

GENERAL INFORMATION	
Title	Accessible education at the University of Jyväskylä
Key words	Accessibility, Physical environments, Psychological environments, Social environments, ICT environments
Objectives	Equal opportunities to learning and participation for all university members
Phase of studies (<i>Choose all phases it applies</i>)	Access X Retain X Graduation X Transition to work-life X
Type of degree (<i>Choose all degrees it applies</i>)	Bachelor's X Graduate X Master's X
Level (<i>Choose all levels it applies</i>)	International National Institutional X Faculty X Group X Individual X
Name of the institution	University of Jyväskylä
Location (<i>City and country</i>)	Jyväskylä, Finland
Target group/s	All applicants, students, and staff but particularly community members with a disability, learning difficulty, ageing persons, cultural or linguistic minorities or other personal characteristics.
Stakeholders involved	Heads of units/Deans, applicants, students, University Services, Student Union, Faculties and departments, also regional (Educational organizations, NGOs, City of Jyväskylä), national (ESOK network , HEIs, NGOs, GOs) and international partners (Network of Disability Coordinators NNDC , various international networks and HEI contacts).
Description of the organisational process	(1) The heads of units are responsible for ensuring that the principles are followed to implement equal opportunities. (2)

	<p>Applicants and students are responsible for reporting on possible barriers and applying for individual arrangements. (3) University Services prepares multiannual plan to realize Rector's Decision together with Planning group of Student Services, university's departments and student representatives. It provides recommendations for individual arrangements and support in implementation (planning, communications, training). It meets annually with (4) the University management and (5) Board of the Student Union for annual action plans and reports. Accessibility is considered from the point of view of social, personal, physical, and ICT learning environments. Information is provided through JYU website which also provides an online form to report possible barriers in accessibility. Individual arrangements related to student admission and studies include, for example, assistive technology, individual guidance and study planning, expert interpreters or other personal assistants, additional time and breaks during the exams. To the extent permitted by the student, a person named by the head of the unit informs personnel about the arrangements in a centralised manner according to the agreement with the student.</p>
--	--

A. FORMAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

<p>A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION <i>Provide sources of information (URL, websites, literature, materials)</i></p>	<p>https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/esteet/eotietoa/accedu#annex (In English) https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/esteet (In Finnish) A guide for evaluating healthy, safety and wellbeing educational institutions by Finnish Student Health Service https://opiskelu.jyu.fi/fi/opiskelijapalvelut/ohjeet/THLterveysjaturvallisuuohjeet2015.pdf (In Finnish)</p>
<p>A2. TIMEFRAME <i>Since when has it been in use? What is its maturity level (initial, intermediate, advanced)? Describe if there is evidence of its duration in the long run. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>Since Rector's decision, 24th of June 2014. Its maturity level is yet initial but arrangements have been made to assure its implementation and continuity in a long run, for example, by distributing of responsibilities between different stakeholders.</p>
<p>A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS <i>How many students are involved? Is the number representative considering the target group?</i></p>	<p>In the case there is either a permanent or temporal need, all applicants and students at the University of Jyväskylä can apply for individual arrangements from University Services. Recommendations have been made to approximately 100 applicants and 50 students per academic year.</p>
<p>A4. SCALABILITY ("volume") <i>Describe how it has been or can 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)?</i></p>	<p>Arrangements are already scaled up at the institutional level and scaled down at the level of individual units and people.</p>

(max. 70 words)	
<p>A5. TRANSFERABILITY (from one context to another) <i>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 to. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>Individual study arrangements have been further developed based on the practices at the University of Turku (Finland). Their transfer has thus already proved possible. Principles apply to all types of individual needs and can be thus applied to different types of target groups as long as a statement from an expert assessing individual's needs are provided. Same principles can be applied in different institutions and societies as long as enough training, information, and resources are addressed to their application.</p>
<p>A6. ASSESSMENT <i>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 been measured? Shortly 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)</i></p>	<p>All university community members can report of accessibility challenges through an online form. The execution plan and actions taken are presented on the university webpage and can be openly commented by anyone. The actions taken are also reported each year to the university heads and student association. Also equity committee evaluates accessibility as a part of their equity planning. Within the limits of data privacy laws, quantitative and qualitative information is gathered on applicants' and students' wishes and needs to further develop the work. Presentations and trainings have increased knowledge and consciousness of students' rights and university's obligations. The increased awareness can be seen on increased contacts made, new initiatives and development projects. Knowledge of students' experiences of individual study arrangements as well as experiences of people in charge of these issues in each unit are collected via surveys. This information is used to improve practices. Also Finnish Student Health Service evaluates health, safety and wellbeing in educational institutions.</p>
<p>A7. CONTACT <i>Who can be contacted so as to seek support and networks for implementing the practice (name, position, e-mail)?</i></p>	<p>Accessible university: Hannu Puupponen hannu.puupponen@jyu.fi Student Services, contact for disabled students: Tuula Maijanen tuula.maijanen@jyu.fi Physical environment, Facility services: Timo Piispanen timo.e.piispanen@jyu.fi</p>

