Jyväskylän yliopiston julkaisuarkisto
Jyväskylä University Digital Archive

UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.
This reprint *may differ* from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Author(s): Mäkelä, Tiina; Puupponen, Hannu

Title: Good Practices for Ensuring Access and Equity in Higher Education

Year: 2017

Version:

Please cite the original version:

Mäkelä, T., & Puupponen, H. (2017). Good Practices for Ensuring Access and Equity in Higher Education. In F. Dovigo, & L. Casanova (Eds.), Good Practices for equity and inclusion in Higher Education. Access4all : Laboratory for Policies and Practices of Social Development in Higher Education (pp. 41-55). Università degli Studi di Bergamo. Collana Educazione Inclusiva - Inclusive Education Series, 6. https://ddd.uab.cat/pub/llibres/2017/171121/A4A_BergConf_a2017.pdf

All material supplied via JYX is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, and duplication or sale of all or part of any of the repository collections is not permitted, except that material may be duplicated by you for your research use or educational purposes in electronic or print form. You must obtain permission for any other use. Electronic or print copies may not be offered, whether for sale or otherwise to anyone who is not an authorised user.

Good practices for improving access, retention and success in Higher Education

Tiina Mäkelä, University of Jyväskylä, Finland Hannu Puupponen, University of Jyväskylä, Finland

Introduction

In this paper, we will first present the evaluation criteria and template developed for identifying, collecting, and sharing good practices for improving access, retention, and success in higher education for vulnerable collectives and non-traditional learners. After that, we will present good practices collected at the University of Jyväskylä. The study has been conducted as a part of the Access4All project (2017) funded by European Union's Erasmus+ programme. The aim of this specific project task was to create clear criteria for identifying and evaluating good practices and methods, materials, and a platform for collecting and disseminating them. Platform was named as a bank of good practices. The bank of good practices is targeted to all people and institutions interested and involved in developing accessibility in higher education, who wish both to learn and evaluate other institution´s good practices and share and dispose their own practices under 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 the 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.

The criteria and template for identifying and collecting good practices were created in collaboration with the project partners but led by the University of Jyväskylä. The criteria was created based on a review of models such as Social Justice principles (Nelson & Creagh, 2013) and each partner's expertise on these issues. After the partner in charge of coordinating this task had created a first draft of criteria and template, suggestions were provided by the other partners. The first version of the template was then tested by each partner by describing one of their institutional practice using the template. Analysing the first good practices collected in one project meeting led to further improvements of the template and evaluation criteria. After final revisions were made, good practices were collected from both project partner higher educational institutions and from external collaborators. At the moment of writing this paper, a total of 54 practices from Finland, Italy, Romania, Portugal, Spain, and the UK have been collected and presented at the Access4All (2017) project webpage.

The template created for collecting and sharing good practices consists of a description of a general information to be collected on good practices. After that, it draws attention to formal and content-related criteria chosen for identifying good practices. In addition to this, it gathers information of success factors required for the successful and sustainable implementation of good practices as well as the challenges that may constrain its implementation. Table 1 presents the information collected by using the template

GENERAL INFORMATION	A. FORMAL EVALUATION CRITERIA
Title	**A1. ACCESS TO INFORMATION**
Key words	**A2. TIMEFRAME** *(initial, intermediate or advanced level of maturity)*
Objectives	**A3. NUMBER OF STUDENTS**
Phase of studies (*Access, Retain, Graduation, Transition to work-life)*	**A4. SCALABILITY**
Type of degree (*Bachelor's, Graduate, Master's)*	**A5. TRANSFERABILITY**
Level *(International, National, Institutional, Faculty, Group, Individual)*	**A6. ASSESSMENT** *(User evaluation, Self-evaluation, Peer evaluation, External expert evaluation)*
Name of the institution	**A7. CONTACT**
Location	
Target group/s	
Stakeholders involved	
Description of the organisational process	
B. CONTENT EVALUATION CRITERIA	**C. FINAL REFLECTIONS**
B1. SOCIAL JUSTICE PRINCIPLES *(Self-determination, Rights, Access, Equity, Participation)*	**Success factors**
B2. COLLABORATION	**Sustainability**
B3. STUDENT SATISFACTION	**Challenges**
B4. STUDENT WELLBEING	

