student admissions and on the number of admitted students, the approval of general guidelines for the Bachelor's and Master's degrees, and the appointment of the University's Academic Affairs Committee, among other things.

The Senate is chaired by the rector and the membership includes representatives of the professoriate, non-academic staff and students. The Senate also has one member from outside the University. The Senate's term is three years.
Rector
The rector heads the University’s operations and deals with and resolves issues pertaining to the general management of the University. The rector chairs the meetings of the Senate, and he is assisted in his work by a management group consisting of the vice-rectors and the director of administration. The rector is responsible for the University’s internal operations management system. The rector may refer to the Senate a matter of fundamental importance within his competence to be resolved by the Senate.

The rector’s decisions related to academic affairs are prepared extensively through consultations with various experts and committees. A number of committees concerned with the development of teaching are chaired by the vice-rector in charge of academic affairs. On the basis of extensive preparations, the rector decides on various awards for teaching achievements, on centres of excellence in teaching and on the grants awarded to these centres. Rectors are elected for a term of five years at a time.

Vice-rector in charge of academic affairs
The University of Helsinki has four vice-rectors to assist the rector. The first vice-rector is responsible for the strategic management of education, setting guidelines for operations and for chairing several committees related to the development of teaching. The vice-rector visits faculties together with the administrators responsible for the preparation of decisions every one or two years to discuss current issues pertaining to the development of teaching.

The other vice-rectors are responsible for research, societal interaction and matters pertaining to the Swedish language and international operations.

Academic Affairs Committee
The Academic Affairs Committee is a strategic support group for the development of education at the University and a preparatory organ for decisions taken by the Senate and the rector. The Academic Affairs Committee is chaired by the vice-rector in charge of academic affairs. The Committee's duty is to:

- Deal with fundamental issues pertaining to university-level teaching, studies, learning and learning environments
- Prepare a draft for the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies
- Prepare the distribution of awards for teaching achievements and nominations for centres of excellence in teaching, and determine the procedures for the evaluation of the quality of teaching
- Develop international operations within the education sector and the classroom use of information and communication technology

The Academic Affairs Committee is entitled to appoint sub-committees to operate under its supervision. The members of the Committee represent the University's campuses, independent institutes providing teaching, students and certain expert groups. The Committee's term is three years.
Other committees

The University has a number of other committees whose duties are related to the development of teaching and the management of operations. The Svenska verksamhetsnämnden (committee for Swedish-language operations) is appointed by the University Senate for a term of three years at a time to develop and harmonise teaching provided in the Swedish language. The committee is chaired by the vice-rector in charge of matters pertaining to the Swedish language in University operations. The Library and Information Services Committee, which consists of librarians, teaching staff and students from the various campuses, makes strategic plans for library operations at the University level. This committee is chaired by the vice-rector in charge of academic affairs. To ensure the legal protection of students, the University has a Board of Examination Appeals, which deals with appeals against the grading of examinations, Licentiate theses and doctoral dissertations.

3.1.2 Administrative units and services

Administration Office

The Administration Office is responsible for preparing and implementing decisions taken by the University Senate and the rector. The preparations are conducted in cooperation with faculties and other University units. Matters pertaining to education and the development of teaching are prepared by the Academic Affairs Unit of the Department for Strategic Planning and Development in the Administration Office.

Academic Affairs Unit

The Academic Affairs Unit, which serves the entire University, is in charge of preparing and implementing strategic decision making concerning academic affairs and operations management, as well as of providing certain centralised services at the University. The Unit promotes the development of teaching and the exploitation of the results of quality assurance and evaluations in teaching and learning. The Unit is responsible for enhancing the use of ICT in teaching and for furthering cooperation within the Virtual University. Furthermore, the Academic Affairs Unit is charged with the internal development of the Student Register and for developing the production of data on teaching. The Unit consists of three units: Academic Administration Team, the Educational Centre for ICT and the Student Register. The preparative work is based on versatile cooperation and interaction with various experts within the academic community and on active cooperation in national and international networks as well as with other universities.

Student Services

Student Services offers expert information and student-oriented services to prospective students and enrolled students. The unit supports the University leadership, faculties, departments and other cooperation partners in the development and organisation of student services. Student Services consists of four service units, namely admissions services, academic guidance and financial aid, international mobility and career services.
Other units and service centres
The departments in the Administration Office include Human Resources and Legal Affairs, the Finance Department (responsible for the University’s overall finances), the Technical Department (responsible for facilities management), Facilities Administration (responsible for facilities maintenance), the IT Department and University Communications. In addition, the Administration Department offers administrative and support services to faculties and independent institutes through services centres on the campus. Such services related to the development of education and teaching include, among other things, academic advice for undergraduate students and financial aid to students.

Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education
The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education operating under the auspices of the Department of Education is both a research unit and a service unit. The Centre furthers research on university pedagogy and expertise on university-level teaching and learning in the entire University. It is also responsible for providing courses in university pedagogy in the form of in-house training at the University. The special University-level duties of the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education are agreed upon in connection with performance negotiations conducted every three years. The University provides funding for the Centre for the organising of in-house training in university pedagogy, among others.

Training related to the professional development of the teaching staff is also offered by the Human Resources and Legal Affairs Department and the Educational Centre for ICT. In-house training in the use of ICT in teaching has been integrated with other in-house training in university pedagogy.

3.2 Management of education in the faculties
According to the division of responsibilities pertaining to quality assurance at the University, faculties are responsible for the quality of their degrees, the attainment of agreed objectives, and for the allocation and prioritising of resources.
3.2.1 Academic leadership

Faculty Council

Strategic decisions concerning the education provided by faculties are made by faculty councils, which are the highest decision-making bodies in the faculties. The primary duty of a faculty council is to develop education and research, draft proposals for operational and financial plans as well as for a budget, to decide on guidelines for the allocation of resources and to deal with matters pertaining to the filling of professorships. With regard to the development of education and teaching, the faculty council:

- Decides on degree requirements and on standing regulations related to degrees and the curriculum, unless the faculty council has transferred the power of decision on the curriculum to departmental steering groups
- Makes a proposal for the annual intake of students and decides on admission criteria in accordance with the general principles of student admission confirmed by the University Senate
- Grants rights to pursue studies (unless this has been delegated to an organ appointed by the faculty council)
- Determines the general criteria according to which studies completed in another Finnish or foreign university or educational institution will be recognised towards a degree
- Decides who will decide on the recognition of credits
- Approves and grades Master’s theses, unless the faculty council has in a standing regulation delegated decisions about the curriculum to departmental steering groups

The faculty council consists of representatives of the professoriate, teaching staff and non-academic staff as well as students. The dean chairs the faculty council.

The dean

The dean is a professor elected by the faculty council to lead and supervise the faculty’s operations. The dean deals with and decides on matters under the faculty’s competence, unless otherwise provided or regulated. The dean has the overall responsibility for the faculty’s human resources administration and its implementation. The dean also bears ultimate responsibility for ensuring that review discussions between supervisors and employees are conducted every year in the faculty. Finally, the dean is responsible for ensuring that the faculty has functional systems for assuring and developing the quality of degrees, teaching and academic support services.

The faculty may have one or several vice-deans. In most faculties, a vice-dean is responsible for the development and follow up of teaching and learning together with a committee for the development of teaching (or equivalent organ) at the faculty level. The deans and vice-deans are elected by the faculty council.
Committee for the development of teaching (or equivalent organ)

A committee for the development of teaching deals with guidelines concerning teaching and learning in the faculty. It supports presenting officials in preparing matters to be decided by the faculty council. In practice, the committee for the development of teaching plans and develops the structure of basic degrees and teaching, prepares development projects concerning the entire faculty and furthers cooperation between departments. In some faculties the committee is also responsible for the preparation and design of degree requirements and the curricula. In most faculties, the committee for the development of teaching is chaired by the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs.

Admissions board (or equivalent organ)

An admissions board appointed by the faculty council prepares, develops, implements and monitors the faculty’s student selection procedure. Most faculties have delegated the decision on granting the right to pursue studies to the admissions board. Depending on the faculty, the board is chaired either by the dean or the vice-dean in charge of academic affairs, or the faculty council appoints the chair. The other members represent the departments of the faculty.

Other committees

Depending on the faculty, issues related to teaching and its development are dealt with by various committees, such as committees for educational development, international affairs, teaching skills and a steering group for quality assurance. The committees and their duties and responsibilities vary according to the faculty. In addition, most faculties have committees (or equivalent organs) consisting of the academic leadership and leading administrators of the faculty to coordinate preparation for decision-making and set guidelines for financial planning, among other things.

Meetings between heads of department (or equivalent organ)

Deans and vice-deans of faculties, heads of departments and libraries, as well as presenting officials regularly arrange meetings to communicate topical information, discuss topical issues and agree on practices to be followed. In some faculties, the meeting between heads of department serves as the faculty’s statutory cooperative organ.

3.2.2 Administrative units and services

Faculty Office and academic administration

Faculty offices and their academic administration are charged with supporting the faculty's core functions and their implementation. Each faculty has a head of academic affairs, who leads the faculty's academic administration. The most important duties of the academic administration include the preparation of decisions and instructions pertaining to degrees and studies, matters relating to student selection, academic advice and guidance, study rights and legal protection, the coordination of practical training included in studies, the administration of Master's theses and diplomas, and the dissemination of information.
Pedagogical units
In some faculties, a pedagogical unit operates under the auspices of, or in close cooperation with, the faculty office. Such units offer expert services related to teaching and learning and their development, and are engaged in pedagogical research. These units organise training in university-level teaching and learning in cooperation with the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, and they may also participate in the coordination, implementation and evaluation of basic education.

If a faculty lacks such a unit, it has organised pedagogical development and cooperation in another way. All faculties and some independent institutes have a senior lecturer of university pedagogy as well as an adviser in web-based instruction. The senior lecturers of university pedagogy not only develop teaching and learning methods but also conduct research and surveys in the field. The advisers for web-based instruction provide support for the faculty's teaching staff in questions related to educational technology and pedagogy.

3.3 Management of education in the departments (or equivalent units)
The management of education and development of teaching is organised in various ways in the departments, depending on their size and the structure of their degrees. The description below includes the most important duties and responsibilities related to the management of education which are primarily provided for by the Universities Act and the Administrative Regulations of the University of Helsinki, and apply equally to all departments.

According to the division of responsibilities pertaining to quality assurance at the University, departments are responsible for the quality of their teaching, examinations and theses. This responsibility entails curriculum design, setting learning objectives, assessment of learning and ensuring teachers' qualifications and professional skills.

3.3.1 Academic leadership

Departmental steering group or committee
The departmental steering group or committee is the highest decision-making body in the department. The steering group is responsible for the evaluation and development of teaching at the department and in its subjects, and for coordinating the teaching programme. The steering group:
- Makes proposals to the faculty council for plans regarding operations, finances and human resources
- Decides on the distribution of allocations that have not been earmarked and on the guidelines for the use of other resources
- Makes a proposal to the faculty council on the annual intake of new students and objectives for completed degrees
- Decides on the departmental teaching programme, provided that the faculty council has delegated this task to the departmental steering group
- Approves Master’s theses, provided that the faculty council has delegated this task to the departmental steering group

**Head of department**

Departments are run by a head of department. The head of department has overall power of decision, in other words, he or she decides all department-related matters which have not been assigned to the departmental steering group. The head of department is responsible for the department’s human resources administration and its implementation. He or she is also responsible for approving the teaching staff’s workplans and for ensuring that review discussions between supervisors and employees are conducted every year in the department. The head of department is in charge of the allocation of resources and the development of the teachers’ qualifications and professional know-how, and of ensuring that the department has a functional system for the quality assurance of degree requirements, teaching and support services. In some departments, the responsibility for the management of education and teaching has been delegated to the deputy head of department.

**Committee for the development of teaching**

Most departments have a committee for the development of teaching to promote the development of the curriculum and teaching at the department. Departments organise development seminars, which deal with development needs and targets from the point of view of a department. Student representatives participate in the work of these development committees and seminars.

**Department meeting**

The department head or steering group may convene a department meeting to discuss general matters concerning the department. The meeting is open to all working or studying at the department.

**Major subject committees (or equivalent organs)**

Professors are responsible for the general development of education in their own field or discipline. Some departments have a major subject committee, chaired by the professor of the major subject, to prepare the teaching in the major subject of the department and proposals concerning personnel matters for departmental steering group decisions. According to the division of responsibilities pertaining to quality assurance at the University, each teacher is responsible for the quality of his or her teaching and for the assessment of learning outcomes as part of the teaching duty.
3.3.2 Administrative units and services

Department office

The department’s administrative services are under the responsibility of department secretaries (amanuensis) or equivalent administrators, who are supervised by the head of department. The department secretary (amanuensis) may serve as the immediate superior of the other administrative and support staff of the department.

Meetings between amanuenses

The heads of academic affairs in most faculties arrange meetings between the faculty’s academic administration and departmental secretaries or amanuenses to discuss practical arrangements related to the planning of studies, the compilation of the curriculum and other administrative matters.

Course coordinator

Some departments have designated course coordinators to be responsible for a given course or courses. The course coordinator plans teaching and makes relevant practical arrangements. He or she may also ensure that course evaluations by students are taken into account in the development of the course.

4 Networks related to the management of education

4.1 Intra-University networks

A central characteristic of the preparation of decisions and proposals concerning the management of education is that the matters under preparation are dealt with and discussed in meetings held by various networks. Some of these networks are permanent and meet regularly, some operate only for a fixed term. All of these networks function informally. Their membership consists of representatives of faculties, independent institutes, the Administration Office and in some cases, also students. The issues dealt with are of current interest, such as educational policies and guidelines or proposals under preparation. The purpose of the networks is to disseminate experiences and good practices throughout the University. Each network has an appointed coordinator to compile meeting agendas and take care of practical arrangements, communication and other commonly agreed matters. The coordinator relays issues that have been raised in the network to the vice-rector in charge of academic affairs, the Academic Affairs Committee and academic administrators in the Administration Office and faculty offices.

Network of vice-deans

The vice-deans and deans in charge of academic affairs convene under the chairmanship of the vice-rector once or twice per term to discuss topical issues related to university education. This network functions as an informal discussion forum for the leadership of the university and the faculties. The network is coordinated by the Academic Affairs Unit of the Administration Office.
Network of heads of academic affairs
Meetings between heads of academic affairs are attended by faculty heads of academic affairs, planning officers, and academic affairs secretaries and coordinators from the faculties, the Language Centre and the central administration. The meeting functions as a cooperation forum for administrators on issues ranging from student exchanges to the degree reform and student services, and from the preparation of statements to performance negotiations and service agreements from the point of view of academic affairs. In the meetings, experiences are exchanged about faculty-specific practices and matters concerning the entire university community are prepared. The network, which convenes once a month, is coordinated by the Academic Affairs Unit of the Administration Office.

