

**UNIVERSITY OF OULU  
FINLAND**

**THE IMPACT OF EVALUATIONS FOR IMPROVING UNIVERSITY TEACHING**  
**Anna-Maija Liuhanen, Paavo Sippola and Asko Karjalainen**

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

In 1959, the University of Oulu, one of Finland's 20 universities, was created 600 km north of Helsinki, the beginning of regional higher education in Finland. Today, its five faculties -- Education, Humanities, Medicine, Science and Technology -- enrol 12 000 students and the university employs 2 600 employees. It receives direct state funding of MK 490 million and its 1995 expenditures totalled MK 704 million. Oulu differs from other Finnish universities by incorporating both Technology and Economics and Business Administration faculties. Regionality continues to be considered a strength of the university, but it is also considered a principal Finnish university centre with international stature in several areas: the university's international research and education and many international contacts are valuable regional resources.

In the 1990s, three national, discipline-based teaching and one institutional evaluation were carried out at the University of Oulu. These four evaluations were partly responsible for the University's new system of continuous assessment of teaching quality, which has changed teaching methods and culture. This paper presents the Programme for Improving University Teaching and its QA system and their impacts on the university.

## **2. TRADITIONS OF IMPROVING UNIVERSITY TEACHING**

For the last twenty years, the University of Oulu has been working to systematically develop teaching. University pedagogy courses, attended by between 100-200 teachers annually, are an essential part of staff development. Their orientation has shifted towards consultation and supervision and in addition, increasingly popular tailored training packages have been created for individual departments.

Since 1977 a Committee on Teaching Development (KOTKA, or EAGLE in English) has worked as a forum for co-operation between faculties and students to improve university teaching. With the money granted by EAGLE in the beginning of 1980s, departments and individual teachers were encouraged to develop their courses and curricula department projects proved to be a functional model from which an entirely new teaching culture evolved from a few isolated development projects. In mid 1980s, entire departments engaged in departmental developing projects (LATO, Nikkanen, 1989) and the importance of departmental-level development work became more obvious to the entire university. Grants for departmental development projects have since become standard procedure and do not consume much of the university's budget. An average of 30 new development

projects are begun yearly with relatively modest funds. In 1995, the most important of the 54 development projects initiated include developing courses, teaching methods and ways of learning; other projects concentrate on producing teaching material and development work for educational technology.

In 1988, teaching was proclaimed the year's theme at the university as a precursor to the current quality assessments. The EAGLE sent an assessment inquiry to every department at the end of the year and this was especially fruitful in the humanities, medicine and education.

### **3. UNIVERSITY STRATEGY AS A RESULT OF INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION**

An extensive strategic process grew out the different evaluations and led to three interdisciplinary research and education foci: biotechnology, information technology and northern issues, which are obvious university strengths, each with a direct connection to the regional industrial development plan. In addition, the university has designated areas of special attention that call for institutional-level action within the next few years. The most important of these is teaching quality. In December 1993, just after the institutional evaluation, the University Senate accepted an extensive programme for improving university teaching with a core of systematic evaluation of teaching based on continuous student feedback and an emphasis on the importance of research and teaching merits, the use of teaching portfolios, teacher tutoring and training in teaching skills, an area in which, for the moment, the University of Oulu seems to be the leading university in Finland.

Other areas of special attention at the university include internationalisation, two new degree programmes which badly need additional resources, the management system and internal university communication practices, and finally the promotion of entrepreneurship, neo-industrialisation and the use of biomasses.

Plans for these activities preceded the 1994 strategic process but the origins of the system dated back to the 70s, when a centralised planning system focused more on resources than on results and better served the Ministry-University dialogue than the university's internal activities. The University Senate saw a need for a different strategy which would help internal decision-making.