Table 1. Template for collecting, evaluating, and sharing good practices in equitable access, retention, and success for higher education

General information collected consists of a title, keywords and from two to three main objectives of the good practice. Next, a person filling out the template was asked to name phases of studies, types of degrees and levels that the practice applied. In addition to documenting the name of the institution, city and country, specific target groups and stakeholders involved were asked. Finally, a general information included a description of the organisational process.

For formal selection criteria (A), the first criteria, (A1), "Access to information" was used to identify whether the information about the practice was publicly available. The second formal criteria (A2), "Timeframe", in turn, intended to find out not only since when the practice had been in use but also its maturity level and whether there was evidence of its duration in the long run. Criteria (A3), "Number of students", was used, in addition to documenting the number of students involved, to evaluate if the number was representative considering the target group. (A4), "Scalability", referred to whether the good practice had been or could potentially be both scaled up and practiced in a wider scale, and scaled down, e.g., from larger to smaller institutions. In (A5) "Transferability", attention was paid on its potential to be transferred and applied to different target groups, institutions, and societies. We also asked if there were some practices that this initiative was developed from or has inspired to. In (A6), "Assessment", focus was on how the practice had been evaluated and how its impact had been measured. Finally, in (A7), "Contact", we asked

who could be contacted so as to seek support and networks for implementing the practice.

In (B), "Content evaluation criteria", Nelson's and Greagh's (2013) Social Justice Principles were used as a first criterion (B1). In this section, we used both numeric ratings (1 = very weakly, 2 = weakly, 3 = well, 4 = very well) and an open space for justifying the rating. This section was divided into five following subcategories and questions:

- B1.1. Self-determination: Have students participated to 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: Has an active and impartial access to the resources (e.g., curriculum, learning, academic, social, cultural, support, and financial resources) been provided?
- 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?

Criterion (B2), "Collaboration", was added to the evaluation to find out if there had been collaboration between various stakeholders and if the practice increased this collaboration. We were also interested in (B3), "Student satisfaction", i.e., what the student perception of this initiative was and if there was evidence of their satisfaction, and in (B3), "Student wellbeing', i.e., how the practice influenced students' psychological, social, academic, and physical wellbeing and what kind of evidence there was on the improved student wellbeing.

There were also three following final reflections in the evaluation template.

- Success factors: What are the factors required for the successful implementation?
- Sustainability: What is needed for the practice to sustain? What resources are required? How it contributes to environmental, economic or social sustainability?
- Challenges: What are the constraints identified? How easy the practice is to learn and implement?

The evaluation template can be filled out by the people involved in the implementation. Information can also be gathered through an interview conducted with the people involved. The set criterion serves as a self-evaluation tool for identifying good practices. Before publishing a good practice, however, it has to go through an expert evaluation, i.e. is evaluated and accepted as a good practice by experts of this areas such as university staff members, policymakers, and student union representatives). When published, it is also exposed to peer evaluation.

Good practices at the University of Jyväskylä

The six good practices selected at the University of Jyväskylä (2017) aimed to give both an overall picture and different perspectives of the work that has been conducted at the univer-

sity in collaboration with various internal and external stakeholders. Information was collected either by asking people in charge of the practice to fill up the template or by interviewing them. Also different documents were used as a support materials for collecting information of the practices.

First practice, *Accessible education at the University of Jyväskylä* (2017) is university's strategy aiming at ensuring equal opportunities to learning and participation for all university members at the institutional level. It applies to all types of degrees and phases of studies starting from the access to the transition to work-life, and also work at the university. The strategy is targeted to everyone but particularly to community members with a disability, learning difficulty, ageing people, cultural or linguistic minorities or other personal characteristics or permanent or temporary situations requiring additional support.

