PROJECT REPORT
SPEAQ YEAR 2 PARTNER PROJECTS

Institution: University of Deusto
Institutional coordinators: Maria Luz Suárez Castiñeira and Asier Altuna García de Salazar
Title of project: Enhancing the quality of study programmes through the interaction of the three quality circles

SUMMARY

Provide a short description of the project

This project is closely related to the participation of Modern Language students in enhancing the quality of their own degree. A group of Modern Language students submitted their own ideas of how to improve the quality of a number of aspects related to their Modern Language Bologna degree. This was done as a necessary complement to the official quality questionnaires carried out by the quality unit of the university and offered by the Faculties and departments at the university. In this light, their views can be seen as a valuable asset within the Speaq project, as students take into their own hands not only quality assurance but, more importantly, quality enhancement. Their views offer a close reflection on the Bologna process and how this is implemented. Accordingly, their document together with a reflection on how the other quality assurance procedures of the university prove to be valid approaches to quality from a bottom up approach.

Suffice to say, that whether the students' views can sometimes be seen as complaints, after close reflection and personal interviews with the students; they also saw their ideas as suggestions for necessary improvement. Students did not see their views only as complaints; but rather as possibilities for interaction within the aspect of quality in their own degree but in higher education in general.

One of the salient aspects the students stressed was that the degree programme should first of all be relevant for them, their interests and their future and that, therefore, outcome oriented programmes cannot be created, organised or improved without the input of students.

Their complaints and suggestions have brought to the surface a number of key issues: 1) that there are contradictions between different views of quality (students', teachers' and quality managers'), 2) that those quality views are not easy to reconcile and that there exists a lack of dialogue and interaction among the three; this makes it impossible for quality to be enhanced as interaction is not present, and 3) that internal and external quality assurance processes do not necessarily measure students' satisfaction with a study programme.

The Faculty and Department authorities took the students' suggestions as an opportunity for reflection on the issues raised by the students and, should it prove necessary, were willing and ready to introduce curricular adaptations and submit them to ANECA (Spanish National Agency of Quality) again. The whole process will have a longer timescale but we think it is an interesting case study linking the different and necessary stakeholders in the interaction of the quality circle in Higher Education.

It is important to point out that at the University of Deusto, and within the context of the challenges represented by the Bologna reforms, the student voices are generating interesting interaction dynamics unthinkable years ago. Accordingly, a shift toward student and stakeholder interests away from the pure supply perspective which had dominated Spanish universities for decades is taking place. This case study proves to be relevant within this context. Therefore, the overall aim of this project is to study the interaction between the three quality circles and the dynamics generated during the process so as to determine how enhancement can be achieved. Tough this project has involved, mostly, Modern Language degree students, the rationale, process and methodology can be outcomes of any other programme students.

BACKGROUND/CONTEXT

Why was this project chosen for implementation (out of the potential projects initiatives identified

by your institution in the SPEAQ first year activities)?
The Bologna degrees had been implemented three years before and the modern-language related degrees were going to be revised following the students and other stakeholders' suggestions. We felt it was a good moment to promote and study the interaction between the three quality circles and see how their different quality views could be negotiated. The information, reports and stakeholders involved were also easy to reach and all this facilitated the access to first hand information for our analysis.

What immediate needs did the project answer?

The immediate need was to accommodate the Modern Language degrees to students' expectations, the labour market as well as the views of the institution itself. We wanted to find out how the students' contributions in the process of the review their degree programme could be negotiated within the already existing institutional mechanisms of revision. The Bologna degrees had already been implemented three years before and now there was readiness to invest time and effort to improve those aspects where need for improvement had been identified by students, instructors and higher academic bodies within the university. Because quality development in higher education represents both a significant procedure and great deal more than the formal quality assurance processes, the meaningful interaction between the three quality circles concerned should be promoted and not only at the level of learning and teaching but also at the level of degree programme review. The student-centred approach Bologna proposes is also applied to student's involvement in the design, implementation and review of programmes.

OBJECTIVES

Indicate aims (as bullets):

- To study the interaction between the three quality circles and the dynamics produced so as to determine how enhancement in the quality of degrees can be achieved.
- To look into de various quality dimensions emerging from the students' and other stakeholders' feedback questionnaires (those generated by the quality managers as well as those produced by the students themselves in order to get feedback from their own classmates).
- To compare/confront quality questionnaires of the different stakeholders and see quality uncovered/ neglected aspects in each.
- To promote "alternate systems" in which students are more actively involved in internal quality assurance procedures, and not only through formal/traditional student feedback questionnaires.
- To propose timelines of action and revision so that degrees are close to reality and meet the changing needs of students, the labour market and/or society.

