

**moonlite**  
MOOCs for Social Inclusion & Employability



**The MOONLITE Policy  
Report on MOOCS for  
Social Inclusion:**

**Maximising the potential  
and minimising the risks  
for designing and utilizing  
MOOCs for refugees**



With the support of the  
Erasmus+ programme  
of the European Union

## Editor

Eric Kluijfhout

## Co-editor

Timothy Read

## Contributors

Elena Bárcena, Markus Bick, Anthony F. Camilleri,  
Alastair Creelman, Piet Henderikx, Corina Löwe,  
Charlotte Traeger, John Traxler, Katerina Zourou.

EADTU, ESCP Europe, Knowledge Innovation Center,  
Linnaeus University, UNED, The University of  
Wolverhampton, Web2Learn

Document Title	<b>The MOONLITE Policy Report on MOOCS for Social Inclusion: Maximising the Potential and Minimising the risks to design</b>
Project Title	MOONLITE
Grant Agreement No	2016-1-ES01-KA203-025731
Part of Deliverable	O6 report
Work package	<i>WP 6 – Policy paper: A viable role of MOOCs in European HEIs - Vision &amp; recommendations</i>
Confidentiality Status	Public

## Contents

Executive Summary .....	6
Zusammenfassung .....	11
Resumen .....	17
1. Introduction .....	23
Why this report? .....	23
How the project aims, consortium composition, activities and planned outputs can lead the report .....	23
The MOONLITE playing field .....	24
Present status and developments .....	25
2. Exploiting MOOCs for Access and Progression into Higher Education Institutions and Employment Market .....	26
Introduction .....	26
Results .....	26
Discussion .....	28
3. Cost–benefit Analysis of MOOCs for Higher Education .....	29
Introduction .....	29
Results .....	29
Discussion .....	30
4. How to design and utilize MOOCs for refugees .....	32
Introduction .....	32
Results .....	32
Aim and objectives of the Meta-MOOC and the two LMOOCs .....	32
Design and development approach .....	32
The modules .....	34
Experiences with running the MOOC (course analysis) .....	34
Discussion .....	35
5. A viable role for MOOCs in European HEIs .....	36
Introduction .....	36
European MOOC Survey 2017 .....	36
Aim of the survey .....	36
Summary of findings .....	36
European MOOC Survey 2018 .....	39
Aim of the survey .....	39
Summary of findings .....	39

European MOOC Survey 2019 .....	41
Aim of the survey.....	41
Summary of findings.....	42
Discussion MOOC surveys .....	46
Interviews .....	47
Aims .....	47
Approach .....	47
Interview outcomes.....	47
Regional focus groups.....	51
Aims .....	51
Approach/activity description .....	51
Focus area 1: HEI organization and collaboration (LNU) .....	52
Focus area 2: MOOC recognition and certification (UNED).....	54
Focus area 3: Funding and political support (EADTU) .....	56
Online vision building events.....	58
Aims .....	58
Approach/activity description .....	58
Vision building workshop.....	58
Oxford debate.....	62
Multiplier events .....	65
Aims .....	65
Approach/activity description .....	65
Madrid multiplier event.....	65
Wolverhampton multiplier event .....	69
The Hague multiplier event .....	71
References .....	77

## Executive Summary

This policy report represents Output 6 (O6) of the MOONLITE project and provides guidelines for policy makers on how to maximise the potential of MOOCs and minimise the potential risks they might introduce to the HEI (system) and society. The recommendations are summarized in the form of a declaration, initiated at the MOONLITE multiplier event organized in The Hague, hence this '*The Hague Declaration on Addressing Europe's MOOC Challenges*'.

### Introduction

This declaration<sup>1</sup> is one of the final results of the MOONLITE project (ref. 2016-1-ES01-KA203-025731) that has focused on a range of topics relating to the ways in which MOOCs can support refugees (and other vulnerable groups), migrants and students in their access to higher education and employment. This support can take the shape of different complementary learning pathways and scenarios that have been explored and analysed by the project partners in their respective HEIs (Higher Education Institutions).

MOOCs are defined here as online courses with at least four characteristics:

- they are designed for an unlimited number of participants;
- they can be accessed at no cost to the students;
- they require no entry qualifications;
- all elements of the course are provided fully online.

The presentation of this document corresponds with the last project multiplier event held in The Hague. This declaration moves beyond this specific area of focus of the project, on supporting refugees, migrants and students to consider broader questions related to the role of MOOCs for social inclusion and societal change. MOOCs have a real potential for social change and contributing to the Sustainable Development Goals intended to be achieved by 2030.

While it cannot be denied that MOOCs have had an impact on the educational panorama arguably since 2012, when the focus was largely on open access to education, it is still a challenge for universities, public authorities and civil society organisations to use them as a tool for societal change in general.

As a result of the work undertaken in this project, and different and varied interchanges of ideas, debates, and collaborations with other academics and experts in the field of open education and social inclusion, it has been possible to identify seven key challenges. The seven challenges presented here are:

- improving access to MOOCs and open education;
- keeping MOOCs open and free;
- the need for support in inclusive MOOCs;
- designing and developing MOOCs for social inclusion;
- the recognition of prior learning and MOOC certification;
- the need for open education policies at national and international level

---

<sup>1</sup> The full document is available at <https://eadtu.eu/home/policy-areas/open-education-and-moocs/news/474-the-hague-declaration-establishing-moocs-as-a-tool-for-societal-change>

- new funding and business models.

The responsibility to address these challenges does not lie only with higher education institutions and MOOC platform providers but also with intermediate support organisations in civil society (NGOs, foundations, support groups, charities, etc.), and national and international governing bodies.

The underlying objective is to place the displaced people at the core of this reflexion and provide them the opportunity to decide and choose *what* and *how* they should learn.

### **Improving access to MOOCs and open education**

Most of the people who could benefit from open online education do not know that such opportunities exist, and even when they do, are unable to find information about how to participate.

Information and awareness raising activities are needed to promote MOOCs and other open education channels for refugees and migrants in order to increase their participation in higher education.

To this end higher education institutions and MOOC platform providers should collaborate with public authorities and civil society organisations to reach out to refugees (and other vulnerable groups) where-ever they are, in asylum centres, in cities and rural areas, and whenever they arrive (not necessarily at the beginning of a semester). Personalised guidance can lead refugees to distinct learning paths, taking into account their life conditions and prior knowledge and qualifications, such as:

- MOOCs on European culture;
- preparatory language and foundation courses;
- MOOC micro-credential programmes facilitating the transition into work;
- online degree level courses and short learning programs in order to involve them gradually in degree studies;
- online courses for graduate refugee students, enabling them to complete an accredited degree in European higher education.

All activities can be based on existing resources from higher education institutions, in particular flexible distance learning provisions, including open educational resources. Comprehensive course packages should be offered to refugees including services. This goes beyond current policies of offering scholarships.

Better coordination is needed between stakeholders (intermediate organizations, higher education institutions, government, etc.) to facilitate a culture where MOOCs and other open educational programmes for social inclusion are more accessible. If the potential of MOOCs as tools for social inclusion in a broad sense, reaching people who have not been fortunate enough to go through standard educational channels, is to be maximized, then the conditions presented here should be met.

Furthermore, course providers and aggregators should provide useful and appropriate course descriptions and enable people to search across multiple platforms. Course information and descriptions should clearly identify their primary target groups and how the course is relevant to them. MOOC publicity should also identify the intermediate groups, associations, foundations or

charities who offer support to the main target groups (e.g. refugees). Once support groups understand what MOOCs are, and how they can use them to support the given collectives, then they can facilitate the adoption of the courses.

### **Keeping MOOCs open and free**

Even when a suitable MOOC is found, few providers have courses that are always open to new participants. A course might be offered once every few months, or even less frequently, and this factor can exclude many potential participants. Therefore, MOOCs should be kept open for access, even when they are not running. Even if there is little interaction for learners in such “read-only” mode courses, access to the material means that third parties can use the course as the basis of a face-to-face courses with local support. Furthermore, it is essential that these courses are available without fees, not only in terms of access but also certification. Inclusive education cannot have costs for the students undertaking it, especially vulnerable groups like refugees.

Furthermore, as much course material as possible should be published with an open licence (e.g. Creative Commons), providing third parties with the ability to adapt and repurpose material for local use.

### **The need for support in inclusive MOOCs**

The majority of MOOCs are aimed at learners with good study skills and digital literacy and are thus not particularly inclusive. Furthermore, many MOOCs are designed from a particular cultural perspective (i.e., European / North American) that will not be relevant to target groups such as refugees. In order to help such learners to benefit from open online education a considerable amount of support is required, preferably local and face-to-face. Course facilitators and mentors, preferably from within the learning community and support organisations, can provide regular meetings at community centres, libraries etc., scaffolding students to learn and participate. Such groups can offer teaching and technical support in the learners’ own languages and help them interact with the online material in the MOOC. Such human support is essential to help the learners acquire the digital and study skills necessary for success in online education.

### **Building MOOCs for Social Inclusion**

MOOCs have the potential to provide educational opportunities for a very wide multilingual and multicultural audience, if they are designed to be inclusive by default. Three phases can be identified in this process: design, development and deployment:

- **Design:** it is important to involve the target audience and relevant stakeholders in the MOOC design process. This process can apply design thinking and follow a bottom-up approach. The natural extension of this process is the co-creation of a MOOC where, for example, refugees can be involved in the course design from the start. An inclusive rubric should be used for the design process that focuses on technology (that used by the students, especially mobile, taking into account connectivity problems), linguistics (extra support required for non-natives), pedagogy, culture & ethics (relations to online interaction and learning), and institutionalization.
- **Development:** the specifics will depend upon the MOOC platform being used and associated tools available. As parts of the course become available it is preferable to test them with members of the target learning community, firstly in a blended and face-to-face setting, and



then fully online. This testing, and any previous design input, places the displaced people at the core of the MOOC's development.

- **Deployment:** when the course is being finalised and before it is opened for students, the facilitators can be provided with early access, given relevant documentation about the course and any provided with training. Each time the course is run the results obtained can be used to make improvements before it is run again.

### **Recognition of prior learning and MOOC certification**

For disadvantaged students taking a MOOC, the issue of accreditation can be very important, since they may not have another way of obtaining any recognition of prior learning or certification. A problem with most MOOCs is that the final assessment of a course, leading to obtaining a completion certificate is not free. In the same way that MOOCs need to remain open and freely accessible to maximize social inclusion for vulnerable groups, then the certification must not have any associated costs. Once this type of recognition and certification is generally available then motivation in the learning community to take these courses and complete them will increase. In order for this to become a reality:

- HEIs need to provide MOOC certification that can accredit for future formal studies and for entering the employment market. Such certification can take the form of ECTS or micro-credential awards, as they become available, including a transcript with the learning objectives of the course, next to the study results of the individual learner.
- Cross-institutional collaboration is required between higher education institutions to recognise open education as an alternative pathway into higher education. This will be potentiated by common European strategies and policies and is presented in the next section.
- Higher education institutions need to help employers understand the value of MOOCs. Given the difficulties in controlling the quality of the student assessment process in these courses, then it is reasonable that employers will not treat such qualifications in the same way as they would those from formal education. MOOC certificates should indicate competences that students can demonstrate in job interviews or formal educational contexts.
- Help needs to be provided to students about how to exploit skills and certification obtained in MOOCs. They need to know what options they have to combine them, how to build a CV (e.g., Europass), and plan a career path.

### **Open education policies at national and international levels**

As has been noted, when MOOCs already exist in a given HEI, there is quite often an understanding of how these courses can be used by the students toward other formal study programmes at the same institution., including micro-credential programmes for continuous education preparing for the labour market. It is important that open education policies are developed at supra-institutional (national and international) levels. This would facilitate and regulate the interaction between HEIs in this area and structure credits and awards that students can gain from MOOCs and other similar open educational initiatives. This needs to be undertaken in two complementary ways:

- Potentiate the generation of new policies and educational standards that make it easier to award micro-credentials and recognise non-formal prior learning obtained in other HEIs. Work has been undertaken in this area, toward the generation of new policies, with initiatives such as the *application of the ESG and ECTS Users' Guide* to the recognition of MOOCs; the ENIC-NARIC Network's guidelines for *credential evaluators*; *Europass*, the *European Qualification Framework*, and the *EU skills profile tool for third country nationals*. New micro-credential initiatives are also appearing, such as the European MOOC Consortium's Common Micro-Credential Framework, and research projects such as Open Education Passport (OEPass), Micro-Credentialing in European HE, the e-Valuate and DigiRec projects, which are exploring standardised ways to address the question of the interoperability of micro-credentials. Finally, some HEIs are already directly adopting learning agreements to make recognition of MOOC-based modules more standardised and transparent.
- Simplify existing policies for the recognition of prior learning so that it is less complicated and time-consuming. These procedures can make the admission process complicated and lead to uncertainty, therefore hindering admissions for disadvantaged students thereby leading to exclusion from higher education.

### **Funding and new business models**

Since MOOCs first came into existence, and became part of HEIs' online educational portfolios, considerable thought has been given to the development of business models that enable institutions to manage the costs of developing and running these courses. In general, business models have evolved that justify MOOC development and delivery costs in terms of building the HEI brand and visibility and thus improving HEI recruitment and enrolment. However, such a general argument is unlikely to work in the context of refugees, who are unable to pay for their entry into an HEI and possibly unable to access national funds.

To make MOOCs and online course provisions work for refugees (and other vulnerable groups), funding initiatives should not only target the development of MOOCs but also the delivery to these groups. This requires specific strategies in cooperation with governments and civil society organisations (see point 1 above). Whereas multiple governmental funding initiatives for refugees deal with scholarships, more attention should go to serving students with difficult life conditions embracing information and awareness raising; MOOCs, online courses and OERs meeting immediate needs; specific courses preparing for degree and micro-credential studies; and courses enabling students to complete their studies for an accredited degree at a European higher education institution.

The development costs and services of MOOCs for refugees may not benefit from the economies of scale, and furthermore, may have higher adaptive maintenance costs tracking the changing refugee demographics and situation. So, the business model for refugee MOOCs is different and makes the case that MOOCs represent an appropriate and cost-effective way to get refugees, especially those with professional, craft or trade experiences, into the formal economy and pump-priming their entrepreneurial efforts. So, there is a macro-economic business model based around an increased national tax base and national capability.

Therefore, dedicated funding must exist that can support countries and their HEIs in handling the costs and keeping their open educational programmes running. HEIs can apply the cost-benefit analysis presented in the MOONLITE project, for their open educational initiatives, following a triple-bottom line analysis. This analysis focusses on social, economic and environmental dimensions, although there is an argument for a quadruple-bottom line that recognises HEIs need to maintain or enhance their research, scholarly and academic productivity and outputs. Such an analysis will help contextualise the expenses of these programmes in a broad institutional context.

As part of this approach, new ways to use MOOC content and activities may emerge that extends their lifetime and contexts of application. A simple example of this process would be to translate existing MOOCs, that have been proved to be effective for a given social group, into minority languages to broaden the number of people who can benefit from them.

## Zusammenfassung

Dieser Bericht fasst Output 6 (O6) des Moonlite-Projekts zusammen und enthält Richtlinien für Entscheidungsträger, mit denen sie das Potenzial von MOOCs maximieren und mögliche Risiken minimieren können, die sie für die Hochschule (System) und die Gesellschaft mit sich bringen. Die Empfehlungen werden in Form einer Erklärung zusammengefasst, die auf der in Den Haag organisierten MOONLITE-Multiplikator-Veranstaltung initiiert wurde, daher der Name „Den Haag Erklärung zu Herausforderungen mit MOOCs in Europa“.

### Einführung

Diese Erklärung<sup>2</sup> ist eines der Ergebnisse des MOONLITE-Projekts (ref. 2016-1-ES01-KA203-025731), dessen Fokus auf einer Reihe von Themen lag mit dem Ziel, Wege aufzuzeigen, wie Flüchtlingen (und anderen schutzbedürftigen Gruppen), Migranten und Studenten mit Hilfe von MOOCs den Zugang zu Hochschulbildung und Einstieg in das Berufsleben erleichtert werden kann. Diese Unterstützung kann in Form verschiedener komplementärer Bildungswege und -szenarien erfolgen, die von den Projektpartnern in ihren jeweiligen Hochschulen (Hochschuleinrichtungen) untersucht und analysiert wurden.

MOOCs werden hier als Online-Kurse mit mindestens vier Merkmalen definiert:

- Sie sind für eine unbegrenzte Anzahl von Teilnehmern konzipiert;
- Sie sind für die Studierenden kostenfrei zugänglich;
- Sie erfordern keine Zugangsvoraussetzungen;
- Alle Elemente des Kurses werden vollständig online bereitgestellt.

Dieses Dokument wurde auf der letzten Projektmultiplikator-Veranstaltung in Den Haag verabschiedet. Diese Erklärung geht jedoch über die speziellen Schwerpunkte des Projekts – die Unterstützung von Geflüchteten, Migranten und Studenten – hinaus und berücksichtigt umfassendere Fragen im Zusammenhang mit der Rolle von MOOCs für die soziale Inklusion und den gesellschaftlichen Wandel. MOOCs haben ein wahrhaftes Potenzial, um den sozialen Wandel voranzutreiben und tragen zu den Nachhaltigkeitszielen bei, die bis 2030 erreicht werden sollen.

---

<sup>2</sup> Das gesamte Dokument ist verfügbar unter: <https://eadtu.eu/home/policy-areas/open-education-and-moocs/news/474-the-hague-declaration-establishing-moocs-as-a-tool-for-societal-change>

Obwohl MOOCs unbestritten seit 2012 ein Einfluss auf die Bildungslandschaft zugeschrieben werden kann, besonders im Hinblick auf einen offenen Zugang zu Bildung, besteht immer noch die Herausforderung für Universitäten, Behörden und Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft, sie als Instrumente für gesellschaftlichen Wandel im Allgemeinen zu nutzen.

Durch die in diesem Projekt geleistete Arbeit, den unterschiedlichen und vielfältigen Austausch von Ideen, durch Debatten und Kooperationen mit anderen Wissenschaftlern und Experten auf dem Gebiet der offenen Bildung (Open Education) und der sozialen Inklusion konnten zentrale Herausforderungen identifiziert werden. Die sieben hier vorgestellten Herausforderungen sind:

- Verbesserung des Zugangs zu MOOCs und zu offener Bildung;
- MOOCs offen und frei zu halten;
- Notwendigkeit der Unterstützung bei inklusiven MOOCs;
- Design und Entwicklung von MOOCs für die soziale Inklusion;
- Anerkennung von Vorkenntnissen und MOOCs-Zertifizierung;
- Notwendigkeit von Richtlinien zu offener Bildung auf nationaler und internationaler Ebene
- Neue Finanzierungs- und Geschäftsmodelle.

Die Verantwortung für das Angehen dieser Herausforderungen liegt nicht nur bei Hochschuleinrichtungen und Anbietern von MOOC-Plattformen, sondern auch bei zwischengeschalteten Unterstützungsorganisationen der Zivilgesellschaft (NGOs, Stiftungen, Unterstützungsgruppen, Wohltätigkeitsorganisationen usw.) sowie nationalen und internationalen Leitungsgremien.

Das zugrunde liegende Ziel besteht darin, die Geflüchtete in den Mittelpunkt dieser Überlegungen zu stellen und ihnen die Möglichkeit zu geben, eigenständig zu entscheiden und auszuwählen, *was* und *wie* sie lernen sollen.

### **Verbesserung des Zugangs zu MOOCs und offener Bildung**

Die meisten Menschen, die von offener Online-Bildung profitieren könnten, wissen nicht, dass solche Möglichkeiten bestehen, und selbst wenn sie es wissen, finden sie nur unzureichende Informationen darüber, wie sie daran teilnehmen können.

Informations- und Sensibilisierungsmaßnahmen sind erforderlich, um auf MOOCs und andere offene Bildungskanäle für Geflüchtete und Migranten aufmerksam zu machen und um ihre Teilnahme an der Hochschulbildung zu erhöhen.

Zu diesem Zweck sollten Hochschuleinrichtungen und MOOC-Plattformanbieter mit Behörden und Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft zusammenarbeiten, um Flüchtlinge (und andere schutzbedürftige Gruppen) zu erreichen, wo immer sie sich befinden, in Asylzentren, in Städten und ländlichen Gebieten und wann immer sie ankommen (nicht unbedingt zu Beginn eines Semesters). Persönliche Beratung kann Geflüchtete unter Berücksichtigung ihrer Lebensbedingungen sowie ihrer Vorkenntnisse und Qualifikationen unterschiedliche Lernwege eröffnen, z.B. die Nutzung von

- MOOCs zur europäischen Kultur;
- Vorbereitenden Sprach- und Grundkursen;
- MOOC Micro-Credential-Programmen, die den Übergang in das Berufsleben erleichtern;

- Online-Studiengänge und kurze Lernprogramme, um sie schrittweise in das Studium einzubeziehen;
- Online-Kurse für Geflüchtete mit Hochschulbildung, die es ihnen ermöglichen, akkreditierte Abschlüsse europäischer Hochschulen zu erreichen.