Second, *Goodie operating model* (2017) aims at supporting student overall wellbeing and learning engagement. It applies all phases of studies at the stage of retain and graduation at the institutional level. The model is targeted to all university students meeting problems or challenges in their university life. Third, *Student Compass* (2017) offers guided online interventions promoting students' psychological wellbeing. Its main objectives are student wellbeing, prevention of problems, and development of wellbeing skills to be utilized during studying, in work and future life. It is applied on the institutional level to students at all degrees and in relation to retain, graduation, and transition to work-life. Fourth, gender equity in traditionally male-dominant subjects relates to equal study opportunities at the Faculty of Information Technology (2017) for both (or all) genders and transforming ways of thinking about IT. Actions apply from access to transition to work life in all types of degrees at the faculty level.

Fifth, University sports (2017) aims at providing all students and staff guidance and opportunities to do physical exercise thus supporting both physical and psychosocial wellbeing. It operates on a national level and applies to all university students and personnel. Sixth, Finnish student health service (2017) provides general, mental and oral health care services for students and promotes student health. It also aims to get students to assume responsibility for their own health (e.g., healthy lifestyles and physical exercise, relationships with other people). It is targeted to all university students except doctoral students during their studies. The Finnish Student Health Service is a nationwide service consisting of mental health professionals (psychiatrists, psychologists), general health professionals (doctors, nurses, counsellors, physiotherapist), and oral health professionals (doctors, nurses).

The following subsections present these practices from the point of view of formal and content evaluation criteria (see Table 1). After this, some final reflections are provided.

Formal evaluation criteria

Timeframe and number of students

In relation to formal evaluation criteria A4 Timeframe (see Table 1), Accessible education strategy (2017) has been vigent since Rector's decision, 24th of June 2014. Its maturity level is thus 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. 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 (Criteria A3, Number of students). Although the number is not high in comparison to student body of approximately 15 000 students, everyone has an equal right to apply for these arrangements.
Goodie operating model's (2017) maturity level for Finnish students is intermediate and for international students, initial. The practice was piloted with Finnish students during years 2011-2013 and from year 2013, it has worked as an established practice. Since year 2015, there has been a pilot phase for international students. Goodie wellbeing activities for Finnish students are based on 72 trained staff members in 19 departments thus covering nearly all university departments. Between 2013-2016 from the student body of 15 000, 1017 students have found their way to Goodie guidance. Piloting the Student Compass (2017) started, in turn, in Spring and the research in Autumn 2012. In 2013 the Student Compass was available for all students at JYU (Maturity level: intermediate). Between 2013-2016 there have been 2600 loggings to an online system and 231 students have met a coach in face-to-face sessions.

While the first three practices described are still relatively recent practices, *gender equity in traditionally male-dominant subjects* seems to be at more advanced maturity level. It has been more usual to have women highly represented in Faculty of Information Technology since 1970', especially in the Computer Science and Information Systems department. Since the definition of a broad faculty mission (approx. 5 years), more systematic work has been made in highlighting the importance of different and complementary perspectives in IT from all individuals representing both (or all) genders. Particularly in Masters' studies, there is a relatively high percentage (around 30 %) of female students in comparison to both earlier years at the faculty and in comparison with IT faculties in other universities. The department of Mathematical Information Technology continues, however, to be more male dominated than Computer Science and Information Systems department. For example, having more female coders is a relatively new phenomenon.
University sports (2017) has been working nearly 45 years. For example, a free sport course for students had existed nearly since the beginning of its existence. Based on the Master's theses (yet unpublished), the most active users at the university are from the Faculty of Sport Science (approx. 80 % of their students participate) and the least active users are from the IT faculty (approx. 29 % of students). The percentage of users in other faculties is around 50-60%. Finally, *Finnish Stu-*

dent Health Service (2017) has been functioning for 60 years. In recent decades, its services have become diverse. Also more attention is given to prevention and health instead of focusing on illnesses. More responsibility is given to nurses. Also digital tools are growingly used. All around 12 000 university students (not including doctoral students) are under these services. General and oral health services are frequently used by the students. Mental health services are used by the small percentage of students but this number appears to have increased in recent years.