The Rector invited the University Senate and senior administrators, altogether some 30 persons, to start the strategic process. In addition, a professor and an outsider both greatly experienced in strategic management and planning in large Finnish firms, were brought in as consultants. The university mission was rewritten, a SWOT analysis made, and a vision for the year 2005 defined in three one-day seminars, supplemented by active teamwork between them. In addition some topics were chosen to be specially developed or resourced within the next few years. After this phase, which provided a strategic planning framework, the work proceeded to the five faculties and the six independent departments which prepared their strategies. Some five months later, these plans were taken up in the Senate and in the first performance negotiations between the Rector and the units. The entire process was meant to be as participative as possible: interaction and student participation were therefore emphasized. Results were varied: in some departments, both students and staff participated whereas in others, the department chair simply wrote the departmental strategy.

Focus fields were more difficult to decide upon at the faculty level as all the disciplines wanted to belong to one of the foci in order to ensure their future despite threatening cuts. The number of foci per faculty averages about half a dozen. However, once the focus fields were chosen, the decisions influenced resources and degree programmes.

#### 4. NATIONAL DISCIPLINE-BASED EVALUATIONS

The first national discipline-based evaluations, initiated by the Finnish Ministry of Education, were carried out in 1991-92 in mathematics and natural sciences and in the humanities (Alanen *et al.*, 1992; *Humanistisen koulutusalan*, 1993). The humanities evaluation also included a more detailed evaluation of some history and English language departments (Svartvik *et al.*, 1993; Hösch et Kirby 1993, respectively). Soon thereafter, an evaluation of education and teacher training was made (Buchberger *et al.*, 1994); all of these involved the University of Oulu (for more information on the National Discipline-based Evaluations, see National Context of the Finnish Cases, Part II, Pakkanen).

These three evaluations were to some extent based on the Dutch model with departmental self-evaluations. However, the evaluation procedures differed in the University of Oulu, among other places, in how the self-evaluations were actually conducted. The mathematics and natural sciences departments answered a number of questions raised by the national evaluation group and collected statistical information about their activities for the international peer-review group. For the humanities, the national evaluation group prepared a check-list for departmental self-assessments. However, in Oulu, the Faculty of Humanities created its own model based on questionnaires to all staff (both teachers/researchers and other staff), student interviews of students, and a questionnaire to all post-graduate students. Each department received its respective results. The report prepared for the national evaluation group was a faculty-level conclusion of the results. Education and teacher training faculties were given some broad guidelines for self-assessment by the National Committee for the Evaluation and Development of Educational Sciences. In Oulu, the Faculty added no specific instructions and the departments were quite free to design their own self-assessments.

No international peer-review participated in the humanities evaluation, nor did the national evaluation group visit the faculties or give them any feedback on their self-assessments, whereas for mathematics and natural sciences, peers visited all the faculties; for education and teacher training, some faculties, including Oulu, were visited and received immediate feedback based on the self-assessment reports and interviews.

#### 5. INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION AND TEACHING ASSESSMENT

In 1991, Oulu volunteered as one of the two Finnish pilot universities to undergo an institutional evaluation (quality audit) initiated by the Finnish Ministry of Education which offered Oulu and Jyväskylä Universities the possibility of an evaluation which Oulu's Rector accepted. The evaluation model was very much like a programme evaluations, and consisted of a self-evaluation and a peer-review. The institutional evaluation was aimed at evaluating and developing the quality of the university's activities and at establishing an evaluation procedure suitable for all Finnish institutions of higher education. However, the concept of quality was not defined or discussed in any detail, either by the Ministry of Education nor by the university. Quality was vaguely assumed to mean anything and everything good.

An executive group consisting of the Rector, the two Vice-Rectors, the five Deans and some senior administrators were responsible for the project which established the main lines of the assessment and supervised its progress. A working group chaired by one of the Vice-Rectors addressed practical planning and implementation, while six theme groups were responsible for collecting the assessment material, mainly in the form of questionnaires addressed to staff and students, and for drafting reports

under their respective themes of Administration and Organisation, Teaching and Basic Degree Education, Research and Postgraduate Education, Adult Education; and Internal Services.