Alle Aktivitäten können auf vorhandenen Ressourcen von Hochschuleinrichtungen aufbauen, insbesondere auf flexiblen Bestimmungen für Fernunterricht, einschließlich offener Bildungsressourcen. Darüber hinaus sollten für Geflüchtete umfassende Kurspakete einschließlich Dienstleistungen angeboten werden. Dies geht über die derzeitige Politik von Stipendienangeboten hinaus.

Eine bessere Koordinierung zwischen den Interessengruppen (zwischengeschaltete Organisationen, Hochschuleinrichtungen, Regierung usw.) ist erforderlich, um eine Kultur zu fördern, in der MOOCs und andere offene Bildungsprogramme für die soziale Inklusion besser zugänglich sind. Wenn es das erklärte Ziel ist, das Potenzial von MOOCs als Instrument zur sozialen Inklusion im weiteren Sinne zu maximieren, um diejenigen Menschen zu erreichen, die nicht das Glück haben, über die üblichen Wege an Bildung zu partizipieren, sollten die hier vorgestellten Bedingungen erfüllt werden.

Darüber hinaus sollten Kursanbieter und -aggregatoren nützliche und angemessene Kursbeschreibungen bereitstellen, diese zu bündeln und es somit Nutzern zu ermöglichen, über mehrere Plattformen hinweg zu suchen. Kursinformationen und -beschreibungen sollten auf die primären Zielgruppen zugeschnitten sein und die Relevanz des Kurses für die Zielgruppe verdeutlichen. MOOC-Werbung sollte auch die Zwischengruppen, Verbände, Stiftungen oder Wohltätigkeitsorganisationen identifizieren, die den Hauptzielgruppen (z. B. Flüchtlingen) Unterstützung bieten. Sobald die Unterstützungsgruppen verstehen, was MOOCs sind und wie sie sie zur Unterstützung der angegebenen Kollektive verwenden können, können sie den Zugang der Kurse erleichtern.

### **MOOCs offen and frei halten**

Selbst wenn ein geeigneter MOOC gefunden wird, bieten nur wenige Anbieter Kurse an, die immer für neue Teilnehmer offen sind. Ein Kurs wird möglicherweise alle paar Monate oder noch seltener angeboten, und dieser Faktor kann viele mögliche Teilnehmer ausschließen. Daher sollten MOOCs offen gehalten werden, auch wenn sie gerade nicht unterrichtet werden. Auch wenn solche Kurse im „Nur-Lese-Modus“ den Lernenden nur wenig Interaktion bieten, ermöglicht der Zugriff auf das Kursmaterial, dass lokale Unterstützungsgruppen diese Kurse als Grundlage für Face-to-Face Kurse verwenden können. Darüber hinaus ist es wichtig, dass diese Kurse nicht nur in Bezug auf den Zugang, sondern auch in Bezug auf die Zertifizierung gebührenfrei angeboten werden. Inklusive Bildung darf keinerlei Kosten für die Studierenden verursachen, und das gilt insbesondere für schutzbedürftige Gruppen wie Geflüchtete.

Darüber hinaus sollte so viel Kursmaterial wie möglich mit einer offenen Lizenz (z. B. Creative Commons) veröffentlicht werden, um Dritten die Möglichkeit zu geben, das Material für eine lokale Verwendung anzupassen und weiterzuverwenden.

### **Die Notwendigkeit der Unterstützung bei inklusiven MOOCs**

Die meisten MOOCs richten sich an Lernende mit guten Lernfähigkeiten und digitaler Kompetenz und sind daher nicht besonders inklusiv. Darüber hinaus sind viele MOOCs aus einer bestimmten kulturellen Perspektive (d.h. europäisch/nordamerikanisch) konzipiert, die für Zielgruppen wie

Flüchtlinge nicht relevant ist. Damit diese Lernenden von einer offenen Online-Ausbildung profitieren können, ist eine ausführliche Unterstützung erforderlich, vorzugsweise vor Ort und Face-to-Face. Kursleiter und Mentoren, vorzugsweise aus der Lerngemeinschaft und den unterstützenden Organisationen, können regelmäßige Treffen in Gemeindezentren, Bibliotheken usw. organisieren, um die Studierenden zum Lernen und Mitmachen zu motivieren. Solche Gruppen können Unterricht und technische Unterstützung in den Sprachen der Lernenden anbieten und ihnen helfen, mit dem Online-Material im MOOC zu interagieren. Eine solche menschliche Unterstützung ist wichtig, um den Lernenden zu helfen, die für einen erfolgreichen Online-Unterricht erforderlichen digitalen Fähigkeiten und Lernfähigkeiten zu entwickeln.

### **Aufbau von MOOCs für die soziale Inklusion**

MOOCs ermöglichen Bildungschancen für ein sehr breites, mehrsprachiges und multikulturelles Publikum, wenn Inklusion bei ihrer Konzipierung bereits standardmäßig mitbedacht wird. In diesem Prozess können drei Phasen identifiziert werden: Design, Entwicklung und Bereitstellung:

- **Design:** Es ist wichtig, die Zielgruppe und die relevanten Stakeholder in den MOOC-Designprozess einzubeziehen. Dieser Prozess kann Design Thinking anwenden und einen Bottom-up-Ansatz verfolgen. Die natürliche Erweiterung dieses Prozesses ist die Mitgestaltung eines MOOC, indem beispielsweise Flüchtlinge von Anfang an in die Kursgestaltung einbezogen werden können. Ein inklusives Bewertungsraster sollte für den Designprozess verwendet werden, das auf Technologie (die von den Studierenden verwendete, insbesondere mobile) eingeht, weiterhin auf Internetzugänge und damit verbundenen Probleme), die linguistische Aufbereitung durch zusätzliche Unterstützung für Nicht-Muttersprachler berücksichtigt, weiterhin Aspekten der Pädagogik, Kultur und Ethik (z.B. Beziehungen zwischen Online-Interaktion und Lernen) und der Institutionalisierung
- **Entwicklung:** Die verwendete MOOC-Plattform und verfügbaren Tools beeinflussen das Kursdesign. Sobald Teile des Kurses verfügbar sind, sollte sie mit Mitgliedern der Ziel-Lerngemeinschaft getestet werden, zunächst in einem blended und Face-to-Face Kontext, und danach vollständig online. Diese Tests und alle früheren Design-Entscheidungen gehen von den Bedürfnissen der Geflüchteten aus und stellen sie in den Mittelpunkt der Entwicklung des MOOC.
- **Umsetzung:** Nach Fertigstellung eines Kurses und noch bevor er für Studenten geöffnet wird, können Kursleiter einen frühen Zugang, relevante Unterlagen und Schulungen erhalten, um Trainingsmaßnahmen vorbereiten zu können. Jedes Mal nach Beendigung eines Kurses sollten Evaluationen zu Verbesserungen dienen, bevor der Kurs erneut angeboten wird.

### **Anerkennung von Vorkenntnissen und MOOC-Zertifizierung**

Für benachteiligte Studierende, die ein MOOC absolvieren, ist die Frage einer Akkreditierung von großer Bedeutung, da sie möglicherweise keine andere Möglichkeit haben, ihre Vorkenntnisse anerkannt zu bekommen und ein Zertifikat dafür vorzuweisen. Ein Problem bei den meisten MOOCs ist, dass die Abschlussbewertung eines Kurses, die zur Erlangung eines Abschlusszertifikats führt, nicht kostenlos ist. So wie MOOCs offen und frei zugänglich bleiben müssen, um die soziale Inklusion schutzbedürftiger Gruppen zu maximieren, dürfen mit der Zertifizierung keine Kosten verbunden

werden. Sobald diese Art der Anerkennung und Zertifizierung verfügbar ist, steigt die Motivation in der Lerngemeinschaft, diese Kurse zu besuchen und zu absolvieren. Damit dies Realität wird:

- Die Hochschulen müssen MOOC-Zertifizierungen anbieten, die für zukünftige reguläre Studien und den Eintritt in den Arbeitsmarkt akkreditieren. Eine solche Zertifizierung kann in Form von ECTS- oder Micro-Credential-Prämien erfolgen, sobald sie verfügbar sind, einschliesslich eines Transkripts mit den Lernzielen des Kurses und den Studienergebnissen des Lernalters.
- Die Hochschuleinrichtungen müssen institutionsübergreifend zusammenarbeiten, um offene Bildung als alternativen Weg zu Hochschulbildung anzuerkennen. Dies wird durch gemeinsame europäische Strategien und Politiken verstärkt und im nächsten Abschnitt vorgestellt.
- Hochschuleinrichtungen müssen Arbeitgeber unterstützen, damit sie den Wert von MOOCs verstehen. Angesichts der Schwierigkeiten bei der Kontrolle der Qualität des Bewertungsprozesses für Studenten in diesen Kursen ist es vernünftig, dass die Arbeitgeber solche Qualifikationen nicht so behandeln, wie sie es mit Zeugnissen von formalen Bildungsträgern gewohnt sind. MOOC-Zertifikate sollten Kompetenzen präsentieren, die die Studenten in Vorstellungsgesprächen oder formalen Bildungskontexten nachweisen können.
- Studenten müssen unterstützt werden, wie sie, ihre in MOOCs erworbenen Fähigkeiten und Zertifikate verwendet werden können. Sie müssen wissen, welche Optionen sie kombinieren, wie sie einen Lebenslauf (z. B. Europass) erstellen und einen Karriereweg planen können.

### **Notwendigkeit von Richtlinien zu offener Bildung auf nationaler und internationaler Ebene**

Wie bereits erwähnt wurde, wenn MOOCs an einer bestimmten Hochschule angeboten werden, gibt es auch oft ein Verständnis dafür, wie diese Kurse von den Studenten für andere reguläre Studienprogramme an derselben Institution verwendet werden können, einschließlich Mikro-credential-Programmen für die Weiterbildung zur Vorbereitung für den Arbeitsmarkt. Es ist wichtig, dass Richtlinien für offene Bildung auf überinstitutioneller (nationaler und internationaler) Ebene entwickelt wird. Dies würde die Interaktion zwischen den Hochschulen in diesem Bereich erleichtern und regulieren, sowie Leistungspunkte (credits) und Auszeichnungen strukturieren, die Studierende durch die Teilnahme an MOOCs und anderen ähnlichen offenen Bildungsinitiativen erwerben können. Dies sollte durch zwei ergänzende Wege erfolgen:

- Durch die Potenzierung der Entwicklung neuer Politik und Bildungsstandards, die die Vergabe von Mikro-credentials und die Anerkennung von nicht formalen Vorkenntnissen erleichtern, die an anderen Hochschulen erworben wurden. In diesem Bereich wurden einige Arbeit unternommen, um neue Richtlinien zu entwickeln, und zwar mit Initiativen wie der *Application of the ESG and ECTS Users' Guide* zur Anerkennung von MOOCs; die Richtlinien des ENIC-NARIC-Netzwerks für *Credential Evaluators*; *Europass*, das *European Qualification Framework*, und das *EU Skills Profile Tool for Third Country Nationals*. Neue Initiativen für Mikro-credentials entstehen, wie das Common Micro-Credential Framework des europäischen MOOC-Konsortiums und Forschungsprojekte wie der Open Education Passport (OEPass), Micro-Credentialing an europäischen Hochschulen, die e-Valuate und

DigiRec Projekte. Diese untersuchen standardisierte Wege zur Beantwortung der Frage der Interoperabilität von Mikro-credentials. Schließlich, einige Hochschulen haben bereits direkt Lernvereinbarungen angenommen, um die Anerkennung MOOC-basierter Module standardisierter und transparenter zu gestalten.

- Vereinfachung von bestehenden Richtlinien für die Anerkennung früherer Lernerfahrungen, damit diese weniger kompliziert und zeitaufwendig sind. Diese Verfahren können das Zulassungsprozess erschweren und zu Unsicherheiten führen, was die Zulassung benachteiligter Studierender behindert und zum Ausschluss von der Hochschulbildung führt.

### **Neue Finanzierungs- und Geschäftsmodelle**

Seit dem Aufkommen von MOOCs, die Teil des Online-Bildungsportfolios von Hochschulen wurden, wurde intensiv über die Entwicklung von Geschäftsmodellen nachgedacht, mit denen die Institutionen die Kosten für die Entwicklung und Durchführung dieser Kurse managen können. Im Allgemeinen sind Geschäftsmodelle entwickelt worden, die die Kosten für die MOOC-Entwicklung und -Zustellung rechtfertigen, um die Marke und Sichtbarkeit der Hochschule zu stärken und damit die Rekrutierung und Registrierung neuer Studierender zu fördern. Es ist jedoch unwahrscheinlich, dass ein solches generelles Argument im Kontext von Geflüchteten gilt, die weder entsprechende Hochschulgebühren noch Zugang zu nationalen Geldern haben.

Damit MOOCs und Online-Kurse für Geflüchtete (und andere schutzbedürftige Gruppen) nutzbar sind, sollten Finanzierungsinitiativen nicht nur auf die Entwicklung von MOOCs abzielen, sondern auch die Verbreitung in diesen Gruppen. Dies erfordert spezifische Strategien in Zusammenarbeit mit Regierungen und Organisationen der Zivilgesellschaft (siehe Punkt 1 oben). Während sich mehrere staatliche Förderinitiativen für Geflüchtete mit Stipendien befassen, sollte mehr Aufmerksamkeit darauf gerichtet werden, Studenten mit schwierigen Lebensbedingungen Informationen zukommen zu lassen, um die Sensibilisierung für MOOCs, Online-Kurse und OERs, die den unmittelbaren Bedarf decken; spezielle Kurse zur Vorbereitung auf Studienabschlüsse und Mikro-credentials Studien zu erhöhen und für Kurse, die es Studierenden ermöglichen, ihr Studium an einer europäischen Hochschule für einen akkreditierten Abschluss abzuschließen.

Die Entwicklungskosten und -dienstleistungen von MOOCs für Flüchtlinge profitieren möglicherweise nicht von Wirtschaftlichkeitseffekten und haben darüber hinaus möglicherweise höhere Anpassungskosten, um sich an die ändernde Demographie und Situation der Geflüchteten anzupassen. Das Geschäftsmodell für MOOCs für Geflüchtete ist daher anders und macht MOOCs zu einem geeigneten und kostengünstigen Weg, um Geflüchtete, insbesondere solche mit Berufs-, Handwerks- oder Handelserfahrung, in das Wirtschaftsleben zu bringen und ihre unternehmerischen Anstrengungen zu fördern. Es gibt also ein makroökonomisches Geschäftsmodell, das auf einer erhöhten nationalen Steuergrundlage und nationalen Fähigkeiten gründet

Daher muss es eine zweckgebundene Finanzierung geben, die Länder und ihre Hochschulen dabei unterstützt, mit den Kosten umzugehen und ihre offenen Bildungsprogramme aufrechtzuerhalten. Hochschulen können die im MOONLITE-Projekt vorgestellte Kosten-Nutzen-Analyse nach einer Triple-Bottom-Line-Analyse für ihre offenen Bildungsinitiativen anwenden. Diese Analyse berücksichtigt soziale, wirtschaftliche und ökologische Dimensionen, obwohl es ebenfalls ein Argument für eine vierte Dimension (quadruple-bottom line) gibt, die den Bedarf von Hochschulen berücksichtigt, ihre wissenschaftliche und akademische Produktivität und ihre Leistungen



aufrechtzuerhalten oder zu verbessern. Eine solche Analyse trägt zu einer Kontextualisierung der Aufwendungen für diese Bildungsprogramme in einem breiteren institutionellen Rahmen bei.

Im Rahmen dieses Ansatzes können neue Möglichkeiten zur Verwendung von MOOC-Inhalten und -Aktivitäten entstehen, die deren Lebensdauer und Anwendungskontexte verlängern. Ein einfach zu implementierendes Beispiel für diesen Prozess wäre die Übersetzung bestehender MOOCs, die sich für eine bestimmte soziale Gruppe bereits als wirksam erwiesen haben, in Minderheitensprachen, um die Anzahl der Personen zu erhöhen, die davon profitieren können.

## Resumen

El presente informe representa el output 6 (O6) del proyecto MOONLITE y proporciona directrices para los responsables de formular políticas sobre cómo maximizar el potencial de los MOOC y minimizar los riesgos potenciales que estos podrían suponer para las instituciones de educación superior y para la sociedad. Las recomendaciones se resumen en forma de una declaración, iniciada en el evento multiplicador del proyecto organizado en La Haya (Países Bajos). De ahí que el título de dicho documento sea 'Declaración de La Haya sobre cómo abordar los desafíos de los MOOC en Europa'.

## Introducción

Esta declaración<sup>3</sup> es uno de los resultados finales del proyecto MOONLITE (ref. 2016-1-ES01-KA203-025731), el cual se ha centrado en una serie de temas relacionados con las maneras en que los MOOC pueden apoyar a los refugiados, migrantes (y otros grupos vulnerables) y estudiantes en su acceso a la educación superior y al empleo. Este apoyo puede adoptar la forma de diferentes itinerarios y escenarios de aprendizaje complementarios que han sido explorados y analizados por los socios del proyecto en sus respectivas instituciones de educación superior (IES en adelante).

Los MOOC se definen aquí como cursos en línea con al menos cuatro características:

- están diseñados para un número ilimitado de participantes;
- se puede acceder a ellos sin coste alguno para los estudiantes;
- no requieren ninguna cualificación de entrada;
- todos los elementos del curso se proporcionan completamente en línea.

La presentación de este documento se corresponde con el último evento multiplicador del proyecto celebrado en La Haya. Esta declaración va más allá del área específica en la que se enfoca el proyecto (el apoyo a los refugiados, migrantes y estudiantes) y considera cuestiones más amplias relacionadas con el papel de los MOOC en la inclusión social y el cambio social. Los MOOC tienen un potencial real de cambio social y contribuyen a los Objetivos de Desarrollo Sostenible que se pretenden alcanzar para 2030.

Si bien no se puede negar que los MOOC han tenido un impacto en el panorama educativo desde 2012, cuando el foco se centraba en gran medida en el acceso abierto a la educación, sigue siendo un reto para las universidades, las autoridades públicas y las organizaciones de la sociedad civil utilizarlos como una herramienta para el cambio social en general.

---

<sup>3</sup> El documento completo está disponible en <https://eadtu.eu/home/policy-areas/open-education-and-moocs/news/474-the-hague-declaration-establishing-moocs-as-a-tool-for-societal-change>

Como resultado del trabajo realizado en este proyecto y de los diferentes y variados intercambios de ideas, debates y colaboraciones con otros académicos y expertos en el campo de la educación abierta y la inclusión social, ha sido posible identificar siete desafíos clave. Estos siete desafíos son:

- mejorar el acceso a los MOOC y a la educación abierta;
- mantener los MOOC abiertos y gratuitos;
- la necesidad de apoyo en los MOOC inclusivos;
- diseñar y desarrollar MOOC para la inclusión social;
- el reconocimiento del aprendizaje previo y la certificación de los MOOC;
- la necesidad de políticas educativas abiertas en el plano nacional e internacional;
- crear nuevos modelos de financiación y de negocio.

La responsabilidad de abordar estos desafíos no recae únicamente en las IES y los proveedores de plataformas MOOC, sino también en las organizaciones intermediarias de apoyo de la sociedad civil (ONG, fundaciones, grupos de apoyo, organizaciones benéficas, etc.), así como en los órganos de gobierno nacionales e internacionales.

El objetivo subyacente es situar a las personas desplazadas en el centro de esta reflexión y darles la oportunidad de decidir y elegir qué y cómo deben aprender.

### **Mejorar el acceso a los MOOC y a la educación abierta**

La mayoría de las personas que podrían beneficiarse de la educación abierta en línea desconocen que dichas oportunidades existen, e incluso cuando saben de su existencia, no pueden encontrar información sobre cómo participar.

Por lo tanto, se necesitan actividades de información y sensibilización para promover los MOOC y otros canales educativos abiertos para los refugiados y migrantes a fin de aumentar su participación en la educación superior.

Con esta finalidad, las IES y los proveedores de plataformas MOOC deberían colaborar con las autoridades públicas y las organizaciones de la sociedad civil para llegar a los refugiados (y a otros grupos vulnerables) dondequiera que se encuentren (en los centros de asilo, en las ciudades y en las zonas rurales) y en el momento de su llegada (no necesariamente al principio de un semestre). La orientación personalizada puede llevar a los refugiados a distintos itinerarios de aprendizaje y debe tener en cuenta sus condiciones de vida, así como sus conocimientos y cualificaciones previos, como por ejemplo:

- MOOC sobre cultura europea;
- cursos preparatorios de idiomas y cursos básicos;
- programas MOOC con microcredenciales que faciliten la incorporación al trabajo;
- cursos en línea de nivel de grado y programas cortos de aprendizaje con el fin de involucrarlos gradualmente en los estudios de grado;
- cursos en línea para estudiantes refugiados graduados, que les permitan completar un título acreditado en la enseñanza superior europea.