Network of academic advisers
The meetings between academic advisers are attended by faculty academic affairs advisers and academic affairs secretaries as well as by various academic affairs administrators from the Department for Strategic Planning and Development. The participants in the meetings discuss and exchange information about current academic affairs, such as student selection practices and student services. The meetings are coordinated by Student Services.

Network of planning officers for international affairs
The network of planning officers for international affairs includes planning officers from the faculties and from the various units of the Administration Office who deal with international affairs. The network, which convenes once a month, is coordinated by the Academic Affairs Unit of the Administration Office.

Network of university lecturers specialised in university level teaching and learning
The university lecturers specialised in university-level teaching and learning form a multi-disciplinary network of experts, whose know-how is at the disposal of the entire University community. Each faculty and some independent institutes have their own lecturer specialised in university level teaching and learning. These lecturers not only develop teaching and learning methods for higher education but also conduct research and surveys in the field. The network of university lecturers specialised in university level teaching and learning, which convenes once a month, is coordinated by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education.

Network of specialists in web-based instruction
The specialists in web-based instruction offer consultation services on the campuses, in the faculties and departments. Their duty is to provide support for their faculty's teaching staff in questions related to educational technology and pedagogy. The support network functions as a cooperation network and medium for the distribution of information and the sharing of experiences between the specialists, the Educational Centre for ICT and other interested parties. The network is coordinated by the Educational Centre for ICT.
Student Union
The University of Helsinki Student Union is a significant cooperation partner for the University in the development of education and teaching. All preparative committees and working groups have a member representing the Student Union. The Student Union not only serves as a link between its members, but also as their lobbyist vis-à-vis the University and society at large. All students pursuing an undergraduate degree at the University of Helsinki belong to the Student Union.

Faculty and subject-specific student organisations
Faculty and subject-specific student organisations are formed by students to bring together students in the same field, lobby for their interests and organise various kinds of activities. These organisations actively participate in the planning of study-related issues and in the development of teaching in the faculties and departments.

4.2 National and international networks
The University is engaged in education-related cooperation with universities, polytechnics and other educational organisations both in Finland and abroad. The cooperation takes place mainly in national and international networks in the field of education.

National forums of cooperation
- The national seminar on academic administration is an annual event organised for the Ministry of Education and Finnish universities to deal with issues, guidelines and the implementation of education and academic administration. A central aim is to establish a common point of view and find common practices and procedures for the implementation of the regulations and decisions concerning academic administration.
- The development seminar for international affairs in universities is an annual event arranged between universities to discuss issues, guidelines and the implementation of international academic affairs.
- The national network of heads of academic affairs in universities aims to create a nationally unified protocol for the implementation of educational policies and other topical reforms. This network meets two to four times during the academic year.
- PedaForum is an expert network on university-level pedagogics. It aims to develop research-informed teaching and disseminate pedagogical expertise, as well as enhance cooperation among universities and their units, researchers engaged in teaching and students.
- The purpose of the IT-Peda network is to promote the use of ICT in teaching and research at universities. It also relays information related to educational technology between the members of the network.
- The purpose of the Oodi Consortium is to maintain the Oodi Student Information System, which has been developed to support the administration of teaching and studies and is currently used by 13 Finnish universities.
- The Finnish Virtual University is a network organisation of universities, the aim of which is to further collaboration between universities in the use of ICT in teaching and learning.
The LUMA Centre is an umbrella organisation coordinated by the Faculty of Science at the University of Helsinki to promote cooperation between schools, universities and the business sector.

The AinO Centre coordinated by the Faculty of Arts is a resource centre for subject teacher education, which aims to bring together the various fields and actors within the arts.

International cooperation forums

The Bologna Process is the main forum of European cooperation within the field of higher education. The aim of the process is the creation of a European area of higher education by 2010.

The University of Helsinki participates in the activities of the following international networks:

- The League of European Research Universities (LERU), which aims to advocate on a European level high-quality and internationally competitive research and teaching based on this research
- eLERU is a network formed by eight member universities in LERU. The purpose of this network is to increase the number of international online courses in the member universities.
- The UNICA Network is a network between universities in the European capitals.
- The Utrecht Network is a cooperation network between European universities.
- The University has concluded bilateral partnerships with 80 universities with the aim of increasing international activities and mobility between universities.
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1. Evaluation of education at the University of Helsinki

1.1 Background
The University of Helsinki is Finland’s oldest, largest and most diverse institution of higher education conducting research and providing education based on research. The University of Helsinki consists of 11 faculties, representing all academic disciplines with the exception of technology and business, and it operates on four campuses. The University community comprises 38,800 degree students (of whom 22,500 are FTEs) and 7,700 staff. The annual intake of new students is over 4,000; only one-fifth of the applicants pass the demanding entrance exams. The University offers instruction in some 300 subjects or degree programmes. The University of Helsinki is a member of the League of European Research Universities (LERU). LERU was founded in 2002 as an association of twelve research-intensive universities sharing the values of high-quality teaching within an environment of internationally competitive research. Currently, LERU includes 20 European universities.

The strategic aim of the University of Helsinki is to reinforce its position among leading European universities both in research and teaching. To achieve this aim, the University regularly carries out international evaluations of its research and education. The evaluation is a part of the University’s quality assurance system. The previous evaluation of education was conducted in 2001-2002; this evaluation focused on all the fields of education represented at the University, language and communication studies, and subject teacher education. For more information about the Evaluation of the Quality of Education and the Degree Programmes in the University of Helsinki in 2001-2002, please see the following website: http://www.kka.fi/pdf/julkaisut/KKA_1802.pdf.

1.2 Aims and focus
The present evaluation of education 2007-2008 is focused on the management and the leadership of education on various levels, including the University as a whole, faculties, departments and the Language Centre.

The management of education at the University refers to those academic leadership and administrative management practices which faculties and departments apply in the planning and implementation of education leading to the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees. The all-embracing goal is to ensure that teaching is carried out in accordance with constructive alignment and that students have the opportunity to complete an academic degree of a high quality. The purpose of the management and

---

1 Constructive alignment, or consistency in teaching, is defined in the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies 2007–2009 as follows: “In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of consistency, teaching is based on four important stages: determination of learning objectives, determination of the subject and content of teaching, determination of assessment methods, and determination of teaching methods. In curriculum design, these four stages must be mutually consistent. When the different stages support each other, teaching has a unified and consistent effect on the learner.” (p.22)
The leadership of education is to support the attainment of objectives in the development of teaching and teaching methods, and in the improvement of the quality of learning. The management of education enhances the student’s profound mastery of and expertise in his or her field.

The evaluation does not include doctoral studies, which will be reviewed in connection with the international evaluation of research scheduled for 2011.

The aim of the evaluation is to enhance the management and leadership of education by evaluating its present state from a critical perspective, recognising strengths and areas in need of development, and by receiving international feedback on the quality of operations.

1.3 Organisation
The University Senate has made a decision on evaluations to be conducted at regular intervals as part of the implementation of the University’s strategic plan. For the 2007–2008 evaluation project, on 23 January 2007 the Rector of the University of Helsinki appointed a steering group consisting of representatives of the various campuses and expert groups. The members of the steering group are as follows:

Professor Hannele Niemi, Vice-Rector in charge of academic affairs (chair)
Ms Johanna Ahola, student representative (Faculty of Arts)
Dr Nina Katajavuori, Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy (Faculty of Pharmacy, until April 2008)
Professor Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Head of the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education (Faculty of Behavioural Sciences)
Professor Arto Mustajoki, Head of the Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures (Faculty of Arts)
Professor Jukka Paakki, Dean of the Faculty of Science
Ms Päivi Pakkanen, Director of Academic Affairs, Academic Affairs
Dr Mirja Ruohoniemi, Senior Lecturer in University Pedagogy (Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, since May 2008), and
Ms Minna Frimodig, Coordinator, Academic Affairs (secretary)

The evaluation process is operationally coordinated by the Academic Affairs (see contact details on the cover). The Unit will coordinate the evaluation by collecting and producing materials, providing instructions and other support, organising the panel visit, collecting the evaluation results for the final reports, and being responsible for communications.

1.4 Evaluation method - enhancement-led evaluation
The evaluation of the management of education will be conducted in accordance with the principle of enhancement-led evaluation. The primary purpose of the evaluation is to obtain information that the University and its faculties and departments can use in the development of their operations. This evaluation focuses rather on processes and their quality, and not on results (cf. the assessment of research, which focuses on the quality of results). At its
best, evaluation is a shared learning process, which enhances a common, deep understanding of the target of evaluation. In accordance with the principles of learning organisations, the evaluation will draw on previously acquired evaluation data and distribute good practices. Enhancement-led evaluation is not based on ready-made standards or predetermined criteria, which means that the University is not seeking accreditation or certain certificates. Evaluation is a tool for strategic management at the University.

The emphasis of the evaluation project is on providing opportunities for the academic community to participate in and affect the planning of the evaluation, its methods and aims as well as its impacts. The general aims and the target of the evaluation have been drafted by the University's Academic Affairs Committee, the members of which include teachers, students and experts from various fields represented at the University. The implementation and the theme of the evaluation have been debated and commented on by the University’s various cooperation networks, such as the meetings between vice-deans and the meetings between heads of academic affairs. Furthermore, information and discussion meetings open to all members of the academic community will be organised. The University community will also participate in the evaluation through self-evaluations and interaction with the external panel of experts (during the panel visits).

1.5 Consequences of the evaluation
The areas in need of development that will emerge from this evaluation will receive project funding reserved for the development of teaching. The University will also award some performance-based funding to the faculties based on the strengths/good practices identified by the evaluation panel. Moreover, the results of the evaluation and the feedback obtained will be exploited in the drafting of new strategic documents, such as the University of Helsinki Strategic Plan and the Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies for the period 2010-2012. Finally, use will be made of the evaluation results in the planning of support services for the management and the leadership of education, such as in-house training.
2. Evaluation process

2.1 Self-evaluation
The starting point of enhancement-led evaluation is the self-evaluation conducted by university units. In the self-evaluation, the faculties and departments describe and discuss as openly and truthfully as possible the strengths and challenges of the management and the leadership of their education. The purpose of the identification of strengths and areas in need of development is to aid the units and their leadership to steer the development of teaching and monitor the effects of the measures that were taken.

The self-evaluation is based on unit-specific descriptions of the management and the leadership of education and on a questionnaire on self-evaluation that the faculties and departments have completed in accordance with instructions (see Appendix 1). The self-evaluation reports by the faculties are written on the basis of departmental self-evaluations and reflections within the faculty. Based on the above-described preparations, each faculty forms a perspective of its evaluation and determines the strengths and areas in need of development in its management of education.

2.2 External evaluation
An external evaluation will complement the perspective formed on the basis of the self-evaluations of the management of education. During their visit to the University (3-7 November 2008), the evaluation panel will have the opportunity to form their opinions based on the self-evaluation reports and other background material. The visit will be planned in cooperation between the Academic Affairs and the evaluation panel in their preparatory meeting in October (7 October 2008). The site visit will include a number of interviews (with, e.g., the leadership, teachers and students). The panel will also divide into smaller groups. The programme will be organised in such a manner that at the end of each day, the panellists will convene to discuss and write down their observations.

The services of the Academic Affairs (e.g., information, facilities, extra materials or revisions of the site visit programme, if requested by the panel) will be available to the panel members throughout the visit to assist the panel in carrying out their expert assignment.

2.2.1 The role of the evaluation panel
The external evaluation will be conducted by an international review panel appointed by the University of Helsinki. In the appointment of the evaluation panel, consideration was given to an equal representation of various disciplines and versatile expertise in the management and development of education. The panel also includes two Finnish academics and a student representative.

---

2 The panel’s role and preparation, and the instructions regarding the provision of evaluation feedback are based on the booklet “Instructions for evaluators” by the Finnish Higher Education Evaluation Council.
The panel is expected to:

- Familiarise themselves with the assignment and the evaluation task with the help of the background material provided by the Evaluation Office (Academic Affairs)
- Familiarise themselves with the University of Helsinki with the help of the background material provided by the Evaluation Office (Academic Affairs)
- Study the University’s self-evaluation materials (University-level, faculty-specific and the Language Centre and Swedish School of Social Sciences self-evaluation reports)
- With the help of the self-evaluation materials, define the issues that will be considered during the panel visit
- Organise the internal division of labour of the panel during the visit and make specifications to the programme of the visit
- Make a site visit to the University of Helsinki
- Form an opinion on the basis of the self-evaluation materials and the site visit of the quality of the management and the leadership of education at the University as a whole and in its faculties, departments and the Language Centre
- Give recommendations for the improvement of the quality of the management and the leadership of education and provide written feedback on the evaluation. The recommendations and the feedback are to be submitted separately to each unit under evaluation.
- Participate in the closing seminar of the evaluation visit, where the faculties and departments will have an opportunity to obtain instant feedback from the panellists and hear the most salient results of the evaluation

Each panel member will participate as an active and equal member in the panel’s work. The panel must be objective and fair towards all units under evaluation. The special duty of the chair of the evaluation panel is to act as the chair during the panel’s site visit and in the panel meetings. The chair will promote a good collegial spirit and be responsible for the evaluation assignment and for the equal treatment of the units under evaluation. The evaluation panel will elect deputy chairs from among its members.

2.2.2 Preparations for the panel visit

The panel’s work will begin with studying the self-evaluation reports and the background materials. During this first stage, each panellist shall make his or her own preliminary observations on the basis of these materials and shall note down both general and unit-specific questions.

In the preparatory meeting of the panel, the implementation of the site visit and the division of labour shall be discussed. The panellist’s preliminary questions will be pulled together and they will serve as a basis for the issues to be dealt with during the visit and the relevant interviews. It is of the utmost importance to agree before the visit how the interviews will be prepared and how feedback will be documented. The questions to be dealt with may also be divided in accordance with the panellists’ specialty areas. The questions to be presented in the interviews should be in line with the self-evaluation questions (see Appendix 1) and specifications to the questions can be made during the visit. During the site visits, the panellists shall make sure that all essential and previously selected viewpoints are considered.
The various aspects of the management of education discussed in the self-evaluation reports may be considered from the following points of view:

- Problems and development needs of the management and the leadership of education
- Sections that identified a specific area to be an area of strength, but no detailed reasons were given for this
- Sections in the self-evaluation reports that left the responsibilities and processes of the management and the leadership of education unclear

2.2.3 Evaluation feedback

The evaluation panel is expected to form an opinion of the management of education in the faculties and make evaluative conclusions, as well as to pinpoint strengths and weaknesses in the management of education. The evaluative conclusions shall be made against the strategic objectives of the University of Helsinki.