The theme group for teaching and basic degree education included five members of the EAGLE (the Vice-Rector chaired the Committee, the head of the Office for Study Affairs, planning officer from the staff development unit and two students), whereas four of the other groups were nominated for evaluation purposes only. The board of continuing education centre acted as theme group for adult education.

## 6. TEACHING SELF-ASSESSMENT AND INSTITUTIONAL EVALUATION

Excerpts from the Self-Assessment Report of the University of Oulu (pp. 29-43) concerning teaching follow

*Information used in the teaching self-assessment report from the University of Oulu was collected from various sources in order to observe long-term developments as well. In addition to the data gathered in autumn 1992 by questionnaire for the self-assessment, the following data was used:*

- *1986-89 data of a departmental development project*
- *1987-88 information collected from the departments during the Year of Teaching*
- *a 1989 survey of student experience of university instruction*
- *1991-92 self-assessment reports and questionnaire data gathered in Faculties of Humanities and Science*
- *a 1991 survey conducted by the Finnish and Swedish Academies of Technology concerning study experiences and expectations among students of technology*
- *statistics of grants awarded by the University of Oulu's Committee on Teaching Development for departmental development projects (1981-1991).*

*The emphasis of the self-assessment was, however, on the data gathered in autumn 1992 data by using a qualitative questionnaire addressed to the teaching staff, students, and study secretaries. 213 teachers and 300 students replied.*

*Despite subject and degree programme differences, student feedback demonstrated some significant features common to all departments and faculties responding to the questionnaire.*

- *Teachers In all faculties made urgent pleas for increasing the prestige of teaching.*
- *Departmental support of staff development was considered meagre and/or insufficient. The development of teacher is taken to be his/her own business.*
- *Almost every teacher who answered the questionnaire gave good and feasible ideas for developing teaching but their realisation seemed difficult.*

- *Systematic methods for collecting student feedback were usually organised by student organisations.*
- *All students would have liked their teachers to have teacher training.*
- *Teachers with a positive attitude to teaching regarded the status of teaching in the University as poor which may explain the desire to concretely increase its prestige. Those wishing to develop teaching were willing to design a system for taking teaching merits into account when filling vacancies.*
- *In all faculties and most departments, many teachers spoke strongly for teaching quality. A great deal of expertise, practical knowledge, and good ideas about teaching exist and could serve as the basis for establishing a new teaching tradition.*

*In conclusion, the report stated:*

*“The University must do central development work on improving the standard of teaching, and give it highest priority. The administration of the University and the faculties must commit themselves to this.*

*Concrete measures to be taken include:*

- *Creating a departmental system for self-assessment of teaching. It is important that the departments learn to assess the state of their teaching and the development needs.*
- *Introducing a system for evaluating teaching merits so that they are taken into account along with research merits when filling vacancies.*
- *Teaching quality should be taken into account when assessing departmental results.*

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE EXTERNAL VISITING GROUP**

Several recommendations were made to both the University and the Ministry of Education. Strategic planning and management and quality of teaching headed the list for the university (Davies *et al.*, 1993); recommendations on teaching addressed primarily delivery rather than contents. After thorough discussion, the University Senate decided to focus on these two issues and launched strategic planning which gave top priority to teaching quality.

## **8. IMPROVEMENT PROGRAMME**

The first three evaluations had created a favourable atmosphere in the university for improving teaching. While the theme group for teaching was compiling the self-assessment report, it came up with the idea of a new programme for improving university teaching; the programme was presented to the university senate less than two months after receiving the report of the external visiting group and was accepted before any other steps relating to the evaluations were even discussed in the Senate.

The essential parts of the programme include continuous QA, emphasizing teaching merits and research merits, the use of portfolios, tutoring, staff development and financial rewards. Measures

consonant with programme development are eligible reward; of these, QA, emphasis on teaching merits, portfolios and financial rewards are new.

