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1. Objectives

Following the first conference of EU-China High Level People-to People Dialogue on 18 April 2012 in Brussels, both sides decided to launch an EU-China Tuning Joint Study. **The General objectives:**

- Strengthen the **compatibility** of EU and Chinese Higher Education and draw on the experience and detailed understanding of the Tuning approach developed in the EU
- Enhance **outcome-based** education
- Establish commonly acknowledged **quality criteria**
- Develop tools for **mutual recognition**
- Overcome obstacles to **mobility** of students, graduates and academic staff between China and the EU
- To enable closer ties between **higher education policy** makers in China and the European Union
Objectives (2)

Concrete tasks:

A. Investigate the **alignment of academic standards and reference points** in higher education for China and the European Union based on Pilot studies of three subject areas: Civil Engineering, Education Studies, Business Studies

B. Applying the successful Tuning methodology in enhancing the quality of Chinese higher education.

A. Chart the best way to **implement a potential follow-up project**, including the scope of the undertaking and issues at stake
Implementation study:
Three subjects, Business Administration, Civil Engineering and Comparative Education, were chosen to be the pilot study. The leading experts of the three groups are:
• Prof. Xi Youmin, Xi’an Jiaotong University, Xi’an
• Prof. Huang Hongwei, Tongji University, Shanghai
• Prof. Liu Baocun, Beijing Normal University, Beijing

In each subject area, 5-10 universities participated in the pilot project. Totally over 20 universities and 30 Chinese professors participated in the study project.
European experts:

• Co-chair of the project: Robert Wagennaar, University of Groningen and his team (Julia Gonzalez, Pablo Beneitone, Ingrid van der Meer)
• Business Administration: Dan Frost (Umea University), Margret Schermutzki (University of Aachen)
• Civil Engineering: Giuliano Augusti (University of Rome), Alfredo Soeiro (University of Porto)
• Education: Arlene Gilpin (Tuning expert, formerly at University of Bristol), Soren Ehlers (University of Copenhagen)

Each subject group hold three meetings during the last two years to move forward the project.
Methodology and Results

Tuning is based on the assumption that higher education in the 21st century should be student driven and learning outcomes based.

Nowadays the students care for “competencies” they obtained to play a successful role in a changing society. Tuning teaching and learning process by consulting four groups: academics, employers, students and graduates.

We collected 1748 questionnaires on generic competences and 1600 on subject specific competences (civil engineering 567, business, 542, education 491).
2. Tuning Methodology

- Develop one language understood worldwide by all stakeholders: competences and learning outcomes
- Stress the importance of general academic competences and skills for society
- Involve stakeholders in the process of curriculum design and enhancement
- Develop shared (inter)national reference points at disciplinary / subject area level
- Give academics a key role in the process of reforming Higher Education structures and its degree programs and qualifications
- Focus on diversity by promoting flexibility
- Facilitate (inter)national mobility and recognition of studies
Consultation

Questionair

- **Generic competencies (33):** a result from consultation of experts from both sides, based on the list provided by European experts, taken into consideration of high education in China and suggestion of experts in the three subject group.

- **Subject specific competencies:** decided respectively by universities in each subject group based on the suggestion of European experts. (Business, 26; Engineering, 27; Education, 22)
Methodology and Results

Four Groups consulted

• Academics
• Employers
• Students
• Graduates
Methodology and Results

Three variables considered

• the degree of importance
  – None
  – Weak
  – Considerable
  – Strong

• the level achievement
  – None
  – Weak
  – Considerable
  – Strong

• ranking
### Academics: Top 5 competences

| 1 | Ab. for abstract thinking, analysis and synthesis  |
| 2 | Ab. to apply knowledge in practical situations   |
| 3 | Knowledge and und. of the subject area and und. of the profession |
| 4 | Ab. to identify, pose and resolve problems       |
| 5 | Cap. to learn and stay up-to-date with learning  |

<p>| 1 | Capacity for analysis and synthesis            |
| 2 | Capacity for applying knowledge in practice    |
| 3 | Capacity to learn actively                    |
| 4 | Problem solving                               |
| 5 | Ability of self management                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>EUROPE</strong></th>
<th><strong>CHINA</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employers: Top 5 competences</strong></td>
<td><strong>Employers: Top 5 competences</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Abil. to appl. knowledge in practice</td>
<td>1. Capacity for analysis and synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ability for abstract thinking, analysis and synthesis</td>
<td>2. Capacity for applying knowledge in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ability to identify, pose and resolve problems</td>
<td>3. Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge and und. of the subject area and und. of the prof.</td>
<td>4. Capacity to learn actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ability to work in a team</td>
<td>5. Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Students: Top 5 competences