In its Teaching Evaluation Matrix, the University of Helsinki presents in a concrete manner the objectives of its Strategic Plan and its Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies (see Appendix 4). The matrix is used in the University's internal quality assurance processes, for example, to support the development of teaching in the faculties and departments, in continuous self-evaluations and in the selection of the University's centres of excellence in teaching. 3

The introduction of the Teaching Evaluation Matrix crystallises the most important strategic objectives related to the quality of teaching at the University of Helsinki, the University's enduring values. These enduring strategic values include the following:

- research-based teaching
- focus on learning (the principle of student-centredness)
- goal-oriented long-term development of teaching
- esteem and support for the teaching profession

The members of the evaluation panel are requested to consider these strategic objectives throughout the evaluation: how do these strategic aims permeate the management and the leadership of education in the light of each of the self-evaluation questions? In addition to presenting the above-mentioned enduring values, the Teaching Evaluation Matrix comprises a four-level verbal definition of the central aspects of the quality of teaching from satisfactory to excellent. The matrix is a tool that the evaluation panel can use to investigate the management and the leadership of education in relation to the University's strategic objectives. The purpose is not, however, to determine whether the operations of the unit under evaluation are passable, improving, good or excellent, but to pinpoint the unit's strengths.

3 Additional information on the use of the Teaching Evaluation Matrix as part of continuous quality assurance and teaching development at the University is available at http://www.helsinki.fi/evaluation/self_evaluation.html and http://www.helsinki.fi/evaluation/excellence_teaching.htm.
and areas in need of development in the light of the University’s strategic objectives, which are expressed in concrete terms by the Teaching Evaluation Matrix.

The panel’s evaluation will be based on the consensus between the panel members. The panel shall raise the strengths and good practices of the units under evaluation and give recommendations for improvement in accordance with the template provided. The template will also be provided to the panellists in electronic form. In addition to their written feedback, the panellists shall provide instant feedback of their observations and the most salient results of the evaluation at the closing seminar of their visit. The panel shall agree on the issues to be raised in this seminar.

The panellists share the responsibility for the provision of feedback. If responsibility for the evaluation questions has been divided in accordance with the panellists’ specialty areas, responsibility for feedback may be divided accordingly. During the panel visit, time is reserved at the end of each day for a panel meeting and for noting down feedback.

The feedback shall be based on the self-evaluation reports, and on information gathered and observations made during the evaluation visit about the management of education. The following principles shall be observed in the production of the written feedback:

1. Providing evidence and documentation. The text should mention the source of a description of a practice or evaluation: a self-evaluation report, discussions during the site visit/ interviews, the panel’s own recommendations.

2. Maintaining a connection between the evaluation and the evaluation materials. The feedback should make references to the self-evaluation process and raise areas in need of development or present development ideas. The evaluation panel is also expected to draw its own conclusions.

3. Writing in the active voice. The feedback should be written in the active voice, e.g. meaning that the panel should express exactly who should improve their operations.

4. Writing on a concrete level. The panel should give concrete examples and express its ideas in specific terms.

Structure of the feedback report
The feedback is to be submitted separately to each unit under evaluation. The structure of the feedback report shall follow the order of the self-evaluation questions. The report
should begin with a description of the entity under evaluation and a presentation of the panel's evaluative observations. The first section should end with the panel's conclusions and evaluations of the unit's strengths and good practices and recommendations for improvement, if any. The conclusions are to be presented in the form of a list beginning with the strengths and ending with recommendations for improvement. The panel shall prioritise its recommendations so that it will first present recommendations that can be implemented in the short term, and then give recommendations for long-term development. Furthermore, the panel may raise other possible observations on the management of education. At the beginning of the unit-specific feedback, the panel may include a brief overview of its focal observations of the management of education at the faculty and departmental levels. In addition to providing the unit-specific feedback, the panel is requested to write an independent section on University-level strengths, good practices and recommendations for improvement concerning the management of education. Finally, a separate section shall be reserved for the panel's observations on the evaluation process and its recommendations for improvement.

3. Final evaluation report

A final report of the evaluation will be drawn up on the basis of the self-evaluation materials and the feedback obtained from the panellists. The report will contain a description of the evaluation process, the descriptions and analyses of operations included in the self-evaluation materials, and the interpretations of the evaluation panel of the strengths and areas in need of development in the management of education at the University of Helsinki. Furthermore, the report will contain descriptions of best practices.

The Academic Affairs is responsible for compiling this report and the faculties will have an opportunity to comment on the report before its publication. Final evaluation report will be made public. The preliminary table of content of the final report can be found in Appendix 5.
Appendix 4

Aspects related to the management of education in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix
Aspects related to the management of education in the Teaching Evaluation Matrix

This document pulls together aspects related to the management of education in the University’s Teaching Evaluation Matrix and the University’s strategic objectives that are at work in the background. The Teaching Evaluation Matrix can be found among the materials provided to the evaluation panel.

The Teaching Evaluation Matrix crystallises the most important strategic values related to the quality of teaching at the University and defines the quality of teaching through a four-level verbal definition of quality. The matrix is a tool that the faculties and departments can use to assess their operations in relation to the University’s strategic objectives. The matrix also functions as an aid in the management of education; using the matrix in self-evaluation helps the unit and its leadership to steer the direction of the development of teaching and to monitor the effects of the measures taken. Moreover, the matrix serves as a criterion in the distribution of performance-based funding at the University. Additional information on the use of the Teaching Evaluation Matrix as part of continuous quality assurance at the University is available at http://www.helsinki.fi/evaluation/self_evaluation.html and http://www.helsinki.fi/evaluation/excellence_teaching.html.

The evaluation panel is requested to make evaluative conclusions against the strategic objectives of the University of Helsinki, which are presented at the beginning of these guidelines (enduring strategic values). The members of the evaluation panel are requested to consider these strategic objectives throughout the evaluation: how do these strategic aims permeate the management of education in the light of each of the self-evaluation questions? If they so wish, the panel may also use the Teaching Evaluation Matrix as an aid and especially its chart, which comprises a four-level verbal definition of the central aspects of the quality of teaching from satisfactory to excellent. The purpose is not, however, to determine whether the operations of the unit under evaluation are passable, improving, good or excellent, but to pinpoint the unit’s strengths and areas in need of development in the light of the University’s strategic objectives, which are expressed in concrete terms by the Teaching Evaluation Matrix. The panel’s evaluation will be based on the personal expertise of each panel member and on the consensus between the panel members about the target of the evaluation.
### Research-based teaching

According to the teaching philosophy of the University, teaching and studies are always based on research. The objective of studies is a student-oriented, thorough education that provides a solid basis for lifelong learning. Teaching is based on appropriate methods that draw on the research and development of higher education. At the University, students will acquire skills to seek out, critically assess, analyse and exploit scholarly knowledge, and to produce and communicate new knowledge in their field. Both competence and the application of theoretical knowledge are surveyed when evaluating learning. At a research-intensive university, the starting points for teaching include broad-based research and excellent teachers who are qualified researchers and teachers in their fields. The high esteem enjoyed by teaching is evident from the significance given to teaching qualifications in the filling of posts. Research-based teaching also entails that students are familiarised with and participate in departmental research work as part of their studies.

Research-based teaching means that research is featured in instruction in various ways and that students are encouraged to get acquainted with and participate in research. When planning teaching, consideration is given to the fact that today's students may be tomorrow's top researchers. Furthermore, studies are designed to allow professors to teach first-year courses and students to form contacts with the department's research right from the beginning of their studies. The curricula will include state-of-the-art research information and teachers are urged to integrate instruction with their own research and the ongoing projects at the department. Research-based teaching encourages students to engage in a learning process where they will search for and independently build up a model of the subject of learning. Students are understood to be members of the scientific community. Teachers and researchers cooperate in the arrangement of instruction. Teachers are provided with opportunities to engage in research work. Teaching and the development of teaching draw from research information on university-level teaching and learning.
Focus on learning

At the core of the University’s teaching philosophy are the promotion of thorough learning based on understanding, high-quality expertise and the ability to apply knowledge in problem solving. The purpose of teaching and supervision is to support learning and professional growth and to encourage lifelong learning and self-development. The principle of student-centredness means that the student is an active and responsible participant in the academic community. The success of teaching is measured by the quality of student learning and learning results. This principle challenges the University to regard students as individuals and as diverse learners. Closely connected to student-centredness is the collective creation of knowledge, which enhances teaching methods that rely on seeking, producing and evaluating information in collaboration. Learning in peer groups steers students to share their expertise and supports their professional development before and during their careers.

Student-centredness means that the student him-or herself is responsible for the learning process. The department, for its part, is responsible for ensuring opportunities for the learning process. The department has adopted versatile teaching methods and teachers are offered training in their application. Student evaluations are collected on a large scale and students receive feedback on their learning results. Students devise personal study plans, whose implementation is monitored in combination with supervision. The department also offers students alternative and flexible learning opportunities. The success of the department’s teaching is measured by the quality of the students’ learning results. Different learning styles are taken into account.

The principle of learning-centredness is manifested in the primary objectives of teaching, which are in-depth learning, based on understanding and high-quality expertise. The department’s teaching methods, learning styles, evaluation criteria and feedback systems are in line with the above-mentioned principle. Students participate in the planning of the objectives and contents of teaching. Learning-centredness also takes into account the substance of instruction, and equal attention is paid to the quality of instruction and teaching methods.
### Goal-oriented long-term development of teaching

The strategic goals and objectives set by the academic community concern all its members. These goals and objectives can be reached in various ways and can be assessed critically. The freedom of teaching enjoyed by the academic community extends to both the content and methods of teaching. The purpose of managing teaching is to support the achievement of objectives set for the quality of teaching and learning, and for the development of teaching methods.

In the development of teaching, the best results can be achieved through goal-oriented long-term development work. The common strategic goals and objectives of the academic community are concretely announced in unit-specific target programmes which are implemented with determination. The departments evaluate and revise their target programmes regularly; moreover they make use of various kinds of evaluation methods when choosing areas of emphasis and means of implementation. For the purposes of improving the quality of teaching, the departments conduct self-evaluations and obtain feedback from external assessors. These assessments will have clear implications for the development of teaching. The development needs revealed by the assessments will be recognised and appropriate action will be taken.

The development of teaching is a common concern for the entire department; the development work should not depend on certain individuals or special projects. Development projects will be planned as part of the regular operations of the unit, in accordance with the principle of continuous improvement. All teachers and students may participate in or obtain information on teaching experiments. The departments follow innovations and developments in other departments and universities in Finland and abroad. The departments are active members of national and international networks related to the development of teaching in their fields.

### Esteem and support for the teaching profession

Ensuring that the teaching staff are competent and can cope with their work is a challenge for the heads of the faculties and departments and the entire teaching community. The University will encourage units to cooperate and create a sense of unity. The high esteem in which teaching is held is evident, for example, in the emphasis given to teaching qualifications in application processes for vacant positions. The University will continue to improve teachers’ teaching skills. Departments will be responsible for providing the teachers with training in university-level teaching and learning during working hours.

Departments can provide concrete examples of how the teaching profession is appreciated and how it is promoted. The departments have considered opportunities for the professional development of their teaching staff and have established functional practices for their professional advancement. Teachers have information about pedagogical training and are offered opportunities to obtain this training. Sufficient teaching qualifications are required in the filling of teaching positions. The departments have discussed the need to consider teaching qualifications and are committed to take continuous heed of the matter. The high esteem for the teaching profession becomes evident in the definite emphasis given to teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching positions.
## Aspects of the quality of teaching

### 1. MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION AT THE UNIVERSITY LEVEL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management and strategic planning of teaching</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management and strategic planning of teaching</td>
<td>The department is not familiar with teaching strategies at the University or faculty level, nor does it have a perspective on it. It is unclear who is in charge of teaching guidelines, decision-making and the division of labour at the department.</td>
<td>University and faculty strategies are familiar and have been discussed, but the department's own views have not been noted down. No decisions on departmental guidelines or adaptations of strategic programmes have been made.</td>
<td>The department has devised its own teaching strategy which is in line with the University and faculty strategies. When devising the strategy, the department's own objectives and means for creating an international learning environment have been surveyed. The head of department and the steering committee play an active role in the implementation of the teaching strategies.</td>
<td>The leadership of the department is committed to carrying out University and faculty strategies and monitors their effects systematically. The division of tasks among the teaching staff and the channelling of resources comply with the strategic guidelines. Strategic guidelines are prepared and carried out in cooperation with the entire teaching staff and students.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Quality assurance of education | The department lacks information on the quality assurance of education and is not interested in it. Old routines are followed by habit and established practices are not questioned. Responsibilities are divided randomly or according to tradition, and no documented information exists on this. | The department is aware of the responsibilities involved in the quality assurance of education and practices have been discussed. The division of responsibilities is clear at least to departmental administrators, and all members of the staff know their own responsibilities. Practices have been documented to some degree, but clear guidelines and objectives are lacking. | Established practices and their present state, division of responsibilities and available resources have been discussed at the department. A well-prepared document on the division of responsibilities has been drafted and is available to staff and students alike. All members of the staff know their own responsibilities. | The department actively develops measures of quality assurance and acknowledges their importance to the improvement of operations. All practices related to the entire learning process have been made transparent, i.e. are documented in writing, have been evaluated and areas in need of development have been recognised. Self-evaluation is regarded as an essential element in gaining recognition for the activities of the department, and monitoring and developing them further. Students are actively involved in evaluation. The information obtained from evaluations is used towards improving operations. |
2. MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE FACULTIES

How does the faculty support the implementation of high-quality teaching and the development of teaching in the entire faculty and its departments? How is this support managed? (Academic leadership of the faculty, academic administration and services)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management and strategic planning of teaching</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department is not familiar with teaching strategies at the University or faculty level, nor does it have a perspective on it. It is unclear who is in charge of teaching guidelines, decision-making and the division of labour at the department.</td>
<td>University and faculty strategies are familiar and have been discussed, but the department's own views have not been noted down. No decisions on departmental guidelines or adaptations of strategic programmes have been made.</td>
<td>The department has devised its own teaching strategy which is in line with the University and faculty strategies. When devising the strategy, the department's own objectives and means for creating an international learning environment have been surveyed. The head of department and the steering committee play an active role in the implementation of the teaching strategies.</td>
<td>The leadership of the department is committed to carrying out University and faculty strategies and monitors their effects systematically. The division of tasks among the teaching staff and the channelling of resources comply with the strategic guidelines. Strategic guidelines are prepared and carried out in cooperation with the entire teaching staff and students.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assurance of education</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department lacks information on the quality assurance of education and is not interested in it. Old routines are followed by habit and established practices are not questioned. Responsibilities are divided randomly or according to tradition, and no documented information exists on this.</td>
<td>The department is aware of the responsibilities involved in the quality assurance of education and practices have been discussed. The division of responsibilities is clear at least to departmental administrators, and all members of the staff know their own responsibilities. Practices have been documented to some degree, but clear guidelines and objectives are lacking.</td>
<td>Established practices and their present state, division of responsibilities and available resources have been discussed at the department. A well-prepared document on the division of responsibilities has been drafted and is available to staff and students alike. All members of the staff know their own responsibilities.</td>
<td>The department actively develops measures of quality assurance and acknowledges their importance to the improvement of operations. All practices related to the entire learning process have been made transparent, i.e. are documented in writing, have been evaluated and areas in need of development have been recognised. Self-evaluation is regarded as an essential element in gaining recognition for the activities of the department, and monitoring and developing them further. Students are actively involved in evaluation. The information obtained from evaluations is used towards improving operations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 3. MANAGEMENT OF EDUCATION IN THE DEPARTMENTS