## **9. TEACHING ASSESSMENT AND FINANCIAL AWARDS**

The QA teaching system in the University of Oulu is a bottom-up model based on continuous evaluation through student feedback collected on courses practically department-wide. Each department has a teaching development team that is responsible for collecting feedback and for taking appropriate measures which is chaired by the department head or designated representative, and at least 4-5 student members. The university tries to keep the system as simple as possible so that the assessment can remain an everyday practice.

Such qualitative assessment makes it possible to pinpoint problems and take focused development measures. Unstructured verbal feedback data can be translated into numerical data when analysed whereas if the initial data is numerical, no exact interpretation of underlying reasons for the problems or the motives of the answers can be made. Numerical feedback cannot be translated into qualitative form.

### **Departmental feedback**

A departmental evaluation, scheduled into the annual teaching schedule, occurs either every term or at least once every academic year when teachers and students prepare a list or a presentation of their questions and problems they want to raise during a discussion. For the purposes of this forum, the feedback is analysed, the background to the problems that have come out investigated, and inquiries about questions found to be important can be made. Courses and departmental activities come to a halt during the evaluation.

### **Reports and awards**

Each departmental teaching development team produces an annual self-assessment report for developing departmental teaching which may include a range of issues and conclusions other than those drawn from student feedback. The University Senate has approved a list of guidelines for the composition of the report (see appendix) which is in no way binding; departments can emphasize their own expertise in the field and bring out their own problems. Departments determine the length and depth of their reports which are sent to the staff development unit for preparing the rewards for the Rector who then rewards the departments on the basis of the performance documented in the reports.

In 1994 and 1995 the self-assessment reports were specifically requested from the departments for awards, and as of 1996, teaching development grants were awarded in the framework of the self-assessment practice in which these reports are a standard procedure.

Departments have received awards for teaching development on the basis of self-assessment reports on three occasions, a process that takes about one week for two people. Awards and selection criteria have been made public in the university's information bulletin, for example. Award decisions mention a few winning key departmental projects; the average sum per department has been slightly below MK 100 000, and the highest figure has been MK 200 000. Each faculty has had from 2 to

4 winning departments; the Faculty of Medicine has just under 30 departments, and has therefore had more winners.

In 1995, total financial awards, or result-based funding, was MK 5,5 million, slightly higher than 1 per cent of the direct funding from state budget (0.8 per cent of the total expenditure). The three criteria were teaching (40 per cent), research (50 per cent) and internationalisation (10 per cent). As of 1997, the sum will be 2-3 per cent of direct state funding.

In addition to the financial awards granted by the Rector, the EAGLE distributes an annual development grant for different teaching development projects in departments totalling approximately MK 350 000 (0.05 per cent of the University's annual expenditure). The civil servant in charge of the preparatory work observes an increase the number of applications for this development grant which suggests a change of atmosphere.

There has been relatively little feedback on making financial awards. Procedure and the criteria have been public and open, and the system seems to have been positively received. Experience thus far shows that qualitative criteria can be used as to allocate teaching development funds. The double purpose of the departmental reports has worked surprisingly well. Some reports are defensive, as might be expected in the case of external control, but open and analytic reports proposing new ideas are increasing in number.

Departments do not systematically use feedback from graduates, although the information has been available for years and the criteria for financial rewards includes employment of graduates and contacts with labour market. All university students receive a questionnaire at graduation and again six months later for employment and educational feedback. In addition three wider surveys have been made.

## **10. OTHER AREAS**

The first Finnish application of the international portfolio system is the use of a merit system for teaching, perhaps the most radical change and the most difficult to implement. About half of the departments apply teaching portfolios.