Were the objectives set achieved? If not, why not?
Yes

ACTIONS/ACTIVITIES

Describe the actions completed and provide photos from any of the activities, if available
- We have required a copy form the Quality Unit of all official questionnaires sent to the different stakeholders
- We have analyzed the dimensions of quality covered in those questionnaires
- We have contrasted those official questionnaires with the questionnaire produced by the students themselves in order to get feedback from their degree mates concerning a number of quality issues which they considered were not covered by the official questionnaires
- We have had meetings with student representatives, teachers and quality managers
- We have followed the process of degree revision

Choose one activity and detail as an illustrative case study/example of the work carried out in the institution

ANALYSIS OF THE DIMENSIONS OF QUALITY COVERED IN BOTH THE OFFICIAL AND UNOFFICIAL QUESTIONNAIRES

Activities	Participants	Deadlines	Results (Measurable)
Stage 1 1. Analysis of the various quality dimensions emerging from the students' and other stakeholders' feedback questionnaires (those generated by the quality managers as well as those produced by the students themselves). 2. Look for quality uncovered/ neglected aspects in each.	Project leaders	February 1-25	Written summary of the different meanings of quality as revealed in the analysis of the questionnaires as well as of the quality gaps/neglected aspects in each.

Questionnaire 1: teaching process evaluation (answered by students (See Annex 1)
Analysis
At the end of each semester students are asked to fill in a questionnaire about the quality of their teacher's performance in each module.
This questionnaire represents the primary tool for students to reflect on quality processes in, first, a specific module and, second, in the module as a significant part of their degree.
The questionnaire comprises 30 items which can be marked from TOTALLY AGREE to TOTALLY DISAGREE. The items cover a variety of issues: the teacher's individual and group relationships, coherence in the teacher's attitude, the design and issuing of study guides, the achievement of the generic and specific competences within the module, the use of ICTs in class, tutorial support, methodological strategies in class and their adequacy to the module, explanation and coherence of the correction and assessment criteria, teacher's enthusiasm, promotion of critical thinking, time management, use of the subject to reflect on reality in terms of social injustice.
The questionnaire makes the students reply to an answer about how the teacher makes them reflect upon their enhancement in their learning process, and how the teacher makes suggestions so that

they can improve (the word quality, however, does not appear as such!)

As for minor aspects that we feel are not properly addressed by the questionnaire filled in by students, one of the issues that does not appear in this questionnaire is the adequacy and relevance of any subject/module to the degree in general. This fact does not make the student understand how some subjects or modules are really fitting for the final profile of the degree.

Besides, although the questionnaire makes the student reflect upon social issues and values, we feel, however, that the student does not have a say on the relevance of subjects or modules for the student's employability in the future.

PROBLEM:

One of the main problems of this questionnaire is that it is the same questionnaire for every single subject/module and the questionnaire is used every semester year after year. This fact may make the filling in of the said questionnaire a repetitive task that does not motivate reflection on the students' side.

Questionnaire 2: teaching process evaluation (teacher's self-evaluation)
Analysis

At the end of each semester teachers are also asked to fill in a questionnaire about the quality of their performance in each module or subject.

The questionnaire comprises 30 items which can be marked from TOTALLY AGREE to TOTALLY DISAGREE. The items covered are the same ones which appear in the one filled in by students; but taken from the perspective of teachers.

In that respect, the same problems of repetition and routine can be applied to this questionnaire.

PROBLEM:

Many teachers see no reason in filling in questionnaires year after year in which class specificity or the cases of individual students do not appear in the questionnaire. Many teachers believe that a reflection of individual cases could prove as cases or events of reference for future teachers and teaching practices. This practice could be envisaged as part of any enhancement of quality within their subjects and the degree as a whole.

Besides, some items as social justice, values, etc… are for many teachers not a matter of their teaching practice.

WHAT COULD BE MISSING

We believe every student should be filling in a different type of questionnaire in which his/her individual performance and learning approach could be somehow assessed. That is, a set of questions which dealt with the students' individual work could also make us reflect on the suitability of the student-centred approach.

This practice could help different stakeholders realize whether the adequacy and relevance of a subject/module exist and whether the subject/module fits in a student's understanding of the whole narrative of the degree as a tool of enhancing quality and a clear instance of applicability of the module and degree to his/her future professional life.

Questionnaire 3: questionnaire on student's satisfaction at the end of the year. See Annex 2
Analysis

At the end of each academic year students are asked to fill in a questionnaire about different issues regarding the degree and the university. With a marking scale of very satisfied to not satisfied in a range of 5, students are asked to respond to 18 items and have a box for extra suggestions.

The questions deal with overall satisfaction with the degree programme, the quality of teaching and tutorials, adequacy of volume of work to be carried out by the students both in class and outside class, the coordination of subjects during the academic year, the relationship student-teacher,

communication channels of the university, university and faculty webpages, the work undertaken at the dean's office, other general university services (restaurant, sports, etc.), different facilities and timetables.

PROBLEM:
As with the individual questionnaires filled in at the end of each semester, we believe some issues are not covered by this questionnaire at the end of the academic year. The students' point of view regarding the quality of their effort and individual performance is not present in this questionnaire either. Besides, there is no question/set of question which addresses the relevance of the academic year for future employability. This fact, in a way, demonstrates the narrative of the degree profile and the employability after is not present for the student. Further questions regarding the learner's own attitude towards his/her studies plus his/her own performance are not part of this questionnaire at the end of the academic year.