**How does your unit agree on the contents, methods and development of teaching?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning objectives and core elements</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Learning objectives have been documented in the faculty course catalogues. They bear little relevance to the teaching of individual teachers, nor help individual students in their learning efforts. The students are not aware of what is the core expertise required of an expert in the field.</td>
<td>Learning objectives are discussed in the department only when the degree requirements or the entire syllabus are being fundamentally reformed. Then, learning objectives and the roles of different sub-fields are agreed upon together. Care is taken to update teaching materials. The analysis of the core curriculum is a familiar concept, but the department lacks knowledge of how it can be implemented in the setting of learning objectives.</td>
<td>The curriculum and learning objectives are regularly discussed and monitored at the department. Learning objectives are presented to the students in a lucid and concrete manner. Also, the demands of the labour market have been taken into account when agreeing on learning objectives. Teachers and students are aware of what the essential core elements in the degree requirements are. On the basis of an analysis of the core curriculum, teachers and students can make a distinction between the core curriculum, which is compulsory to all, and optional elements.</td>
<td>Course contents and learning objectives have been chosen to form a balanced whole, catering for both academic standards and professional demands. Also students participate in the definition and evaluation of learning objectives. The department uses international research results as reference material when deciding on degree requirements. The department regularly reviews the core curriculum on the basis of international developments and feedback from the labour market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Teaching methods | Teaching methods are not consciously evaluated. Teaching is routinely based on traditional methods and ICT is not used in teaching. | Individual teachers experiment with new teaching methods, (including the use of ICT), suitable for different teaching situations and exploring different alternatives. | The department supports the development of teaching methods. The matter is discussed openly in the department and the connection between learning objectives and learning assessment is understood. Teachers make use of their training in university-level teaching and the use of ICT in the development of teaching methods. | Versatile learning situations and teaching methods support different learners and the attainment of learning objectives. The importance of applying relevant pedagogical methods in various teaching situations is understood, and a range of methodological options are in use. The department closely follows the latest publications on educational research. |
Feedback on teaching and supervision is not collected on a departmental scale. Some individual teachers may collect feedback for their own purposes. No channels exist for student feedback.

There are attempts to maintain a student feedback system. Continuity is uncertain, for students are passive and teachers do not wish to or know how to make use of feedback obtained from students in teaching or supervision. The importance of feedback is acknowledged, but is also conceived as complicated, laborious and even oppressive.

Feedback is collected on learning, teaching and supervision. The department is engaged in continuous development and includes students also in this work. Feedback is appreciated and taken into account in activities. Students are regularly informed of the development of feedback practices.

The department develops feedback practices in order to ensure appropriateness and objectivity. Feedback is also used as an instrument in the development of collegiality and interaction. Both teachers and students focus on developing their abilities to provide and receive feedback. Feedback is always given constructively in a spirit of mutual respect. Students are also asked to provide feedback on the success of the department’s international activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How does your unit prepare and decide on degree requirements?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Passable quality and results</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither the department nor the teachers have a complete picture of the educational programme. Teachers do not know what their colleagues are teaching. The courses do not form a sensible whole and the effectiveness of the curriculum is not monitored. There are bottlenecks in the way of study progress, but they go undetected and thus are not removed. Teachers and students are unsure about how and when they could influence curriculum design.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How does your unit ensure an appropriate distribution of workloads in teaching?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Management of human resources</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The department has not fully succeeded in ensuring the teaching staff's academic competence or other necessary expertise. The division of labour and prioritising of tasks are not considered together with staff. The teachers are overburdened, but the department has taken no action within its power to remedy the situation. The teachers have no clear idea of the department's overall resources. The majority of the teaching staff are employed on a fixed-term basis.</td>
<td>The distribution of labour and priorities are discussed on the basis of the faculty human resources policy. The professional competence and job satisfaction of the teaching staff are regarded as a common challenge for the department. The department is aware of the possible lack of teaching resources or expertise. Some individual solutions have been found in some disciplines or fields, but these have not been of a permanent nature.</td>
<td>To ensure the professional and scholarly competence of its teaching staff, and to enhance their well-being at work, the department has devised its own human resources policy. The policy also considers the opportunities and challenges brought about by international teaching cooperation and international staff at the department. An even distribution of labour (incl. international cooperation, coordination of international projects and related tasks) and priorities have been agreed upon. Many researchers teach and supervise students. Teachers are encouraged to participate in higher education development courses, cooperation and networks. Students participate in the planning of the department's future activities and the contributions of all personnel groups are highly appreciated.</td>
<td>The department’s human resources policy is implemented and monitored systematically. The whole staff, including researchers and students, are aware of the overall resources of the department, and together explore solutions for the lack of resources. New solutions have been found for the shortage of resources, and plans extend far into the future. International teacher exchanges support the human resources policy; visiting teachers contribute to teaching resources and teachers returning from abroad bring back valuable experiences that can be exploited in departmental activities. The system of teaching periods facilitates the integration of teaching and research work. Teachers are motivated and can cope with the pressures of their work.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### How does your unit promote the professional skills and expertise of the teaching staff (research opportunities, pedagogical training, recruitment)?

| Teaching skills | Teachers have no pedagogical training, and teaching skills are not taken into account in the planning and management of operations at the department. The head of department is not informed of the teachers’ qualifications, and does not conduct review meetings with the staff. | Some teachers have taken the initiative to acquire pedagogical training and training in the use of ICT in teaching, even though this is not encouraged at the department. Review meetings are a familiar concept but have not yet been introduced or have been replaced with assessment discussions related to the new salary system. | The department encourages the development of teaching skills. Most teachers have acquired pedagogical training and/or training and in the use ICT in teaching. Student feedback praises the high standard of teaching. As the head of department conducts review meetings with the teachers, communications have improved and the discussions contribute to the planning of teaching. | The goal is that all teachers, including non-permanent staff, receive pedagogical training and training in the use of ICT in teaching. The results of higher education research are taken into account in many ways in departmental planning and management. New teachers are familiarised with the teaching tasks in accordance with the department’s teaching philosophy. Teachers who teach international student groups are offered the opportunity to participate in special training in intercultural teaching. The department has issued recommendations for the language requirements of teachers teaching international student groups. |
| Teaching qualifications in the filling of teaching posts | Teaching qualifications, such as pedagogical training and the use of ICT in teaching, are not taken into account when teaching posts are filled. Such merits are viewed with suspicion or belittlement. | Teachers have academic portfolios which are used when applying for a position. It is unclear, however, how teaching qualifications are assessed and what the department’s view of them is. | The department has drawn up a consistent set of principles according to which teaching qualifications are considered and assessed. Faculty guidelines for the filling of posts (incl. evaluation of teaching qualifications, international teaching experience) are fully implemented. Teachers are encouraged to compile academic portfolios and the department’s atmosphere is favourable towards the upgrading of teaching qualifications. | The leadership of the department is committed to consistently promoting teaching qualifications and the high quality of teaching. This is a self-evident and predictable practice and continuously produces good results. The department and the faculty monitor the implementation of the relevant guidelines in the filling of posts. |
### Bases of the verbal definitions of quality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASPECTS OF THE QUALITY OF TEACHING</th>
<th>Passable quality and results</th>
<th>Improving quality and results</th>
<th>Good quality and results</th>
<th>Excellent quality and results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Strategies are unclear, no documentation, not much interest in the development of operations</td>
<td>• Willingness for development, common discussions occur in the unit</td>
<td>• The unit has its own guidelines and policies</td>
<td>In addition to top-level performance, the unit meets the following quality criteria:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Guidelines are non-existent or random, no goal-orientedness</td>
<td>• The leadership is committed and active</td>
<td>• Operations proceed according to policies, operations are systematic and goal-oriented and include follow-up measures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Some individual good practices occur in the unit</td>
<td>• Discussions are conducted in a goal-oriented manner and in support of collegial decision-making</td>
<td>• The entire unit is involved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Feedback is collected systematically</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Sunday 2.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>Meeting of the panel</td>
<td>Banqueting room of the Unioninkatu, Aino -hall, Unioninkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Welcome dinner</td>
<td>Banqueting room of the Unioninkatu, Yellow -hall, Unioninkatu 33&lt;br&gt;Together with the steering group, hosted by vice-rector Hannele Niemi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Monday 3.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.50</td>
<td>Organisation of the panel</td>
<td>Runeberg -hall, University main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.00-10.50</td>
<td>Rectors</td>
<td>Runeberg -hall, University main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00-11.50</td>
<td>Academic Affairs Committee</td>
<td>Runeberg -hall, University main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-14.30</td>
<td>Sub-group 1: Deans/vice-deans in charge of academic affairs</td>
<td>Runeberg -hall, University main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group 2: Support of pedagogic development and staff development</td>
<td>Auditorium VIII, University main building, 2. floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sub-group 3: Management of the academic affairs</td>
<td>Emma Irene -room, University main building, ground floor, Fabianinkatu 33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.20</td>
<td>Break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.30</td>
<td>Meeting of the panel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.00</td>
<td>Dinner</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 1: Faculty of Science Physicum, C208, Gustaf Hällstörmin katu 2</td>
<td>SUB-GROUP 2: Faculty of Social Sciences Faculty boardroom, Unioninkatu 37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.40</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50-10.30</td>
<td>Students I</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40-11.20</td>
<td>Teachers I</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.10</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments I</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-14.10</td>
<td>Students II</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the school level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20-15.00</td>
<td>Teachers II</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Break</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.10-15.50</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments II</td>
<td>Teachers and M&amp;L at the subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.40</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the language units</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the language units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.30</td>
<td>Meeting of the panel</td>
<td>Transfer and break at the Hotel</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **WEDNESDAY 5.11.** | **SUB-GROUP 1:** Faculty of Bioscience Cab 3109, Biocentre 1, 2.
floor, Viikinkaari 9 | **SUB-GROUP 2:** Faculty of Behavioural Sciences Meeting room K108, Sokla,
Siltavuorenpenegre 20 R | **SUB-GROUP 3:** Faculty of Arts Runeberg -hall, Univ.
Main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00-9.40</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.50-10.30</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.40-11.20</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30-12.10</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.15</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Arriving</td>
<td>Break</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.30-14.10</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the faculty level</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.20-15.00</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Break at the Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.10-15.50</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Teachers</td>
<td>Break at the Hotel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.00-16.40</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments</td>
<td>M&amp;L at the departments</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.00</td>
<td>Meeting of the panel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### THURSDAY 6.11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUB-GROUP 1:</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 2:</th>
<th>SUB-GROUP 3:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Faculty of Medicine  
Room 8-9, Biomedicum,  
P-floor, Haartmaninkatu 8 | Faculty of Veterinary Medicine  
Meeting room 4024, EE-building, 3. floor, Agnes Sjöberginkatu 2 | Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry  
Cab 3109, Biocentre 1, 2. floor, Viikinkaari 9 |
| 8.45 Arriving | 8.45 Arriving | 8.45 Arriving |
| 9.00-9.40 | ▪ M&L at the faculty level | ▪ M&L at the faculty level | ▪ M&L at the faculty level |
| 9.50-10.30 | ▪ Students | ▪ Students | ▪ Students |
| 10.40-11.20 | ▪ Teachers | ▪ Teachers | ▪ Teachers |
| 11.30-12.10 | ▪ M&L at the departments | ▪ M&L at the departments | ▪ M&L at the departments |
| 12.30 | Lunch | | |
| 13.30-14.30 | ▪ Extra interview: Deans/Vice Deans in charge of Academic Affairs  
Runeberg -hall, University main building, 1. floor, Fabianinkatu 33 | ▪ Student Union of the University of Helsinki  
Central Office of Student Union,  
Mannerheimintie 5 A, 2.floor | |
| 15.30-18.00 | Meeting of the panel | |
| 18.45 | Break | |
| 19.00 | Closing dinner  
Restaurant Palace Gourmet, 10. floor, Etelänta 10  
Together with the deans/vice-deans in charge of academic affairs, hosted by  
rector Thomas Wilhelmsson | |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30-12.00</td>
<td>Meeting of the panel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00-13.30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 13.30-15.00  | Closing seminar
Hall 1, Metsätalo, ground floor, Unioninkatu 40
Programme:
Opening: Rector Thomas Wilhelmsson
Introduction of the evaluation panel: Vice-rector Hannele Niemi
Main observations and feedback: Vice-rector Eva Åkesson, chair of the panel
Discussion
Closing: Rector Thomas Wilhelmsson |
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University Level, 3.11.2008

10.00–10.50  Rectors
Thomas Wilhelmsson, Rector
Hannele Niemi, Vice Rector
  • Educational and Academic Affairs
  • Library Affairs
  • Quality Assurance System
  • Equality
Johanna Björkroth, Vice Rector
  • Science and Researcher Training
Markku Löytönen, Vice Rector
  • Interaction with Society
  • Information Technology
Kari Suokko, Head of Administration

11.00-11.50  Academic Affairs Committee
Johanna Ahola, Student, Faculty of Biosciences
Marja Airaksinen, Professor, Faculty of Pharmacy
  • Chair of the Sub-Committee on Doctoral Education
Janne Kaisto, University Lecturer, Faculty of Law
Timo Kuusi, Head of the Research and Development Unit for Medical Education
Hannele Niemi, Vice Rector
  • Chair of the Academic Affairs Committee
Mikko Oivanen, Professor, Faculty of Science
Päivi Pakkanen, Director of Academic Affairs
  • Secretary of the Academic Affairs Committee
Hannu Pietiäinen, University Lecturer, Faculty of Bioscience
Kari Pitkänen, University Lecturer, Language Centre

