

O2. A Bank of Good Practices

Introduction

The aim of this project output was to identify, collect, and share good practices for improving access, retention, and success in Higher Education for vulnerable groups and non-traditional learners. More specifically, we have created

- a clear criteria for identifying and evaluating good practices and
- methods, materials, and a platform for collecting and disseminating them.

The bank of good practices is targeted at all people and institutions interested and involved in developing accessibility in high education, who wish both to learn and evaluate other institution's good practices and share their own practices through evaluation.

In this project's context, practice refers to *performing habitually or customarily a specific technique, method, process, activity, policy or strategy*. To be a good practice, a practice has to *serve the desired purpose better than an average practice*. Good practice differs from the best practices in the sense that is *a common practice that works, something that is actually practised*, while the best practice is something that surpasses all others in excellence but may not be yet very commonly practised.

Formal and content-related criteria are used to identify good practices. They are described under the following subheadings. In addition to this, we gathered information of success factors required for the successful and sustainable implementation of good practices as well as the challenges that may constrain its implementation.

A template has been created for collecting and sharing good practices. This was completed by the people involved in the implementation. Information was also gathered through interviews conducted with the people involved. The set criteria serve as (1) a self-evaluation tool for identifying good practices. Before publishing a good practice, however, it went go through (2) an expert evaluation (i.e. to be evaluated and accepted as a good practice by experts of this areas such as university staff members, policymakers, and student union representatives). When published, each good practice was also exposed to (3) peer evaluation (i.e., rated by the peers familiarizing with the description).

Criteria for selecting good practices

A FORMAL CRITERIA

A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION: Is the information about the practice **publicly available**? YES/NO

A2. TIMEFRAME: **Since when** has it been in use (time frame)? What is its maturity level (initial, intermediate, advanced)? Is there evidence of its duration in the long run?

A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS: **How many students** are involved? Is the number representative considering the target group?

A4. SCALABILITY: Has it been or can it potentially be scaled up and practiced in a wider scale? Or, has it been or can it potentially be scaled down (e.g., from larger to smaller institutions)?

A5. TRANSFERABILITY: Has it been or can it potentially be transferred and applied to different (a) target groups, (b) institutions, and (c) societies? Can you name some practices that this initiative was developed from or has inspired to?

A6. ASSESSMENT: How has it been evaluated? How has it proved its relevance as the most effective way to achieve the objective? How was it successfully adopted? How has it had a positive impact on people? How has the impact been measured?

A6.1 **User evaluation** (all stakeholders involved) YES/NO

A6.2 **Self-evaluation** YES/NO

A6.3 **Peer evaluation** YES/NO

A6.4 **External expert evaluation** YES/NO

A7. CONTACT: Who can be contacted to seek **support and networks** for implementing the practice?

B CONTENT CRITERIA

B1. SOCIAL JUSTICE PRINCIPLES (see Nelson & Creagh, 2013):

B1.1 **Self-determination**: Have students participated in its (a) design, (b) enactment and (c) evaluation? Is it possible to make informed decisions about the participation?

B1.2 **Rights**: Are all participants treated with dignity and respect? How have their individual cultural, social and knowledge systems been recognised and valued?

B1.3 **Access**: Is there active and impartial access to the resources (e.g., curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, and financial resources)?

B1.4 **Equity**: Does it openly demystify and decode dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts?

B1.5 **Participation**: Has it led to socially inclusive practices? Does it increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness?

B2. COLLABORATION: Is there collaboration between various stakeholders? Does the practice increase this collaboration?

B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION: What is the student perception of this initiative? Is there evidence of their satisfaction? (see also A4)

B.4 STUDENT WELLBEING: How does it influence students' (a) psychological, (b) social, (c) academic, and (d) physical wellbeing? What kind of evidence there is for improved student wellbeing?