Questionnaire 4: questionnaire on teacher's satisfaction at the end of the year
Analysis
At the end of each academic year teachers are also asked to fill in a questionnaire about different issues about the degree and the university. With a marking scale of very satisfied to not satisfied in a range of 5, teachers are asked to respond to 19 items and have a box for extra suggestions.
The questions deal with satisfaction with the degree programme, the quality of teaching, adequacy of volume of work to be carried out by the students, the coordination of subjects, the relationship student-teacher, communication channels of the university, university webpages, the work carried out in the dean's office, general university services (restaurant, sports, etc.), different facilities and timetables.
There is also a number of questions that refer to the relevance and adequacy of mobility for students and staff, the importance of internships in the degree, the pedagogical model that the university offers, and how well prepared the students are at the completion of their degree programme.
This questionnaire seems to be better focused than the one for the students in the sense that employability and quality of learning are items that appear in it. The teacher in this respect has a say about many different issues and, in a way, has a broader picture of the narrative of the degree.

Questionnaire 5: questionnaire produced by Modern Language Degree students. See Annex 3
Analysis
A significant number of students considered that the official questionnaires prepared and distributed by the university through the UTIC (quality body within the University of Deusto) did not cover a number of aspects they considered important. For students, the answers to those questionnaires, therefore, did not reflect the gaps and incoherencies they saw in the new Bologna degree programme.
The quality dimensions addressed in the questionnaire produced by the students themselves are conveyed mainly through open questions that refer to the following categories of items:

1. Items related to the languages of instruction
2. Items related to the curriculum design (subjects, internships, …)
3. Items related to the quality of teaching and tutorials
4. Items related to the suitability of the degree modules to satisfy the needs of the labour market

Questions focus:

Positive elements
Negative elements
Aspects to be improved
Language levels required

Classroom size
Discipline-related subjects (available and expected)

ANALYSIS

At first sight, just to comment briefly on the issues above, we can see that the students already tackle the main weaknesses we encountered in the official questionnaires distributed by the UTIC at the end of their semester and the academic year. Some of them may seem minor in relevance. However, those related to employability and the importance of the performance of the student also seem a matter of concern for the students.

From the students' feedback we can make a list of strengths and weaknesses. As will be seen, those aspects regarded as weaknesses by the students refer to quality of the degree programme and how the quality circles do not seem to function correctly. The students believe that the relevance and adequacy of the degree to their future employability should be essential and for that reason some of the modules or subjects should fit better within the degree:

Strengths:
- The degree has an acceptably good humanistic basis
- A second compulsory foreign language
- Erasmus mobility
- Teacher quality
- Timetables

Weaknesses:
- Very general subjects
- Study of language and culture lacks depth (more specific subjects needed)
- Shortage in language provision/offer
- Shortage of subjects taught in Basque and English
- Gap between practical skills and theoretical knowledge provided on the one hand and employment market needs on the other.
- Lack of progression in the design of the study of the second language (incoherence in curriculum design)

Aspects to be improved:

The aspects indicated in the weaknesses mainly. Special emphasis should be paid to curriculum design and employability, according to the students. In this respect, specialization seems to be the answer for students. We should point out, however, that the new design of curricula at national level presents the bachelor degrees as general programmes, leaving specialization for the level of MA.

Did you cover all activities planned for? If not, why not and where are you at? Are there intentions to complete the activities not covered in the future?
Yes

Please provide a summary of the feedback regarding the activities from the stakeholders participating in your partner project

In general, the participants were willing to engage in the activities proposed and appreciated the focus of the project. For students, it was really interesting to see that a European project was considering the questionnaires they themselves had designed to get feedback from their classmates on a number of quality aspects important to them but not covered by the institutional questionnaires. They also appreciated the interest of the project coordinators to promote new practices of interactive discussion between the different stakeholders concerned, especially discussions that would involve increasing participation of students on issues that were not only related to academia but also to their future and their employability.
The student representative interviewed appreciated how this mini-project within Speaq had brought to the surface their own questionnaires and also how their action regarding quality could also be analysed and repeated in other European countries.
The quality managers appreciated this new interest in quality issues at a moment when many lecturers and students were apparently getting tired with having to answer questionnaires on different matters concerning not only teaching and learning but also research matters, university services, etc. They suggested they would be happy to read the results of the comparison between the different questionnaires involved.
The Modern Language Department authorities willingly provided the project coordinator with the material they had been handed in by the student representatives. This material had been previously discussed in a meeting where most Department teachers were present.

DELIVERABLES

Describe the deliverables produced, i.e. podcasts, worksheets, blogs, wikis, interactive quizzes etc. (and provide as annex)

Include the list of deliverables you are annexing
The deliverables of the project include questionnaires (Annex 1 and 2), summary reports of the interviews and meetings held with the different stakeholders (Annex 3). Other documents, like the different suggestions and proposals for modifications of the Study Plan proposal as well as the official document sent to the Quality Agency are confidential and therefore we do not have the permission to upload them.

Were the deliverables anticipated achieved? If not, why not.
Yes

Please provide a summary of the feedback regarding the deliverables from the stakeholders participating in your partner project.