13.30-14.30  Deans/Vice Deans in Charge of Academic Affairs
Marianne Enebäck, Director of Academic Affairs, Swedish School of Social Sciences
Jouni Hirvonen, Vice Dean, Faculty of Pharmacy
Chrsteter Holmberg, Vice Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Jukka Kekkonen, Dean, Faculty of Law
Heikki Kotila, Vice Dean, Faculty of Theolog
Ulla-Maija Kulonen, Dean, Faculty of Arts
Hannu Niemi, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Heimo Saarikko, Vice Dean, Faculty of Science
Marketta Sipi, Vice Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry
Timo Soveri, Vice Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Seppo Tella, Vice Dean, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
Ulla-Kristiina Tuomi, Director, Language Centre
Juha Voipio, Vice Dean, Faculty of Biosciences

13.30-14.30  Support of Pedagogic Development and Staff Development
Aino-Maija Evers, Development Manager, Administrative Services, University Administration Office
Laura Hirsto, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy, Faculty of Theology
Taina Kaivola, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy, Faculty of Science
Sari Koski-Kotiranta, Head of the Centre for Educational Technology / Academic Affairs, University Administration Office
Sari Lindblom-Ylänne, Director, the Helsinki University Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
Mika Tuulialainen, Liaison Manager, Career Services / Students Affairs, University Administration Office

13.30-14.30 Management of Academic Affairs
Marion von Etter, Director of Swedish-Language Affairs, University Administration Office
Laura Karppinen, Head of Academic Affairs, Faculty of Law
Kati Kettunen, Director of Student Services / Department for Strategic Planning and Development, University Administration Office
Esko Koponen, International Education Adviser, Academic Affairs / Department for Strategic Planning and Development, University Administration Office
Päivi Pakkanen, Director of Academic Affairs / Department for Strategic Planning and Development, University Administration Office
Ulla Sarajärvi, Head of Academic Affairs, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry
Ossi Tuomi, Director, Department for Strategic Planning and Development, University Administration Office

Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry, 6.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Hanna-Riitta Kymäläinen, Adjunct Professor, Department of Agrotechnology
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching,
Kristina Lindström, Professor, Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching,
Sari Mikkola, Planning Officer of International Affairs
Ulla Sarajärvi, Head of Academic Affairs
Marketta Sipi, Professor, Department of Forest Resource Management
• Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
Leena Suominen, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy, Adjunct Professor
• Coordinator of the Evaluation of Education
Maija Strömberg, Planning Officer of Academic Affairs
Outi Valkama, Specialist in Web-Based Education
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching

9.50–10.30 Students
Jenny Bjärs, Department of Forest Economics
• Deputy Member of the Steering Group
Laura Harju, Department of Food Technology
• Deputy Member of the Steering Group
Jaana Korhonen, Department of Forest Economics
• Member of the Steering Group
Juho Korvenoja, Department of Economics and Management
Lotta Lassila, Department of Animal Science
• Chair of the Student’s Faculty Organisation Sampsa
Jan Majuri, Department of Forest Ecology
Jani Männikkö, Department of Forest Ecology
Osmo Suominen, Department of Forest Resource Management
• Member of the League of Agricultural and Forestry Students Associations
Eveliina Varis, Department of Forest Ecology
• Member of the Steering Group
Maria Vuorelma, Department of Economics and Management

10.40–11.20  Teachers
Kari Elo, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Animal Science
• Member of the Steering Group
Pauliina Lankinen, University Lecturer, Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology
Päivi Lyttikainen-Saarenmaa, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Forest Ecology
Heikki Mäkinen, Doctoral Student, Department of Economics and Management
Sari Ollila, Assistant, Department of Economics and Management
Mika Rekola, University Lecturer, Department of Forest Economics
• Deputy Member of the Steering Group
Juha Rikala, University Lecturer, Department of Forest Resource Management
Asko Simojoki, University Lecturer, Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology
Frederick Stoddard, University Lecturer, Department of Applied Biology

11.30–12.10  Management and Leadership at the Departments
Juha Helenius, Professor, Department of Applied Biology
• Vice Head of the Department
• Chair of the Faculty Committee for the Assessment of Teaching Skills
Lea Hyvönen, Professor, Department of Food Technology
• Member of the Steering Group
Jari Kuuluvainen, Professor, Department of Forest Economics
• Chairman of the Steering Group
Christel Lamberg-Allardt, Professor, Department of Applied Chemistry and Microbiology
• Head of the Department
Matti Näsi, Professor, Department of Animal Science
• Head of the Department
• Professor in Charge of the Discipline
Erja Rappe, Planning Officer of Academic Affairs, Department of Applied Biology
Lauri Valsta, Professor, Department of Forest Economics
• Vice Chair of the Steering Group
Carl Johan Westman, Professor, Department of Forest Ecology
• Head of the Department

Faculty of Arts, 5.11.2008

9.00–9.40  Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Tero Ijäs, Student, Department of Philosophy
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching
Minna Kaartinen-Koutaniemi, Planning Officer
• Coordinator in the Evaluation of Education
Hanna Korsberg, Professor
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching
Ulla-Maija Kulonen, Professor
• Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
Anna Mauranen, Professor, Department of English
• Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
Kaisa Pesola, Planning Officer of International Affairs
Johanna Vaattovaara, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy

9.50–10.50 Students
Johanna Harju, Department of History
Marianne Hiirsalmi, Department of English
Jarkko Immonen, Department of English
Minna Kallankari, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
Matti Karhumäki, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
Katri Korolainen-Virkajärvi, Department of History
Martta Lindström, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
Niina Lätti, Institute for Asian and African Studies
Sara Miettunen, Department of History
Riku Nöjd, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
Siiri Susitaival, Department of Translation Studies
Max Wahlström, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literature

11.00–12.00 Teachers
Lotta Aunio, Senior Lecturer, Institute for Asian and African Studies
Markku Haakana, Senior Lecturer, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
Tuomas Heikkilä, Senior Lecturer, Department of History
Anna Hollsten, Lecturer, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
Seppo Kittilä, Senior Lecturer, Department of General Linguistics
Helena Lehecková, Senior Lecturer, Department of Slavonic and Baltic Languages and Literatures
Krister Lindén, Researcher, Department of General Linguistics
Carita Rosenberg-Wolff, Lecturer, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
Leena-Maija Rossi, Senior Lecturer, Christina Institute for Women’s Study
Mikko Saikku, Senior Lecturer, Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies
Lotte Tarkka, Doctoral Assistant, Institute for Cultural Research
Marjo Vesalainen, Senior Lecturer, Department of German

13.15–14.00 Management and Leadership at the Departments I
Tanja Asikainen-Kunnari, Amanuensis, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
Riho Grünthal, Professor, Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies
• Head of Department
Jouni Heikkinen, Amanuensis, Department of German
Katarina Koskiranta, Amanuensis, Institute for Cultural Research
Lars-Folke Landgren, Professor, Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies
• Head of Department
Hanna Lehti-Eklund, Professor, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
• Deputy Head of Department
Elena Liikanen, Planning Officer, Department of Romance Languages
Kirsu Saarikangas, Professor, Christina Institute for Women’s Study
• Head of Department
Hanne Selkokari, Amanuensis, Institute for Art Research
Matti Sintonen, Professor, Department of Philosophy
• Deputy Head of Department
14.15-15.00 Management and Leadership at the Departments II
Maria Fremer, Amanuensis, Department of Scandinavian Languages and Literature
Lotta Jalava, Amanuensis, Department of Finno-Ugrian Studies
Mika Kajava, Professor, Department of Classical Philology
Jyrki Kalliokoski, Professor, Department of Finnish Language and Literature
• Head of Department
Laura Kolbe, Professor, Department of History
• Deputy Head of Department
Juhani U.E. Lehtonen, Professor, Institute of Cultural Research
• Head of Department
Joonas Leppänen, Planning Officer, Department of Philosophy
Jani Penttilä, Course Coordinator, Renvall Institute for Area and Cultural Studies
Heta Pyrhönen, Professor, Institute for Art Research
• Head of Department
Tia Svanberg, Planning Officer, Department of English

Faculty of Behavioural Sciences, 5.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Niina Jokela, Planning Officer of International Affairs
Helena Laurila, Coordinator of Academic Affairs
Leila Pehkonen, University Lecturer, Department of Education
• Member of the Teaching Committee
Patrik Scheinin, Dean
Seppo Tella, Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
Auli Toom, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy, Adjunct Professor
Hanna Virtanen, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science
• Member of the Teaching Committee

9.50–10.30 Students
Tuomas Carlberg, Department of Education
Anna Eteläaho, Kindergarten Teacher Education, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
Lauri Hietajärvi, Class Teacher Education, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
Tuire Jääskeläinen, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science, Home Economics
Mona Lehtinen, Department of Speech Sciences
Vilja Silmune, Department of Speech Sciences, Logopedics
Mikito Takada, Department of Psychology, Cognitive Science
Tuisku-Karoliina Tanska, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science, Craft Science
Tiina Yliherne, Department of Psychology

10.40–11.20 Teachers
Hannele Cantell, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
Miiia Collanus, Teaching Assistant, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science, Craft Science
Merja Ikonen-Varila, University Lecturer, Department of Education
Vuokko Jarva, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science, Home economics
Riitta Jyrhämä, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
Minna Laakso, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Speech Sciences
Aino-Maija Lahtinen, University Lecturer (dep.), Department of Education
Otto Lappi, University Instructor, Department of Psychology, Cognitive Science
Marjaana Lindeman, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Psychology
Saila Poutiainen, University Lecturer, Department of Speech Sciences, Speech Communication

11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Jukka Husu, Professor, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
• Deputy Head of Department (in Charge of Academic Affairs),
Juhani Hytönen, Professor, Department of Applied Sciences of Education
• Head of the Department
Christina Krause, Professor, Department of Psychology
• Deputy Head of Department (in Charge of Academic Affairs)
Kaisa Launonen, Professor, Department of Speech Sciences, Logopedics
• Deputy Head of Department
Jari Lavonen, Professor Department of Applied Sciences of Education, Subject Teacher Education
• Director of the Subject Teacher Education Section
Marja Martikainen, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Education
• Head of the Department
Päivi Palojoki, Professor, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science
• Deputy Head of Department (in Charge of Academic Affairs)
Hilkka Pakarinen, Amanuensis, Department of Psychology
Kirsti Salo-Mattila, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Home Economics and Craft Science
• Head of Department

Faculty of Biosciences, 5.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Maija-Liisa Ahtiainen, Planning Officer of International Affairs Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Secretary)
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Secretary)
Jari Niemelä, Professor, Dean
• Faculty Council (Chair)
• Planning Committee of the Faculty (Chair)
• Major Subject Committee in Environmental Sciences (Member)
Mervi Pyyhtiä, Head of Academic Affairs
• Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Secretary)
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Secretary)
Hannu Saarilahti, University Lecturer, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
• Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Deputy Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Biotechnology (Chair)
Maria Tuomi, Undergraduate Student, Degree Programme in Biology, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Symbioosi Student Organisation
• Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
Viivi Virtanen, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
• Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
Juha Voipio, Professor, Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs, Responsible Professor in Physiology
• Faculty Council (Deputy Member)
• Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Chair)
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Chair)
• Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Physiology (Chair)

9.50–10.30 Students
Mira Grönroos, Degree Programme in Limnology and Fishery Science, Limnology
• Major Subject Committee in Aquatic Sciences (Member)
Markku Hakala, Degree Programme in Biochemistry, Biochemistry, Academic Affairs Representative of the Student Organisation Helix
• Faculty Council (Deputy Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Biochemistry (Member)
Aili Jukarainen, Degree Programme in Environmental Sciences, Environmental Science and Policy, Academic Affairs
• Representative of the Student Organisation Myy
• Major Subject Committee in Environmental Sciences (Member)
Laura Jäätelä, Degree Programme in Biology, Ecology and Evolutionary Biology
• Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (Member)
Anniina Kuusijärvi, Degree Programme in Biology, Academic Affairs Representative of the Student Organisation Symbioosi
Cynthia Moed, Degree Programme in Biology, Genetics
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Deputy Member)
• Committee for Teaching in Swedish (Member)
Kirsi Siivola, Degree Programme in Biology, Genetics, Academic Affairs Representative of the Student Organisation Helix
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Member)
• Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Deputy Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Genetics (Member)
Ilpo Weijola, Degree Programme in Biotechnology (HEBIOT), Biotechnology, Academic Affairs Representative of the Student Organisation Boa

10.40–11.20 Teachers
Reetta Ahlfors, University Lecturer, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
• Academic Advisor in Plant Biology Major Subject Committee in Plant Biology (Member)
Kurt Fagerstedt, Professor, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
• Responsible Professor in Plant Biology Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Vice Chair)
• Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Plant Biology (Chair)
Leila Kauppinen, Coordinator, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
• Admissions Board of the Faculty (Member)
• Major Subject Committee in Biotechnology (Member)
Elina Leskinen, University Lecturer Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Academic Advisor in Hydrobiology

- Major Subject Committee in Aquatic Sciences (Member)
- Academic Affairs Committee of the University (Deputy Member)
- Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Vice Chair)

Martin Lodenius, Senior Lecturer, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences

- Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Deputy Member)
- Committee for Teaching in Swedish (Member)

Juha Mikola, University Lecturer, Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

Pirjo Nikula-Ijäs, University Lecturer, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Academic Advisor in Biochemistry

- Major Subject Committee in Biochemistry (Member)

Anne Ojala, University Lecturer, Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

- Admissions Board of the Faculty (Deputy Member)

11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments

Kielo Hahtelä, Professor, Head of the Department, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences,

- Faculty Council (Member)
- Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Chair)
- Major Subject Committee in General Microbiology (Member)

Timo Kairesalo, Professor, Head of the Department, Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

- Faculty Council (Member)
- Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences (Chair)

Veijo Kaitala, Professor, Deputy Head of the Department (in Charge of Educational Planning and Management), Responsible Professor in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences

- Planning Committee of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Vice Chair)
- Major Subject Committee in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (Chair)

Olli-Pekka Penttinen, University Lecturer, Academic Advisor in Ecological and Environmental Sciences, Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences

- Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
- Admissions Board of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences (Member)

Jouko Rikkinen, Professor, Responsible Person in Subject Teacher Education in Biology, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences,

- Major Subject Committee in Plant Biology (Member)

Rauni Strömmer, Professor, Responsible Person of the Curriculum Planning at the Department, Department of Ecological and Environmental Sciences
Ilkka Teräs, Planning Officer, Academic Advisor in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
- Admissions Board of the Faculty (Deputy Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Member)
- Major Subject Committee in Ecology and Evolutionary Biology (Secretary)

Heikki Tuurala, Planning Officer, Academic Advisor, Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences
- Committee for the Development of Teaching and Studies of the Faculty (Member)
- Admissions Board of the Faculty (Member)
- Steering Group of the Department of Biological and Environmental Sciences (Secretary)