Template for collecting good practices v 1.0

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Title	
Key words (3 to 5 key words)	
Objectives (2 to 3 objectives)	
Phase of studies (Choose all phases to which it applies)	Access Retention Graduation Transition to work-life
Type of degree (Choose all degrees it applies)	Bachelors Graduate Masters
Level (Choose all levels it applies)	International National Institutional Faculty Group Individual
Name of the institution	
Location (City and country)	
Target group/s	
Stakeholders involved	
Description of the organisational process <i>Actors, triggering evidence, campaigns, graph... (max. 300 words)</i>	

A. FORMAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION Provide sources of information (URL, websites, literature, materials)</p>	
<p>A2. TIMEFRAME Since when has it been in use? What is its maturity level (initial, intermediate, advanced)? Describe if there is evidence of its long term duration. (max. 70 words)</p>	
<p>A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS How many students are involved? Is the number representative considering the target group?</p>	
<p>A4. SCALABILITY (“volume”) Describe how it has been or can potentially be scaled up and practiced at a wider scale. Or, has it been or can it potentially be scaled down (e.g., from larger to smaller institutions)? (max. 70 words)</p>	
<p>A5. TRANSFERABILITY (from one context to another) Describe how it has been or can potentially be transferred and applied to different (a) target groups, (b) institutions, and (c) societies. If possible, name also some practices that this initiative was developed from or has inspired. (max. 70 words)</p>	
<p>A6. ASSESSMENT Describe how it has been evaluated. How has it proved its relevance as the most effective way to achieve the objective? How it was successfully adopted? How it has had a positive impact on people? How the impact has</p>	

been measured? Briefly describe how various forms of evaluations have been used in the assessment (A6.1 User evaluation, A6.2 Self-evaluation, A6.3 Peer evaluation, A6.4 External expert evaluation). Provide references, if possible. (max. 200 words)

A7. CONTACT
Who can be contacted to seek support and networks for implementing the practice (name, position, e-mail)?

B. CONTENT EVALUATION CRITERIA

B1. SOCIAL JUSTICE PRINCIPLES (see Nelson & Creagh, 2013)

<p>B1.1 Self-determination <i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i></p> <p><i>(How students have participated in its (a) design, (b) enactment and (c) evaluation and how they can (d) make informed decisions about the participation)</i></p>	<p><i>Very weakly</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Weakly</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Well</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Very well</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>B1.2 Rights <i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i></p> <p><i>(The extent to which all participants are treated with dignity and respect. How have their individual cultural, social and knowledge systems been recognised and valued)</i></p>	<p><i>Very weakly</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Weakly</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Well</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p><i>Very well</i></p> <input type="checkbox"/>

B1.3 Access <i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i> <i>(The extent to which active and impartial access to the resources is ensured (e.g., curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, and financial resources))</i>	<i>Very weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>
B1.4 Equity <i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i> <i>(To what extent it openly demystifies and decodes dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts)</i>	<i>Very weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>
B1.5 Participation <i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i> <i>(The extent to which it has led to socially inclusive practices. How far does it increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness?)</i>	<i>Very weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Weakly</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>	<i>Very well</i> <input type="checkbox"/>

<p>B2. COLLABORATION <i>Describe what kind of collaboration there is between various stakeholders. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	
<p>B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION <i>Describe the students perceptions of this initiative. Is there evidence of their satisfaction? (see also A6.1) (max. 200 words)</i></p>	
<p>B4. STUDENT WELLBEING <i>How does it influence students' (a) psychological, (b) social, (c) academic, and (d) physical wellbeing? What kind of evidence is there? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	
<p>C. FINAL REFLECTIONS (based on the previous description of you good practice)</p>	
<p>Success factors <i>What are the factors required for successful implementation? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	
<p>Sustainability <i>What is needed for the practice to be sustained? What resources are required? How does it contribute to environmental, economic or social sustainability? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	
<p>Challenges <i>What are the constraints identified? How easy is it to learn and implement? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	

Sources

Kunttu, K. 2005. The study ability model. The Finnish Student Health Service (FSHS). (http://www.yths.fi/filebank/692-ENG_OPISKELUKYKYMALLI_pdf.pdf)

Nelson, K & Creagh T. 2013. A Good Practice Guide: Safeguarding Student Learning Engagement. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane, Australia. (http://safeguardingstudentlearning.net/wp-content/uploads/2012/04/LTU_Good-practice-guide_eBook_20130320.pdf)

This document has been produced with the financial assistance of the European Union (Erasmus + Programme), through the project "ACCESS4ALL – Laboratory for Policies and Practices of Social Development in Higher Education" (Ref. 2015-1-ES01-KA203-015970). The contents of this document are under the sole responsibility of the authors and under no circumstances can be considered as reflecting the position of the European Union.