Our deliverables will have two main recipients.
On the one hand the department will have access to our findings and suggestions and will most probably tackle some of the main issues raised by the students in their questionnaires. This has already had some impact on the quality of the programmes involved, as the department is already envisaging changes in the degree, which will address employability too.
On the other hand, our findings will also be sent to UTIC, the internal quality body at the university. We will discuss with them the possibility of including some of the ideas students shared with us and

that could enhance some of the items in questionnaires.
In this way, our idea of putting the three quality cycles in action will really make sense.

IMPACT

Describe the impact the project has had.

The project feeds on not only the official questionnaires designed by the institution Quality Unit (UTIC) meant to evaluate teaching and learning processes but also on questionnaires designed by the students themselves to get feedback on issues the former questionnaires do not cover. In this sense by comparing the "official" and "unofficial" questionnaires we can get a complete view of quality aspects that in one way or another should be evaluated by University departments, such as for example the coordination of the different modules of the programme, the coherence of the programme design, or its suitability in terms of student preparation for the labour market. It seems that these aspects are not necessarily covered by the "official" questionnaires.

Therefore, the projects has initiated a dynamics promoting a system by which students are more actively involved in internal quality assurance procedures:

- It gives importance to students' participation in quality processes which also involve the needs they see as important.
- It makes the interaction of all stakeholders necessary and relevant in order to make degree programmes more modern and up-to-date.

We have produced documents and conclusions on how extra quality variables can affect traditional quality questionnaires as these can be seen as deficient in showing the needs of programme design under the Bologna process requisites. We have submitted a copy of the conclusions to the Institution Quality Unit in charge of designing the questionnaires.

However, the most immediately measurable impact is that the Department of Modern Languages, after seriously considering the views expressed by the students, and also their instructors, concerning the aspects that needed revision in the modern language degrees, were ready to invest time and effort to improve those aspects that seemed reasonable and were seen viable by the institution. After negotiating the modifications at various levels, a commission worked on the document to be submitted to the ANECA (the Spanish quality agency) and submitted it a few weeks ago in order to get their approval.

The students are, unarguably, the most important stakeholders of Higher Education systems. The interest and participation of students at all levels in both internal quality assurance and external quality assurance need to play a central role. At the University of Deusto, the students' voice has passed from being minimal to being fundamental in a few years; from abstention in participation processes to feeling that it is possible for them to influence the running of departments and faculties. However, the main challenge for the students who are involved in quality processes is that they still are not seen, and do not see themselves as collaborators in, more than users of, higher education so that they become important actors in quality enhancement.

This project shows that little by little, students are giving up the role of being merely passive receivers of the training process, and are beginning to participate in all stages of the decision making process, formulating learning and teaching practices and providing ideas on how to adapt study programmes. Seeing that this participation is becoming a reality, though it will still take some time before this is seen as the norm by all stakeholders, has been the most rewarding aspect.

Did the project have the impact envisaged? If not, why not.
Yes

> **Please provide a summary of the feedback regarding the impact from the stakeholders participating in your partner project**
>
> Students, and also instructors, expressed their satisfaction that the project had been able to promote interactive discussions that had led to a number of modifications in the study curriculum; their voices had been heard to some extent, though the last stages in the negotiations of those modifications have, according to the students, not been very transparent, probably because of time constraints. However, they saw as positive that this project was able to record the process.
>
> Quality managers expressed the view that everybody gad gained in those discussions, and that even if the ideas on quality expressed by the different stakeholders were not always in agreement, the fact that they were able to discuss such a sensitive issue as quality was already a very positive sign.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION

> **Describe ways you evaluated the activities and the outcomes**
>
> As explained above, the activities received positive feedback from all the participants, mostly from students who saw that their voice and contribution had been taken into account for the revision of the Modern Language Degree and that the modifications proposal had been negotiated and sent to the National Quality Agency for approval.

> **How did the project address the quality assurance agenda of your institution?**
> - It gives importance to students' participation in quality processes which also involve the needs they see as important.
> - It fosters student-centred approach not only in learning and teaching but also in processes of quality assurance and enhancement.
> - It makes the interaction of all stakeholders involved necessary and relevant in making degree programmes more modern and up-to-date.

> **How did the project connect the three quality circles and with what effect?**
>
> From the very beginning, the project set out to maintain the three main actors of the quality circles in close analysis. Thus, interviews were undertaken and different responses were compared.
> In this sense, it was easier to perceive how change and action could be taken at any moment as long as the interaction of all the actors involved was properly analysed.
> It turned out that the connection of the three quality circles enabled a closer look at quality; and more importantly, that quality assurance and enhancement are not seen as something difficult to achieve but as necessary steps in the improvement of degrees.

> **What were the major difficulties encountered?**
>
> - Different views of quality
> - Students not always informed about steps taken, especially at the end
> - Time constraints

> **What kinds of constraints or impositions affected the implementation, if any?**
>
> - Participation in degree review process as a whole at an institution-wide level is still limited but something has been achieved within the limits of this process.
> - Students still have the preconceived idea that their feedback counts very little, and do not

see themselves as collaborators in, more than users of, higher education.