1. Ab. to apply knowledge in practical situations
2. Ab. for abstract thinking, analysis and synthesis
3. Ab. to identify, pose and resolve problems
4. Knowledge and und. of the subject area and und. of the profession
5. Ability to work in a team

1. Capacity for analysis and synthesis
2. Capacity for applying knowledge in practice
3. Capacity to learn actively
4. Problem solving
5. Interpersonal skills
## Graduates: Top 5 competences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Europe</th>
<th>China</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ab. to apply knowledge in practical situations</td>
<td>1. Capacity for analysis and synthesis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ab. for abstract thinking, analysis and synthesis</td>
<td>2. Capacity to learn actively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Ab. to identify, pose and resolve problems</td>
<td>3. Capacity for applying knowledge in practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Knowledge and und. of the sub. area and und. of the prof.</td>
<td>4. Problem solving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cap. to learn and stay up-to-date with learning</td>
<td>5. Interpersonal skills</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lessons learned (2)

EUROPE

CHINA

ALL GROUPS: Ranking, Top 5

Common 3 competences equal:

- Capacity for analysis and synthesis
- Capacity for applying knowledge in practice
- Problem solving
Lessons learned (3)

Common 2 competences equal:

- Capacity for analysis and synthesis
- Capacity for applying knowledge in practice
3. Lessons learned

A. Alignment of academic standards and reference points

- Survey has offered *more insight*: Comparable expectations among and between stakeholder groups in China and Europe (and other world regions)
- Relevance of *generic competences highly valued* in both China and Europe
- *Similar results survey* China with other world regions: same top 3 key generic competences identified for Europe and China
- *Wider gap* between *Importance* and *Achievement* of *generic competences* in China compared to Europe
Lessons learned (4)

Alignment of academic standards and reference points

- Survey shows *substantial differences* between three subject areas regarding subject specific competences of Business Administration, Civil Engineering and Comparative Education.

- Confirms idea that *more sectors and disciplines should be covered* as part of a Tuning Process to obtain a better understanding of weaknesses and strengths.
Lessons learned (5)

No consistency in outcomes between subject areas regarding subject specific competences:

- Substantial differences between importance and achievement: business and education
- No substantial differences between importance and achievement: civil engineering
- High level of correlation between stakeholder groups: business
- Differences regarding importance between 4 stakeholder groups: civil engineering and education
- (Some) Subject specific competences strongly linked to generic competences: business and education
- Many competences rated low in terms of importance, but rated high level of achievement: civil engineering
Lessons learned (7)

- The Tuning ‘student-oriented and competences based’ approach is in compliance with the Chinese reform policy for Higher Education.

- The theories and methods of Tuning have obvious value as reference for the planned reform process of the talent – training model of Higher Education in China.

- The lack of a credit mechanism to compare and recognize periods of studies between China and Europe (ECTS) proves to be a substantial obstacle for the extension and deepening of cooperation.
B. Relevance of the Tuning approach for China

- The feasibility study shows that *China is struggling with comparable problems* to modernize its Higher Education sector as other world regions (including Europe)

- The approach and language used is clearly recognized and understood in the Chinese context

- It has proven to be possible and feasible to develop high level and relevant Meta-profiles / conceptual frameworks for different types of subject areas / disciplines: Business Studies, Civil Engineering, Education Studies
The common challenges of higher education in China and Europe are to deal with the continuous changing supply and demand of labor market. The China-EU Joint Study is valuable in promoting the three pilot subject more transparent and compatible. It provides effective instruments of mutual recognition between China and Europe. Tuning methodology and the Chinese ongoing exploration of cooperative education are in the same direction. Tuning will be a good reference to enhance quality of higher education in China.
4. Follow-up

On the basis of the outcomes of this three subject Pilot Study it is recommended to set-up an Extended Study:

1. **Disseminate and discuss the outcomes** of the Pilot Study among HE institutions in China which offer degrees in the three disciplines covered: Business, Civil Engineering and Education

2. **Widen the group of disciplines to cover other academic domains** of Higher Education (Natural Sciences, Health Care, and Arts and Humanities)
3. **Align the EU and Chinese credit systems** by focusing on the outcomes of the learning process and the workload of students, which might imply to move forward the reform process of the present credit system(s) in China. As Erasmudus Program, 2-3 universities can cooperate to provide European Master Program. Is it possible for Universities in China and Europe to provide one integrated program?

4. **Align the quality assurance mechanisms** in China and the EU to facilitate recognition and mobility.

5. Disseminate outcomes of Pilot Study in Europe by publication of book and articles in English and on Tuning Website and offer presentations at designated conferences.
Thank you for your attention!

非常感謝

http://tuningacademy.org