Scalability and transferability

In relation to scalability (see A4, Table 1) and transferability (A5, Table 1), in *Accessible education* (2017) model, arrangements are already scaled up at the institutional level and scaled down at the level of individual units and people. 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.
Goodie operating model (2017) has already been scaled up to include not only Finnish students but also international students. Scalability may be successful as long as the networking and collaboration with various stakeholders will be lively. The model could be used in any HE institution in order to develop low threshold counselling at department level. It requires relatively little resources as agency is given to university teachers and students themselves instead of external stakeholders.
University sports (2017) has been scaled up to offer some services for polytechnics (JAMK and Humak) in the city. Target groups are already wide: students, staff members, people with varying ages, varying sizes and varying health conditions, etc. participate. Based on international exchanges, there may be cultural differences obstructing the transfer. For example, in some countries university sport may be more focused on professional sport than student and staff wellbeing. Activities may also be more expensive, fixed and closed.
Student Compass's (2017) self-guided independently used online program could be easily scaled up or down. Regarding guided online ACT intervention (Assessment Crisis intervention Trauma treatment), it is recommendable to organize the coach support in work community or locally. Student Compass guided online ACT intervention may be transferred to other universities and be utilized by young adults in general in various communities and societies.
Practices related to *gender equity in traditionally male-dominant subjects* could be scaled up or down. The same principles of valuing differences can be applied to any issues related to equity. There may be, however, a need to better model these practices and be more systematic so as to assure the scalability and transferability. At this moment, practices are still more based on general culture and natural ways of working providing all participants with autonomy, and trusting that they consider gender equality aspects in their individ-

ual practices. These practices reflect societal values related to gender equity and equity in general.

There has been discussion of extending *Student Health Service* (2017) to cover Polytechnics. Transfer to similar higher education institutions such as polytechnics is seen as relatively easy. When considering transfer to other societies, some issues should be considered. For example, it is important to assure that the nurses are highly educated, as they are given lots of responsibility. Divisions in work and hierarchies between doctors and nurses may also obstruct this working model. The work is based on collaboration and trust between different professionals. There is a need to view health holistically from various perspectives. In some societies, doctors are very specialized in one area, general health care perspective may be more difficult to obtain. In some cultures focus on prevention instead of curing may also be challenging. And finally, society's welfare services may differ from Finland (KELA, the Finnish Centre for Pensions is a mayor funder of these services).

Assessment

In relation to assessment (Criterion A6, see Table 1) of *Accessible education* (2017), 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 Equality Committee evaluates accessibility as a part of their equality 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. Also surveys are used to gather information. For example, there is a student survey every second year and Equality survey in approximately every 3 years.

In relation to *Goodie operational model* (2017), the developers have documented student feedback and Goodie adviser reports to be analysed for quality assurance. In Student Compass (2017), the feedback from the students who participate coach sessions is gathered by online questionnaire. Statistics of student access and retention are used to evaluate the gender balance within the faculty of IT (see e.g., University of Jyväskylä Equality plan, 2017). Also past projects such as *Understanding and Providing a Developmental Approach to Technology project* (UPDATE, 2017) have provided evaluation data. In addition to this, student surveys provide data.

University sports (2017) gathers feedback in many ways. There is, for example, a wide notice board where users can leave their messages. Messages written in one week's time are photographed and saved for the analysis. Feedback is also provided by means of surveys, and for example, in a Facebook. Student association has also organized theme weeks for expressing complains or providing positive feedback. Participants in the sport course write their learning diaries and also provide general feedback at the end of the course. *Student Health Service* (2017) is evaluated, for example, by a satisfac-

tion survey, online feedback, an electronic emoji-quick response tool. In addition to this, students in the Student Health Service board have organized surveys for students such as The Finnish Student Health Survey (2015).