Faculty of Law, 5.11.2008

13.30–14.10 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Laura Blomqvist, Student
- Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching

Johan Bärlund, Senior Researcher, Docent of Civil and Commercial Law
- Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching

Anne Haarala-Muhonen, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
- Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching

Teija Isotalo, Planning Officer of International Affairs

Laura Karpinnen, Head of Academic Affairs
- Member of the Committee for the Development of Teaching

Jukka Kekkonen, Dean (in Charge of Academic Affairs)

14.20–15.00 Students

Sofia Danielsson
- Chairperson of Swedish Law Students Association Codex
- Member of Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty

Pinja Jaspers
- Member of University of Helsinki Senate

Gabrielle Hjelt

Otto Markkanen
- Member of the Faculty Council
- Member of the Department of Private Law Steering Group
- Member of Academic Affairs Committee of the Faculty

Tuomas Rytkönen
- Member of the Faculty Council

Mia Westerlund
- Member of the Faculty Council
- Member of the Department of Public Law Steering Group

15.10–15.50 Teachers

Mia Korpiola, Docent of Legal History, Post-Doctoral Researcher, Department of Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies
- Member of Committee for the Development of Teaching

Matti Mikkola, Professor of Labour Law, Department of Private Law

Jarna Petman, Senior Lecturer in International Law, Department of Public Law
- Responsible Teacher of International Law

Heikki Pihlajamäki, Docent and Senior Lecturer in Legal History, Department of Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies
Taina Pihlajarinne, Assistant of Commercial Law, Department of Private Law
• Member of the Department Steering Group
• Member of the Faculty Council
Désirée Söderlund, Assistant of Private Law (Swedish), Department of Private Law
Heikki Toiviainen, Docent of Commercial Law, Acting Professor in Commercial Law, Department of Private Law

16.00–16.40 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Heikki Halila, Professor of Sports Law, Department of Private Law
• Head of Department of Private Law
• Member of the Faculty Council
Ari Hirvonen, Professor of General Jurisprudential Studies, Department of Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies
• Head of Department of Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies
• Member of the Faculty Council
Esko Linnakangas, Professor of Fiscal Law, Department of Public Law
• Head of Department of Public Law
• Member of the Department Steering Group
Tuomas Ojanen, Professor of Constitutional Law, Department of Public Law
• Head of Studies in Constitutional Law
• Member of the Department Steering Group
Juha Raitio, Professor of European Law, Department of Criminal Law, Judicial Procedure and General Jurisprudential Studies
• Head of Studies in European Law
Anni Tuomela, Amanuensis, Department of Public Law
• Member of the Faculty Council
• Member of the Department Steering Group

Faculty of Medicine, 6.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Jonna Cannelin, Head of Academic Affairs
Christer Holmberg, Professor, Vice Dean in Charge of Education
Kimmo Kontula, Professor, Dean of the Faculty
Iiro Linko, Student
• Member of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Dental Education
Eeva Pyörälä, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
Veli-Jukka Uttro, Professor
• Chair of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Dental Education
Velina Vangelova, Student
• Member of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education

9.50–10.30 Students
Henrik Bygglin, 6th year Medical Student (Swedish Training Program)
Elina Hakonen, 6th year Medical Student
Annette Holmberg, 5th year Dental Student
Marienka Lindqvist, 4th year Medical Student (Swedish Training Program)
Arri Niemenmaa, 2nd year Dental Student
Reetta Peltonen, 5th year Medical Student (M.D., Ph.D. Program)
Joonas Rautavaara, 3rd year Medical Student

10.40–11.20 Teachers
Oskari Heikinheimo, Clinical Teacher, Institute of Clinical Medicine
• Teacher of Clinical Studies, Member of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education
Heikki Hervonen, University Lecturer, Institute of Biomedicine
• Coordinator of Biomedical Studies
• Member of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education

Sakari Jokiranta, University Lecturer, Haartman Institute
• Teacher of Clinical-Theoretical Studies

Raili Kauppinen, Clinical Teacher, Research & Development Unit for Medical Education
• Coordinator for International Education in Medicine

Lena Sjöberg-Tuominen, Clinical Teacher, Institute of Clinical Medicine and the Department of Public Health
• Teacher of Clinical Studies and Public Health Studies

Kimmo Suomalainen, University Lecturer, Research & Development Unit for Medical Education
• Coordinator of Dental Studies
• Member of the Planning Committees for Undergraduate Medical and Dental Education

Tom Pettersson, Clinical Teacher, Research & Development Unit for Medical Education
• Coordinator of the Swedish Training Program
• Member of the Planning Committee for Undergraduate Medical Education

Jarkko Hietanen, Professor
• Head of the Institute of Dentistry

Eija Kalso, Professor
• Member of the Steering Group of the Institute of Clinical Medicine

Esa Korpi, Professor
• Head of the Institute of Biomedicine

Seppo Meri, Professor
• Head of the Haartman Institute

Seppo Sarna, Professor
• Deputy Head of the Department of Public Health

Seija Seppänen, Coordinator of Student Affairs, Student Office of the Institute of Dentistry

Erkki Vuori, Professor
• Head of the Department of Forensic Medicine

Faculty of Pharmacy, 5.11.2008

13.30–14.10 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level

Maija-Liisa Ahtiainen, Planning Officer of International Affairs

Jouni Hirvonen, Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs

Ulla Lehtonen, Head of Academic Affairs

Tuula Jääskeläinen, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy / Coordinator of the Evaluation of Education

Maija Tiippana, Planning Officer

Jyrki Heinämäki, University Lecturer
• Member of the Academic Committee
• Deputy Member of the Admission Board
Minna Saari, Student
• Member of the Academic Committee of the Faculty
• Chairman of the Committee for Student Affairs in the Student Organisation of Pharmacy

14.20–15.00 Students
Inkatuuli Heikkinen, 2. years Student
• Member Responsible for the Environmental and Festival Affairs in the Student Organisation of Pharmacy
Lasse Karhu, 3. years Student
• Member of the Admission Board
Jonna Korkeaviita, 3. years Student
Eeva-Katri Kumpula, 5. years Student
Saija Leikola, Postgraduate Student
Jarkko Mäkinen, 2. years Student

15.10–15.50 Teachers
Samuli Hirsjärvi, University Lecturer, Division of Pharmaceutical Technology
Yvonne Holm, University Lecturer, Division of Pharmaceutical Biology
• Chairman of the Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Deputy Member of the Academic Committee
• Deputy Member of the Planning Committee
Mikko Käenmäki, University Lecturer, Division of Pharmacology and Toxicology
Tuuli Marvola, University Lecturer, Division of Biopharmaceutics and Pharmacokinetics
• Deputy Member of the Academic Committee
• Deputy Member of the Admission Board
Marika Pohjanoksa-Mäntylä, Assistant, Division of Social Pharmacy
• Member of the Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Deputy Member of the Academic Committee
• Deputy Member of the Admission Board
Erik Wallén, University Lecturer, Division of Pharmaceutical Chemistry
• Member of the Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Deputy Member of the Academic Committee
• Deputy Member of the Admission Board

16.00–16.40 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Marja Airaksinen, Professor
• Head of the Division of Social Pharmacy
Raimo Hiltunen, Dean, Professor
• Head of the Division of Pharmaceutical Biology
Risto Kostiainen, Professor
• Head of the Division of Pharmaceutical Chemistry
Pekka Männistö, Professor
• Director of The Graduate School in Pharmaceutical Research
Niklas Sandler, Professor of Industrial Pharmacy
• Division of Pharmaceutical Technology
Päivi Tammela, University Researcher, Centre for Drug Research
Raimo Tuominen, Professor
• Head of the Division of Pharmacology and Toxicology
Arto Urtti, Professor
• Director of the Centre for Drug Research
Marjo Yliperttula, Professor
• Head of the Division of Biopharmaceutics and Pharmacokinetics
Faculty of Science, 4.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Maarat Alaluusua, International Affairs Coordinator (Faculty Office)
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
Nina Aremo, Planning Officer (Research and Development Unit for Science Education)
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
Quality Specialist
Taina Kaivola, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy (Research and Development Unit for Science Education)
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the University’s Academic Affairs Committee
Jaakko Kurhila, University Lecturer (Department of Computer Science)
• Head of Studies at the Department of Computer Science
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
Anne Palo-Kauppi, Head of Academic Affairs (Faculty Office)
• Secretary of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
Heimo Saarikko, Professor (Department of Physics)
• Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
• Chairman of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the Faculty Council
• Director of the LUMA Centre
Ilmo Teikari, Student (Department of Chemistry)
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the Faculty’s Admissions Board
• Member of the Faculty Council

9.50–10.30 Students I
Reko Hynönen, (Department of Physics)
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Chairman of the Student Organisation Resonanssi
• Active in the Student Organisations Limes and SFO
Tatu Iivanainen (Department of Chemistry)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Active in the Student Organisation HYK
Hanna-Mari Kivinen (Department of Physics)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Deputy Member of the Faculty Council
Merli Lahtinen (Department of Astronomy)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
Tuomo Lauri (Department of Physics)
Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Chairman of the Student Organisation Synop
• Study Secretary in the Student Organisation Resonanssi
Katri Leinonen (Department of Physics)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Active in the Student Organisation Geysir
Miia Mäntymäki (Department of Chemistry)
Teemu Rajala (Department of Chemistry)
Tiina Sarnet (Department of Chemistry)
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Person in Charge of Study Issues in the Student Organisation HYK

10.40–11.20 Teachers I
Maija Aksela, University Lecturer (Department of Chemistry)
• Coordinator of the LUMA Centre
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
Thomas Hackman, University Lecturer (Department of Astronomy)
• Deputy Member of the Faculty Council
Petri Heinonen, University Lecturer (Department of Chemistry)
Jouni Niskanen, University Researcher (Department of Physics)
• Student Advisor in Theoretical Physics
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
Kai Nordlund, Professor (Department of Physics)
• The Professor in Charge of the Swedish-language Education in Physics
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
Eero Rauhala, University Lecturer (Department of Physics)
• Student Advisor in Physics
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
Mikko Ritala, Professor (Department of Chemistry)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Faculty Council
Marja Siitari-Kauppi, Researcher (Department of Chemistry)
Timo Vesala, Professor (Department of Physics)
• The Professor in Charge of the Education in Meteorology
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments I
Juhani Huovelin, Adjunct Professor (Department of Astronomy)
• Deputy Head of Department
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
Jarkko Ihanus, Coordinator (Department of Chemistry)
• Member of the Faculty Council
Lauri Jetsu, Adjunct Professor (Department of Astronomy)
• Head of Department
• Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
Juhani Keinonen, Professor (Department of Physics)
• Head of Department
• Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Faculty Council
Ismo Koponen, University Lecturer (Department of Physics)
• Student Advisor in Physics for Teachers Education
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Chairman of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the Faculty’s Admissions Board
Mikko Oivanen, Professor (Department of Chemistry)
• Chairman of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Chairman of the Faculty’s Admissions Board
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the University’s Academic Affairs Committee
Markku Räsänen, Professor (Department of Chemistry)
• Head of Department
• Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group

Markku Räsänen, Professor (Department of Chemistry)
• Head of Department
• Chairman of the Faculty’s Admissions Board
• Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the University’s Academic Affairs Committee

Jani Arponen (Department of Geography)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Tuulia Häkkinen (Department of Geology)
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Active in the Student Organisation Vasara

Tuomas Jokela (Department of Geology)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Active in the Student Organisation Vasara

Joel Kaasinen (Department of Computer Science)
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Person in Charge of Study Issues in the Student Organisation TКО-äly

Sampsa Lappalainen (Department of Computer Science)
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Person in Charge of Study Issues in the Student Organisation TКО-äly

Anna-Riikka Leppäranta (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
• Active in Tutoring

Rami Luisto (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
• Active in the Student Organisation Matrix

Susanna Oksanen (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
• Deputy Member of the Departmental Steering Group

Tuulia Puustinen (Department of Geography)
• Member of the Departmental Steering Group
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Matti Seise (Department of Computer Science)
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching
• Person in Charge of Study Issues in the Student Organisation TКО-äly

Kari Auranen, University Lecturer (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
Katariina Kosonen, University Lecturer (Department of Geography)
• Member of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Lea Kutvonen, Professor (acting) (Department of Computer Science)
• Person in Charge of Distributed Systems and Data Communications Master’s Sub-Programme

Heikki Lokki, Lecturer (Department of Computer Science)
• Chairman of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Juha Oikkonen, Dosent (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
• Chairman of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Petri Ola, University Lecturer (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
Sini Ruohomaa, Assistant (Department of Computer Science)
- Member of the Department's Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Tapani Rämö, Professor (Department of Geology)
- Member of the Department's Working Group for the Development of Teaching
- Member of the Faculty’s Committee for the Development of Teaching

15.10–15.50 Management and Leadership at the Departments II
Hannu Erkiö, Lecturer (Department of Computer Science)
- Head of Studies (until Sep 1)

Mats Gyllenberg, Professor (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
- Head of Department
- Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
- Member of the Faculty Council

Terhi Hautala, Amanuensis (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
- Secretary of the Department’s Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Hannu Honkasalo, Head of Office (Department of Mathematics and Statistics)
- Member of the Faculty's Admissions Board

Juha Karhu, Professor (Department of Geology)
- Head of Department
- Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
- Member of the Faculty Council

Mia Kotilainen, Amanuensis (Department of Geology)
- Secretary of the Departmental Steering Group

Olli Ruth, University Lecturer (Department of Geography)
- Chairman of the Department's Working Group for the Development of Teaching

Hannu Toivonen, Professor (Department of Computer Science)
- Head of Department
- Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
- Member of the Faculty Council

John Westerholm, Professor (Department of Geography)
- Head of Department
- Chairman of the Departmental Steering Group
- Member of the Faculty Council

Faculty of Social Sciences, 4.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Tuula Hakkola, Head of Academic Affairs
Ari Haukkala, Teacher Member of the Committee for the Development of Studies
Taina Joutsenvirta, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
Marjanne Järveläinen, Planning Officer of International Affairs
Atte Vieno, Student Member of the Committee for the Development of Studies, Department of Sociology
Turo Virtanen, Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs

9.50–10.30 Students
Totte Harinen, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy
Suvi Kiesiläinen, Department of Social Policy
Antti Korhonen, Department of Social Science History
Tuomas Niska, Department of Sociology
Jan Rosenström, Department of Social Science History
Outi Sirniö, Department of Sociology
10.40–11.20 Teachers
Klaus Helkama, Professor, Department of Social Psychology
Deputy Member of the Faculty Council
Kristian Klockars, University Lecturer, Department of Social and Moral Philosophy
Riika Kuusisto, University Lecturer, Department of Political Science
Hannu Nieminen, Professor, Department of Communication
Pirkko-Liisa Rauhala, University Lecturer, Department of Social Policy
Harriet Strandell, University Lecturer, Department of Sociology
Kimmo Vehkalahti, University Lecturer, Department of Mathematics and Statistics
• Member of the Committee for the Development of Studies