Tutoring began as a national experience, in 1991 at the same time as the first national study field evaluations, and has proven essential for teaching development. Now virtually all departments with their own degree programme (25) participate in this project. The Programme for Improving University Teaching is complemented with staff development and the Good Teacher Awards, granted since 1990. Ongoing teaching assessment, the merit reward system for teaching and financial rewards compose a cohesive unity and resulted in a significant pilot project in Finland's HE. This project also improves the chances of university departments to compete for Ministry of Education awards allocated to top teaching units (centres of excellence).

## **11. WHOSE PROGRAMME?**

The Programme for Improving University Teaching depends on the departments and on the administrative staff development unit; it bypasses the faculties which have not found their place in it. In implementing the program, active, visionary individuals hold key positions from the very top to grass roots levels which of course makes the system vulnerable as long as it has not been firmly

rooted in the university . In developing teaching, the Faculties grant a part of their funds using a format that considers the amount of degrees and credits awarded but no qualitative criteria. Not all faculties have fully approved the strong emphasis on teaching and may see it as a threat to research, making it difficult to apply the teaching portfolios.

## **12. PROGRAMME IMPACT FOR IMPROVING UNIVERSITY TEACHING**

Institutionally speaking, the most important impact of the different evaluations has certainly been an obvious change in the atmosphere which has in turn made other changes and measures possible. In 1992, some members of the University Senate questioned the ability of students to evaluate teaching but this no longer occurs or at least it is not admitted.

## **13. EXTERNAL EVALUATIONS VIEWED BY THREE FACULTY SECRETARIES**

When the secretaries of the three faculties where study field evaluations were carried out were asked “What kind of impacts do you think the programme evaluations had on your faculty?” they found it rather difficult to distinguish between institutional and programme evaluations and therefore commented on both.

In the Faculty of Humanities, the institutional evaluation “was a success and resulted in a system of continuous assessment of departmental teaching and education” which has increased student participation in teaching and planning of teaching. Curricula and degree programmes options have grown, teaching methods have been developed, and the number of essay exams has increased (Koivunen). In the Faculty of Science, departments are now better informed about other Finnish departments of respective disciplines, and know their competitive situation better than before the evaluations (Ala). “The initiative came from the institutional evaluation. Structures were being analysed and the national programme evaluation took a step forward and we realised that change was going on and that it had to continue” (Lehtimäki).

More open discussion seem to take place now in faculty councils than before the evaluations, accompanied by a shift towards a more holistic way of handling affairs. “The faculty is now one entity, earlier it was a pile of black boxes.” Secretaries spoke of a better faculty identity and spirit: “The Faculty Committee has developed from a bureaucratic decision maker towards a team. In decision-making, its impacts on education and progress in general are now discussed more.”

## **14. VIEWS OF THE MEMBERS OF THE UNIVERSITY SENATE**

At the end of a meeting in March 1996, the members of University Senate were asked to designate the main points of the Programme for Improving University Teaching, and the impacts, if any, that they saw at department, faculty and individual levels. Fourteen of 16 members gave 12 answers, of which two had been done in pairs.

The first question was designed to describe senate members’ commitment to the Programme which the previous senate had accepted in November 1993; some members were therefore not familiar with it. Senate members addressed the issue with enthusiasm and the main points of the programme were mentioned in almost all answers. The merit system for teaching and portfolios was remembered best



(11 out of 12 answers); eight answers mentioned the feedback system, financial rewards and staff development.

Respondents did not really consider different administrative levels but concentrated on the general impacts of the Programme for Improving University Teaching. The most important impacts seemed to be a change in the atmosphere and increased student involvement (8 answers), the establishment of the feedback system and the development of teaching methods (7 answers). Curricular changes (degree structure) were mentioned 6 times. The Staff Development Unit was delighted by the answers as they feel that the support from the University Senate is essential.