Todas las actividades pueden basarse en los recursos existentes de las IES, en particular en la oferta flexible de educación a distancia, incluidos los recursos educativos abiertos. Se deben ofrecer a los

refugiados paquetes de cursos completos que incluyan servicios, lo cual va más allá de la política actual de ofrecer becas de estudio.

Se necesita una mejor coordinación entre las partes interesadas (entidades de apoyo, instituciones de educación superior, gobierno, etc.), con el objetivo de facilitar una cultura en la que los MOOC y otros programas educativos abiertos para la inclusión social sean más accesibles. Si se quiere maximizar el potencial de los MOOC como herramientas para la inclusión social en un sentido amplio y que lleguen a personas que no han tenido la suerte de pasar por los canales educativos estándar, deben cumplirse las condiciones aquí presentadas.

Asimismo, los proveedores y agregadores de cursos deben proporcionar descripciones de cursos útiles y apropiadas, además de permitir a la gente buscar en múltiples plataformas. La información y las descripciones de los cursos deben identificar claramente los principales públicos objetivos y la forma en que el curso es relevante para ellos. La publicidad de los MOOC también debe identificar a los grupos intermediarios, asociaciones, fundaciones u organizaciones benéficas que ofrecen apoyo a los principales grupos destinatarios (por ejemplo, los refugiados). Una vez que los grupos de apoyo comprendan qué son los MOOC y cómo pueden utilizarlos para apoyar a los colectivos, podrán facilitar la adopción de los cursos a dichos colectivos.

### **Mantener los MOOC abiertos y gratuitos**

Aun cuando se encuentra un MOOC adecuado, pocos proveedores tienen cursos que estén siempre abiertos a nuevos participantes. Aunque un curso se ofrezca una vez cada pocos meses, o incluso con menos frecuencia, esto puede excluir a muchos participantes potenciales. Por lo tanto, los MOOC deben mantenerse abiertos para su acceso, incluso cuando no estén en funcionamiento. A pesar de que pueda haber poca interacción para los alumnos en estos cursos en modo "solo lectura", el acceso al material significa que terceros pueden utilizar el curso como base de un curso presencial con apoyo local. Además, es esencial que estos cursos estén disponibles sin coste alguno, no solamente en términos de acceso sino también de certificación. La educación inclusiva no puede tener costes para los estudiantes que la emprenden, especialmente para los grupos vulnerables como los refugiados.

Asimismo, la mayor cantidad posible de material didáctico debe publicarse con una licencia abierta (por ejemplo, Creative Commons), la cual permita a terceros adaptar y reutilizar el material para su uso local.

### **La necesidad de apoyo en los MOOC inclusivos**

La mayoría de cursos MOOC se dirigen a alumnos con buenas aptitudes para el estudio y con conocimientos de informática, por lo que no son especialmente integradores. Además, muchos MOOC están diseñados desde una perspectiva cultural particular (por ejemplo, europea o norteamericana), la cual que no es relevante para algunos grupos meta como los refugiados. Para ayudar a estos estudiantes a beneficiarse de la educación abierta en línea, se necesita una cantidad considerable de apoyo, preferiblemente local y presencial. Los facilitadores y mentores de los cursos, preferentemente de la comunidad de aprendizaje y de las organizaciones de apoyo, pueden ofrecer reuniones periódicas en centros comunitarios, bibliotecas, etc., para que los estudiantes aprendan y participen. Estos grupos pueden ofrecer apoyo pedagógico y técnico en los propios idiomas de los alumnos y ayudarles a interactuar con el material en línea de los cursos. Este apoyo

humano es esencial para ayudar a los alumnos a adquirir las habilidades digitales y de estudio necesarias para tener éxito en la educación en línea.

### Construir MOOC para la inclusión social

Los MOOC tienen el potencial de ofrecer oportunidades educativas a un público multilingüe y multicultural muy amplio, si se diseñan para ser inclusivos. En este proceso se pueden identificar tres fases: diseño, desarrollo e implementación:

- **Diseño:** es importante involucrar al público objetivo y a las partes interesadas en el proceso de diseño de un MOOC. En este proceso puede aplicarse la metodología de Design Thinking (pensamiento de diseño) y seguir un planteamiento o enfoque ascendente (*bottom-up*). La extensión natural de este proceso es la cocreación de un MOOC donde, por ejemplo, los refugiados puedan participar en el diseño del curso desde el principio. Se debe utilizar una rúbrica inclusiva para el proceso de diseño que se centre en los siguientes aspectos: la tecnología (la que utilizan los estudiantes, especialmente los móviles, teniendo en cuenta los problemas de conectividad), la lingüística (apoyo adicional necesario para los no nativos), la pedagogía, la cultura y la ética (relaciones con la interacción y el aprendizaje en línea) y la institucionalización.
- **Desarrollo:** las características específicas dependerán de la plataforma MOOC que se utilice y de las herramientas asociadas de las que dicha plataforma disponga. A medida que las partes del curso estén disponibles, es preferible ponerlas a prueba con los miembros de la comunidad de aprendizaje que conforman el grupo meta, primero en un entorno mixto y cara a cara, y luego completamente en línea. Estas pruebas, y cualquier otra aportación de diseño anterior, sitúan a las personas desplazadas en el centro del desarrollo del MOOC.
- **Implementación:** al finalizar el curso y antes de que se abra a los participantes, se puede proporcionar anteriormente el acceso a los facilitadores con la documentación pertinente sobre el curso y cualquier otro tipo de formación. Cada vez que se lleve a cabo el curso, los resultados obtenidos pueden ser utilizados para hacer mejoras antes de que se ejecute de nuevo.

### El reconocimiento del aprendizaje previo y la certificación de los MOOC

Para los estudiantes desfavorecidos que realizan un MOOC, la cuestión de la acreditación puede ser muy importante, ya que es posible que no tengan otra forma de obtener el reconocimiento del aprendizaje o la certificación previos. Un problema con la mayoría de los MOOC es que la evaluación final de un curso, que conduce a la obtención de un certificado de finalización, no es gratuita. De la misma manera que los MOOC necesitan permanecer abiertos y ser de libre acceso para maximizar la inclusión social de los grupos vulnerables, la certificación no debe tener ningún coste asociado. Una vez que este tipo de reconocimiento y certificación esté disponible generalmente, aumentará la motivación en la comunidad de aprendizaje para realizar estos cursos y completarlos. Los siguientes aspectos deben tenerse en cuenta para que esto se haga realidad:

- Las IES deben proporcionar un certificado para los MOOC que pueda acreditar la realización de estudios formales en el futuro y la entrada en el mercado laboral. Esta certificación puede adoptar la forma de créditos europeos ECTS o microcredenciales, a medida que vayan estando disponibles, y debe incluir una transcripción con los objetivos de aprendizaje del curso, junto a los resultados del estudio del alumno de manera individual.

- Es necesaria la colaboración interinstitucional entre las IES para reconocer la educación abierta como una vía alternativa de acceso a la educación superior. Esto se verá potenciado por estrategias y políticas europeas comunes y se presenta en la siguiente sección.
- Las IES deben ayudar a los empleadores a comprender el valor de los MOOC. Dadas las dificultades para controlar la calidad del proceso de evaluación de los estudiantes en estos cursos, es razonable que los empleadores no traten dichas calificaciones de la misma manera que lo harían con las de la educación formal. Los certificados MOOC deben indicar las competencias que los estudiantes pueden demostrar en entrevistas de trabajo o en contextos educativos formales.
- Es necesario ayudar a los estudiantes a explotar las habilidades y la certificación obtenidas en los MOOC. Necesitan saber qué opciones tienen para combinarlas, cómo crear un currículum vitae (por ejemplo, Europass), así como planificar una carrera profesional.

### **Políticas de educación abierta en los planos nacional e internacional**

Como se ha señalado más arriba, cuando ya existen MOOC en una determinada institución de educación superior, a menudo hay un entendimiento de cómo los estudiantes pueden utilizar estos cursos para otros programas de estudios formales en la misma institución, incluidos los programas de microcredenciales de formación permanente que preparan para el mercado laboral. Es importante que las políticas de educación abierta se desarrollen a nivel supranacional (nacional e internacional). Esto facilitaría y regularía la interacción entre las IES en esta área y estructuraría los créditos y reconocimientos que los estudiantes pueden obtener de los MOOC y otras iniciativas educativas abiertas similares. Esto debe llevarse a cabo de dos maneras complementarias:

- Potenciar la generación de nuevas políticas y estándares educativos que faciliten la concesión de microcredenciales y el reconocimiento del aprendizaje no formal previo obtenido en otras IES. En este ámbito se ha trabajado en la generación de nuevas políticas, con iniciativas como la aplicación de los ESG (European Standards and Guidelines) y la Guía de uso de ECTS (*ECTS Users' Guide*) al reconocimiento de los MOOC; las directrices de la red ENIC-NARIC para evaluadores de credenciales; Europass; el Marco Europeo de Cualificaciones (European Qualification Framework); y la herramienta de perfil de competencias de la UE para nacionales de terceros países (EU Skills Profile Tool for Third Country Nationals).
- También están apareciendo nuevas iniciativas de microcredenciales, como el Marco Común de Microcredenciales del Consorcio Europeo MOOC (European MOOC Consortium's Common Micro-Credential Framework), y proyectos de investigación como Open Education Passport (OEPass), Micro-Credentialing in European HE, o los proyectos e-Valuate y DigiRec, que están explorando formas estandarizadas de abordar la cuestión de la interoperabilidad de las microcredenciales. Por último, algunas IES ya están adoptando directamente acuerdos de aprendizaje para que el reconocimiento de los módulos basados en MOOC sea más estandarizado y transparente.
- Simplificar las políticas existentes para el reconocimiento del aprendizaje previo, de modo que sea menos complicado y requiera menos tiempo. Estos procedimientos pueden complicar el proceso de admisión y generar incertidumbre, lo que dificulta la admisión de estudiantes desfavorecidos y conduce a la exclusión en la educación superior.

### **Financiación y nuevos modelos de negocio**

Desde que se crearon los MOOC y se incorporaron a los portafolios educativos en línea de las IES, se ha reflexionado mucho sobre el desarrollo de modelos de negocio que permitan a las instituciones gestionar los costes de desarrollo e impartición de estos cursos. En general, los modelos de negocio han evolucionado y justifican el desarrollo de cursos MOOC y sus costes de desarrollo y mantenimiento en términos de creación de la marca y visibilidad de las IES y, por lo tanto, de mejora de la atracción de nuevos estudiantes y la matriculación. Sin embargo, es poco probable que este argumento general funcione en el contexto de los refugiados, los cuales no pueden pagar para entrar en una institución de educación superior y posiblemente no puedan acceder a los fondos nacionales.

Para que los MOOC y las disposiciones de los cursos en línea funcionen para los refugiados (y otros grupos vulnerables), las iniciativas de financiación no solo deberían centrarse en el desarrollo de los MOOC, sino también en la prestación de servicios a estos grupos. Esto requiere estrategias específicas de cooperación con los gobiernos y las organizaciones de la sociedad civil (véase el punto 1). Mientras que las múltiples iniciativas gubernamentales de financiación para los refugiados se ocupan de las becas, debería prestarse más atención a dar soporte a los estudiantes con condiciones de vida difíciles en el manejo de la información y la mejora de su concienciación; así como en proporcionar MOOC, cursos en línea y recursos educativos abiertos para sus necesidades inmediatas, cursos específicos que les preparen para estudios de grado y de microcredenciales, y cursos que permitan a los estudiantes completar sus estudios para obtener un título acreditado en una institución de enseñanza superior europea.

Los costes de desarrollo y servicios de los MOOC para refugiados pueden no beneficiarse de las economías de escala y, además, pueden tener costes de mantenimiento adaptativo más elevados, debido a la evolución demográfica y la situación de los refugiados. Por lo tanto, el modelo de negocio para los MOOC de refugiados es diferente y argumenta que estos cursos representan una forma apropiada y rentable de conseguir que los refugiados, especialmente aquellos con experiencia profesional, artesanal o comercial, se incorporen a la economía formal y estimulen sus esfuerzos empresariales. Por ello, existe un modelo de negocio macroeconómico basado en el aumento de la base impositiva nacional y de la capacidad o poder nacional.

Por consiguiente, debe existir una financiación específica que pueda ayudar a los países y a sus IES a hacer frente a los costes y a mantener en funcionamiento sus programas educativos abiertos. Las instituciones pueden aplicar el análisis de coste-beneficio presentado en el proyecto MOONLITE a sus iniciativas educativas abiertas siguiendo un análisis de triple resultado. Este análisis se centra en las dimensiones sociales, económicas y medioambientales, aunque existe un argumento a favor de un resultado cuádruple que reconozca la necesidad de las IES de mantener o mejorar su investigación, su productividad académica y sus resultados. Este análisis ayudará a contextualizar los gastos de estos programas en un contexto institucional amplio.

Como parte de este enfoque, pueden surgir nuevas formas de utilizar el contenido y las actividades de los MOOC que amplíen su vida útil y sus contextos de aplicación. Un ejemplo sencillo de este proceso sería traducir los MOOC existentes que han demostrado ser eficaces para un determinado grupo social a lenguas minoritarias para ampliar el número de personas que pueden beneficiarse de ellos.

## 1. Introduction

### Why this report?

This policy report represents Output 6 (O6) of the MOONLITE project and provides guidelines for policy makers on how to maximise the potential of MOOCs and minimise the potential risks they might introduce to the HEI (system) and society.

Since the other project outputs contribute to these policy recommendations, these outputs are also summarized in this report with reference to their original reports. The report's main emphasis, however, is on the project activities and outcomes leading to the policy recommendations for a viable role of MOOCs in European HEIs at local, regional and European level as contained in the Executive summary in the form of the '*The Hague Declaration on Addressing Europe's MOOC Challenges*'.

The main target groups are policy makers at both HEI level and regional/governmental level. The latter is seen as an important player in the social dimension of the educational system and the role that MOOCs can play at this level. Different governments and governmental bodies already facilitate and (financially) stimulate the development and implementation of MOOCs and other non-formal online courses related to HEIs 2nd (teaching) and 3rd (societal) mission.

This policy report not only focuses on entrepreneurial skills and support for refugees but also expands to the perspective beyond. It addresses the use of MOOCs for those who are for some reason excluded from education or employment. As such the policy guidelines strongly relate to European society values related to our HEI system such as social justice, inclusion, equality and social mobility.

### How the project aims, consortium composition, activities and planned outputs can lead the report

The project has specifically been designed with the objective to:

- Widen and improve the HEIs teaching for registered HEI students (1st mission)
- Create new educational pathways for refugees (serving society, 3rd mission) and
- Build entrepreneurial and language skills among those two groups

In doing so, the project addresses the following sectoral and horizontal strategic European priorities:

- Inclusive education, training and youth: The MOONLITE project aims to strategically utilize existing learning opportunities from Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs) to build entrepreneurial and language skills in Europe.
- Transparency and recognition of skills and qualifications to facilitate learning, employability and labour mobility: recognition of entrepreneurial and linguistic skills acquired through non-formal open learning, MOOCs in particular, is a core aim of the MOONLITE project.
- Open and innovative education, training and youth work, embedded in the digital era: the MOONLITE scenarios that will be implemented will innovate pedagogical and recognition practice in project partner institutions utilizing digital technology, in particular Massive Open Online Courses.

To meet these ambitions, the MOONLITE consortium comprises experienced actors in the field, including those with experience in:

- Designing and running MOOCs
- Designing solutions for MOOC recognition and assessment
- Setting up quality frameworks for MOOCs
- Coordinating groups of institutions producing MOOCs
- Researching the contribution of MOOCs to language teaching

To realise the project objectives, the consortium activities have focused on:

- Implementing a set of scenarios in partner HEIs and amongst our partnership reaching 3686 learners, refugees and registered students. This is covered in the practice report 'Exploiting MOOCs for access and progression into HEI & employment market' (Output 3) which is summarized in chapter 2.
- Creating a cost-benefit analysis tool (Output 4), allowing Higher Education Institutions to calculate the impact of MOOC-provision on their triple bottom lines (financial, environmental, social): This is described in the paper *Cost-Benefit Analysis for MOOC provision* and is summarized in chapter 3.
- Developing and running an open online course targeted at MOOC providers and refugee support groups on how to design and utilize MOOCs for refugees while make learning resources available beyond course duration (Output 5). This is summarized in chapter 4.
- Creating a vision and recommendations, aimed at European policy makers and institutional leaders, for a more viable and strategic role of MOOCs in European HEIs (Output 6). The activities leading up to these recommendations are described in chapter 5.

Thus, the outputs O3, O4, and O5 feed into O6, with all partners having contributed to this O6-report.

### The MOONLITE playing field

Over the past years, MOOCs have moved into the mainstream of European Higher Education. Despite this fact, there are few examples within the EHEA of institutions strategically deploying MOOCs to complement their own educational offer. Apart from virtual mobility arrangements among selected universities, partnerships in ICT-supported teaching and consequent recognition of achieved learning outcomes are scarce in European HEIs.

The MOONLITE project specifically addresses the European Commission's 2013 Communication on Opening up Education which stated that "In addition to broadening access to education, wider use of new technology and open educational resources can contribute to alleviating costs for educational institutions and for students, especially among disadvantaged groups". In the analysis at the time, this potential of MOOCs had not been fully realised due to a lack of uniform arrangements for recognition, transferability and portability of credit, as well as due to an immature evaluation framework for assessing the quality and cost-effectiveness of the same MOOCs.

In particular, MOOCs have the potential of "Supporting the efforts of EU countries to integrate refugees in Europe's education systems and ensure their skills development is an urgent task in the light of the current migration crisis" (EC, 2016). Refugees face legal, linguistic and financial barriers to enter higher education, in addition to the challenges coming from the 'lost time' obtaining refugee status, finding accommodation, re-establishing links with family etc. With the help of credit-bearing MOOCs, students would be able to commence their studies at their own pace, without needing to enroll at any institutions, knowing that this credit would be eventually recognised



towards their final degree, once they were able to access the formal higher education system. Alternatively, MOOCs could help refugees top-up specific skills and directly enter the labour market.

### Present status and developments

The concept of MOOCs has been under constant development during the project's lifetime with increasingly wider interpretations and variations. One clear trend over the last two years has been the monetization of MOOCs provided by the major MOOC consortia such as Coursera, FutureLearn and EdX. Free certification is now the exception rather than the rule and an increasing number of courses require a fee even for access to the course material. This may lead to the exclusion of groups such as refugees and migrants who could potentially benefit from access to such courses. In addition, the term MOOC is seldom mentioned in the platforms' marketing material and it is becoming increasingly hard to differentiate between MOOCs and other forms of online education. The often-quoted principle that every letter in the acronym MOOC is negotiable is even more true today, especially in terms of how we define the concept of *open*. As a result of this diversity the project has needed to also include other open online courses that may not be particularly massive or be classified under the term MOOC.

A major success factor for using MOOCs with marginalized groups such as refugees is adapting the material to the needs of the target group and even the co-creation of resources. This model can be implemented at a local level but is not applicable for global courses on the major international platforms where courses are more generic in design. Many successful cases of MOOCs being used with refugees and migrants have been locally produced courses where the HEI has worked closely with the target groups as well as other stakeholders.

## 2. Exploiting MOOCs for Access and Progression into Higher Education Institutions and Employment Market

### Introduction

This chapter summarizes the work carried out as part of Output 3 on exploiting MOOCs for access and progression into Higher Education Institutions and the employment market, as fully covered in the report *Exploiting MOOCs for Access and Progression into Higher Education Institutions and Employment Market*, available at <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/exploiting-moocs-for-access-and-progression-heis-and-employment/>.

The report lays out the institutional context, goals of the scenarios, type of learners (own learners and/or refugees), MOOC or set of MOOCs in which the learners engaged as well as their given approach to assessment and certification, additional support mechanisms provided by the partners, administrative arrangements for recognition of the learning outcomes as well as collaborations with the MOOC provider or refugee stakeholders.

The report was written in a concise and informative way providing sufficient details to transfer the practice to other higher education institutions. The addressed readers are higher education (mid) management and MOOC providers.

### Results

The report describes the conceptual and methodological approach of the MOONLITE consortium to output 3 as well as the research and practical results and recommendations for Higher Education Institutions (HEIs): *Exploiting MOOCs for Access and Progression into Higher Education Institutions and Employment Market* of the MOONLITE project.

MOOCs are online courses, which (1) are designed for large numbers of participants, (2) can be accessed by anyone anywhere as long as they have an Internet connection, (3) are open to everyone without entry qualifications and (4) offer a full/complete course experience online for free (Mulder & Jansen, 2015). Within this report, a specific focus is put on how and why various scenarios that address students' and refugees' skills development are put into practice.

The MOONLITE consortium first started exploring the needs and actual situation of the migrants and refugees in their host countries. To do so, interviews with refugee stakeholders were undertaken to obtain knowledge on their needs and challenges. Second, the concepts of employability and entrepreneurship were examined in order to identify whether entrepreneurship can be turned into opportunities for refugees and migrants. However, we reflected on our perspective of researcher in this examination, to which refugees needs to develop their entrepreneurial and language skills. Is this a valid question? Or is our 'Western' perspective making us believe that refugees need to develop language and entrepreneurial skills when they arrive in Europe? To address this question we conducted semi-structured interviews with refugee stakeholders.