Content evaluation criteria

Social justice principles

From the perspective of Social justice principles (see Table 1, see also Nelson & Creagh, 2013) and self-determination (B1.1), in Accessible education (2017) model, applicants and students are responsible of informing possible barriers and of applying for individual arrangements. When applying for these arrangements, group discussions are hold with the student, teacher, accessibility coordinator, and, if needed, with external experts. 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. In Goodie operational model (2017), students have not actively participated in program design but research results and students´ feedback has been taken into account in design, enactment and evaluation. The psychology students have actively participated in designing, enactment and evaluation of the Student Compass (2017). Students, and especially female students, are also actively involved at the Faculty of IT (2017), for example, through students' subject associations. At University sports (2017), activities are designed, enacted and evaluated in close collaboration with students (student association, subject associations, individual students...). In Student Health Services (2017), student board members actively bring students concerns on the table.

In Accessible education (2017) strategy, all individuals are provided rights (B1.2, see Table 1, see also Nelson & Creagh, 2013) of applying for individual arrangements based on an expert statement. Discussions related to them are confidential. In Goodie operational model (2017), actions plans for students are tailored to meet their individual circumstances by listening to their responses and issues. Piloting the English version of Student Compass (2017) was executed by a group of international students from various backgrounds in order to gather their views. The faculty of IT's (2017) approach highlighting everyone's individual traits instead of categorizing people based on their gender or other characteristics, can be viewed to respect everyone's rights. Students are also encouraged to participate in sport activities at the University Sports (2017) no matter what their background or skill level is. In Student Health Services (2017), information is provided in English and services are extended to foreign students as well. Training is also provided to professionals so as to be able to respect individual's fundamental rights.

These practices also seem to considers the access (B1.3, see Table 1, see also Nelson & Creagh, 2013) to information and services. Information is made available on webpages and social media (Finnish and English) and information sessions are provided for students. Accessible education model (2017) consid-

ers the access for personal, social, physical, and virtual learning environments. Practices and environments are also developed respecting the principles of Design for All (2017). For example, Student Compass (2017) is available online anytime for all students at JYU. At the University sports (2017) and Student Health Services (2017), services and activities are economical and even free of charge. Technological tools (e.g., text phone) are used to communicate with students with hearing or visual challenges. This communication is also sometimes facilitated by interpreters.

In relation to equity (B1.4, see Table 1, see also Nelson & Creagh, 2013), Accessible education (2017) strategy is based on the Non-Discrimination Act (20.1.2004/21) obliging authorities to alter particularly those circumstances that prevent the realisation of equality. While gender equity is supported at the Faculty of IT (2017), there seems to be gender-based preferences. For example, women tend to focus more on teaching, management, cognitive science and user-centeredness. There are more men focusing on coding. While breaking the traditional role divisions is encouraged, it is also possible that, for example, different cultures between two faculty departments influence individual's thinking and choices. At University sports (2017), the wide variety of activities enables equal participation for all. In Student Health Services (2017), questions regarding rights and equity are dealt in training for professionals. For example, there was a training considering people with transgender.

In relation to participation (B1.5, see Table 1, see also Nelson & Creagh, 2013), in Accessible education (2017) model, students have an active part in identifying their personal needs. Goodie activities (2017) have helped not only individual students but also affected the social environment by raising the awareness of responsibilities and possibilities to enhance student wellbeing. Student Compass (2017) intervention helps the student to find his/her own motivation and goals, which may increase the engagement in studies and belongingness in community. At the Faculty of IT (2017), students, and especially female students, participate actively, for example, through students' subject associations. There may be, however, a need to support male students in their social relations. Women seem to have stronger social networks than male students. This can be one factor also explaining why female students often advance better in their studies than male students. At University sports (2017), everyone is encouraged to participate; everyone is helped to find an activity suitable for them. Students from the IT faculty (seemingly less active University sport users) have been invited to test new pages for wellbeing so as to contribute to this work from their perspective. One part of Student Health Services (2017), are group activities (e.g., massage groups, conversational groups, weight control support groups, relaxation group activities, a group for students having eating disorders). Together with other possibilities to participate, these groups can increase students' sense of belonging and connectedness.