11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Tapani Alkula, Amanuensis, Department of Sociology
• Deputy Head of the Department
Mikko Mattila, Professor, Department of Political Science
Anssi Peräkylä, Professor, Department of Sociology
• Head of the Department
Anna-Maija Pirttilä-Backman, Professor, Department of Social Psychology
• Head of the Department
Mikko Puukko, Amanuensis, Department of Social Policy
Keijo Rahkonen, University Lecturer, Department of Political Science
• Head of the Department
Piia Susiluoto, Amanuensis, Institute of Development Studies

Swedish School of Social Sciences, 4.11.08

13.30–14.10 Management and Leadership at the School Level
Marina Aalto, Head of Academic Affairs
• Secretary of the School Academic Affairs Committee
Marianne Enebäck, Director of Academic Affairs
• Chair of the School Academic Affairs Committee
Malin Hauk, International Planning Officer
• Secretary of the International Affairs Committee
Henrik Hägglund, Rector
• Chair of the Board
Christian Kroll, University Lecturer
• Member of the Board
Jonas Lindholm, Student
• Member of the Board
Henrika Zilliacus-Tikkanen, Temp. Professor
• Member of the School Academic Affairs Committee
• Chair of Admissions Board

14.20–15.00 Students
Sebastian Gahnström
• Member of the School Academic Affairs Committee
Hanna Hakkarainen
• Member of the Disciplinary Committee
Rasmus Kyllönen
• Member of the Disciplinary Committee
Michaela von Kügelgen
• Chair of Board at the Student Organization at the Swedish School of Social Science
• Member of the Disciplinary Committee
Janna Ranta
• Student Organization at SSKH, Chair of Study- and International Affairs Committee
Jonna Similä
Staffan Småros
• Member of the School Academic Affairs Committee
Joanna Wikström
• Member of the Disciplinary Committee

15.10–15.50 Teachers
Helena Blomberg-Kroll, Professor
• Disciplinary Head
• Board Professorial Representative
Martin Björklund, Senior Lecturer
• School Academic Affairs Committee Discipline Representative
Airi Hautamäki, Professor
• Disciplinary Head
• Board Professorial Representative
• School Academic Affairs Committee Discipline Representative
Tom Moring, Professor
• Disciplinary Head
• Board Professorial Representative
Elianne Riska, Professor
• Disciplinary Head
• Board Professorial Representative
Stefan Sjöblom, Professor
• Disciplinary Head
• Board Professorial Representative
Christian Starck, University Lecturer (Compulsory Studies)
Kim Zilliacus, University Lecturer
• School Academic Affairs Committee Discipline Representative

Faculty of Theology, 4.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Ismo Dunderberg, Professor, Department of Biblical Studies
• Deputy Member of the Pedagogical Unit Steering Group
Laura Hiristo, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
Hanna-Maija Ketola, Planning Officer, Coordinator of the Evaluation of Education
Heikki Kotila, Professor, Department of Practical Theology
• Vice Dean in Charge of Academic Affairs
Karolina Kouvola, Student
• Student Study Ministry in the Student’s Faculty Organisation
• Member of the Pedagogical Unit
Juha Malmisalo, Project Coordinator
Mervi Palva, Head of Academic Affairs

9.50–10.30 Students
Tiina Hallikainen, Department of Biblical Studies
• Member of the Steering Group
Karoliina Korhonen, Department of Practical Theology
• Member of the Steering Group
Laura Leipakka
• Study Secretary in the Student’s Faculty Organisation
• Deputy Member of the Pedagogical Unit
Janne Rauhala, Department of Systematic Theology
• Member of the Steering Group
Hannu Salmela
• Member of the Faculty Council
Joona Salminen
• Member of the Faculty Council

10.40–11.20 Teachers
Merja Alanne, University Lecturer, Department of Biblical Studies
Jaana Hallamaa, Professor, Department of Systematic Theology
• Head of the Department
Juha Meriläinen, Researcher, Part-Time Teacher, Department of Church History, Member of the Faculty Council
Heikki Pesonen, University Lecturer, Adjunct Professor, Department of Comparative Religion
Lassi Pruuki, Professor, Department of Practical Theology
Päivi Salmesvuori, University Lecturer, Department of Church History

11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Eila Helander, Professor, Department of Practical Theology
• Professor in Charge of the Discipline
Aila Lauha, Professor, Department of Church History
• Professor in Charge of the Discipline, (Dean)
Jaana Nylund, Amanuensis, Department of Systematic Theology
Tuula Sakaranaho, Professor, Department of Comparative Religion
• Head of the Department
Risto Uro, Professor, Department of Biblical Studies
• Head of the Department
Timo Åvist, Amanuensis, Department of Practical Theology

Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, 6.11.2008

9.00–9.40 Management and Leadership at the Faculty Level
Riitta Kaitajärvi, Planning Officer of International Affairs
Marja Raekallio, University Lecturer
• Member of the Academic Planning Committee
Mirja Ruohoniemi, Senior Lecturer of University Pedagogy
Sanna Ryhänen, Head of Academic Affairs
Timo Soveri, Vice Dean in Charge of Undergraduate Education
Antti Sukura, Dean
Anna Suontama-Laakkonen, Student
• Member of the Academic Planning Committee

9.50–10.30 Students
Elias Dahlsten
Reija Heikkinen
Heidi Hiitiö
Martta Jalkanen
Karoliina Mikola
Jussi Virta

10.40–11.20 Teachers
Karoliina Autio, Hospital Veterinarian
Sanna Hellström, University Lecturer
Antti Iivanainen, Professor
Miia Lindström, Postdoctoral Researcher
Helena Rautala, Clinical Teacher
Marjatta Snellman, Professor
11.30–12.10 Management and Leadership at the Departments
Marja-Liisa Hänninen, Professor, Department of Food and Environmental Hygiene
Riikka Laukkanen, University Lecturer
Satu Pyörälä, Professor, Department of Production Animal Medicine
Reeta Pösö, Professor, Department of Basic Veterinary Sciences
Satu Sankari, Clinical Teacher
• Head of the Central Laboratory
Riitta-Mari Tulamo, Professor, Department of Equine and Small Animal Medicine
• Head of Department

Language Centre, 4.11.2008

13.30–14.10 Management and Leadership at the Language Centre
Irma Hyvärinen, Professor of German, Faculty of Arts
• Deputy Member of the LC Board (Representative of the Faculties)
Sinikka Karjalainen, Amanuensis
• LC Coordinator for the Evaluation of Education
• Secretary of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Marjaana Kuokkanen-Kekki, Lecturer in Spanish,
• Member of the LC Board (Representative of the LC Staff)
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Tiina Laulajainen, Head of Academic Affairs
• Superior of the LC Academic Affairs Unit
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Ilmo Teikari, Student, Faculty of Science
• Member of the LC Board (Representative of Students)
Ulla-Kristiina Tuomi, Director of the Language Centre (LC)
Kirsi Wallinheimo, University Lecturer in Swedish
• Chair of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching

14.20–15.00 Students
Janni Hiltunen, Faculty of Law
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Deputy Member of the LC Student Council
Reko Hynönen, Faculty of Science
• Chair of Resonanssi ry (Organization of Students of Physical Sciences at the University of Helsinki)
• Board Member of Limes ry (Organization of Students of Mathematics, Computer Science and exact natural Sciences)
Laura Leipakka, Faculty of Theology
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
• Member of the LC Student Council
Katri Leinonen, Faculty of Science
• Member of the Steering Group of the Department of Physics
• Member of the Working Group for the Development of Teaching of the Department of Physics
Liisa Reunanen, Faculty of Law
• Member of the Board of The Student Union of the University of Helsinki
Kai Tainio, Faculty of Arts
• Deputy Member of the LC Board (Representative of Students)

15.10–15.50 Teachers
Lis Auvinen, University Lecturer in Swedish
• Deputy Member of the LC Board (Representative of the LC Staff)
Jacqueline Chávez Turro, Lecturer in Spanish
Leena Karlsson, Lecturer in English
• Vice Chair of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Tiina Mäenpää, Lecturer in Swedish
Kari Pitkänen, University Lecturer in English
• Deputy Member of the Academic Affairs Committee of the University of Helsinki
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Roy Siddall, University Lecturer in English
Ciro Imperato, Part-time Teacher of Italian
Tia Patenge, Part-time Teacher of German

16.00–16.40 Unit Superiors: Language Units, the Academic Affairs Unit
Ullamaija Fiilin, Lecturer in Swedish
• Superior of the Swedish Language Unit
Miia Hietaranta, Lecturer in Spanish
• Superior of the Spanish and Italian Language Units
Eija Hämäläinen, Lecturer in Russian
• Superior of the Russian Language Unit
Felicity Kjisik, University Lecturer in English
• Superior of the English Language Unit
Tiina Laulajainen, Head of Academic Affairs
• Superior of the LC Academic Affairs Unit
• Member of the LC Committee for the Development of Teaching
Tuula Lehtonen, University Lecturer in English
• Superior of the English Language Unit
Tuula Pyrhönen, Lecturer in German
• Superior of the German Language Unit
Leena Syvähuoko, Lecturer in French
• Superior of the French Language Unit

Extra interviews 6.11.2008

13.30-14.30 Deans/Vice Deans in Charge of Academic Affairs
Marianne Enebäck, Director of Academic Affairs, Swedish School of Social Sciences
Christer Holmberg, Vice Dean, Faculty of Medicine
Jukka Kekkonen, Dean, Faculty of Law
Hannu Niemi, Dean, Faculty of Social Sciences
Heimo Saarikko, Vice Dean, Faculty of Science
Marketta Sipi, Vice Dean, Faculty of Agriculture and Forestry
Timo Soveri, Vice Dean, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine
Seppo Tella, Vice Dean, Faculty of Behavioural Sciences
Ulla-Kristiina Tuomi, Director, Language Centre
Juha Voipio, Vice Dean, Faculty of Biosciences

13.30-14.30 The Student Union of the University of Helsinki
AnneSophie Hokkanen, Member of Executive Board (Student Union)
• Responsible for International Affairs, Bilingualism, Alumni
• Study: Faculty of Social Sciences, Swedish School of Social Science
• Representations at the University:
  • Member of the Planning Group in Swedish Affairs in the University Reform
  • Member of Committee for Swedish-language Operations
• Others:
  • Member of Student Organisation Delegation (Club of Students in Swedish School of Social Sciences)
  • Member of Samordningsdelegationen (Consultative Committee of Swedish Language higher Education)
• And in the past she has been in various committees in the Swedish School of Social Sciences

**Pasi Hario**, Member of Executive Board (Student Union)
- Responsible for Organisational Affairs, Tutoring, Development
- Study: Faculty of Art, Department of History
- Representations at the University
- Vice Member of the Faculty Council in Faculty of Arts
- Member of University Collegium
- Vice Member of Committee for Rectification of the Grading of Study Attainment

**Harri Waltari**, Secretary of Academic Affairs
- Responsible for University Administration, Planning and Resourcing and Networks of Student Representatives
- Study: Faculty of Science, Department of Physics
- Representations at the University:
  - Member of the University Senate
  - Member of the Planning Group in Organization, Leadership and Management of the University reform
  - Member of the Planning Group of University Statutes
  - Member of the Steering Group of the Development Program of Administration and Support Services
- Member of the Consultative Committee of the University of Helsinki and Southern Finland Universities of Applied Sciences
- Representations at National Union of University Students in Finland (SYL)
- Member of the working Group Planning good Practices in electing Student Representatives to University Administration

**Liisa Ansala**, Secretary of Academic Affairs
- Responsible for Study Affairs, Development of Teaching, Support Services, quality and Students Legal rights in Studying
- Does not study in the University of Helsinki, former member of SYL Executive Board
- Representations in the University of Helsinki:
  - Member of Academic Affairs Committee
  - Member of Meetings in the Network of Heads of Academic Affairs (of Faculties)
  - Member of Group Planning Studies between Hanken School of Economics and UH
Appendix 7

Abbreviations and terminology used in the self-evaluation reports
Academy of Finland

The Academy of Finland is an expert organisation that funds scientific research and promotes science policies. It operates within the administrative sector of the Ministry of Education. The Academy funds research carried out in universities and public research institutions. General research projects, research programmes, Centre of Excellence programmes and research posts are the main recipients of funding.

Among other things, the Academy of Finland offers fixed-term, esteemed posts for Academy Professors and Academy Research Fellows. It also funds postdoctoral researcher projects.

Alma

The intranet of the University of Helsinki.

Annual workload

The annual workload of university instructors is 1,600 hours. The duties included in the workload are determined in the work plan drawn up annually. Teaching, research and other duties can be flexibly distributed between teachers in a way considered to be the most appropriate within the limits of the annual workload.

Bologna process

The main objective of the Bologna Declaration is to create a European area of higher education by 2010. The goal is to increase the competitiveness and attractiveness of the European system of higher education in relation to other continents.

The biggest reform carried out in Finland in conjunction with the Bologna process was the adoption of a two-tier degree system. In addition, the national system used to accumulate and calculate credits was replaced with a credit system that complies with ECTS (the European Credit Transfer System). Following the degree reform, the University of Helsinki drew up new policies for all university degrees.

Checkpoint system (Etappi)

The University of Helsinki has set up a system to monitor and support study progress, the aim being to boost studies and speed up the completion of degrees. Study progress, that is, the number of accumulated credits, is monitored at different checkpoints and progress is supported using the curriculum and personal guidance. The requirements for accumulated credits are defined in each Faculty, and the Faculties also hold responsibility for the system. The system is coordinated by the University, which centrally provides Faculty-specific register extracts and related reports.

CIMO

CIMO (Centre for International MObility) is an expert service organisation for international affairs, which coordinates, for example, ERASMUS exchange programmes in Finland. It is subordinated to the Ministry of Education.
### Constructive Alignment

The University of Helsinki’s Programme for the Development of Teaching and Studies defines constructive alignment in the following way:

“In order to be consistent, all the elements of teaching should promote learning and competence to help students achieve high-quality, profound understanding. From the point of view of consistency, teaching is based on four important stages: 1) determination of learning objectives, 2) determination of the subject and content of teaching, 3) determination of assessment methods and 4) determination of teaching methods. In curriculum design, these four stages must be aligned. When the different stages support each other, teaching has a unified and consistent effect on the learner.”

The concept was originally launched by John Biggs in 1966.

### Cooperation meeting

A meeting arranged in compliance with the Act on Cooperation within Undertakings, which aims to improve employees’ opportunities to influence decisions that affect their work, working conditions and position in the company.