Four conceptual pathways, called 'scenarios', have been elaborated:

- The first scenario aims at using online learning to enhance the progression of students.
- The second scenario aims at using online learning to enhance skills of refugees and/or other individuals and facilitate their access to HEIs.
- The third scenario aims at using online learning to enhance skills of refugees and/or other individuals and facilitate their access to the labour market.

- The last scenario aims at using online learning to enhance skills of registered students and facilitate their access to the labour market.

These scenarios were put into practice in four different higher education institutions: UNED (Universidad Nacional de Educación a Distancia), UW (University of Wolverhampton), ESCP Europe (ESCP Europe Wirtschaftshochschule Berlin e.V.) and LNU (Linnaeus University). These scenarios were implemented at these partner institutions as follows:

At UNED a learning pathway combining scenario two and three was implemented. UNED developed two MOOCs to address the daily needs of migrants and refugees living in Spain. Those were in Spanish language with Spanish, French and Arabic subtitles. 3686 refugees took part in these MOOCs that ran for six weeks each.

At UW a learning pathway in line with scenario two was implemented. Eight MOOCs were identified that address the needs of refugees. A flyer was shared with refugees by social workers indicating the list of the MOOCs and a number to contact when one had completed a MOOC. One staff member at UW was appointed to support refugees who had taken the MOOC and wanted to apply for admission. This person evaluated the skills of the refugees and enrolled them in a course at the University based on the skills developed through the MOOCs. Thus, UW used APL (accreditation of prior learning) procedures to assess and recognise the skills acquired through the MOOCs by matching them with formal conventional courses and granting the corresponding number and level of credits.

LNU chose to implement scenario one. The LNU team used existing MOOCs addressing the requirement of LNU students in terms of language and entrepreneurial skills. They used a blended-learning method. Forty learners have been reached.

ESCP Europe conceptualized and developed scenario two but was not able to implement it. ESCP Europe developed a partnership with Kiron University to recognize refugees' skill development through MOOC by enrolling them in its programs (e.g. Bachelor, Master in Management). Two refugees were interested to enroll the bachelor program of the ESCP Europe. However, while scholarships were arranged to cover the costs of the programs, the Bachelor program requires that refugees live in three different cities during the program (e.g. Paris, Berlin, Turino). This was not feasible because of local legal constraints and cost of living in those European capitals.

However, two learning pathways addressing scenario one have been implemented at ESCP Europe and enabled to reach 320 learners. A blended-learning method using an existing online learning platform for language skills development of Bachelor students has been implemented. Furthermore, an online course was developed by Martin Kupp, professor of entrepreneurship at the ESCP Europe, to teach digital transformation to students. This course was fully online and integrally part of the Executive Master in International Business of the ESCP Europe.

Overall, the implementation of the scenarios enabled the development and testing of various online learning methods for the development of linguistic and entrepreneurial skills for students. These skills have been found to be particularly crucial in a globalized context characterized by high unemployment rates of young people in several European countries. Specifically, two online learning methods (blended-learning method and online learning platform) have been tested in two different countries and university, i.e. LNU and ESCP, showing good results about the progression of students. Furthermore, pathways have been conceptualized and developed to support skill development of

refugees through online learning (addressing scenario 2 (UW, ESCP). While UNED successfully implemented scenarios two and three and reached a large number of learners, we encourage future research to investigate the extent to which online learning is appropriate for refugees to learn and develop the skills necessary to feel fully part of their host country.

## Discussion

The O3 results lead to the following practical implications:

- They highlight important social mechanisms to support the learning experience of refugees and students, thus enhancing their skills and competence development. In other words, we provide a guideline for teaching staff and HEI decision makers when designing, developing and implementing online tools to foster the learning of their students.
- They extend our understanding of refugee's needs and challenges in six European countries, characterized by diverse migration histories, refugee policies and public opinions about refugees. Therefore, we enhance knowledge on the refugee context, which may be used by various stakeholders to support refugees in their host countries.

For future research:

- We encourage future research to reflect upon the work carried out over the past ten years to use online learning for minorities. Specifically, understanding our role as researcher in this investigation and reflecting upon our assumptions on the use of online learning for these populations will advance the scholarly debate.
- Based on these investigations, we suggest future research to give more voice to the refugees and empower them to develop their own way to acquire the necessary knowledge. Specifically, understanding entrepreneurial thinking and acting in the country of origin of the refugees would be very useful to enrich our entrepreneurship comprehension. It is probable that the way entrepreneurship is taught and implemented in Europe does not align with entrepreneurial vision in host country. Therefore, increasing our understanding of entrepreneurship in Syria and Iran would be of particular interest.

### 3. Cost–benefit Analysis of MOOCs for Higher Education

#### Introduction

This chapter summarizes the work carried out as part of Output 4 on the development of a cost-benefit analysis tool (available at <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/cba/>), and as fully described in the article *Cost-Benefit Analysis for MOOC provision*, retrieved from <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/cba>)

In the context of MOONLITE, which examines the application of MOOCs in contexts of social inclusion and employability, the need to analyse both the efficacy of MOOC-based interventions and to compare the opportunity cost of investing in MOOCs versus other interventions must be considered. This activity in MOONLITE therefore aimed to:

- Create a framework for measuring overall impact of a MOOC, as well as the efficiency of interventions;
- Test the framework in participating institutions within the MOONLITE project;
- Use the feedback to improve the impact measurement tool, as well as to
- Extrapolate general conclusions about institutional approaches to MOOCs in contexts of social inclusion and employment.

The output is a tool targeted towards middle management within higher educational Institutions. Its main aim is to quantify the contribution that MOOCs and other informal online courses make to institutions' triple bottom line (i.e., financial, environmental and social), and how their effectiveness compares to other more traditional services offered by the same higher educational institutions.

In particular, the tool serves to inform institutional leaders as to the cost-effectiveness of implementing MOOC programmes within their institutions and give some guidelines on how to assess the effectiveness of their implementation.

#### Results

Following assessment of different approaches to impact assessment and cost-benefit analysis, Triple Bottom Line Reporting was identified as the most suitable approach, given its focus on financial, environmental and social costs and benefits.

To develop a framework for analysis ISO 26000 - Social Responsibility Guidance and the GRI Standards were used. Each of the criteria in these standards was examined to determine its applicability as an indicator for MOOC-based educational provision. This led to the suggestion of 26 indicators across the three domains. These were then structured using the following format:

Indicator	Students Given Access to Education
Description	Students given access to study a subject area they would not have otherwise studied thanks to MOOCs
Unit of Measurement	# of students OR # of student-study hours (ECTS-equivalents)

Contributes to Reporting	ISO 26000: 6.3.9 GRI G4: 412
How to Measure	Pre-Course Survey:  1. Would you have tried to study this subject elsewhere if it was not offered as a (free & online) MOOC? Yes / No

Figure: Example for the criterion ‘Students Given Access to Education’

Using a semi-standardised reporting template, four institutions took part in the analysis pilot:

- UNED applied the methodology to its entire MOOC programme. The chief results was the gaining of a better idea of its social impact, gathering together disparate indicators from across the institution. However environmental analysis proved impossible.
- LNU conducted an ‘after the fact’ analysis of a single MOOC over three iterations. This allowed it to gain useful information about the internationalisation of the institution via the MOOC, and its real outreach.
- ESCP applied the analysis to its (pilot) MOOC Programme. The analysis aided them in analysing the diversity of MOOC participants attending the course. Similarly to UNED, environmental analysis proved impossible.
- WU attempted to apply the analysis to its MOOC programme, however, due to institutional limitations on reporting was unable to gather any relevant data.

## Discussion

From the limited pilot conducted within the framework of the MOONLITE project it is clear that in participating institutions, **the impact of MOOCs is not being measured against either Financial, Social or Environmental criteria**. This implies that demonstrable impact (as well as costs) is not the main driver of MOOC development. While more research would be needed to confirm this, interviews with piloting institutions indicate that MOOC programmes are considered experimental, with success criteria being defined as ascertaining pedagogical appropriateness of the medium, and the institution’s ‘ability to offer’ such programmes. Other possible reasons include ‘fear of missing out’ given the MOOC bubble within European institutions, and the inclusion of MOOCs as a vague action within wider Corporate Social Responsibility or institutional promotion packages.

Despite the limitations of participating partners in trying to implement the framework, the value of such an approach was recognised by all participants. In particular, the framework allowed for improved understanding of how MOOCs contribute to institutional diversity, improving motivation for learning and internationalisation of the institutions.

This said, while social impact was considered relevant for partners, environmental impact was not a factor in decisions to offer or continue MOOC programmes. In fact none of the participating institutions measure the environmental cost of MOOCs or have implemented MOOCs to reduce their environmental footprint. Despite the fact that institutions have overall environmental strategies, it seems that the possibilities of MOOCs to contribute such strategies are still not recognised.

A major limiting factor of the approach is that none of the participating institutions do granular analysis of the cost-benefits of any of their individual programmes. Institutional success tends to be

driven by the priorities of those funding the programmes. Thus, for public institutions indicators are linked to Quality Assurance reviews, while for private institutions they are tied closely to admission and graduation figures. All institutions are significantly driven by institutional ranking. Unless determined by these tools, wider impact indicators do not have direct business relevance to the institutions.

Finally, several participants have argued that triple-bottom line reporting does not appropriately capture the mission of universities, with a fourth bottom line in terms of academic/research/knowledge impact being proposed as being separate (and more important than) social impact.

With these limitations in mind, we believe that our work suggests that some elements of triple-bottom line reporting may be used to make the case for a more systematic use of MOOCs, given that these are still a niche activity for most institutions. Being able to showcase the cost-benefits of a MOOC programme, and being able to contrast these with those of other learning methodologies may allow MOOC-departments to make a case for expansion and mainstreaming to management. However, taking advantage of this possibility requires departments to create an analytics strategy from the outset, and measurement of it over years.

## 4. How to design and utilize MOOCs for refugees

### Introduction

This chapter summarizes the work carried out as part of Output 5, where a (meta)MOOC was developed on how to design, develop and deploy MOOCs for displaced people. The MOOC was aimed at MOOC providers, HEIs, teachers, migrants, and refugee support groups such as NGOs, foundations, etc. The MOOC as an interactive course is now closed, but its content is still available at <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/how-to-design-and-utilize-moocs-for-refugees/>

### Results

#### Aim and objectives of the Meta-MOOC and the two LMOOCs

In order to present the research undertaken and the experience acquired during the project, it was decided that a MOOC would be more practical, effective and interactive than a written report. This is even more so the case since the main objective of the project is to explore the potential and suitability of MOOCs for social inclusion and for those left behind, especially for displaced people. This MOOC, entitled: “The value of developing and using MOOCs for refugees and migrants in the European context”, was also referred to informally within the project as the “Meta-MOOC” (since it is a MOOC about how to use MOOCs). It had the following aims:

- To help all interested parties gain a better understanding of the problems that refugees have and how MOOCs can be used to help them.
- To familiarize MOOC providers with the learning specifics of refugees, migrants and support groups (associations, foundations and NGOs).
- To help support groups gain awareness of open education, especially that related to the development of linguistic and entrepreneurial skills.
- To provide a better understanding of how MOOCs are developed/executed and their underlying business model.
- To create a dialogue between MOOC providers and support groups around how to exploit open education in the context of higher education institutions for refugees, and migrants.

Together with this MOOC, two Language MOOCs (LMOOCs) were also created. They were developed as a part of the educational scenario of the institution of the coordinators, UNED. The principal aim for these LMOOCs was to illustrate the design, development and deployment of LMOOC tailored for refugees and migrants, within a specific social context, in this case, Spain. They targeted newly arrived refugees and migrants to help them learn the Spanish language (from A1 to A2+). Data obtained from the courses, and questionnaires undertaken by its students, showed how this type of student, can effectively be engaged to participate and interact with their teachers, facilitators and peers in a MOOC.

#### Design and development approach

The design of the Meta-MOOC started with all members of the project team collaborating on relevant documents held in Google Drive, in order to specify the structure, content, and duration of the course. It was decided that the MOOC would have 6 modules, designed to be studied one week at a time, although all were open from the beginning of the course, following the standard flexibility and modularity of MOOCs.



Since the MOOC needed to be deployed on the Open EdX platform used by UNED, the following types of resources and activities were included, and were taken into account for the final student grade, necessary in order to get the certificate:

- Reading activity: this consists of reading a text in PDF.
- Watching activity: this consists of watching a brief video recording.
- Reading & Watching activity: this is used for sections with different types of activity.
- Questionnaire activity: there are two questionnaires in this course, one to be completed before the students start the course, and one at the end, after they have finished it

In addition to these activities, there were 3 types of optional social and collaborative activities, not affecting the final grade for the certificate, but of great importance to facilitate learning:

- Forums. The platform has a forum tool that can be used to interact and communicate with the other participants and the teaching team, to ask questions or engage in discussions. The Meta-MOOC had a total of seven forums: a general discussion one, to ask questions or make comments about the course, and six others, one for each module, for questions related to its contents. All forums were open while the course was running. Participation instructions and rules on forum interaction were given in the course guide.
- Peer to peer activities. The course included one P2P activity, with a correction rubric to help the students evaluate the answers of their peers.
- Google Docs activity: The course included an optional collaborative activity of adding and editing text in a Google Document, in order to build a summary and group reflections.

With respect to the certification, interested students could request a completion certificate once the course finished. It included the full name of the participant, the name of the course, the institutional logo, the course duration and its equivalence as 1 ECTS. In order to obtain it, the compulsory activities had to be completed and 60% of the course had to have been completed.

In order to prepare the course materials and activities for the course, UNED provided the members of the project with a series of templates (text, video, etc.), so all content was homogeneous and included a Creative Commons license. Indications were also provided on how to create and implement the elements of the course. For the recording of the videos, different techniques and styles were used: self-recording using mobile phones or laptop cameras, professional video recording teams on an HEI campus or in its TV studios.

When the educational resources were ready, UNED undertook the upload and configuration of these on the Open EdX platform: Firstly, the outline and structure of the course and each module was undertaken; Secondly, the upload and setup of materials and activities (readings, videos, questionnaires, forum discussion and p2p) were done, together with the configuration of course evaluation and the certificate; Finally, all members of the project reviewed the course, and based upon their comments, adjustments were made, and the starting dates were agreed.

In order to disseminate the course, a publicity campaign was planned and undertaken in several different places: on the web pages of every partner institutions, on social networks, and via email sent to relevant people and groups, etc. The dissemination plan and activities were recorded in a table shared in a Google Spreadsheet.

## The modules

As noted above, the Meta-MOOC has 6 modules and follows the structure of the project and its outputs: one overview module focused on the platform itself, the presentation of the course and the MOONLITE project; and five main modules: “Introduction” with a contextualisation of MOOCs for displaced people related to language learning and employability; “Case studies I and II” divided over two modules; “The application of a cost-based analysis tool to the triple-bottom line for MOOCs”; and “Synthesis of the best practices for the application of MOOCs for social inclusion”. Each module has its own discussion forum, and since the course was planned to be studied over a 5-week period (the first week for Modules 0 and 1), every week the project members responsible for every module, focused on their activities in their corresponding forums.

Module 0 “Presentation of the course” has an overview of the whole course, and each module an overview section, which consisted of a list of topics, learning materials and activities to be carried out during the corresponding week and module.

- In Module 0 the course structure is presented, together with a course guide on how the Open EdX platform at UNED works
- Module 1 focuses on the research undertaken during the first period of the project, on the contextualisation of open and online education for displaced people.
- Module 2 and Module 3 presents the four case studies carried out by the project partners (LNU in Sweden, ESCP in Germany, WVU in the UK, and UNED in Spain), showing different educational scenarios on application of MOOCs in European HEIs with students, migrants and refugees (as described in chapter 2).
- Module 4 presents a cost-benefit analysis tool developed within the project, in order to analyse the economic, social and environmental sustainability for institutions when using open online courses and MOOCs (as described in chapter 3).
- Finally, Module 5 gathered a synthesis of best practices of the application of MOOCs for social inclusion for those left behind, specifically displaced people.

## Experiences with running the MOOC (course analysis)

The Meta-MOOC was launched on 8 January 2019 and finished on 18 February 2019. However, the course has been left permanently open and available as an open educational resource, although the forums will not be attended by the teaching team, and are in fact left in read-only mode. The aim of leaving the course open is that people interested in how MOOCs can be used for social inclusion, can enter the course, watch the videos and download all the materials, and read the discussions in the forums, even if they cannot add any further questions or comments.

The course was intended to engage a minimum of 50 participants. However, 201 participants were registered, of which a total of 30 people (15%) completed the mandatory activities, which is a high completion rate for a MOOC, since normally it is less than 10%. Therefore, it can be said that the quantitative results were satisfactory.

It is important to note that the profile of participants were not students really interested in finishing the course to obtain a certificate, but rather professionals from different fields who wanted to learn about using MOOCs for social inclusion. Therefore, they were more interested in engaging with the materials and discussions and not with undertaking the compulsory activities.

## Discussion

The key results of this output, derived from the forums discussions, and recommendations that can be drawn are the following:

- MOOCs represent an effective learning mechanism for refugees if the target group are kept in mind and participate in the design, development, and deployment phases. The courses should work well on the types of mobile technology that they typically have.
- It is not necessary to have a MOOC platform for interested parties to prepare and run their own MOOC, since many platforms are openly available.
- The partner scenarios presented here represent the different perceived value of MOOCs in European countries. These differences can be studied by people wanting to reproduce the MOONLITE experience, so that they will be able to apply some of the experiences presented and the conclusions produced.
- It is important for both refugee support groups and refugees themselves to be included in the MOOC design process, so that the courses can take into account the fact that refugees and migrants are not a homogeneous social group.
- It is difficult for refugees to have their previous learning recognised and certified, since they typically don't carry their educational certificates with them. MOOCs can encapsulate parts of their prior learning and provide a way to gain some kind of certification for prior knowledge.
- The cost-benefit analysis tool with its triple bottom line (social, ecological and economic sustainability) provides a way to articulate the benefits of applying MOOCs for refugees in a given educational and institutional context. Using the triple bottom line, a given institution can focus on the parts of the MOOC value model that are relevant for their business model.
- The best practices that have been highlighted in this output, regarding the application of MOOCs for refugees, can be expanded to the area of general social inclusion. National and international policies are of great importance in supra-institutional contexts and help adapt the work presented here to other social collectives and educational objectives.

## 5. A viable role for MOOCs in European HEIs

### Introduction

This chapter describes the activities leading up to the formulation of the guidelines on how to maximise the potential of MOOCs and minimise the potential risks they might introduce to HEI (system) and society. The guidelines themselves, in the form of the *'The Hague Declaration on Addressing Europe's MOOC Challenges'*, are included as the executive summary of this report.

The main target groups for the guidelines are policy makers at HEI level and at regional/governmental level. Different governments and governmental bodies already facilitate and (financially) stimulate the development and implementation of MOOCs and other non-formal online courses related to HEIs 2nd (teaching) and 3rd (society) mission.

The following activities were carried out under O6 and are reported in this chapter:

- European MOOC survey 2017 (O6-A1)
- European MOOC survey 2018 (O6-A1)
- European MOOC survey 2019 (O6-A1)
- Interviews (O6-A2)
- Regional focus groups (O6-A2)
- Online vision building events (O6-A3)
- Multiplier events

### European MOOC Survey 2017

#### Aim of the survey

The report *MOOC Strategies of European Institutions* (available at [https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC\\_Strategies\\_of\\_European\\_Institutions.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC_Strategies_of_European_Institutions.pdf)) presents the results of the MOOC survey amongst European Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) conducted between November 2016 and February 2017. This survey is part of a series of annual surveys conducted since 2014.

The questionnaire was open from 4 November 2016 until 14 February 2017 and consisted of 11 sections. Six sections are identical to the initial survey conducted in 2014 (Jansen & Schuwer, 2015) and seven sections identical to the 2015 survey (Jansen & Goes-Daniels, 2016). As such this report also discusses some initial trends in European MOOC strategies. Next to determining possible changes over the years, it also aims on getting more details about possible collaboration models and to know more about characteristics of the social dimension of MOOC involvement of European HEIs.

#### Summary of findings

##### **Uptake of MOOCs by HEIs**

Last year's report (Jansen & Goes-Daniels, 2016) already demonstrated that a large percentage (at least 40%) of the European Higher Education Institutions seems to have developed a MOOC or is planning to develop a MOOC. This in contrast to in the United States (US) where the number of HEIs that have a MOOC, or is planning to add MOOC offering is stable at 12-13% for over four years.

When comparing the status of MOOC offering to the survey results of 2014 and 2015, a steady growth in the number of institutions offering MOOCs is seen. Institutions who are planning to add MOOC offerings and who not yet have decided about MOOCs is decreasing at the same time.

However, the total number of institutions having or planning to add a MOOC is overall stable, with 68% in this 2016 and in the 2015 survey, and 72% in 2014.