Collaboration

Networking and collaboration (Criterion B2, see Table 1) between various internal and external stakeholders characterizes all these practices. Some of the internal stakeholders are

- applicants, students, student ambassadors, University student services, University Services, University space services, heads of units or Deans, Faculties and departments, University teachers and other staff members, Personal study Plan Counsellors, University sport, Department for communication, Student association, and University subject associations.

External stakeholders entail, e.g.,

- Student Union, City of Jyväskylä (e.g., health and social services), public employment services, Finnish students' sport association, Finnish sport associations, ex-students (alumni), and experts in the fields represented by the university.

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. Work is also done in collaboration with regional (Educational organizations, NGOs,), national (e.g., HEIs, NGOs, GOs) and international partners (e.g., student and disability organizations such as Nordic Network of Disability Coordinators NNDC, 2017; Inclusive Higher Education (ESOK) project 2006-2011).

One example of the collaboration between various stakeholders is a Health working group consisting of Student Health Service, University sport, Pastoral care, and student members. Finnish Student Health Service and University sports also aim at identifying services for physically more passive students. University Sports had also been collaborating with Student association in training of sport tutors for each faculty. Student Health Service as well as University Language Center inform students of Student Compass. Its online program is developed together with University IT-services. Goodie wellbeing advisors also utilize and recommend Student Compass and the online exercises. Student Health Service units also collaborate in each city. Students can, for example, use services from other city, if there is no such a service available in hometown.

Student satisfaction and wellbeing

Evaluations on student satisfaction (Criterion B3, Table 1) and wellbeing (Criterion B4, Table 1) on Accessible education (2017) indicate that these practices have increased both students' and staff members' awareness related to accessibility issues. The increased awareness can be seen on increased contacts made, new initiatives and development projects. Students also appear satisfied with the Goodie operational model (2017). According to feedback from the students (n=59), 95% of respondents found guidance useful (got the help needed), 44% found Goodies very good in giving new viewpoints to clear up their situation, and 35 % found them good. Further,

98% of respondents experienced that they were heard in their situation and 90% found it easy to meet Goodies and found the service easily accessible. Students have also reported that Goodie operational model enables searching for help in an early stage and makes approaching Goodies easy as they are near the student community and conversations are kept as confidential. Information on the evaluations will be available in university webpages soon in both Finnish and English.

Based on online questionnaires on students who participate Coach sessions in Student Compass (2017), participants have been satisfied with them. Participants' satisfaction with the program has been 7.8 (on a scale 1-10). Further, self-evaluations show that Student Compass increases wellbeing and satisfaction with life also some time after the interventions. The results were maintained at the 12-month follow-up. Student Compass intervention helps students, for example, to reduce stress and symptoms of depression. (See Räsänen et al., 2016.) Based on student surveys, gender equity is not viewed as problematic by students at the faculty of IT (2017). When it comes to psychological and social wellbeing, based on overall observations, male students may require more support than female students.

Based on feedback provided by students on the sport course organized by the University Sports (2017), students value experiences obtained during it. They perceive that the climate is open and permissive. It has helped some students to get rid of negative opinions about sports. Activities are seen to promote physical and psychological wellbeing and satisfaction. Foreign students have also commented that these activities have provided opportunities for social life.

Based on the feedback received by Student Health Service (2017), approximately 70 % of respondents would recommend these services to others. Services and care is generally perceived positively. Negative feedback is most commonly related to long waiting time. Student Health Service (2017) can be viewed as an important contributor to students' psychological, social, academic and physical wellbeing. For example, students can get help with their anxieties, stress, economical problems, pressure, life skills (sleeping and eating habits), heavy drinking, hectic life rhythm and good social life. (See The Finnish Student Health Survey, 2015.)