Changes in the study culture as seen by the driving force of teaching development, Mr. Asko Karjalainen

It seems that the most effective factors influencing the staff and student behaviour are the practices of student based quality assessment, the teaching portfolio method in the merit system for teaching, and tutoring. These have caused some sort of institutional movement towards a new academic identity that emphasize teaching and learning. Rhetorically at least, teachers and students have now been accepted as members of scientific community which was previously reserved for researchers.

Defining a new academic role and position for students has been the central issue in the years after the 1992-1993 institutional evaluation, the single-most stimulating phase ever experienced in the history of the university. As the first university in Finland, ours formed not only systems of merit and quality assessment for teaching but also an explicit *institutional* educational philosophy defining high quality teaching and learning as a primary tool for promoting research and creating new knowledge. "It is our highly regarded privilege to help the students discover and learn effective scientific practices and thought processes." Upon entering the university, the student is a novice member of the academic community. We perceive that the future of this community depends on the students.

Our philosophy has gone beyond ideas and words; it has been carried on and is continuously being realised in everyday practices. A recent example, the long-term project called the "Theme Decade of Academic Learning" began in 1996 and will continue until 2006. During these years our purpose is to provide the foundation for a totally new student generation, whose deepest passion will be the profound learning of scientific thought, in addition to personal development and active participation in faculties and departments.

The institutional meaning of activities outlined above might resemble something like "starting a new epoch." We have been going through a kind of peaceful revolution which must surely have had (serious) consequences. Socio-culturally, we have observed many interesting phenomena in both staff relations and student interaction.

A new discursive culture has taken root. More than ever before, explicit conversation about teaching and learning can be found at all levels of departments. The most effective facilitator of "thoughts and talks" have been the teaching development teams, which exist in all university departments since 1993.

Conflicts between conservative and most promising teachers have sometimes occurred. Especially during the last few years, some staff members have suddenly, and in several cases, more or less openly tried to get other colleagues and teachers into trouble for adopting unorthodox teaching methods. Are these envious reactions? A very difficult economic situation, together with growing funding of quality teaching have sometimes caused resentment and unhealthy competition. Hidden

contradictions in the new discourse culture are also more likely to surface. In some departments, critical cliques have born and have occasionally attacked the shared values of teaching development. These critical, conservative voices are not openly hostile teaching, but are against the hegemony of teaching and sometimes against bureaucracy.

Teachers have been very enthusiastic about developing their teaching practices and skills. From 1992-1995, the staff development unit has trained more than 500 teachers in teaching skills. Some have been enthusiastic enough to publish articles concerning new teaching and examination practises. Student-centered, active teaching methods have been used increasingly in all faculties.

Student opposition did not come as a total surprise, but has shocked some teachers. Students have occasionally given teachers the message, that “returning to the old routines would be much easier for both of us”. The new teaching practices are far more demanding than the prior methods. Learning diaries, home essays, simulating examinations, have dramatically increased student workloads on occasion; students have mostly accepted the new methods because they feel them to be much more useful for learning. The “Theme Decade of Academic Learning” has been designed to win this kind of student conservatism.

## 15. CONCLUSION

It is difficult to separate the effects of different assessments from each other and from external factors since the University has undergone major changes during the period of the four assessments, including the change in the steering system of public administration (results-management, a new budgeting system, delegation of executive power), the recession in Finland and the state budget funding cuts, launching the new HE polytechnic sector which could mean competition for both money and students.

The University has been able to work on only a few of the recommendations proposed by the external visiting groups. The budget cuts have encouraged the University Senate to pay particular attention to the suggestion to devise a strategy and to enhance management. Procedural changes in the Faculty Committees probably reflect the assessments and the changes in the steering system and economic situation and the work done in the strategy process.

All four assessment groups made suggestions concerning the development of teaching. The institutional evaluation group, however, emphasized the point most by saying that the development of teaching is vital to the university, the problem that was tackled first at the institutional level. The core of the programme for improving university teaching had already been born in the self-assessment where the Committee on Teaching Development composed one theme group which is why the programme was easy to prepare receive quick Senate approbation. The feedback from the external assessment group and the Development Programme approved by the Senate added authority to the work that had long been ongoing.