The survey shows that the majority of HEIs (66%) are not connected to one of the big MOOC platform providers (e.g., edX, Coursera, FutureLearn, Miriada X, etc.), but offer their MOOCs in their institutional platforms or in available regional/national platforms. That the uptake of MOOCs in Europe is maturing at a much higher level compared to the US, is also an achievement of the regional, partially language-bound platforms.

Already 20% of responding HEIs offers six or more MOOCs, indicating a transition where HEIs are using MOOCs beyond pilot phase (although 32% still offers only one to five MOOCs).

### **Objectives of HEIs for MOOC involvement**

Overall, already three consecutive surveys show that European HEIs are very positive towards using MOOCs to learn about online pedagogy and more than half of the respondents consider MOOCs to be a sustainable method for offering courses.

The primary objectives of HEIs in MOOC offering is overall consistent over the last three years. Increase institutional visibility and flexible learning opportunities are seen as the most important objectives for Higher Education Institutions. While generating income, learning about scaling and exploring cost reductions are believed to be the least important objectives throughout the last three years. However, this year, for the first time, flexible learning opportunities are seen as the most important objective to offer MOOCs (33%). The objective to increase institutional visibility is still seen as important, but dropped to 23% compared to 33% in the 2015 survey.

Related to the relevance of objectives, the innovation area of MOOCs (e.g., improve quality of on campus offering, contribute to the transition to more flexible and online education, improve teaching) are seen as the most important cluster of objectives. In total 82% of the respondents consider it to be (highly) relevant for their institutions. Again, financial reasons are the least important objective, only 17% of the institutions viewed it as (highly) relevant. These results are very consistent over the last three survey years although a slight decrease of relevance regarding reputation/visibility and demands of learners and societies is observed (but still seen as (highly) relevant).

Related to the main (society) drivers behind MOOC offering, the need for (e-) skills and jobs together with improving the quality of learning are (highly) relevant for the participating institutions. In all three surveys the drivers include new forms to educate the many, technical innovation push and openness as step to circulation of knowledge are seen as (highly) relevant. The latter, however, is increased in relevance over the years, positioning MOOCs in Europe as part of the open education movement.

### **MOOCs for Opening up Education to all**

MOOCs started with the promise to open up quality education for all. The vast majority of the respondents (51%) agreed that MOOCs should be for everyone, not for specific target groups. However, only 1% states that MOOCs should be specifically targeting those potentially left behind (e.g., unemployed, persons with disabilities, migrants and refugees).

Open Education has many dimensions (see for example UNESCO-COL publication by Patru & Balaji, 2016). One dimension is related to the re-use of material and open licenses. Already 36% of the institutions are developing MOOCs to be re-used by other institutions and also 36% are re-using existing MOOCs for students in continuous and/or degree education.

When asked if HEIs should develop a policy to open up their educational offer to those potentially left behind, 74% of the respondents (strongly) agree. Also, the majority agrees (63%) with the statement that Collaboration with NGOs and civil society organisations is essential to guarantee the use of MOOCs to those potentially left behind. A wide variety of possible measures are suggested for opening up education to those potentially left behind, ranging from technological, pedagogical, facilitation and support, marketing, cooperation and costs.

### **Certification of MOOCs**

In contrast to previous years, the number of institutions that believed credentials for MOOC completions caused confusion decreased by about 6% (respectively 16% and 17% in 2014 and 2016), compared to over 60% in the 2013 US survey (Allen & Seaman, 2014). A majority (63%) of the respondents (strongly) agrees with that statement that it is essential to offer a formal (ECTS) credit next to more informal certificates like for example a certificate of participation and even 70% (strongly) agrees that these formal (ECTS) credits should be recognised in formal bachelor/master programs of the institution that offers the MOOC and these (ECTS) credits should be recognised by other HEIs as well (e.g., as part of joint programs or virtual exchange). As such this response shows a strong willingness to incorporate MOOC in regular education offering and recognise credit accordingly.

### **Need for European collaboration**

As many HEIs are (going to be) involved in MOOCs, the need for regional / cross-institutional collaboration schemes will increase. Especially as most of these HEIs cannot become partner of the big MOOC providers as they apply selective contracting policies to HEIs. Moreover, data about MOOC participants, their behaviour and preferences related to the needs in society, etc. are strongly biased towards reports of the big MOOC platform providers. As many European MOOC efforts are local/regional (66% of responded HEIs), there is a lack of coherent research at a European level.

As MOOCs are for massive audiences and relate to scalability – joint partnerships are essential. However, the regional differences in languages, cultures and pedagogical approaches might hinder an effective collaboration on scalable services in MOOC provision.

### **Collaboration of outsourcing**

The 2015 survey already demonstrated that many European HEIs are willing to collaborate on scalable services in MOOC provision, and that a regional collaboration is much more likely than outsourcing services to corporates parties. This year's survey confirms that European HEIs are very much willing to collaborate on services like co-creating MOOCs with other institutions, sharing and reusing elements from MOOCs, design and development of MOOC (materials). Collaboration on services like translation services and support on licensing (copyright-copyleft) is perceived as less likely. Two other studies done in 2016 confirm this, but in addition indicate a willingness to collaborate on a quality assurance framework for MOOCs and on recognition of each other's MOOCs.

Related to the organisation of MOOC support, European HEIs are most likely to collaborate with a regional or national support centre, least likely is the collaboration with a global market player. 56% of the respondents believe that support services in Europe(an regions) should not be provided by mainly for-profit organisations and should be financed by public means.

## European MOOC Survey 2018

### Aim of the survey

The report *MOOC strategies in European Universities* (available at [https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC\\_Strategies\\_in\\_European\\_Universities.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC_Strategies_in_European_Universities.pdf)) presents the results of the MOOC survey amongst European Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) conducted between December 15, 2017 and May 15, 2018. This survey is part of a series of annual surveys conducted since 2014.

The report focusses on the present uptake of MOOCs at European HEIs; the motives whether or not to use MOOCs, and the barriers experienced to their uptake; whether MOOCs are meeting their promise to open up (higher) education; the present status on recognition and certification of MOOCs; and the need for European collaboration and possible outsourcing models.

The underlying survey consisted of eleven sections, six of which are identical to the first survey conducted in 2014 (Jansen & Schuwer, 2015) and seven are identical to the 2015 survey (Jansen & Goes-Daniels, 2016). Thus, the collected data does to some extent allow for timeline analysis and trend reporting.

### Summary of findings

#### **Uptake of MOOCs by European HEIs**

The majority of the responding HEIs are publicly financed (89%) and have an on-campus education provision (71%). More than half of the respondents is already offering MOOCs, while another quarter is planning to do so, with some institutions still hesitant. Only 3% of the institutions has no intention to offer MOOCs at all. Those offering MOOCs are equally divided over those offering 1-5 MOOCs, and those offering more than 5 MOOCs. The uptake shows a marked increase compared to last year's survey (from 43% to 55% of HEIs offering MOOCs), as does the number of MOOCs offered.

The majority of respondents feel that MOOCs should be offered to everyone, not for specific target groups. This indicates that MOOCs are still connected to their initially social inclusion goals, giving everyone access to quality education. In practice, we see an increase in institutions actually deploying MOOCs as part of their regular educational offering in continuous and/or degree education: from just over one-third last year to more than half in 2017.

From those offering MOOCs, a third does so through one of the big MOOC platform providers (e.g., edX, Coursera, FutureLearn, MiriadaX, etc.), while another third has installed one of the open source platforms at their own institution (e.g., Moodle, OpenedX, etc.). The rest either has developed their own platform or uses a national platform.

When comparing the status of MOOC offering to the survey results of 2014 (EU2014), 2015 (S2015), and 2016 (S2016), the continuing growth in the number of institutions offering MOOCs is reconfirmed. This is in line with the global trend. The number of institutions that has not yet decided about MOOCs is further decreasing, as has the number that has decided not to offer any MOOCs.

MOOCs are increasingly deployed as part of the HEIs regular educational offering in continuous and/or degree education (up from 36% in 2016 to 56% in 2017).

### **Objectives of HEIs for MOOC involvement**

Providing flexible learning opportunities and increasing institutional visibility are still the most important objectives for European HEIs to be offering MOOCs. However, the importance of institutional visibility is steadily decreasing in relevance for the third year in a row now. Reaching new students and exploring innovative pedagogies are of medium importance, while financial motives – exploring cost reductions and generating income – are considered least important. The latter seems in contrast to the global trend (Class Central, 2017) of the ‘shrinking of free’ leads to learners not just paying for certification and credentials, but also for access to content.

Overall, the majority of institutions consider MOOCs a sustainable method for offering courses, and close to half agree that MOOCs meet most or all of their institution’s objectives. That awarding credentials for MOOC completion would lead to confusion about the HEIs degrees is disputed by over half of the respondents. All these results seem stable over the different surveys.

When asked for the relevance of the various objectives, reputation/visibility is considered to be highly relevant the institution, closely followed by MOOCs as an innovation area, and meeting demands from learners and society at large. Financial reasons are considered least relevant. Also, these results are consistent over the years.

### **MOOCs for opening up education to those potentially left behind**

MOOCs’ initial promise was to open up quality education for all, including those potentially left behind (for example the unemployed, persons with disabilities, migrants and refugees).

When asked whether HEIs should develop a policy to open up their educational offer to those potentially left behind, indeed over three-quarters of respondents (strongly) agrees, and over one-third actually do offer MOOCs on topics that they consider highly interesting for those potentially left behind. However, only 1% percent of respondents considers this to be the prime target group for their MOOC offerings. So, although those potentially left behind are not HEIs’ main target group for MOOCs, there is widespread support for opening up MOOCs for this group.

However, by now it is recognised that special measures are needed to make educational offers like MOOCs suitable for this target group. When asked about supportive measures, respondents specifically indicated targeted marketing, free access to computer and internet facilities, extensive support and tutoring, and attention to accessibility and culturally suitable pedagogical approaches as specifically relevant for this target group. As with other MOOC students, recognition of learning outcomes is also relevant for this group. Thus, although HEIs do not specifically develop their MOOCs for those potentially left behind, HEIs should address potential barriers like costs, support, and accessibility for this group.

In addition, NGOs and civil society organisations may have an important role to play in reaching those potentially left behind.

### **Certification of MOOCs**



Three-quarters of respondents agree that formal recognition of MOOC learning outcomes through awarding (ECTS) credits is of (major) importance for the further uptake of MOOCs. This should apply to the institution's own MOOCs as well as those offered by other institutions.

Respondents indicate that this will require a national or even international framework for the recognition of micro-credentials and formal MOOC credits. To get such a framework operational challenges related to quality assurance- and certification procedures and -mechanisms need to be addressed. Also, mechanisms for reliable (online) student assessment and proctoring are repeatedly mentioned as prerequisites to the recognition of MOOC learning outcomes.

The fear that awarding credits for MOOC completion would lead to confusion about the HEIs degrees is disputed by over half of the respondents.

### **Need for European collaboration**

As indicated earlier, just a third of the HEIs offers their MOOCs through one of the big MOOC platform providers, while the rest uses in-house or national platforms. As MOOCs are based on the principle of mass participation and scalability, joint partnerships are of major importance. However, Europe's regional differences in languages, cultures and pedagogical approaches may hinder the effective collaboration on scalable services in MOOC provision.

When asked for areas where cooperation would be beneficial, especially co-development was mentioned, referring to online learning materials, complete MOOCs, and even cross-institutional programmes. The expected benefits are increased efficiency (sharing expertise, scarce resources, costs) and expected higher quality of the resulting MOOCs. Also, recognition of each other's MOOCs and cooperation on learning analytics scored favourably. Collaboration on translation services and licensing (copyright-copyleft) is perceived as less likely. Also, the importance of joint development/use of a shared MOOC platform scores consistently low over the years.

On the mode of cooperation that should lead to a wider uptake of MOOCs, the HEIs do not indicate a clear preference for either of the following options: a) each HEI works individually; b) HEIs cooperate through a regional or national support centre; or c) HEIs cooperate through a European MOOC consortium. There seems some shared support in favour of 'local' or European solutions over collaboration with a global market player however.

Reasons not to cooperate with others include legislative barriers, copyright issues, and considerations of competition and branding.

Outsourcing of MOOC services to other providers is considered less likely than cooperation with other HEIs. Lack of funds, the fear of losing control, branding, and concerns about educational quality are mentioned. At the same time, major reasons mentioned in favour of outsourcing are a lack of expertise and institutional capacity, and cost-efficiency. So, it seems the (lack of) funds and capacity can be both a reason to outsource and not to outsource, depending on the local context. When outsourcing, the majority of respondents is not in favour to outsource to for-profit organisation.

## [European MOOC Survey 2019](#)

### [Aim of the survey](#)

This report presents the results of an online survey amongst European Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) conducted in the period April-June 2019. The full report '*MOOC status in European HEIs – with*

*special reference to opening up education for refugees'* is available at [https://eadtu.eu/documents/MOOC\\_status\\_in\\_European\\_HEIs.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/documents/MOOC_status_in_European_HEIs.pdf)

This survey is part of a series of surveys conducted annually by EADTU since 2014, though this year's survey has a somewhat different structure than the previous surveys, with specific emphasis on the topics of recognition and accreditation of MOOCs, and on refugees as a target group for MOOCs.

The survey comprises of seven sections: profile information; the present uptake of MOOCs at European HEIs; re-using MOOCs; institutional strategies for the development and delivery of MOOCs; strategies to boost the development and uptake of MOOCs; recognition and certification of MOOCs; and strategies to promote MOOCs for opening up education to refugees.

## Summary of findings

### Sample information

A sample of 96 HEIs from 20 countries forms the basis for this report, with more than half of the respondents holding (senior) positions directly related to ITC, e-learning and/or MOOCs. Of the total sample of 96 institutions, large sub-samples are from Turkey (31 HEIs) and from France (29 HEIs). In case there are marked differences between the overall sample and the sub-samples, this is reported.

The large majority of responding institutions is publicly financed, as was the case with the surveys in previous years. Over half mainly provide on-campus education, while one-third are mixed-mode institutions. This year's sample contains more mixed-mode institutions, mainly among the French and Turkey's institutions, than the 2018 survey.

The largest share of institutions (36) enroll 30.000 or more students. Twenty-one institutions enroll 15.000-29.999 students, twenty-three enroll 5.000-14.999 students, and sixteen less than 5000 students. This distribution is similar to that of the 2018 survey.

Overall the institutional profiles are similar to those of the 2018 sample, although the sub-samples from Turkey and France somewhat differ from the overall sample: they contain relatively more small institutions<sup>4</sup> and more often offer a mix of on-campus and online education than HEIs in the overall sample. Turkish HEIs are more often privately funded, while French institutions are more often publicly funded than in the overall sample.

### Status of MOOC offering

Overall three-quarters of the institutions are already offering MOOCs, with another five institutions in the process of developing one or more MOOCs right now. Only six institutions in the overall sample do not intend to offer any MOOCs, neither now nor in future. MOOC uptake differs considerably between the sub-samples: of the French HEIs 90% is offering MOOCs, while for the Turkish sub-sample this is 32%.

When comparing this year's numbers to those of the previous surveys, the annual growth in institutions offering MOOCs again continues this year. Further growth in the uptake of MOOCs is especially possible in the Turkish sub-sample, with indeed almost half of the sample indicating they are either in the process of developing MOOCs (7%) or are planning to do so in future (39%). In the rest of the sample the adoption of MOOCs is close to stabilization, taking into account the number of

---

<sup>4</sup> One of the largest HEIs however is also from Turkey, Anadolu university, which is mandated as the national provider for distance education.

institutions already offering MOOCs and those in the process of developing these (83% together) and 9% with no intention to offer MOOCs whatsoever.

The further uptake of MOOCs could still be realised by increasing the number of MOOCs offered per institution. The numbers to support such a possible trend are mixed however. Of the institutions already offering MOOCs in this year's survey, more than half currently offer between 1-10 MOOCs, while ten institutions offer 11-20 MOOCs, nine offer 21-30 MOOCs, and three offer over a hundred MOOCs. When compared to last year's survey, the percentage of institutions offering 1-10 MOOCs has remained constant, with considerable growth in the percentage of institutions offering 11-30 MOOCs, but with a decrease in the percentage offering more than 30 MOOCs.

The majority of institutions offering MOOC(s) offer these through one of the large international platforms (edX, Coursera, FutureLearn, Miriádx, FUN etc.). The use of institutional platforms (e.g. Moodle, OpenedX) comes second. National/ regional platforms and especially locally developed platforms are less popular. Eight institutions deploy more than one platform, usually next to one of the large international platforms. The relative importance of the large international platforms is even higher for the French sub-sample (25 out of 29 use these), while in the Turkish sub-sample seven out of the nine institutions already offering MOOCs offer these through existing software installed as the institutional platform (e.g. Moodle, OpenedX).

Compared to last year's survey the adoption of the large international platforms has increased considerably, from 31% then to 67% now, with a corresponding decrease in the use of locally installed open source platforms and in-house developed platforms. The percentage of national/regional platforms has slightly risen (from 5% to 13%), but due to low numbers it is not clear whether this indeed is part of a trend.

### **Re-use of existing MOOCs**

Of the 59 institutions already offering MOOCs 19 only offer MOOCs they developed themselves while 32 (also) offer MOOCs developed by others. This is similar to the ratio in last year's survey. These MOOCs are mainly offered as part of continuous education, and to a somewhat lesser degree as part of a Master programme or Bachelor programme. Of the institutions offering MOOCs, 27 indicate that their MOOCs are re-used by others.

When asked whether institutions are also willing to integrate MOOCs taught in another language, there is a marked differences between the different sub-samples. Overall 41 institutions indicate they are willing to do so, while 38 indicate they definitely are not willing to do so. Of these 38 institutions 25 are from the Turkish sub-sample, and nine from the French sub-sample. From the remaining institutions (the other European countries) the large majority is willing to integrate foreign-language MOOCs. Slightly less institutions are prepared to integrate foreign-language MOOCs after translation, or to integrate foreign-language MOOCs as an elective.

Thus half of the institutions already offering MOOCs also include MOOCs developed by others, most often as part of their continuous education offering. The re-use of MOOCs *from* others is mirrored by the re-use *by* others. Whether the MOOC is taught in a foreign-language does not make a difference in the willingness to integrate that MOOC or not. Institutions seem somewhat less keen on translating such foreign-language MOOCs before offering them, or to offer them as an elective. Overall Turkish and French HEIs are less likely to include MOOCs from others and foreign-language MOOCs (whether in their original language or as a translated version) than HEIs in the rest of the

sample. As the surveys of previous years did not contain questions on the (re-)use of foreign-language MOOCs, no trend analysis is possible on this issue.

### **Institutional strategies for the development and delivery of MOOCs**

Almost all institutions presently offering MOOCs do so as ‘open education’ for the general public (49 out of the 59). The majority also offers MOOCs to their Degree students (35) and continuous education students (32). Institutions offering MOOCs for the general public remarkably often combine this with offering MOOCs for continuous professional development (30 institutions).

Eleven institutions offer MOOCs to disadvantaged groups specifically. Those eleven institutions all offer 10 or more MOOCs and tend to offer MOOCs to (almost) all the other categories of learners as well. Disadvantaged groups thus do not seem a strategic target group for HEIs in their MOOC offering.

Raising institutional visibility is still the most important motive to offer MOOCs. Other important motives are experimenting with innovative online pedagogies and enriching continuous professional development.

The least important motive to develop and offer MOOCs is to generate income. This low score reconfirms similar results found with the previous 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 surveys. This seems to contrast with the trend (Class Central 2017) of the ‘shrinking of free’ of MOOC offerings. This is thus not confirmed for our sample, possibly due to the fact that the large majority of our sample comprises of publicly financed institutions.

The motive to reaching out to disadvantaged groups through MOOCs is a special case. For the Turkish sub-sample this is the most important motive, while for the French sub-sample this is the two-but-least important motive.

When asked for the main barriers that prevent the development of MOOCs within one’s institution, the lack of staff availability scores highest. For Turkish HEIs this seems directly linked to the lack of staff competences and the lack of specialized staff support. For the rest of the sample the lack of staff competences and specialized staff support is somewhat less of a barrier, but instead is the lack of funds a relatively important barrier. Most likely this lack of funds for these institutions is directly linked to the staffing issue, as ‘Lack of support from management’ for this group scores relatively low, indicating that the staffing issue is not the result of management deprioritizing MOOC development, but that real financial restrictions lead to low staff availability for MOOC development.

Well over half of the institutions are prepared to develop MOOCs in a foreign language to reach out to other countries; about a quarter is not prepared to do this, and the rest does not know. This willingness to develop MOOCs in a foreign language thus is matched by the willingness to integrate foreign-language MOOCs in one’s own offering (see above under the previous section on re-use of MOOCs).

### **National strategies for the development and delivery of MOOCs**

There are major differences between the sub-sample when it comes to national strategies/policies, barriers, and possible measures to boost the development and delivery of MOOCs.