Describe dissemination methods applied/envisaged and provide photos from any dissemination events, if available

The project was disseminated in several ways:
- Webpage: http://www.iee.deusto.es/servlet/Satellite/Page/1329900605133/_cast/%231116406939495%231329900605133/UniversidadDeusto/Page/PaginaCollTemplate
- Conferences: "Second Colloquium on World Languages and Cultures" organized by a group of Modern Language and Humanities students and lecturers and celebrated at the University of Deusto on 6-7 March 2013. A power point was presented with the main objectives.
- Meetings with colleagues
- Meetings with quality managers
- Distribution of flyers in information points in the various university buildings of the UD
- Project Tuning Russia: dissemination of the project in various Russian universities: Russian State University of the Humanities, Moscow 17 June 2013; Tula State Lev Tolstoy Pedagogical University, Tula, 22 June 2013.
- Presentation of Project at the University of Pune, India, August 2013
- Reference to Speaq in the book *Marcos interpretativos de la realidad social contemporánea / Egungo gizarte errealitatea interpretatzeko bideak*. Mercedes Acillona López (ed.), Serie Maior, 10 (Ciencias Sociales y Humanas), Universidad de Deusto, 2012. ISBN: 978-84-9830-354-4. 252 págs. Edición impresa y Edición digital (Formato: pdf). See http://www.deusto-publicaciones.es/ud/paginas/vendidos/novedades_115_c.html

Please provide a summary of the feedback regarding the dissemination from the stakeholders participating in your partner project

Students representatives said they were impressed by the posters and by how the posters reflecting their case had reached no only the different stakeholders within the universities involved but such a wide audience in different countries.
As for the feedback from the other stakeholders, it has not reached us yet.

Describe continuation/multiplication/exploitation plan, if appropriate.

Future revisions of the quality questionnaires should be in place at a regular basis as the needs and suggestions from the actors in the three quality circles are of utmost importance for the design and improvement of degree programmes in Higher Education.

Deusto
Unidad Técnica de Innovación
y Calidad (UTIC)
Berrikuntza eta Kalitateko
Unitate Teknikoa (BKUT)

CUESTIONARIO DE EVALUACIÓN DE LA DOCENCIA POR LOS ESTUDIANTES

A continuación vas a encontrar una serie de afirmaciones que tratan de recoger tu visión sobre el modo en que, en general, el profesor cuya docencia evalúas ha desarrollado algunas de las actividades y tareas propias de su proceso docente durante el periodo evaluado y en relación a esta asignatura o materia.

Señala la casilla correspondiente, según tu grado de acuerdo con dicha afirmación:

TD - Totalmente en Desacuerdo

D - Desacuerdo

N - Neutral

A - De Acuerdo

TA - Totalmente de Acuerdo

	TD	D	N	A	TA
1. Muestra coherencia entre su discurso y su forma de actuar.	○	○	○	○	○
2. Muestra un trato equitativo y justo con todos los estudiantes.	○	○	○	○	○
3. Cumple los compromisos adquiridos en el Programa y Guía de aprendizaje.	○	○	○	○	○
4. Nos ayuda a reflexionar desde la asignatura sobre la realidad en términos de justicia social.	○	○	○	○	○
5. Define las Competencias que se van a trabajar en la asignatura y la forma en que se van a evaluar.	○	○	○	○	○
6. Señala los métodos que se van a emplear para trabajar cada una de las competencias a desarrollar.	○	○	○	○	○
7. Edita en soporte electrónico la documentación necesaria para el seguimiento de la asignatura.	○	○	○	○	○
8. Utiliza las TIC (Tecnologías de la Información y Comunicación) como apoyo para impartir la asignatura.	○	○	○	○	○
9. Gestiona el tiempo de trabajo de los estudiantes de acuerdo con el Plan de Trabajo establecido.	○	○	○	○	○
10. Estima de forma ajustada el tiempo para la realización de los trabajos y actividades de los estudiantes.	○	○	○	○	○
11. Informa con antelación sobre el Plan de trabajo de la asignatura para poder organizarnos.	○	○	○	○	○