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>Very weakly</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Weakly</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Well</p> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>Very well</p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	---	--	--------------------------------------	--

<p><i>(how students have participated to its (a) design, (b) enactment and (c) evaluation and how they can (d) make informed decisions about the participation)</i></p>	<p>Applicants and students are responsible of informing possible barriers and of applying for individual arrangements. Student association and disabled students have been represented in with work group developing the proposal since the beginning. At the final phase of the resolution, student association and different university units could comment the proposal from their perspectives.</p>			
<p>B1.2 Rights Rate and Justify (max. 70 words) <i>(how it is assured that all participants are treated with dignity and respect. How have their individual cultural, social and knowledge systems been recognised and valued?)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>B1.3 Access Rate and Justify (max. 70 words) <i>(how it is assured that there is an active and impartial access to the resources (e.g., curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, and financial resources)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>B1.4 Equity Rate and Justify (max. 70 words) <i>(how if it openly demystifies and decodes dominant university cultures, processes, expectations and language for differently prepared cohorts)</i></p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well <input type="checkbox"/></p>
<p>B1.5 Participation</p>	<p>Very weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Weakly <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Well <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>Very well <input type="checkbox"/></p>

<p><i>Rate and Justify (max. 70 words)</i></p> <p><i>(how it has led to socially inclusive practices. How does it increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness?)</i></p>	<p>Students have an active part in identifying their personal needs. Providing equal access for all gives all community members possibilities to be connected and be part of the community. Heads of units are expected to create an atmosphere that is open to the diversity of the University community. Different environments, practices and services, which are available for all, foster sense of communality. In the opposite case, some situations or spaces would not be available for all, either by lack of awareness or interests towards differing needs.</p>
<p>B2. COLLABORATION</p> <p><i>Describe what kind of collaboration there is between various stakeholders. (max. 70 words)</i></p>	<p>University Services are in charge for the planning, communication, guideline creation and overall support needed to implement accessibility, as well as for the coordination and evaluation of the activity. They work in collaboration with faculties and departments or other university units. Applicants and students inform about possible barriers and apply individual arrangements through University Services.</p>
<p>B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION</p> <p><i>Describe the student perception of this initiative. Is there evidence of their satisfaction? (see also A6.1) (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>Practices have increased both students' and staff members' awareness related to accessibility issues. Information on arrangements are collected and students' experiences are collected in a student survey every second year and in equity survey in approximately every 3 years. Involving students in the design have assured that these practices match with their needs.</p>
<p>B4. STUDENT WELLBEING</p> <p><i>How does it influence on students' (a) psychological, (b) social, (c) academic, and (d) physical wellbeing? What kind of evidence there is? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>The model aims at increasing students' overall wellbeing by removing possible barriers for receiving high quality education and to be part of learning community. These arrangements provide students contacts outside of their own faculty, with whom they can collaboratively and with full confidentiality search solutions to diverse challenges related to equity and accessibility.</p>
<p>C. FINAL REFLECTIONS (based on the previous description of you good practice)</p>	
<p>Success factors</p> <p><i>What are the factors required for the successful implementation? (max. 200 words)</i></p>	<p>Model requires collaboration and participation of various entities and individuals. Rector's decision for promoting accessible education was crucial. Before that, there was no systematic approach and commitment from all entities. It is also crucial for strategic planning that data is collected and evaluated in a centralized manner. Also, by means of recommendations created for individual students, it is possible to assure that students in different units receive more equal treatment and more equal opportunities.</p>
<p>Sustainability</p> <p><i>What is needed for the practice to sustain? What resources are required? How it contributes to environmental,</i></p>	<p>The work at University Services or similar entities in coordinating, providing information and training is needed. Also time is needed for each unit to implement these practices. Improving accessibility in all its dimensions is a</p>

<p><i>economic or social sustainability?</i> (max. 200 words)</p>	<p>long-term work. Due to economical limitations, it may not always be possible to realize immediately all petitions related to it. Developing campus, facilities, IT systems, services, guidance and knowhow based on Design for All/Universal design, fosters social sustainability.</p>
<p>Challenges <i>What are the constraints identified?</i> <i>How easy it is to learn and implement?</i> (max. 200 words)</p>	<p>On one hand, there is a need for specialists in accessibility issues in all types of planning (e.g., physical, pedagogical or technological environments). Implementation may be challenging if not enough information and expertise is available. On the other hand, instead of having only few experts of these issues, it would be also important to assure that accessibility would be generally considered, for example, in teacher training and architectural studies so that all important stakeholders would have sufficient information on these issues and they would be taken into account in a natural manner.</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)