Final reflections

Success factors, sustainability, and possible challenges.

As a summary of the success factors related to these practices (see Table 1), the following factors can be identified:

- national and international legal support (e.g., Act on Equality between Women and Men 609/1986; EU Directive 2016/2102/EU, EN 301549 Accessibility requirements suitable for public procurement of ICT products and services in Europe);
- cultural and societal support;
- support from the direction and university strategies;

- collaboration, networking, participation, and engagement of various entities and individuals;
- university community's shared vision and values;
- higher education research and research and research-based solutions;
- the quality, high professionality, and positive attitudes of the staff working with accessibility issues; and
- an ambient of trust and overall satisfaction.

Developing campus, facilities, IT systems, services, guidance and knowhow based on Design for All/Universal design, fosters social sustainability. Social sustainability is also promoted, for example, by Goodie training including information on learning difficulties and university accessibility policy. Maintaining and developing wellbeing and health are also economically and socially beneficial both for the individual and for the society. Student Compass, from its part, is cost-effective, easily accessible for any student anytime and anyplace, it saves time and reduces need to travel. Online interventions require, however, IT infrastructure, development and maintenance.

Time is needed to implement these practices. Improving accessibility in all its dimensions is a long-term work. Due to economical limitations, it may not always be possible to realize immediately all petitions related to it. There is also a need for entities and staff who coordinate, develop, maintain, provide information, support and training, as well as evaluate these practices. Projects related to these practices have enabled working with these issues in a more systematic manner. The challenge is how to sustain these practices after the project funding. There needs to be readiness to change and constantly develop oneself and the organization, based on changes in the society. One example of changes is the rapid digitalization of societies.

As an example of possible challenges (see Table 1) on Accessible education (2017) , on one hand, there is a need for experts 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. There is also a risk that in group discussions for individual arrangements, student´s voice is not respected. As a critic to this practice, it does not appear as completely inclusive as students may perceive that special arrangements are for special need students, which can be stigmatizing (cf. Wray, 2013; Waterfield & West, 2005).

One challenge at the University Sports (2017) continues to be how to motivate people with negative perceptions of physical exercise. Student Health Service model as it is known now is a result of 60 years of development supported by the welfare state model. Finnish society, Finnish social security and health services is going through structural changes which may affect its autonomy and economical support. Savings may put

the quality and quantity of services in danger. There seems also to be a growing need for services such as mental health services and even support for basic life skills.

All in all, maintaining relationships with all stakeholders is challenging. The current tendency of increasing work efficiency may also obstruct working with these issues. Further, evaluating the effectiveness (whether these practices improve students' wellbeing and success in studies) requires longitudinal studies.

Concluding words

Based on the good practices collected in Access4All project (2017) so far, evaluation criteria developed, appeared as a useful tool for identifying, sharing, and comparing good practices for access, retention, and success in higher education. We argue that it is important to evaluate practices from various perspectives. For example, although a number of students (Criterion A3, see Table 1) using the service may help to evaluate its success from the quantitative perspective, each individual's rights for support should be considered no matter how many students take advantage of the service.

At least some practices involve and affect many stakeholders. Providing equal opportunities as the method and the aim when planning and creating the practice has been an arena of disputes and various interpretations. So even thinking of applying the practices in new contexts (A4, Transferability) seems challenging without further background information of the sociocultural context where the practice would be transferred. In this sense, self-evaluation of possible transfer serves only as initial reflections to be confirmed if transferred into other context. On the other hand, questions on transfer can be seen as the essence of broadening the access "to challenge thinking about dominant cultures and ways of knowing in higher education institutions" as in Social Justice framework (Nelson & Creagh, 2013 106). Likewise, scaling up (A5) the services is dependent on the availability of resources such as time, money, personnel, working spaces, information, and training.