12. Nos ofrece un apoyo, tanto personal como grupal, para facilitar nuestro aprendizaje.	○	○	○	○	○
13. Plantea preguntas que nos hacen pensar sobre nuestra experiencia de aprendizaje	○	○	○	○	○
14. Propone problemas y tareas complejas, cuya resolución es un estímulo para nosotros/as.	○	○	○	○	○
15. Tiene un trato amable y cordial.	○	○	○	○	○
16. Atiende a las cuestiones y demandas que le planteamos.	○	○	○	○	○
17. Se muestra abierto/a y dispuesto/a al diálogo.	○	○	○	○	○
18. La metodología que utiliza nos ayuda a realizar las tareas de manera autónoma.	○	○	○	○	○
19. El material didáctico (presentaciones, bibliografía, problemas, casos, ...) facilita nuestro aprendizaje.	○	○	○	○	○
20. Promueve la responsabilidad de todos en la buena marcha de la clase.	○	○	○	○	○
21. Favorece la participación activa de los estudiantes.	○	○	○	○	○
22. Estimula la generación de ideas y propuestas por los estudiantes.	○	○	○	○	○
23. Indica los criterios de evaluación de modo que entendamos lo que se espera de nosotros/as.	○	○	○	○	○
24. Indica los criterios de calidad utilizados para la corrección y calificación de los trabajos.	○	○	○	○	○
25. Nos devuelve información sobre las actividades y trabajos con el fin de que podamos mejorar.	○	○	○	○	○
26. Realiza tutorías (on line, en clase, en el despacho) para el seguimiento de los trabajos.	○	○	○	○	○
27. Promueve la planificación de metas personales de estudio y aprendizaje en los estudiantes.	○	○	○	○	○
28. Cuando hacemos alguna pregunta nos responde de forma clara.	○	○	○	○	○
29. Ha mostrado entusiasmo impartiendo esta asignatura.	○	○	○	○	○
30. Considero que ha sido un profesor/a competente.	○	○	○	○	○

Deusto

Unidad Técnica de Innovación
y Calidad (UTIC)
Berrikuntza eta Kalitateko
Unitate Teknikoa (BKUT)

SPEAQ

14��

Dentro de nuestro Sistema de Garantía Interna de Calidad uno de los procesos estratégicos es el proceso "Satisfacción de los grupos de interés". Por ello, es indispensable conocer vuestro estado de satisfacción actual, que nos servirá de referencia para la mejora continua de nuestro plan de estudios y de nuestro centro.

Kalitatea bermatzeko dugun barne sistemaren barruan, "intereseko taldeen gogobetetasuna" neurtzea da prozesu estrategikoetako bat. Hori dela eta, behar-beharrezkoa da zuen gogobetetasuna ezagutzea, ikasketa plana eta ikastegia etengabe hobetzeko erreferentzia gisa balioko digu eta.

Valora por favor, marcando con una X cada apartado según tu grado de satisfacción de Muy bajo a Muy alto, o déjalo en blanco si te resulta desconocido.

Mesedez, baloratu atal bakoitza Oso baxutik Oso altura X baten bidez adieraziz, zure gogobetetasun mailaren arabera edo utzi erantzun barik gaia zuretzat ezezaguna bada.

Grado de Satisfacción/ Gogobetetasun maila	Muy bajo/ Oso baxua	Bajo/ Baxua	Medio/ Ertaina	Alto/ Altua	Muy alto/ Oso altua
1. El **Plan de estudios** **Ikasketa plana**	U	U	U	U	U
2. **Carga de trabajo** (Valora si estás satisfecho o no) **Lan karga** (baloratu gogobetetasun maila)	U	U	U	U	U
3. La adecuación de los **procedimientos y criterios de evaluación** **Ebaluazio prozeduren eta irizpideen** egokitasuna	U	U	U	U	U
4. El grado de **coordinación entre las asignaturas del plan de estudios** (No duplicación de contenidos, orden progresivo de impartición de asignaturas, etc). **Ikasketa planeko irakasgaien arteko koordinazio** maila (Hemen ez da baloratu behar edukiak errepikatu diren, irakasgaietan ordena progresiboari jarraitu zaion, etab.)	U	U	U	U	U
5. La **calidad del profesorado** **Irakasleen kalitatea**	U	U	U	U	U
6. La **relación profesor/a-estudiante** **Irakaslearen eta ikaslearen arteko harremana**	U	U	U	U	U
7. La **metodología de aprendizaje** **Ikaskuntzaren metodologia**	U	U	U	U	U
8. El **sistema de tutoría** (utilidad de la tutoría) **Tutoretza sistema** (tutoretza zenbateraino den baliagarria)	U	U	U	U	U

	Muy bajo/ Oso baxua	Bajo/ Baxua	Medio/ Ertaina	Alto/ Altua	Muy alto/ Oso altua
9. La **labor de información** realizada por los/as tutores/as Tutoreek egindako **informazio lana**	U	U	U	U	U
10. La **atención** prestada por los/as tutores/as Tutoreek eskaini didaten **arreta**	U	U	U	U	U
11. La adecuación de los **horarios** que establece la Facultad Fakultateak ezarritako **ordutegien** egokitasuna	U	U	U	U	U
12. La **información de la página Web** de la Facultad Fakultateko **web orrialdeko informazioa**	U	U	U	U	U