On the availability of a national policy/strategy to promote MOOCs, the large majority of French respondents (77%) indicates that such a national policy/strategy exists and is implemented by their

Government. Many Turkish respondents either indicate no such national MOOC policy exists (45%), or they are not sure (42%). Of the remaining countries, 72% of respondents indicate that no such policy/strategy exists or they are not sure (14%). Except for France no national policies/strategies to promote MOOCs thus seem to be (effectively) implemented.

To boost the development of MOOCs, first of all an accepted policy on credits and recognition is required, closely followed by a central funding mechanism. Interestingly, the importance of an accepted policy on credits and recognition is equally important for the French institutions, although the responses on the existence of a national MOOC strategy/policy above seems to indicate that such a national policy/strategy does exist and has been implemented. This French national MOOC policy/strategy thus seems to exclude a solution for the recognition and accreditation of MOOCs.

A central staff training initiative for the development and delivery of MOOCs is especially important to the Turkish sub-sample, which confirms the earlier finding that lack of staff is considered a major barrier to the development of MOOCs by Turkish HEIs.

Both in Turkey and France a *national* MOOC platform is expected to boost the development of MOOCs more than in the rest of Europe. In view of the earlier finding that most French institutions currently deploy one of the large international platforms, this call for a national platform seems to indicate some dissatisfaction with the international platforms currently in use. Interestingly, in the Turkish sub-sample most institutions use existing software (e.g. Moodle, OpenedX) installed locally as the institutional platform, but also here the provision of a national platform is expected to boost MOOC development.

### **Recognition of MOOC-based learning**

Findings under the previous section already identified (the lack of) recognition of MOOC-based learning as somewhat of a barrier to the development of MOOCs in one's institution, while an accepted policy on credits and recognition is considered a major boost to the development of MOOCs in one's country.

Here respondents consider the option to formally reward credits for MOOCs to be highly relevant, not only for students asking for such a formal reward, but as a general principle for all students. Devising a common framework through which to offer formal credits for MOOCs thus could be a major incentive to the development and uptake of MOOCs.

But will an (inter)nationally accepted method for awarding formal credits to MOOCs also lead to the recognition of those credits by other institutions? On this issue we see a marked difference within Europe. From the French and Turkish institutions a quarter is willing to recognize such credits in either Degree programmes, while for the rest of Europe this is over 50%.

When asked to score various support measures to support recognition, the most interesting fact is the high scores on all proposed measures. The recognition of MOOC-based learning thus seems to be a really pressing issue, with as most important measure the possibility to award formal (ECTS) credits to a MOOC. This is closely followed by building a national framework and giving an award with formal (ECTS) credits to a MOOC. Awarding certificates of attendance (without formal assessment) scores somewhat lower but is still considered relevant.

### **MOOCs for opening up education to refugees**

The last section of the survey investigates the (potential) role of MOOCs for refugees, which is an important topic of the MOONLITE project under which this survey was conducted. The responses to previous questions under the section 'Institutional strategies' (see above) already indicated that few institutions specifically target disadvantaged groups with their MOOC offering.

This is further confirmed here with half of the 50 institutions presently offering MOOCs indicating that these MOOCs are not relevant for refugees. The other half mostly list their introduction courses to various academic topics as relevant to refugees. Only a few institutions, already offering MOOCs to various target groups, report offering MOOCs specifically targeted towards refugees.

Next to the actual offerings for refugees, we also asked about the potential to offer MOOCs that are interesting to refugees. The 25 institutions that above indicated they already do offer MOOCs interesting for refugees all reconfirmed this here. Of these, about two-third listed the same topics they are presently offering, thus indicating they intend not to offer MOOCs interesting for refugees on more topics than they already do.

When asked which measures can contribute to opening up MOOCs for refugees, the most interesting finding is probably that all options score about the same, and only just above average. This either indicates that respondents have no firm opinion on the issue, or that it is not considered very pressing. This seems further corroborated by the fact that 20 respondents did not answer this question at all (while non-responses on other questions were minimal)

### Discussion MOOC surveys

Structure and question-sets of the three surveys were not identical, nor were the respondents the same over the three years. However, some questions were repeated every year, and the contacted target audience for the surveys (mainly EADTU's database of affiliated HEIs) also remained basically the same. This allows for some cautious trend analysis:

- We see a steady growth in the number of HEIs offering MOOCs, almost reaching saturation with the 2019 survey.
- Also, the number of MOOCs offered per HEI is increasing, although the 'barrier' of more than 10 MOOCs seems difficult to break through. MOOCs therefore remain a small part of institutional offering at most HEIs.
- The main motive for offering MOOCs, consistent over the years, is to increase institutional visibility while also (experimenting with) innovative pedagogies and flexibility is important.
- Generating income through MOOCs as a motive remains consistently low, which seems to contrast with the trend (Class central 2017) of 'the shrinking of free' of MOOC offerings for our European sample (mainly publicly funded HEIs).
- The main target groups for MOOCs remain the general public and continuous professional development learners, but the number of MOOCs offered as part of Degree programmes is slowly growing.
- Offering MOOCs specifically for disadvantaged groups remains of low priority.
- There is a clear shift from deploying local MOOC platforms towards adoption of the large international MOOC platforms.
- To devise a common (national and European) framework through which to offer formal credits for MOOCs will be a major boost for the development, uptake and recognition of MOOCs.

## Interviews

### Aims

The aim of the interviews was to identify lessons learned and generate (policy) recommendations at national and European level. These outcomes are summarised in this document. Together with the outcomes of the European survey 2017-2018 ‘MOOC Strategies in European Universities’ these served as input to three regional focus groups (reported in the next section).

### Approach

Fourteen structured interviews were conducted with policy- and decision makers at institutional and national level on the topic of MOOCs and blended educational offerings for refugees and migrants. The interviews were conducted by various MOONLITE partners with organizations in their own country.

The fourteen interviews were transcribed, and text fragments were grouped together under the five interview headings:

1. Type of activities of the organisation related to refugees and migrants
2. Activities related to online education for refugees and migrants
3. Experiences, challenges, opportunities, barriers
4. Supporting or hindering institutional and governmental policies
5. Future strategies and policies

This resulted in a 4-page 'copy-paste' listing, under the following headings (slightly altered from the interview wording, but basically the same structure):

1. Types of organizations interviewed (and their relation to the topic)
2. Activities related to online education for refugees and migrants
3. Experiences, challenges and barriers encountered
4. Supporting or hindering policies
5. Policy- and strategy recommendations

Next, for each of these 5 headings, similar text fragments were clustered and then the total turned into running text presented below.

### Interview outcomes

#### 1. Types of organizations interviewed

The experts interviewed represent a wide range of organizations actively engaged with online and blended (higher) education for refugees and migrants: projects and programmes both at ‘traditional’ and online universities serving these target groups; NGO’s active both nationally and internationally; private companies active in the field of ICT and online learning; and dedicated online learning providers. These are the fourteen organizations interviewed:

#	Organization	Relevant URL
1	On Campus	<a href="https://www.oncampus.de/">https://www.oncampus.de/</a>
2	Kiron	<a href="https://kiron.ngo/">https://kiron.ngo/</a>
3	Hellenic Open University, project PRESS	<a href="http://press-project.eap.gr">http://press-project.eap.gr</a>

4	University of Oslo	<a href="https://www.uio.no/english/about/collaboration/academic-dugnad/">https://www.uio.no/english/about/collaboration/academic-dugnad/</a>
5	Sky School	<a href="https://www.skyschool.world/">https://www.skyschool.world/</a>
6	Fédération Interuniversitaire de l'Enseignement à Distance	<a href="https://www.fied.fr">https://www.fied.fr</a>
7	Action Synergy	<a href="http://action.gr/">http://action.gr/</a>
8	Dublin City University, University of Sanctuary	<a href="https://www.dcu.ie/sanctuary">https://www.dcu.ie/sanctuary</a>
9	Red Cross Leicester, City of Sanctuary	<a href="https://leicester.cityofsanctuary.org/british-red-cross">https://leicester.cityofsanctuary.org/british-red-cross</a>
10	Leicester University, University of Sanctuary	<a href="https://le.ac.uk/about/csr/uni-of-sanctuary">https://le.ac.uk/about/csr/uni-of-sanctuary</a>
11	UNINETTUNO, The University for Refugees	<a href="https://www.uninettunouniversity.net/en/notizia.aspx?ID=7">https://www.uninettunouniversity.net/en/notizia.aspx?ID=7</a>
12	Universidas Telefónica	<a href="https://miriadax.net/web/universitas-telefonica">https://miriadax.net/web/universitas-telefonica</a>
13	SPARK	<a href="https://spark-online.org">https://spark-online.org</a>
14	NUFFIC	<a href="https://www.nuffic.nl/en/">https://www.nuffic.nl/en/</a>

## 2. Activities related to online education for refugees and migrants

When considered all together, the interviewed organizations cover the full value chain of (online) higher education for refugees and migrants and their activities cover referral, admission-support, course- and programme development, course offering, and internship- and career advice services. Both refugees in the region and migrants in host countries are covered by these organizations.

Refugees with the potential and wish to enrol in higher education are typically referred by intermediate organizations to suitable university programmes directly, or to organizations that assist them with the often-complicated process of admissions and enrolment.

These advisory and support services on admissions and enrolment cover a range of issues: recognition of secondary education diplomas as part of entry qualifications to Bachelor programmes; validation and recognition of academic diploma's and prior learning for exemptions, or for direct entry into Master programmes; and securing free access to higher education through special scholarships for refugees or through donation schemes.

Universities, often in cooperation with intermediate organizations, develop and offer specific and often free-of charge programmes for refugees and migrants. Such offerings range from general introduction courses on the host country and its culture, to language courses, to courses that help potential students to prepare for university entry, and finally full academic programmes specifically compiled for refugees. Such academic programmes are usually offered by, or in cooperation with, established universities, compiled on the basis of existing course components, and offered in blended mode to provide flexibility (freedom of time and place) with additional face-to-face tutoring, mentoring and student counselling services.

Finally, refugee students are supported in their labour market entry through the provision of internship opportunities and career advice services.



In addition to courses for refugees and migrants, courses on how to work in a multi-cultural context and with traumatised people are offered for professionals like social workers, NGO-employees, and teachers.

In some cases these activities, initiated for refugees specifically, led to innovations that eventually benefit all learners. For example, the provision of online blended learning programmes where previously only campus-based courses were offered; strengthening the network between HEI-institutions; new tools and guidelines for the recognition of prior learning; and the development of quality criteria for online education.

### **3. Challenges and barriers encountered**

The interviewed organizations report challenges and barriers specific to the identification of suitable study opportunities; the personal situation of refugees and migrants; recognition-issues; and the lack of funds and facilities.

**Study opportunities.** Bringing ‘demand and supply’ together is problematic. For refugees, but also for intermediate organizations, it is difficult to get an overview of the available online learning opportunities. Intermediate organizations wanting to develop tailored programmes for refugees report problems with identifying suitable partner universities, and a lack of skills required for developing and offering effective blended learning programmes. And misconceptions on online learning, the unfamiliarity of course developers with refugees’ personal situation, and quality issues all pose challenges to the uptake of blended learning courses and programmes for refugees.

**Personal situation.** Social, political and financial conditions force many refugees to concentrate first and foremost on crucial issues like accommodation, food, water, and heating. Refugees in the region often live in cramped conditions in refugee camps, and many carry the responsibility for their extended family and work. As a result, not much time remains available for study.

(Foreign) language levels vary considerably within the group of refugee learners, and self-directed learning skills are generally weak: learners tend to be active during the classroom-based teaching sessions, but far less active in between. As a result, extensive support and motivating actions are needed throughout the study process. There is serious doubt whether MOOCs can replace on-campus study programmes, especially for vulnerable groups who benefit from social interaction and local integration. On teachers’ side there is a need for trauma-informed pedagogy, counselling provision for distance learner students, and PTSD in class.

**Recognition.** Recognition-issues deter uptake in three ways. First the lack of recognition of prior learning, and the lengthy process of diploma validation, tends to delay admissions. Second, most MOOCs and other online courses do not lead to formal qualifications. And third, even if they do lead to formal recognition, some countries will not accept online or blended learning as ‘proper’ education. As a result, some organizations consider online courses cannot fully substitute for a campus-based academic setting. However, although e.g. MOOCs have not fulfilled all their promises regarding impactful study opportunities for refugees, they may still serve a useful role as foundation courses/digital preparation and orientation for university admission (Kirion), and as language training support, especially in the early phase after arrival in the host country.

**Funds and facilities.** Enrolment fees are a major barrier. This is aggravated by the fact that in some countries, refugees, as long as they have not yet received their residence permit, are considered

overseas students for whom fees are higher. Reimbursing study costs is sometimes complicated by the fact that a refugee does not have a bank account.

Access to proper study facilities, especially computers and broadband internet access, may be problematic in refugee camps in the region, but seems to be less of a problem with migrants to European countries.

Many countries now shift from (online) courses and programmes specifically targeting ‘refugees’ toward a more general focus on ‘accessibility for less privileged’ groups.

#### **4. Supporting and hindering policies**

**Supporting policies.** Various respondents reported positively on the application of EU guidelines and tool sets: the ESG and ECTS Users’ Guide was applied to set clear standards for recognition, and these were translated for the recognition of MOOCs; the ENIC-NARIC Network’s guidelines ‘Recognize qualifications held by refugees – guide for credential evaluators’ were used for the recognition of prior academic careers; and the Europass, European Qualification Framework, and the EU skills profile tool for third country nationals were used for professional qualification- and skill recognition. Norway developed specific recognition procedures specifically for refugee. Some universities were flexible enough to agree upon so-called ‘learning agreements’ to make recognition of MOOC-based modules more standardised and transparent.

**Hindering policies.** Policy issues reported as hindering access to (higher) online and blended education were more varied: the complicated and time-consuming procedures for refugees to get accepted tend to create uncertainty and hinder admissions; lack of scholarships for refugees hindering access; lack of financial support from government, with costs to be carried by individual universities or EU-projects, hinders broad uptake of these programmes; (too) strict institutional- and faculty regulations regarding diploma recognition hindering admission; and the emphasis on learning the host country’s national language impacts negatively on the English-language skills of refugees required for most academic studies. In for example Jordan, online education is not recognised. In general refugees as a target group are considered too small to devise specific national and institutional HE policies for. Developing online courses and programmes is expensive, and HEIs therefore need to be convinced in advance these will be successful, which may be difficult to guarantee for refugee-enrolments.

#### **5. Policy- and strategy recommendations**

The policy- and strategy recommendations made by the respondents mirror the barriers, challenges and hindering policies reported in the previous sections. Recommendations focus on organizational issues, recognition, and funding.

**Organization.** At HE-sector level, the offering of courses and programmes for refugees requires better coordination and increased visibility. The cooperation between the various stakeholders (intermediate organizations, universities, government) can be improved and a culture of cooperation is required to reach and support refugees. Within HEI’s high-level champions are required to make the introduction of blended learning a success, and HEIs should become more multilingual and intercultural. For refugees HE courses could be offered in other languages than the national one.

**Recognition.** Clear legislation is required on online education as an alternative pathway into higher education, including recognition for access. This would guarantee clear expectations for refugees

and could increase motivation as recognition would not be on an individual basis anymore. A common European strategy and operational framework facilitating the recognition of prior learning in all member states would be of great help in this respect. At institutional level, faculties should critically examine their (often very strict) entry requirements, and also recognise prior learning and how that has contributed to a person's development, motivation and capabilities to study at academic level.

Funding. Sustained funding is required at both national (Government) and European level. Funds are required for policy development (i.e. in the area of recognition); in experimenting and developing online education programmes specifically for refugees; and for offering scholarships for refugees, e.g. through a quota system.

## Regional focus groups

### Aims

Three online focus groups were run to test and discuss the results of the interviews and the EADTU 2018 MOOC survey.

### Approach/activity description

The groups were run by EADTU, UNED and LNU. Given the problems with the dates, and getting the relevant people together for a face-to-face meeting, the members of the groups interacted online, via email.

Based upon the results of the interviews and the EADTU MOOC survey three focus areas were identified together with the following questions:

#### Focus area 1: HEI organization and collaboration (LNU):

1. How can HEIs with a mainly national student population (the customers who pay the fees) be encouraged to become more multilingual and intercultural?
2. What kind of champions, or experts, are required in HEIs to promote the use of MOOCs for social inclusion and how can they influence institutional policy?
3. If HEIs have their own MOOC platforms, what strategies can be adopted to facilitate cross-institutional organization or collaboration?

#### Focus area 2: MOOC recognition and certification (UNED):

1. What kind of (national and European) legislation is required for open education to provide an alternative route to entering higher education for vulnerable social groups?
2. How can higher education institutions adapt their entry requirements to support such legislation if they are already willing to offer ECTS for their existing MOOC offer?
3. What strategies can be applied to support the cross-institutional recognition of existing open educational certification?
4. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding how we can support groups like refugees and migrants in meeting their education needs to help them enter the labour market?

#### Focus area 3: Funding and political support (EADTU):

1. Do you see opportunities for MOOCs/online learning courses/programmes to benefit refugees/migrants by increasing their accessibility to higher education (e.g. alternative entry routes cfr. Kirion; language and culture programmes; addressing entry deficiencies, ....)
2. Would you envisage funding of such initiatives to promote access for refugees/migrants to higher education in your country? (e.g. developing and offering such courses; awareness raising among refugees/migrants; alternative/flexible entry schemes; .....)
3. How could collaboration with NGOs and civil society partners facilitate the funding of such initiatives?
4. Do you have suggestions for the Council of Ministers of the European Commission to set up a (large scale) action plan for the inclusion of refugees and migrants in higher education?

#### Focus area 1: HEI organization and collaboration (LNU)

- Ellen Merethe Magnus (EM), Oslo Metropolitan University
- Torunn Gjelsvik (TG), Director, Flexible Education Norway (Fleksibel Utdanning Norge)
- Lehti Pilt (LP), University of Tartu, Estonia
- Susanne Koch (SK), Diku - Norwegian Agency for International Cooperation and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education

#### **1. How can HEIs with a mainly national student population (the customers who pay the fees) be encouraged to become more multilingual and intercultural?**

**EM:** These values must be anchored at the HEI leadership (values and objectives) and followed by strategies and plans to make the strategies operative. And there must be funding.

**TG:** European frameworks and EU policies encourage internationalization, increased student mobility and collaboration across institutions and borders. It is expected that national policies will be aligned with the European policies on the subject, at least is this the case in Norway. A white paper on student mobility is in preparation (to be released in 2020), and the topic is related to a strategic implementation of quality (“culture for quality” in Higher Education in Norway. Digital cross-institutional and cross-country collaboration to enhance increased access to education and sustainable educational models is expected to be a part of the white paper, f.ex can “incoming student mobility” be used strategically as a part of the internationalization of study programs. Internationalization in combination with digitization can also increase diversity, identify important future skills and therefore increase students’ employability. At the global level, the Sustainable Development goal 4 and the Education 2030 Framework for Action is highly relevant for not only national policies, but also HEIs’ “corporate responsibility”.

**LP:** In our case it has been clear policy on the state and university level. 10 years have been invested into internationalization and now it starts to bring results. MOOCs are one good possibility to introduce the university study opportunities and promote our curricula in English to potential future international learners.

**SK:** By combining incentives for internationalization and digitization, HEIs can be encouraged to design their courses with an international audience in mind. We already see this happening in Erasmus+ Strategic Partnerships. Here in Norway, we expect this to be one of the effects of having one national agency in charge of quality enhancement in higher education through both

digitization and internationalization. Diku, the Norwegian Agency for International Cooperation and Quality Enhancement in Higher Education was established in 2018.

## **2. What kind of champions, or experts, are required in HEIs to promote the use of MOOCs for social inclusion and how can they influence institutional policy?**

**EM:** MOOCs can be a good supplement for social inclusion. However, I doubt that MOOCs alone will do the trick. I refer to question 1 – anchoring at the leadership is alpha and omega.

**TG:** A joint effort from institutional international offices, teaching and learning centers and support labs and institutional leadership for internationalization of education. Institutional leadership can be influenced with a holistic approach to the universities' responsibility in enhancing international and digital citizenships. This aligns with the UNESCO sustainable development agenda to increase access to education and lifelong learning opportunities for all. International education should be integrated into all curriculum development, and the necessary support given to program coordinators and teaching staff.

Scalability (increased student numbers), cost effectiveness and global outreach are arguments that might influence institutional policies in the direction of MOOCs for social inclusion.

**LP:** We have made investments to encourage creating MOOCs but there is no special finances to run them. We are not so sure that our MOOCs are oriented for social inclusion, they address wider audience and that is not always those who maybe in need.

**SK:** Ideally, this issue should be championed by the top level university management. That is not always easy to achieve. MOOCs for social inclusion could be included in institutional policies by being anchored with one or more of persons/offices responsible for:

- Sustainable development
- Corporate social responsibility
- Academia/workplace collaboration
- Teaching and learning centre
- Internationalization

With a multi-prong approach like this, MOOCs for social inclusion will have visibility in many fora. These offices will have plenty of options to influence institutional policies in their respective areas of responsibility.