Finally, when comparing practices at the University of Jyväskylä, some general characteristics of these practices seem to be:

- the focus on overall (psychological, social, academic, physical) wellbeing;
- networking and collaboration with various internal and external stakeholders;
- Services provided by the state/municipality for students (e.g., interprets, subsidies, discounts);
- no high hierarchies between different groups (e.g., students, university staff, doctors, nurses…), relations based on trust more than on control;
- students have relatively high degrees of self-determination, participation, and their voice is heard;
- connection with the principles of universal design, inclusiveness and equity; and
- piloting new practices before implementing them in a larger scale.

In our view, these characteristics reflect wider Finnish societal context, societal model, underlying values, support systems, and ways of dealing with issues related to equal opportunities for all thus making the transfer of these practices to other contexts as an interesting challenge to be considered.

References

Access4All project (2017) http://access4allproject.eu/ Accessed 18 of January 2017

Accessible education at the University of Jyväskylä (2017) https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/esteet/eotietoa/accedu#annex Accessed 18 of January 2017

Act on Equality between Women and Men (609/1986) http://www.finlex.fi/fi/laki/kaannokset/1986/en19860609.pdf Accessed 18 of January 2017

Design for All (2017). http://designforall.org Accessed 18 of January 2017

EU Directive 2016/2102/EU, EN 301549 Accessibility requirements suitable for public procurement of ICT products and services in Europe. http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:32016L2102 Accessed 18 of January 2017

Faculty of Information Technology (2017). https://www.jyu.fi/it/en Accessed 18 of January 2017

Finnish Student Health Services (2017) http://www.yths.fi/en Accessed 18 of January 2017

Finnish Student Health Service (2015). A guide for evaluating healthy, safety and wellbeing educational institutions. https://opiskelu.jyu.fi/fi/opiskelijapalvelut/ohjeet/THLterveysjaturvallisuusohjeet2015.pdf (In Finnish) Accessed 18 of January 2017

Goodie operating model (2017) https://www.jyu.fi/studentlife/studentlife/en/goodie Accessed 18 of January 2017

Inclusive Higher Education (ESOK) project 2006-2011 (2017) http://www.esok.fi/esok-hanke/esittely/en Accessed 18 of January 2017

Kunttu, K. 2005. The study ability model. The Finnish Student Health Service (FSHS).

Nelson, K & Creagh T. 2013. A Good Practice Guide: Safeguarding Student Learning Engagement. Queensland University of Technology. Brisbane, Australia.

Nordic Network of Disability Coordinators NNDC, (2017) http://www.universell.no/nordicnetwork/network-of-disability-coordinators/ Accessed 18 of January 2017

Räsänen, P., Lappalainen, P., Muotka, J., Tolvanen, A., Lappalainen, R. (2016). An online guided ACT intervention for enhancing the psychological wellbeing of university students: A randomized controlled clinical trial. Behaviour Research and Therapy 78 (2016) 30e42.

Student Compass (2017) https://www.jyu.fi/opiskelu/ajankoht/opiskelijan-kompassi-

auttaa-jaksamaan-opinnoissa-ja-arjessa (in Finnish) Accessed 18 of January 2017
University of Jyväskylä (2017) https://www.jyu.fi/en Accessed 18 of January 2017
University of Jyväskylä Equality plan (2017) https://www.jyu.fi/hallinto/toimikunnat/tasa-arvotoimikunta/Dokumentit/suunnitelmat/ep20162018 Accessed 18 of January 2017
University Sports (2017). https://www.korkeakoululiikunta.fi/en Accessed 18 of January 2017
UPDATE (2017). Understanding and Providing a Developmental Approach to Technology Education project outcomes. https://agoracenter.jyu.fi/projects/updatex/publications Accessed 18 of January 2017
Waterfield, J. & West, B. (2005). Inclusive Assessment in Higher Education: A Resource for Change, HEFCE.
Wray, M. (2013). Developing an inclusive culture in higher education: final report. York: Higher Education Academy.