Grado de Satisfacción/ Gogobetetasun maila	Muy bajo/ Oso baxua	Bajo/ Baxua	Medio/ Ertaina	Alto/ Altua	Muy alto/ Oso altua
13. Los **canales de comunicación** establecidos **entre los estudiantes y la Facultad** **Ikasleen eta Fakultatearen** artean ezarrita dauden **komunikaziorako bideak**	U	U	U	U	U
14. La **calidad de la atención** que me presta el personal de la Facultad Fakultateko langileek ematen didaten **arretaren kalitatea**					
Equipo Decanal Dekanotzako lantaldeak	U	U	U	U	U
Secretaría de Decanato Dekanotzako Idazkaritzak	U	U	U	U	U
Bedeles de Facultad Fakultateko eskolazainek	U	U	U	U	U
Monitores de salas de ordenadores Ordenagailu geletako monitoreek	U	U	U	U	U
15. El **prestigio** que te merece la Facultad Zure iritziz Fakultateak merezi duen **prestigioa**	U	U	U	U	U
16. Tu **satisfacción global** con la Facultad Fakultatearekiko **gogobetetasuna oro har**	U	U	U	U	U
17. Las **actividades** (culturales, deportivas, valores, sociales...) que ofrece la Universidad Unibertsitateak eskaintzen dituen **ekintzak** (kultura, kirol, balio, gizarte eta abarrekoak)	U	U	U	U	U
18. Las **instalaciones y servicios** que ofrece la Universidad: salas de ordenadores, salas de estudio, laboratorios, CRAI, etc Unibertsitateak eskaintzen dituen **instalazio eta zerbitzuak:** ordenagailuen gelak, ikasgelak, laborategiak, Unibertsitateko Liburutegia, etab.	U	U	U	U	U
19. Por último, si tienes algún **comentario o sugerencia**, por favor indícalo a continuación. Cuanto más concretes la información y el personal a quién va dirigido más fácil será establecer las acciones de mejora oportunas. Azkenik, **oharrik edo iradokizunik** egin nahi baduzu, egizu hemen, mesedez. Zenbat eta zehatzago adierazi zein ohar edo iradokizun egin nahi duzun eta zein langileri zuzenduta dagoen, orduan eta errazago ezarriko dira hobekuntzak lortzeko ekintza egokiak.					

Muchas gracias por tu colaboración/ Eskerrik asko zure laguntzagatik

Annex 3

CUESTIONARIO DISEÑADO POR LOS ALUMNOS DE LENGUAS MODERNAS

FEEDBACK SOBRE EL PLAN DE ESTUDIOS DE LENGUAS MODERNAS (Alumnos)

Esta encuesta es voluntaria y anónima. Se realiza con el fin de saber la opinión que los estudiantes de Lenguas Modernas de 1º, 2º, 3º y 4º curso, tienen sobre la calidad académica de nuestro plan de estudio.

1) En tu opinión, ¿qué elementos positivos tiene el Grado de Lenguas Modernas?

2) En tu opinión, ¿qué elementos negativos tiene el Grado de Lenguas Modernas?

3) ¿Qué cosas se pueden mejorar en nuestro Grado?

4) ¿Consideras que se debe exigir el mismo nivel de inglés a las cuatro titulaciones de Grado (Humanidades, Filología Vasca, Lenguas Modernas y Lenguas Modernas y Gestión?

- Si
- No
- Razones:

5) ¿Crees que debería ofrecerse en todas las asignaturas la opción de elegirlas en euskera, inglés o castellano?

- Si
- No
- Razones:

8) Para un buen trabajo en clase, el número de personas en el aula, para el estudio de idiomas (inglés, chino, francés, alemán, euskera):

- Crees que está bien.
- Deberían ser grupos de más de 20 personas.
- Deberían ser grupos de menos de 20 personas.
- Indicar cuál es el número adecuado y porqué

7) ¿Consideras que nuestro grado debería tener desde 2º curso más asignaturas relacionadas con la lengua y la cultura inglesa, en la mención en inglés, y con la lengua y la cultura hispánica, en la mención hispánicas?

- Si
- No

8) Después de estar cursando el grado de Lenguas Modernas (1º, 2º, 3º 4º) en la Universidad de Deusto, ¿te has planteado la posibilidad de cambiar de universidad?

- Sin
- No
- Añadir razones:

9) En la siguiente pregunta marca con un círculo el asterisco de la opción que elijas. Pueden seleccionar más de una opción:

De las siguientes asignaturas, ¿cuáles crees que deberían estar en nuestro plan de estudios?

* Relacionadas con el estudio de la lengua y la lingüística: Gramática, fonética, fonología, lingüística, sintaxis, etc.

* Relacionadas con el estudio de la literatura: Poesía, narrativa, teatro, etc.

*Relacionadas con el estudio de la cultura y la historia de los diferentes países de habla inglesa e hispana.

* Relacionadas con el estudio de la cultura y la historia de los países de la 2ª lengua.

* Relacionadas con el estudio de traducción

Stage 4 Follow-up of action taken by the stakeholders involved: degree aspects to be reviewed, participants in the reviewing process, problems met, quality dimensions taken considered, why? etc…	Project leaders, Heads of Depts., students, quality managers	April-July	Feedback report

As part of stage 4, the information below is taken from an hour's interview with a student and also class representative of 4th year Modern Languages.

This student also took part in the student internal report (the report based on the feedback received from the students themselves as a response to the questionnaire designed by a group of students) submitted to the Faculty and department with regard to issues affecting, in their view, the quality of the degrees following the Bologna process. As is apparent in the introduction to their report, the students are aware of their new role within the new system.

After over 1 years of the report submission, we thought it was essential to collect some more feedback on the way the faculty and departments was dealing with the students' feedback and how the students viewed the institutional responses to their understanding of quality enhancement.