Why did development work stall in the seventies when teaching was assessed inside the University? A change in the working practices could explain this. In the 70s, teaching development was conducted as staff development courses emphasising different parts of teaching (planning, carrying out, evaluation), with no attention paid to the differences between disciplines. In the 80s, departmental development project demonstrated the shifts in thinking when its focus moved to departmental development work. In the 90s, the Staff Development Unit has become more and more consultative and is now based on the ideas for development projects from the departments;

development work has moved closer to the level of a teacher's every day work. This all began in the self-assessment process and was based on teacher feedback. Another very important reason is that now the development work has gained the support of the operational system level. Taken together, assessments, active support from the top management and successful staff choices seem to create fertile ground for continuous teaching development work in the University of Oulu.

When asked who benefited from the changes, the Rector answered, "Most importantly, our students."

**APPENDIX**  
**GUIDELINES FOR DEALING THE FINANCIAL REWARDS FOR TEACHING**

1. Type and new forms of exams.
2. Curriculum and the structure of degree programmes.
3. Teaching practices.
4. Tutoring and co-operation with students.
5. Student counselling.
6. Consideration of teaching and acknowledging teaching in departmental procedures, personnel strategy.
7. Teaching-research link and how they support each other.
8. Study materials.
9. Continuous teaching QA, student feedback system/other feedback systems.
10. Co-operation with other departments in organising teaching (also with other universities).
11. Using and developing teaching technology.
12. Drop-outs, graduates and student employment.
13. Contacts with labour market and connections outside university in developing university education.
14. Staff development.
15. The work of the departmental teaching development teams; programme, plan and strategy for developing teaching.
16. Co-operation between teachers in organising and carrying out teaching.
17. Internationalisation in improving the quality of teaching.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

ALANEN, A.R., K. BAKKER, A.L. FETTER, K.H. HOFFMANN, B. LINDMAN (1992), *Report on the External Evaluation of Higher Education in Mathematics and Natural Science in Finland*, Publications from the Council for Higher Education 3/92, Jyväskylä.

BUCHBERGER, F., E. de CORTE, B. GROOMBRIDGE, M. KENNEDY (1994), *Educational Studies and Teacher Education in Finnish Universities*, Ministry of Education, Helsinki.

DAVIES J.L., C.G. LINDSTRÖM, K.H. POLLOK, G. RICHEL, F. SCHUTTE (1993), *Evaluation of the University of Oulu*, Ministry of Education, Helsinki.

*Humanistisen koulutusalan arvioinnin tulokset* (1993), Humanististen tutkintojen työryhmän loppuraportti, Helsinki, Opetusministeriön työryhmien muistioita 9.

(Outcomes of the Humanities Degree Committee).

HÖSCH, E., D. KIRBY (1993), *Peer Review of the Teaching of History in Finnish Universities*, Helsinki.

NIKKANEN, P. (ed.) (1989), *Yliopiston sisäinen kehittäminen, Näkökohtia laitostason kehittämiseen (Development of university education, Perspectives on department-level activities)* Oulun yliopiston hallintoviraston julkaisuja 3, Oulu.

*Report on the Self-Assessment of the University of Oulu* (1993), University of Oulu, Oulu.

SVARTVIK, J., N. BLAKE, G. TOURY (1993), *Peer Review of the Teaching of English Studies in Finnish Universities*, Helsinki.

### Interviews

Professor Lauri Lajunen, Rector of the University; 2 July 1996

Ms Kaisa Ala, Faculty Secretary, Faculty of Science; 12 April 1996

Ms Sinikka Koivunen, Faculty Secretary, Faculty of Humanities; 20 March 1996

Mr Juhani Lehtimäki, Planning Officer, Faculty of Education; 20 March 1996