## **3. If HEIs have their own MOOC platforms, what strategies can be adopted to facilitate cross-institutional organization or collaboration?**

**EM:** A good starting point would be to share what MOOCs each HEI offers, a European portal?

**TG:** “Granulation of education” makes it easier to share and reuse parts of study programs and courses. The use of OER (open educational resources) is an important strategy and can be “a catalyst for innovation”, with reference to OECD <https://www.oecd.org/innovation/open-educational-resources-9789264247543-en.htm>

Increased student volumes through partnerships can activate more learning data (learning analytics), which again can be used to analyse and prescribe student behaviour. When used

prescriptive (see illustration from Gartner at <https://tinyurl.com/y62jph7p>) it may lead to more adaptive and personalized learning.

Seek project partnerships through Erasmus + or other international project funding – identify the required institutional resources and competencies.

**LP:**

- Applying Erasmus+ project money for creating cross-institutional MOOCs.
- Creating MOOC learning materials as open access content packages outside the learning platform. Then learning materials can be used not only during course delivery, but in a meantime as well. Each institution can offer MOOC in its own learning environment, referring to publicly accessible external materials developed jointly.
- Putting the MOOCs information into an international database so that information about the MOOCs can reach the target groups better.

**SK:** The very best option would be to have a national platform and encourage HEIs to use this. In reality, many institutions have good reasons to prefer a particular platform. When this is the case, national incentives can reward cross-institutional organization and/or collaboration. National incentives and technological solutions for sharing learning resources is another way to go.

#### Focus area 2: MOOC recognition and certification (UNED)

- Ignacio Despujol Zabala (**IZ**), Information and Communication Systems, UPV (Polytechnic University of Valencia)
- Jordi Claramonte (**JC**), Associate Pro Vice-Chancellor of Digitalization and Innovation, Director of OpenUNED, UNED

#### **1. What kind of (national and European) legislation is required for open education to provide an alternative route to entering higher education for vulnerable social groups?**

**IZ:** I think that creating a common framework for certification of online content could help institutions set up pathways into their study programs. The creation of a national or European certification body accepted by all EU countries could help with the process of recognition of prior learning.

**JC:** In general terms, any legislation that comes into existence at a supra-institutional level needs to complement the existing internal institutional rules and guidelines about open education, where they already exist. The typical problem in this field is not that a given institution does not recognise its own open educational initiatives for its formal teaching programmes, rather that there is no easy and general way of recognising prior open learning undertaken by students in other institutions. Typically, each case has to be processed on a one by one basis. This is difficult, slow, and not easily scalable.

It is difficult for political bodies to produce legislation a priori that is relevant in such a specific field as the recognition of open education. What is needed here are open educational standards, that as they become widely accepted, are easy for institutions to adopt to establish processes that

facilitate the recognition of open educational undertaken anywhere for their own teaching and learning programmes. Subsequently, legislation can be built around the standards.

Some work is already being undertaken in this area, such as the Common Micro-credential Framework (CMF) that is being developed by The European MOOC Consortium (including FutureLearn, France Université Numérique, OpenupEd, Miríadax, and EduOpen). Other examples include the ERASMUS+ projects OEPass (specifying an Open Education Passport) and MicroHE (aiming to provide a comprehensive policy analysis of the impact of modularisation, unbundling and micro-credentialing in European Higher Education).

## ***2. How can higher education institutions adapt their entry requirements to support such legislation if they are already willing to offer ECTS for their existing MOOC offer?***

**IZ:** Nowadays, educational institutions can recognize MOOCs on a one by one basis depending of what the faculties evaluating the courses decide. If a common mechanism existed to certify online education, with related and published procedures, institutions could create pathways into their programs or rules for recognition between MOOCs and some of their courses.

**JC:** HE Institutions already accept credits gained in external formal educational contexts either as part of the entry requirements for their courses, or in substitution of parts of a given teaching programme. Once open education standards exist, with a guarantee of quality, then they can do the same with this type of prior learning. Exactly how such learning will be quantified, and how it can be used by students either to start a new study programme, or merely have to study less on that programme, will inevitably depend on each HEI. This could come to positively affect the attractiveness and competitiveness of different universities. If, hypothetically speaking, a student can find the same course that s/he wants to take in two different universities, and one of them offers better recognition of the open educational certificates that s/he has, then the student's choice will inevitably be swayed.

## ***3. What strategies can be applied to support the cross-institutional recognition of existing open educational certification?***

**IZ:** Other initiatives could foster the creation of HEI consortiums, until the common framework for certification were established, that could recognize certification from different institutions. This is already being done but it could be supported at national/EU level. It is usually done by adding a knowledge check in the receiving institution.

**JC:** It is highly likely that cross-institutional recognition of open education will start in an ad hoc manner, and scale up depending upon demand, independently of whether international standards already exist. A limiting factor for all kinds of recognition of this type, on the part of the students, is the language in which they are undertaken. For example, a student who has open educational certification for courses undertaken in German is unlikely to apply for a formal study programme to be studied in Spanish!

Generally speaking, the HE marketplace is ever more competitive, so any initiative such as the effective recognition of open education undertaken prior to applying for courses at an institution by a student, offers a way to strengthen the relevant business model, and potentially attract new students. Furthermore, programmes could be developed between institutions where parts of the course are undertaken either in or by different HEIs. This would be beneficial both for the institutions and the students.

Finally, it should be noted that for the foreseeable future, the numbers of students applying to HEIs with such a large amount of prior learning in the form of open education, will be low, and therefore not something that will negatively affect the profitability of said institutions.

**4. Is there anything else you would like to add regarding how we can support groups like refugees and migrants in meeting their education needs to help them enter the labour market?**

**JC:** UNED, as an HEI with a strong international projection, already has nearly 50 years of experience of accepting students from a wide and varied background. It is always looking at ways to extend its educational and business models. Social inclusion forms an explicit and important part of the university's charter so any open educational standards that appear in this area will inevitably be adopted. It is already participating in projects aimed to modularise its educational offer, in the form of the so-called Short Learning Programmes, so could in an agile and flexible fashion incorporate any standards developed for the recognition of open education. This must surely be the case for other HE institutions in other European countries.

Focus area 3: Funding and political support (EADTU)

- Katrien Baradoel (**KB**), Senior policy advisor, NUFFIC
- Mike Bernd (**MB**), Quality Assurance Manager Kiron
- Peter van der Hijden (**PH**), retired Head of Sector Higher Policy at the European Commission

**1. Do you see opportunities for MOOCs/online learning courses/programmes to benefit refugees/migrants by increasing their accessibility to higher education (e.g. alternative entry routes cfr. Kirion; language and culture programmes; addressing entry deficiencies, ....)**

**KB:** Yes, Kiron is a good example. I imagine MOOCs can also be used to prepare students for a study programme (language, culture programmes and take away deficiencies) but I'm not aware of any good practice/examples. In the Netherlands universities offer entree years for refugees (not online).

**MB:** Kiron and other organizations have already proven that online courses can facilitate access to higher education for refugees. However, with the multitude of online learning opportunities out there, it is essential that online courses and online curricula need to be developed or compiled in order to meet the requirements of HEI.

This is why Kiron has developed quality assurance standards, processes and measures that are in line with the standards and guidelines for quality assurance in the

EHEA. In addition, I'm convinced that an accreditation/certification of the educational offer by an accreditation body is needed to gain an external proof that online courses are on par with offline



courses offered at HEI. Only by developing these kinds of confidence-building measures can online education be an alternative pathway and entry route to higher education.

**PH:** Absolutely, as long as there is a wide and diverse multilingual offering, a clear framework, funding and guidance. See below.

***2. Would you envisage funding of such initiatives to promote access for refugees/migrants to higher education in your country? (e.g. developing and offering such courses; awareness raising among refugees/migrants; alternative/flexible entry schemes; .....)***

**KB:** This is not within the remit of Nuffic as we do not offer MOOCs/study programmes. Nuffic is involved in recognition of qualifications and works on the development of common practice in the EHEA to recognize MOOCs and other forms of e-learning. We do so in the framework of the Erasmus+ e-Valuate project.

**MB:** 2. Kiron is an NGO supported by and/or working together with numerous partners like state institutions, foundations and other NGOs. These networks are not only vital to allow refugees free access to higher online education, but also to develop guidance and support structures which are necessary for empowerment and learning success.

**PH:** Yes. Complementing and upscaling existing initiatives. See questions 3 and 4.

***3. How could collaboration with NGOs and civil society partners facilitate the funding of such initiatives?***

**KB:** ?

**MB:** It is crucial that more best practice models emerge which exemplify successful funding strategies. As a best practice model, it is crucial that all partners involved recognize the added value of the project.

**PH:** By joining the European MicroCredentials Fund (EMC Fund). See question 4 below.

***4. Do you have suggestions for the Council of Ministers of the European Commission to set up a (large scale) action plan for the inclusion of refugees and migrants in higher education?***

**KB:** Promote common standards for quality and content of MOOCs – the Common Microcredentials Framework of the European MOOC consortium is a good example. In the end this will support recognition of MOOCs for admission or exemption to (formal) study programmes – and should make it easier for disadvantaged groups (incl. refugees) to access higher education.

**MB:** The recognition of online courses needs to be facilitated by the development of general European standards and guidelines. To take, for instance, the German higher education system which is very complex and therefore intransparent due to different laws and regulations of the individual federal states. That's why general answers about the recognition of online courses can't be given, as in principle each HEI decides for itself. The lack of standards makes recognition and transfer to HEI a lengthy bureaucratic process that further complicates the lives of refugees. Therefore, in order to be able to work more closely together and to follow a student-centered approach, clear standards and guidelines are required.

**PH:** We should think big (large scale). My suggestions are threefold:

### *Action Plan*

Yes, but not only for refugees and migrants, the Action Plan should cover all learners in order to be consensual and effective.

### *Regulatory measures*

The Commission could propose a Council and Parliament Recommendation on the establishment of a European Framework for Microcredentials. See text copied in below. The Recommendation could be adopted roughly in parallel (before or after) the spring 2020 Bologna Ministers Conference Communiqué. A common practice in the EU-Bologna interplay.

### *Budget - The European MicroCredentials Fund (EMC Fund)*

A European MicroCredentials Fund (EMC Fund) could be set up to assist learners according to the priorities of public and private sponsors: National and EU programmes (including Erasmus and the Structural Funds), Employers, NGOs, Civil Society Partners, Philanthropist, Legacies, Crowd Funding etc.. Priorities may include refugees, migrants, unemployed, women re-entering the labour market, people in rural areas (yellow jackets), the highly gifted, persons from certain countries or (world) regions.

## Online vision building events

### Aims

Based on the results of the interviews of O6-A2, two online vision-building workshops in form of two interactive online events were organised in the framework of O6-A3.

Through this activity the project aimed to involve policy makers and experts in building a vision on how to involve cross-institutional collaboration to exploit MOOCs within a network of institutions, and on the role regional and governmental bodies can and must play in stimulating the uptake of MOOCs to refugees and society goals.

### Approach/activity description

The first event was organized at UNED on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2019, focusing on policy makers of HEIs. Attendees discussed the future of MOOCs and other non-formal online courses to add to HEIs 2nd (teaching) and 3rd (society) mission, expanding the perspective beyond a focus on entrepreneurial skills and support for refugees and also discussed the option to exploit MOOCs within a network of institutions.

The second online event related to cross-institutional collaboration and the role regional and governmental bodies can and must play in stimulating the uptake of MOOCs to refugees and society goals, and was conducted through an online 'Oxford debate'.

### Vision building workshop

The first online event took the form of a webinar and focused on the future of MOOCs and other open education related to HEIs 2nd (teaching) and 3rd (society) mission.

The title of this first online building-event was "1st MOONLITE online vision-building event on the future of inclusive online education" and it took place on Friday 10 May 2019. **Thirty nine** participants were registered for the event via the MOONLITE project website. The videoconferencing tool that was used was Zoom, since it allows an unlimited number of participants and one of the

institutions members of the project (LNU) provided the virtual room, since the moderator of the session was undertaken by a partner from this institution. Information about the webinar and its recording are available on the MOONLITE website: <https://moonliteproject.eu/events/1st-moonlite-online-vision-building-event/>

In this event two experts on open education in HE, two members of the project (one as a speaker, Beatriz Sedano from UNED, and one as a moderator, Alastair Creelman form LNU), together with the participants discussed the future of inclusive online education with a main focus on MOOCs. The two experts who took part in the webinar were:

- Kate Borthwick is a Principal Enterprise Fellow (Educational innovation) in Modern Languages and Linguistics and Director of Programme Development (online learning) at the University of Southampton. She leads the University's MOOC programme and she is an award-winning, experienced language teacher, developer of online learning materials/courses and e-tutor. She is also a member the executive board of the European Association for Computer Assisted Language Learning.
- Mark Brown is Ireland's first Chair in Digital Learning and Director of the National Institute for Digital Learning (NIDL) at Dublin City University. He is a member of the Executive Committee of [European Distance and e-Learning Network](#) (EDEN) and also serves on the Supervisory Board of the [European Association of Distance Teaching Universities](#) (EADTU). He is Chair of the 2019 ICDE [World Conference on Online Learning](#) in Dublin in November.

### **Summary of interventions and discussion**

Higher education institutions are beginning to use MOOCs to support refugees and migrants but there are a range of issues that need to be considered for such initiatives to be extended to represent generally inclusive open education for society to help people toward social inclusion and access to higher education and employment.

The first speaker was Beatriz Sedano, a member of the MOONLITE project, who reflected on the present and future of inclusive open education from the experience of the MOONLITE project.

She started by giving a brief introduction to the situation of inclusive online education, naming a few European initiatives offering open online education. Secondly, she continued talking about the use of MOOC by HEIs in Europe, and in particular, the engagement of institutions with inclusive education on the basis on the report of the 2018 EADTU survey report launched within the context of MOONLITE amongst higher education institutions about their strategies of applying MOOCs and their potential use for those "potentially left behind". The results showed that of the HEIs offering or planning to offer MOOCs, only a few are offering MOOCs that could be considered as useful for refugees and migrants, but they do think is important to do it.

Subsequently, some challenges and opportunities of using MOOCs for social inclusion were discussed. Among the challenges identified were: difficulties in finding and accessing the online learning offer, lack of digital literacy and study skills, personal, economic, technical, cultural and linguistic barriers, and a lack of recognition. Some groups that are left behind include: women, children, the elderly, people in refugee camps. Regarding the opportunities noted: richness of cultural diversity, options for social inclusion and being part of a community; understanding the new society; and the possibility of recognition, certification, and access to HE.

Finally, she shared some ideas for the future of inclusive education that can be summarised as follows:

- Awareness of the diversity of profile and situations.
- Consideration of multicultural and multilingual aspects.
- Awareness of connectivity problems and a variety of digital competences, with a focus on mobile learning.
- Targeted, blended and facilitated learning.
- Collaboration between stakeholders.
- Recognition and certification (ECTS, credit transfer, SLPs).
- More policies and funding (EU & national level).

The main findings and recommendations from UNED's experience with inclusive MOOCs within the MOONLITE project are:

- Understand student profile and needs.
- Involve the target audience in the MOOC production process.

3 Ds (design, development and deployment).

- Provide scaffolding for learning and participation.
- Design the course based on specific "inclusion criteria" (technology, linguistics, pedagogy, culture & ethics, institutionalization).
- Offer a free certificate with official recognition (1 ECTS).

During a stimulating discussion, full of practical ideas, the second speaker, Kate Borthwick, reflected on the present and what is already inclusive in MOOC, from the point of view of design, and how much more we need to do.

Firstly, she reviewed the definitions of inclusivity and she pointed out that we have to be more conscious in order to avoid excluding people unintentionally. MOOCs are inherently inclusive for the following reasons: open to anyone to undertake, no access or legal requirements, free, learner is in control of their own engagement, they offer community and peer learning, and the flexibility of learning from anywhere and anytime. Therefore, MOOCs significantly lower the barriers that many people face when they want to access education, especially HE.

Secondly, she showed the experience of the University of Southampton with MOOCs and the FutureLearn platform with the example of the course "English as a Medium of Instruction for Academics", a teacher trainer course for people who are not natives but have to teach in English, as an example of inclusive activities. Since, the participants are in different cultural settings the course should be as inclusive as possible. For instance, the community building is a crucial aspect.

Thirdly, she focused on the inclusivity from the MOOC design perspective and listed a few technical aspects that are being taken into account such as subtitles on videos, downloadable version of tests, ALT text in images, alternative activities, etc., and that make a MOOC more pedagogically inclusive.

According to Kate, these are some of the current challenges and the ideas and recommendations for the future:

1. How to find the audiences we want to reach.

2. Language and how language it is used.
3. Access to technology, broad band of digital literacy.
4. Differences in educational culture and conceptions of learner autonomy.
5. Evaluation and how do we know we have reached the people we want to include?
6. Costs of open access and business models.

Finally, she presented the following ideas to overcome those challenges in the future:

1. Learn how to promote MOOCs well to learner communities.
2. More MOOCs in other languages.
3. Create inclusive technical spaces.
4. Mix of global and local resources to respond to learner needs.
5. Understand how to overcome technical and pedagogical barriers to engage learners with online education.
6. Make more MOOCs and open content and find business models that help us to do that.

Throughout an inspiring talk, the third speaker, Mark Brown, made participants reflect on the present and future of inclusive education. He started by highlighting the challenges for inclusive online education in general, because the reality is that education has been not always been inclusive and has often benefited only a privileged few.

Secondly, he talked about Dublin City University in the context of inclusive education, which is part of Universities of Sanctuary and had some experiences with displaced people: helping people to access HE, providing online learning opportunities, and offering 30 scholarships for refugees in partnership with FutureLearn.

Thirdly, he presented several examples of MOOCs and other digital resources, where, apparently, there is a contradiction in inclusivity that depends on the perspective of those who are telling the story, and not from the one who are the real stakeholder (for example, migrants and refugees). It's crucial to ask questions and know first-hand what the audience of such courses really need.

Subsequently, through a stimulating quiz with illustrative examples, like an exercise in which people with colour blindness could not respond (there is no longer inclusion here for example), the lack of inclusiveness in society and education is revealed.

While it seems that there is still a lot to be done the future is bright! Quoting Paulo Freire, who said that it is not education that changes the world, but education that changes people and they change the world - a comparison can be made with MOOCs. We have a duty to explore and experience what can be done with MOOCs and technology, try different ways of doing things, and fail to succeed. MOOCs are growing, and from an ecological perspective, they are alive and have to adapt and evolve to current changes. It's not about the MOOCs themselves, but what we can do with them to achieve inclusive education.

Finally, in reference to the Sustainable Development Goals to be reached in 2030, Mark quoted Barnett stating that "MOOCs should be in the service of big ideas, not as a big idea in itself" and ended with the final thought that, from within the field of Education, we must continue to reflect and experiment together towards "a more evenly distributed future", which can be an excellent summary of this online vision-building event.

### Oxford debate

In this Oxford-style debate the question was discussed whether MOOCs can facilitate cross-institutional collaboration and the generation of European policies for refugees. This issue is also highly relevant for social inclusion in general and is applicable to a wide range of people “left behind” by standard HE. This debate took place in the context of the MOONLITE project (<http://moonliteproject.eu>), where the applicability and appropriateness of applying MOOCs to refugees and migrants have been analysed and different scenarios for supporting language learning and entrepreneurial skills for this collective have been explored. The protagonist for this debate was Prof. John Traxler, an expert in digital learning and member of the MOONLITE project. The antagonist Caroline Kuhn, an authority in the field of open education.

The debate was announced through the project website, through the various communication channels from the project partners, and announced at meetings like the The Hague multiplier event. The debate ran for one week from June 17 till June 24.

### The motion

***MOOCs can enhance the cross-institutional collaboration and European policies necessary to support refugee HE and employment***

## Rebuttals

Representing the sides were John Traxler, defending the motion (<https://youtu.be/Te5aJOajQuo>)

Professor John Traxler was Professor of Mobile Learning, the world's first, since September 2009, and now Research Professor of Digital Learning in the Institute of Education at the University of Wolverhampton UK. He is one of the pioneers of mobile learning and has been associated with mobile learning projects since 2001 when he was evaluator for m-learning, the first major EU project. He is a Founding Director and current Vice-President of the International Association for Mobile Learning, responsible for the annual international mLearn research conference running since 2002.

Against the motion was Caroline Kuhn ([https://youtu.be/njs7sG\\_ze78](https://youtu.be/njs7sG_ze78))

Caroline's PhD topic examines the intersections between education, technology, and sociology, looking at students' daily entanglements with digital tools and platforms, exploring their agency or lack of in digital spaces. She is an open education practitioner and an open researcher.

The debate was moderated by Charlotte Traeger - Charlotte is a research associate, PhD student and the local coordinator of the project MOONLITE at the ESCP Europe in Berlin and has led an output on the possible pathways for the development of skills and knowledge of refugees and students via online learning to promote their access to the labor market and HEI.