Some comments:

- The report had been sent as a warning to the department and faculty, as students saw at that time that what they expected from the degree was not actually what they were being offered.
- Once they had reached their final year and saw a wider and more accurate picture of the degree, their view of the degree slightly altered and did not agree with some of the points related to the comment above as. They think, however, that a clearer picture should be given from day one of the degree, and to achieve this some changes were most probably needed.
- They appreciated how they were treated by the head of the department at that time and some teachers, but not all, as some of the teachers were not clear about the very degree themselves.
- As for the curriculum design they think that some of the basic pillars of studies in modern languages should be introduced at an earlier stage. (Phonetics, grammar, different skills, history of civilisations, more literature). Students believe that by the time they reach 4th year all these should have been introduced in a better way. They think that there is room for that and not for other subjects.

- Students believe that the variety of subjects looks ok once you are in 4th year. This is the best year for most of them and though the number of subjects is varied, they protest that the quality of some of these subjects (teaching and what is expected and taught could be revised urgently).
- As for ECTS, they think that the time that is allotted for most of the tasks to be performed is not realistic. It is sometimes impossible to see to all these as a student. Most students can understand the idea of the student-centred approach; but, they also believe that team work should be better explained. The timings are not clear and a lot more is expected in the 4th year.
- 3rd year seems to be a problem as most students are on Erasmus mobility and there is no correlation between what they do in those universities in other countries and what they do in their home university.
- As for quality, this individual student seems to be happy but she believes most of the other students do not probably agree with her.
- She believes that many of them feel sad and angry that no response was given to them after that report although they have heard from unofficial sources that some changes will take place in the design of their study programme. However, they are happy to have contributed to quality enhancement, as they feel responsible for initiating the important process of their degree review.
- She thinks that what they wrote can be considered as their part in the process of quality enhancement and believes that if students had a more important say on all these issues many of the misunderstandings could be solved at many other levels in the university. One of the most important obstacles to be solved is communication.

As part of stage 4, the information below is taken from interviews with the Head of the Department of Modern Languages and different lecturers.

These interviews were carried out with the Head of the Department and many of the academics of the department of Modern Languages as they also took part in the introduction to the Speaq project last year. Most of these academics were also aware of the unofficial report submitted by students of modern languages and many of these academics are also in charge of proposing changes in the curriculum. Therefore, these are essential persons of interest to contact for our mini-project.

After 2 years of the submission of the students' questionnaire-report, we thought it was essential to collect some more feedback on the way the faculty and departments dealt with students' responses to quality so as to better understand the students' involvement in quality enhancement.

Some comments:

- Most academics found projects like Speaq really helpful and useful as it gives them time to reflect not only on their own subject as such, but also on the whole curriculum and the design of the study programme.
- They believe that the questionnaires distributed by faculties and departments are a necessary and very useful tool. However, because of the constraints of time and the length of the questionnaire, not all items are examined carefully.

- A wider reflection like Speaq, with the quality cycles, gives them the chance to see to important issues regarding quality enhancement and quality assurance and how to better insert it into their teaching practice.
- Lecturers find sometimes difficult to add the employability component into their teaching practice. Students want to know how their degree will help them to enter the labour market and academics feel that their dedication to their own subject sometimes prevents them from seeing the whole picture of the design of the curriculum. Besides, in some subjects, not necessarily theirs, the employability focus can be better applied.
- Lecturers feel there should be more flexibility in the re-design of study programmes, as they feel there is too much paper work to be sent to different ministerial bodies in order to make necessary changes in the curriculum.
- The question of quality in the teaching practice and in the student's learning process is vital for all academics. Although they sometimes feel it is difficult to best incorporate how quality should be present from day one in their practice, they feel it should have an important place.

As part of stage 4, the information below is taken from interviews with the Head and members of the UTIC (quality agency of the university of Deusto).

These interviews were carried out with the Head of the Quality Unit and a member in charge of sending and elaborating the questionnaires of the Faculty and the University. They had been acquainted with Speaq as they also took part in the first phase of the project last year.

Their interest in the project was crucial as they wanted to see how quality was perceived from the different stakeholders; and more importantly, how a European project like this could shed some light on how quality was enhanced and assured in Europe once the Bologna process was well under way.

Some comments:

- The UTIC (quality agency of the University of Deusto) found projects like Speaq really useful as it gives their quality body a wider sample of data for reflection on many issues regarding quality and not only the design of study programmes.
- They believe that the questionnaires distributed by faculties and departments are a necessary and very useful tool. However, they also feel that they want to have feedback from other stakeholders who are participant in the whole idea of quality.
- As with academics, a wider reflection like Speaq, with the quality cycles, gives this quality body the chance to see to important issues regarding quality enhancement and quality assurance and how to better insert it into their questionnaires on a yearly basis.
- One of the worries that the UTIC is finding is that the completion of questionnaires is seen as a routine task. In this way, many of the questionnaires are filled in quickly and without paying much attention to the wording of the items.
- They also see that through their work and projects like Speaq, there is an awareness of the changes that could be needed for the enhancing and assurance of quality.