### Credit

The University of Helsinki awards credits in compliance with the ECTS (European Credit Transfer System). The annual workload of students is 1,600 hours. In this context, workload refers to the amount of time in which an average learner is expected to attain the required learning outcomes. One year of full-time studies corresponds to 60 credits.

### Curriculum core analysis

The curriculum core analysis is a tool used to plan and develop university degrees. The purpose of the tool is to help teachers to understand the hierarchies and relationships between the theoretical and practical skills of the subjects they teach and to ensure that they are in line with the time available to students for learning, with the degree requirements and with the curriculum.

Curriculum core analyses focus on the internal structure of the subject taught. Teachers categorise the skills and knowledge related to their subject into different classes. The usual number of classes is two to four, depending on the subject and topic. The categorisation of skills and knowledge is based on their importance. For example, in a three-way categorisation information is divided into core content, complementary knowledge and special knowledge. Core content covers all the skills and knowledge that students must master in order to assimilate new information. The presentation and adoption of the core content should take up most of the time allocated to the course. The goal is for all students to understand the core content.

### Degree reform

See: Bologna process

### eHOPS

eHOPS is a tool that helps students at the University of Helsinki to draw up a personal study plan online.
| **ERASMUS** | Erasmus is Europe’s biggest exchange programme for university students. It was established in 1987. The Erasmus programme supports cooperation and mobility between European institutions for higher education. |
| **Flexible Study Rights scheme** | Based on an agreement made by Finnish universities, students can complete courses in institutions other than their home university and include the courses in their degree. Studies are free of charge, but students must separately apply for a study right. |
| **LUMA Centre** | The LUMA Centre is an umbrella organisation coordinated by the Faculty of Science of the University of Helsinki to bring schools, universities and industries together. The aim of the LUMA Centre is to promote the learning, studying and teaching of natural sciences, mathematics, computer science and technology at all levels. |
| **OODI** | Oodi is an information system jointly developed by Finnish universities to support teaching and studies. Oodi includes the personal information and study rights of students. All completed credits and degrees are also registered in the system. Oodi offers tools for both administrative employees and students. The tool used by students is called WebOodi. |
| **OpasOodi** | OpasOodi is a tool in WebOodi that enables faculties to create and publish study guides with information about, for example, degree structures, study modules, courses and individual teaching events. |
| **OSCE** | The Objective Structured Clinical Examination is used to test the clinical skills needed in the practical work of doctors. It consists of standardised cases played out by actor patients. OSCEs have been used at the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Helsinki since 2000. |
| **PBL** | Problem-based learning. PBL is a form of instruction/learning that is used, for example, in the Faculty of Medicine at the University of Helsinki. PBL typically consists of students working in groups to solve a large number of concrete problems or phenomena related to everyday life and/or scientific research. These are called cases and are handled in seven phases: 1) examination of the topic, 2) definition of the problem or phenomenon, 3) brainstorming, 4) development of an explanatory model for the phenomenon, 5) specification of learning goals, 6) individual study and 7) analysis and assessment of the information learned. A tutor teacher is present at the first and last phase. The teacher’s role is to supervise the setting of learning objectives, to provide guidance in group work and to assist students in the search for learning materials and other similar matters. The method was originally developed in Canada, at the McMaster University, in the late 1950s. |
| **Period teaching** | Instruction at the University of Helsinki is divided into four periods. The autumn and spring terms are both split into two seven-week periods of teaching, separated by a one-week break. The goal of period teaching is to support the learning process, to facilitate student exchange programmes and mobility between faculties and universities, as well as to make studies more systematic. Teachers benefit from period teaching, as it enables them to take a leave of absence for research. |
| **Personal study plan** | At the University of Helsinki, the requirements for the Bachelor’s and Master’s degrees include a personal study plan drawn up to support students. The study plan is a tool for planning and guiding studies to ensure the completion of the degree and to support the smooth progress of studies. Students draw up a personal study plan for the entire duration of studies. The plan is regularly checked with the help of guidance and feedback. The goal is to help students to reflect on and assess their own competence and learning. The personal study plan consists of the student’s study plan and schedule, learning objectives and continuous self-evaluation during his or her studies. |
| **Portfolio** | Academic portfolio. An academic portfolio is an account similar to an academic report, in which the author documents his or her core professional competence and reviews his or her academic work (research, teaching, administrative duties and other tasks) as a whole. Academic portfolios are used, for example, when filling posts and in review discussions. Teaching portfolio. A portfolio that describes competence related to teaching. |
| **Review discussions** | Review discussions are meetings between a superior and subordinate, which are planned and agreed on in advance, have a specific objective and are systematic and regular in nature. The University of Helsinki recommends conducting discussions once a year in the autumn. From the employees’ point of view, the discussions focus on plans for the coming year, as well as on the content of work based on, for example, the University’s strategy and the needs of the personnel and units. The goal is for review discussions to work as a tool for putting the strategy into action. Review discussions are not synonymous with salary-related assessments of personal work performance. |
| **Survey of learning and learning environments** | The survey of learning and learning environments belongs to a research project coordinated by the Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education, which aims to provide information about teaching and studies in different disciplines. Among other things, the survey provides information about the ways in which university students approach learning and how their experiences of the learning environment change over the course of their studies. It also indicates how students’ learning and their experiences of the learning environment differ depending on the discipline. |
| **W5W, W5W2** | The W5W projects are funded by the Ministry of Education to support the national degree reform in 2004–2006 and 2007–2009. Their goal is to promote the quality of the practical implementation of the degree reform especially in the fields of curriculum work and study guidance in Finnish universities. As a part of the project, universities are offered training, consultation and material. |
| **WebOodi** | WebOodi is a student and study register used at the University of Helsinki to store information about the courses that students complete. Most faculties also use it for course and exam enrolment. Students can also use WebOodi to follow their completed studies request an unofficial transcript of studies as an e-mail draw up a personal study plan browse the degree requirements and instruction offered give course feedback make an address change register as an attending or non-attending student. |
| **Work plan** | A work plan is a written plan in which the teacher and the head of department agree on the teacher’s annual work contribution and describe future duties. Work plans are based on the department’s action plans and curricula. |
Abstract
The University of Helsinki is a research-intensive university with a leading position in Finland. In the University Strategy it is stated that “the University of Helsinki will establish its position among the leading multidisciplinary research intensive universities in Europe”. As part of its quality assurance and strategic development, the University of Helsinki regularly conducts evaluations of its education and research. The previous evaluation of education, which was of considerable scope, was carried out between 2001 and 2002. The results of this evaluation included a recommendation for the evaluation of the management of education. The selected focus of the present evaluation is thus the management of education, investigated from the viewpoint of both leadership and management. Without doubt, this approach can be deemed to be novel also on the international level.

The management of education at the University of Helsinki is a topical issue connected to the reform of the University's management system, the organisation of research and teaching and the streamlining of relevant decision making. When the evaluation project was planned, it was not known how quickly the upcoming university reform in Finland would be launched. Now, this report is being published in the middle of the university reform. The report offers the University recommendations for strategic planning at an opportune moment and enables the University to benefit from outside expert views in the upcoming process of change.

Self-evaluations in the faculties and departments were implemented in the form of cooperative learning processes, which, in the manner of enhancement-led evaluation, promoted and tested the university community's understanding of the strengths and weaknesses of the management of education.

The external evaluation was conducted by an international panel consisting of 12 experts. The panel was chaired by Professor, Vice-Rector Eva Åkesson from Lund University. The Panel interviewed over 400 members of the academic community.

The strengths, good practices and development proposals presented in the evaluation report offer both a detailed analysis of the present state of affairs and recommendations for development.

The main four evaluation topics were as follows:

1. **Setting strategic objectives and translating them into concrete measures**
   
   The breadth of expertise in the University was seen both as a strength and a real opportunity for future development.
   
   A longer time span for the University's Strategic Plan, at least a five- to six-year strategic horizon, was recommended.

2. **The support provided by follow-up data (numeric and qualitative) for the management of education**
   
   The Teaching Evaluation Matrix and the experiences of the teaching and learning questionnaire (ETLQ) and of the checkpoint system were considered strengths.
   
   The evaluation recommended that the University review the present arrangements for the collection and use of management information at all levels. Much data is collected, but its use is often imprecise; some information is collected but not used.

3. **The distribution of responsibilities and labour in the management of education**
   
   The University's strong tradition of democratic and participative governance was considered a strength. There is a strong awareness of the need to involve all staff in the development of policy. The Centre for Research and Development of Higher Education and the University-wide system of senior lecturers in university pedagogy received praise.
   
   A detailed review of the University's decision-making structures at all levels was recommended.
   
   The faculties should define and elaborate more explicitly what a learner-centred approach means in their disciplines.

4. **Service management within the sphere of academic administration**
   
   The very high level of professional commitment and expertise among the staff at all levels in the University was found to be impressive. The University has responded positively to the demands of the Bologna process.
   
   The panel recommended a review of the quality control of the student checkpoint system.

**Keywords:** evaluation of education, university development, leadership and management
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TOIMITTAJAT
Seppo Saari & Minna Frimodig (Eds.)


Tiedekuntien ja laitosten itsearvioinnit toteutettiin yhteistoiminnallisena oppimisprosessina, jossa kehitettävän arvioinnin menetelmän tuotettiin yliopistoyhteisön yhteistä ymmärrystä yliopistojen kehittämiseen liittyvistä vahvuudesta ja heikkouksista.


Raportissa esitetyt vahvuudet, hyvät käytännöt ja suositukset tarjoavat sekä yksityiskohtaisia nykytilan analyysiä että runsaasti ehdotuksia yliopiston kehittämiseen.

Arvioinnin neljä pääteemaa olivat:

1. **Strategisten tavoitteiden asettaminen ja niiden tulkinta konkreettisina mittareina**

   Yliopiston laaja asiantuntijuus nähtiin sekä vahvuutena että hyvänä kehittämisen mahdollisuutena.

   Yliopiston strategiakausia suositeltiin pidennettäväksi ainakin viiden–kuuden vuoden mittaisiksi.

2. **Määrällisen ja laadullisen seuranta-aineiston kerääminen johtamista varten**

   Vahvuutena pidettiin opetuksen arviointimatriisia, opintojen etenemisen seurantaa, ja opiskelijapalautetta sekä niistä saatuja kokemuksia.

   Raportti suositti yliopiston arvioivan nykyistä informaatio-ohjauksen tiedonkeruuta ja sen käyttöä johtamisessa kaikilla tasoilla.

3. **Vastuiden ja työmäärän jakautuminen koulutuksen johtamisessa**


   Yliopistolle suositeltiin päätöksenteon yksityiskohtaisia tarkasteluita kaikilla tasoilla.

   Arviointi esitti, että opiskelijoiden lähestymistapa koulutuksessa määritellään tarkemmin.

4. **Palvelutoiminnan johtaminen koulutuksen hallinnossa**

   Arviointi totesi, että yliopiston henkilökunta on kaikilla tasoilla ammatillisesti korkeatasoista ja sitoutunutta. Yliopiston todettiin vastanneen positiivisesti Bologna-prosessin kehitysvaateisiin.

   Arviointi esitti, että yliopiston henkilökunta on kaikilla tasoilla ammatillisesti korkeatasoista ja sitoutunutta. Yliopiston todettiin vastanneen positiivisesti Bologna-prosessin kehitysvaateisiin.

   Arviointi esitti, että yliopiston henkilökunta on kaikilla tasoilla ammatillisesti korkeatasoista ja sitoutunutta. Yliopiston todettiin vastanneen positiivisesti Bologna-prosessin kehitysvaateisiin.

   Opiskelijoiden seurantajärjestelmää suositeltiin tarkemmin arvioitavaksi.
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Sammandrag


Ledningen av universitetets undervisningsverksamhet är ett aktuellt tema som ingår i reformen av hela universitetets ledningssystem, organiseringen av forskningen och undervisningen samt klarläggandet av det relaterade beslutsfattandet. När utvärderingen planerades visste man ännu inte hur snabbt universitetsreformen skulle komma igång. Den rapport som nu publiceras kommer emellertid mitt i reformen. Den ger universitetet rekommendationer för den strategiska planeringen i precis rätt tid, så att man vid förändringen kan dra nytta av synpunkter som givits av utomstående sakkunniga.

Fakulteternas och institutionernas självvärderingar genomfördes som en inlärningsprocess i samverkan, där man i form av utvecklande värdering gav uttryck åt och testade universitetssamfundets förståelse av universitetets styrkor och svagheter inom ledningen av undervisningsverksamheten. Den externa utvärderingen genomfördes av en internationell panel bestående av tolv medlemmar. Panelens ordförande var professor, prorektor Eva Åkesson från Lunds universitet. Panelen intervjuade över 400 personer vid Helsingfors universitet. De styrkor, bästa tillvägagångssätt och förslag som framlägs i rapporten ger både en detaljerad analys av nuläget och rekommendationer för utveckling.

Utvärderingens fyra huvudteman var:

1. Uppställande av strategiska mål och tolkning av dem med konkreta mätare
   Universitetets vida expertis sågs som både en styrka och som en faktisk möjlighet för den framtidiga utvecklingen.
   Universitetets strategiplan rekommenderades bli utsträckt till att omfatta åtminstone fem, sex år.

2. Insamling av kvantitativt och kvalitativt uppföljningsmaterial för ledningen
   De starka sidorna ansågs vara matriisen för utvärdering av undervisningen och (ETLQ), erfarenhet av enkäter om undervisning och inlärning och av kontrollsystem.
   Saker att utveckla var de nuvarande systemen för insamling av information för ledningen på alla nivåer inom universitetet.

3. Fördelningen av ansvaret och arbetet inom ledningen av utbildningen
   En styrka ansågs vara den starka demokratiska traditionen och en engagerad förvaltning, som fick erkännande. Det finns en stark känsla vid universitetet för att engagera hela personalen i utvecklingspolicyen. Universitetspedagogiska forskningsenheten och universitetspedagogiska lektorer ansågs vara bra.
   En detaljerad granskning av beslutsfattandet rekommenderades på alla nivåer.
   Fakulteterna bör definiera och tydligare precisera vilken betydelse studentcentrering ska ges vid utvecklingen.

4. Ledningen av serviceverksamheten inom administrationen av utbildningen
   Utvärderingen konstaterade att personalens högklassiga professionella engagemang och expertis på alla nivåer var synnerligen påfallande. Universitetet konstaterades ha svarat positivt på de utmaningar Bolognaprocessen ställde.
   En närmare kontroll eller utvärdering av systemet för uppföljning av studenterna rekommenderades.

Nyckelord: utvärdering av utbildningen, utveckling av universitetet, ledning