## Rebuttals

### Participants



#### Pro

**John Traxler** - Professor John Traxler was Professor of Mobile Learning, the world's first, since September 2009, and now Research Professor of Digital Learning in the Institute of Education at the University of Wolverhampton UK. He is one of the pioneers of mobile learning and has been associated with mobile learning projects since 2001 when he was evaluator for m-learning, the first major EU project. He is a Founding Director and current Vice-President of the International Association for Mobile Learning, responsible for the annual international mLearn research conference running since 2002.



#### Con

**Caroline Kuhn** - Caroline's PhD topic examines the intersections between education, technology, and sociology, looking at students' daily entanglements with digital tools and platforms, exploring their agency or lack of in digital spaces. She is an open education practitioner and an open researcher.



## Outcomes

To the question of whether ‘MOOCs can enhance the cross-institutional collaboration and European policies necessary to support refugee HE and employment’ 63% of the participants agreed, while 37% disagreed.

Practical recommendations for the use of MOOCs for refugees have been presented in this debate:


- Firstly, when designing MOOC content it is crucial to take into account the social context of the targeted audience (language, education, background, needs). Specifically, a range of sociocultural, technological and pedagogical factors should be taking into account, as highlighted by Read, Sedano & Barcena (2018).
- Secondly, refugees’ learning experience should be improved by actively promoting a sense of social inclusion. This can be done through the provision of support and face-to-face guidance, which reinforce their social experience. For instance, blended learning methods have been presented as a promising way of addressing social inclusion needs (see e.g. Webinar from Divjak B., Röwert R., Mauer R., Tannhäuser A.C.)
- Thirdly, teachers and volunteers supporting refugees should be familiarized with the use of online resources in order to exploit their full potential. The Erasmus+ project Reopen (<http://reopen.eu>) provides useful training tools to teach teaching staff to use online learning methods.
- Fourthly, it is essential to ensure the open and inclusive character of MOOCs, for example by putting in place geographical and linguistic means.

Resonating with the arguments presented in this debate we encourage future initiatives to further explore how MOOCs can be used and developed to foster the inclusion of refugees into a new place of living. Specifically, it would be particularly useful to develop ways to certify the skills developed in MOOCs. While certifications and badges have been developed, there is still no official recognition in the labor market of the knowledge and skills developed through MOOCs. Similarly, we lack an understanding of the social experience of MOOC users and the means to measure MOOC success are still lacking.

Furthermore, as part of the MOONLITE project, we have been exploring the effectiveness of a cost-benefit analysis tool for institutions wishing to include MOOCs as part of their business model. The initial results of this work will be available shortly on the MOONLITE website: <https://moonliteproject.eu>.

Finally, most initiatives have approached the refugees as a homogenous group, we suggest the need for future research to further explore their uniqueness and develop tailored solutions for this cohort as a very diverse group of individuals (e.g. qualification, language, education). By placing refugees at the core of the design and development of MOOCs, we empower them to create their own MOOCs.

**This house believes that MOOCs can enhance the cross-institutional collaboration and European policies necessary to support refugee HE and employment**

 This Oxford debate is being conducted as part of the MOONLITE Project. [JOIN THIS DEBATE](#)

Summary	Opening Statements	Rebuttals	Final Statements	The Result
	Monday June <b>17</b>	Monday June <b>24</b>	Monday July <b>1</b>	Thursday July <b>4</b>

**Do you agree with the motion?**

**63%** voted yes      **37%** voted no

**Comments**

This debate has finished. Voting is now closed.



#### Reference:

Read T., Sedano B. & Barcena E. 2018. Tailoring Language MOOC design for migrants and refugees. In T. Read, S. Montaner & B. Sedano [eds] Technological Innovation for Specialized Linguistic Domains: Languages for Digital Lives and Cultures Proceedings of TISLID'18. Mauritius: Éditions Universitaires Européennes, 383-396. <https://bit.ly/2DBoESP>.

### Multiplier events

#### Aims

Three multiplier events were conducted with the aim to disseminate project outcomes and engage the project's target audiences.

#### Approach/activity description

The three multiplier events were each organized and hosted by a project partner, with participation from the other consortium members. The three events were conducted:

- Friday 23th November 2018, hosted by UNED in Madrid, Spain. The event's central theme was 'MOOCs for university teaching and supporting refugees'
- Wednesday 27th March 2019, hosted by Wolverhampton University, the UK. The event's central theme was 'digital learning for disadvantaged communities'.
- Thursday 20th June 2019, hosted by EADTU and The Hague School of Applied Sciences in The Hague, the Netherlands. The event's central theme was 'MOOCs as a tool for challenges in society'.

#### Madrid multiplier event

The first Multiplier Event of the project was entitled "MOOCs for university teaching and supporting refugees" and was related with O3 and O4. This event had the purpose of sharing, discussing and promoting the core results of the different scenarios in the project, and the cost-benefit analysis tool and findings.

The Multiplier event took place on the 23 and 24 of November at UNED, Madrid, Spain and lasted a total of 7 hours, with six presentations.

Six members with wide experience of open education and MOOCs from the ATLAS research group working in the MOONLITE project at UNED (Timothy Read, Elena Barcena, Beatriz Sedano and Elena Martín-Monje) and at Universidad Complutense de Madrid (Jorge Arús-Hita) participated in presentations and workshops, and other member of the consortium, Anthony Camilleri from KIC contributed remotely with a presentation of the cost-benefit analysis tool, as leader of this project output.

Three more experts on open inclusive education participated as speakers: Ildiko Mazar, from the Education Quality Institute in Estonia, who has worked in the field of open & distance education and e-learning since 1998, accumulating particularly significant experience in the management of EU co-funded projects; Maria Bloecher from Kiron in Germany, who has a broad and international experience as a German language teacher for refugees and has worked for the Higher Education Unit of the UNHCR in Geneva; and Kate Borthwick from the University of Southampton, UK, who is the Director of Programme Development (online learning) at this university, leads the University's MOOC programme and is an award-winning, experienced language teacher, a developer of online learning materials/courses, and is an e-tutor.

Firstly, on the afternoon of Thursday 23 of November, MOONLITE's coordinator, Timothy Read, welcomed everyone present. The first day was focused on some of the output projects and other experiences on online open inclusive education.

During the first presentation, Jorge Arús-Hita and Beatriz Sedano presented the MOONLITE project and its outputs. Beatriz started introducing the context of the projects, its objectives concreted in the four outputs. First, O3 was presented with the different learning paths explored, the desktop research undertaken (concept of refugees and migrants, existing MOOC offer in entrepreneurship, languages, and CLIL; MOOC accreditation and recognition; MOOC specific-inclusive criteria; and interviews with migrants and refugees stakeholders); and the MOONLITE scenarios implemented in the four HEIs institutions participating in the project: LNU and ESCP integrating language MOOCs and entrepreneurial MOOCs into formal education, WVL providing guidance to refugees on existing MOOCs, and UNED creating new LMOOCs for refugees and migrants. Then, Jorge explained in detail the UNED scenario: the design and implementation of the two Spanish language MOOCs carried out in collaboration with Spanish support groups and the inclusion of refugees and migrants themselves, by making them part and protagonists in the process. In addition, the O3 report was presented. Subsequently, Beatriz presented O5 Meta-MOOC topics and objectives, together with the types of materials and activities, and the link to the registration, since the MOOC was launched one month and a half after the event, and the attendees could participate in it. Finally, O6 objectives and planned activities still to be undertaken were described: the annual surveys for HEIs; the interviews to policy makers; the online-vision events and focus groups; and the final report with a set of recommendations for institutional, national and European policy makers and MOOC providers.

The second speaker was Ildiko Mazar, presenting the experience of two Erasmus+ projects called OEPass and MicroHE, the idea of an open education passport and the possibilities of micro-credentials for refugees and migrants. She started talking about the limitations of MOOCs recognition. She argued that they could but do not automatically imply a better access to the higher education system. OEPass's mission is to create a digital standard format for documenting open education credentials based on ECTS, meanwhile MicroHE's mission is to create a model blockchain infrastructure for storing and automatically verifying credentials. However, there are still many barriers that exclude people who need the recognition most, such as refugees and migrants: credentials are still not digital; there is limited access to underlying information; an existing lack of technical standards for credential information, security and verification; credentials are expensive, and hard to use and share etc. Therefore, while there is a need for a more flexible and transparent system, we can imagine a future where recognition is universal, automatic and seamless.

The third and final speaker at the first day of the event was Maria Blöcher from Kiron, who showed Kiron's educational model and quality assurance for MOOC-based curricula. After introducing Kiron, the barriers that refugees face when trying to access higher education, and Kiron's study and quality model, she presented different cases of recognition of previous learning that can serve as examples for other institutions. Finally, she presented Kiron's Quality Handbook Curriculum, a document that can be downloaded and which describes the processes they follow for curriculum development our quality standards.

The following day was focused on the design of inclusive open learning and MOOCs, and the cost-benefit analysis of using these courses.

Firstly, Kate Borthwick talked about the inherent inclusiveness of MOOCs by design, and how these courses have the potential to reach people in ways that other online courses do not. She talked about the openness of MOOCs and why they are inclusive: they are open to anyone to access and undertake, they are free, offer an online community with peer learning, and they are flexible from the learner perspective autonomy of learning, space and time. Therefore, MOOCs are very suitable for refugees and migrants because in some cases they do not have the right entry qualifications to access a course or to enter into formal education, they do not have enough money or time due to their complex situation, or they are not in the right geographical location. Then, she showed some experiences and examples of inclusive MOOC design, and she reflected on what are the challenges still need to be faced in order to achieve real inclusivity in MOOCs: how to reach the real target audience and how to evaluate that; how to overcome technological issues such as access, broad band or digital literacy; the need of more languages in MOOCs and how languages is used; and pedagogical aspects such as the concept of learner autonomy.

Secondly, Anthony Camilleri, presented the tool developed within the project and the Output 4, created for institutions in order to quantifying the contribution, costs & benefits that MOOCs and other informal online courses make to institutions' triple-bottom line: economic, social and environmental impact. This tool is appropriate for anyone who wants to understand the true impact of implementing a MOOC programme for a target group, such as migrants and refugees. He explained the applications of this tool such as: calculate full cost and benefits of a MOOC/online learning programme or of a particular course, calculate the contribution of MOOCs to the institutional mission, calculate benefit of investing in MOOCs against other investments, and use MOOC data in sustainability reporting activities. Then, he detailed the steps of using the tool: 1) identify economic, environmental, and social effects of MOOCs; 2) identify indicators and data sources; 3) define core and supplementary assessment indicators; and 4) map the tool against existing major sustainability certifications. Finally, he showed specific examples of the triple-bottom line indicators in order to show the attendees the practical application of the tool.

To finalise the event, Timothy Read and Elena Martin-Monje conducted a workshop on how to design socially inclusive MOOCs, based on the previous experience of the research group designing LMOOC in different contexts and in the UNED's own scenario in the project, with the two Spanish MOOCs for refugees and migrants. Firstly, Elena showed the Practical Guide for MOOC Tutoring and Design, a document that was originally published in Spanish and whose English translation was funded by the MOONLITE project. This document is a practical guide for those who want to know more about methodological aspects in order to use or design MOOCs. Elena presented the different chapters of the guide, together with the crucial elements that should be taken into account in the design of MOOCs: aspects before designing the course (topic, target audience, teaching team, platform, etc.); content creation (videos, textual resources), assessment tools (test, P2P, ) communication tools (forums, social networks, videoconferences), roles of the teaching team, and some considerations for inclusive design and accessibility (subtitles, audio transcription, screen contrast, etc.). Then, Timothy reflected on how to make a MOOC more inclusive, especially for displaced people, and talked about the inclusion criteria that the research group have identified: technological, linguistic, pedagogical, ethical and cultural, and policy criteria, showing some examples of the application of these criteria in the LMOOCs "Open Doors" I y II. Subsequently, during the practical part of the workshop, the attendees were divided in groups had time to explore the different sections of the guide presented and do some planning for a future inclusive MOOC they would like to create. Finally, the ideas were shared in an insightful debate.

Among the participants, there were university professors from different European HEIs (Spain, England, France, Greece); master and doctoral students related to online open inclusive education at national and European level; members of support entities and NGOs, among which there were language teachers to refugees and migrants; and a MOOC provider from Spain, from MiriadaX. In addition, we also invited some refugees who came from Germany and who were able to share their own experience and opinion of how open education and MOOCs can help them in their process of social inclusion. This was especially enriching for the event, and again corroborated the idea that collaboration between the above-mentioned stakeholders is a fundamental aspect in order to achieve the full potential of using MOOCs for social inclusion. Therefore, it is possible to affirm that the target public that was intended to be reached was reached.

The implications and recommendations derived from this event are the following:

- For the attendance to multiplier events, it is crucial to invite not only stakeholders from universities and other institutions that should be interested in the topic of the event, but also the target audience of the project, in this case, displaced people, to know first-hand their opinions and experiences.
- MOOCs have the potential to be inclusive and useful for social inclusion, as the case studies of the project and other experiences from other institutions showed, but we still have to face some challenges and join forces between stakeholders.
- Recognition of open learning experiences such as MOOC is a crucial aspect for social inclusion, and there is need to work on more initiatives of micro-credential recognition, like the European projects OEPass and MicroHE.
- A cost-benefit analysis tool could be useful for institutions in order to measure the use and design of MOOCs for inclusion.

The full program and the links to the video presentations can be seen at the following:

Friday November 23

- Welcome (Timothy Read, UNED, Spain): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbcd2ab1111f5e718b916d>
- Presentation of the MOONLITE project and its outputs (Jorge Arús-Hita, UCM, Spain & Beatriz Sedano, UNED, Spain): <https://canal.uned.es/series/5bfbcacfb1111f5f718b91b8>
- Open Education Passports and Micro Credentials for refugees and migrants (Ildiko Mazar, Education Quality Institute, Estonia): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbcdbb1111f5b718b9132>
- Kiron Educational Model and Quality Assurance for MOOC-based curricula (Maria Blöcher, Kiron, Germany): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbcdb8b1111f5b718b912c>

Saturday November 24

- Inclusive by design: how MOOCs have the potential to reach people in ways other online courses do not (Kate Borthwick, University of Southampton, UK): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbd89b1111f5e718b91d6>
- A tool for institutions for quantifying the costs & benefits of Open Education (Anthony Camilleri, Knowledge Innovation Centre, Malta): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbd89b1111f5e718b91d9>
- Workshop on how to design a socially inclusive MOOC (Elena Martín- Monje & Timothy Read, UNED, Spain): <https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbd88b1111f5e718b91d3>  
[/https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbd88b1111f5e718b91d0](https://canal.uned.es/video/5bfbd88b1111f5e718b91d0)

## Wolverhampton multiplier event

### Theme of the second multiplier event

This multiplier event brought together three different experts and areas of expertise, namely insights into the situation of refugees, the learning of languages and the design of MOOCs. Massive open online courses (MOOCs), have become widely popular and wildly successful as ways of delivering interactive and media-rich courses to very large numbers of students across a variety of subjects. Whilst the established platforms such as FutureLearn, edX, Coursera and Udemy get most of the publicity and enrolments, it is possible to reach specialist audiences, for example refugees, non-traditional students or language learners, with a MOOC approach but using a more flexible, cost-effective and participative technologies. This Erasmus+ multiplier event took place on Wednesday 27th March 2019 as part of the MOONLITE project, which is based around harnessing the potential of MOOCs for refugees and migrants to build skills for employment, education, and inclusion

### Designing MOOCs for language learning

Professor Agnes Kukulska-Hulme, of the Open University spoke about the design of MOOCs for language learning and about a range of Open University projects. Mobile learning supporting MOOCs has language learning potential in out-of-class and blended settings

- connection and continuity: e.g. learning applied to life, daily activities, habits
- personal goal setting and self-directed learning
- harnessing spontaneous and incidental learning
- easy media creation and sharing, e.g. to document experiences, capture data
- context and location-relevant learning, e.g. significant places
- playful game-based learning
- layering multimedia information (e.g. AR) for enhanced understanding or enrichment
- rapid communication, collaboration, peer support
- notifications or prompts for reflection and action
- immediate 'intelligent' assistance

And current Open University projects address problems like

- financial problems
- mental health issues
- political controversies
- relationship difficulties
- domestic violence
- exploitation at work
- substance abuse
- alternative lifestyles
- black humour
- crime and punishment

### Online learning for refugees

Gabi Witthaus, from the University of Birmingham and Art of E-learning with Marwa Belghazi, of the Refugee Resettlement Service spoke about designing open, online learning with and for refugees

with a novel dialogic presentation. They talked about the positive role that can be played by refugees and migrants in all stages of the MOOC design and delivery cycle, while also noting the potential danger of creating a “niche sector” for refugees (de Jong, 2018), of “branding” individuals by their refugee or asylum status above all their other personal and professional identities, and of placing a burden of representativity on a few individuals in relation to others from vastly diverse backgrounds.

The concept of the Third Space is one that both speakers were drawn to. The term was coined by postcolonial theorist Bhabha (1994), who described the potential for a new, “hybrid” culture to be created when two or more cultures come together. In this space, new possibilities can arise where neither group dominates, both groups recognise the equal status of the other, and both groups learn from one another. The Third Space does not necessarily emerge automatically; it is most likely to arise in situations where both parties are open to being influenced by the other. They played with this idea in terms of the coming together of practitioners and academics, as well as in relation to the positioning of MOOCs as a third space between formal and non-formal education (Cronin, 2014), and the notion of “closed bubbles” of face-to-face meet-ups forming that third space between MOOCs and learners (Creelman and Witthaus, 2018). They talked about the importance of boundaries, buffer zones and bridges in making Third Spaces both safe and dynamic. They also talked about the pitfall of over-compensating for real power differences by using “odd” language to symbolise togetherness (e.g. use of the pronoun “we” in instructions to MOOC learners in contexts where, in the words of an audience member, it feels “odd”).

They ended their dialogue with Marwa’s proposal of “speed-dating” as a format for practitioners and academics to network and collaborate – and her challenge to academics to consider the accessibility of university venues to people in the outside world. The idea is intriguing, so they do hope that one day they will be able to make it happen.

### **Early experiences of MOOCs**

Dr Inge de Waard, of InnoEnergy talked about the experience of designing MobiMOOC, an early free community MOOC that attracted hundreds of participants. Challenges. She described what was involved in creating and delivering a MOOC which could be engaged with entirely via mobile devices – not least of which was a learning design decision to allow participants to “branch” out to different topic areas depending on their interests, which had the unintended effect of diluting the interaction. In the cases described by Inge, it was clear that hard work, perseverance and a desire to push the boundaries of what is possible in mobile learning had led to the creation of memorable and effective MOOCs, which stand as models of good practice for others to follow.

MobiMOOC was offered over a course of six weeks with each week organized thematically and facilitated by leading mobile learning researchers and practitioners. The MobiMOOC included an introductory session to MobiMOOC, mobile learning planning, mobile learning for development (M4D), innovations in mobile learning, interaction between mobile learning and a mobile connected society and mobile learning in K-12 environments. All the facilitators were guides-on-the-side, each putting forward as many learning actions and follow-ups as they wanted; each of these facilitators was voluntary engaged in this course. All participants, including the facilitators, were free to receive new information and construct new knowledge that fit their own personal mobile learning needs. As such, participants were in charge of their own learning. The participants were able to get information that was relevant to them by asking the entire group for their insights.

## **MOOC design workshop**

In the afternoon, Professor John Traxler ran a short design workshop, excerpted from a much longer and comprehensive process, drawing attention to the range of factors that constrain the 'design space', the levels of designs and their various forms of representation and some of the heuristics that help navigate the 'design space'. This was part of the development and design processes for a 'community MOOC' based on two of the principles implicit in the MobiMOOC or community MOOC: heutagogy, or self-directed learning (Blaschke 2012), and the curation or orchestration of resources (Botticelli et al 2011). The community MOOC format is essentially self-directed. Further pedagogic improvements would be possible by increased alignment with the heutagogy community. It is also self-evidently part of the curation or orchestration movement, which grows out of recognition of the abundance of digital resources, albeit mostly in the languages and values of the global North. Again, pedagogic improvements will become likely as the curation movements develops transferable heuristics, building on social book-making tools and social bibliographic databases. There should however be greater recognition that these digital resources include not only digital content but also digital communities and digital tools.

Another principle that emerges is that of active learning with user-generated content (Lee & McLoughlin 2007), meaning not only can users gain agency, control and self-confidence by contributing, by uploading, their own images, ideas, information and opinions, but there is also the possibility of increased meta-cognition and critical capacity by facilitating the commenting, reviewing and rating each other's contributions. This can sometimes be formalised or 'badged' with systems modelled on Goodreads, Amazon, TripAdvisor and Wikipedia, which have already given learners experiences of rating, reviewing and editing. The participants at the MOONLITE event used the workshop to try out these principles and heuristics within the context of what had heard earlier in the day.

## [The Hague multiplier event](#)

### **Theme of the third multiplier event**

This third MOONLITE multiplier event was organised at, and in cooperation with, The Hague University of Applied Sciences as a half-day conference on June 20th in The Hague.

The central theme of the conference was whether MOOCs have the potential to overcome legal, linguistic and financial barriers for an important part of society as a key step toward social inclusion, employment and entering higher education. At this stage of the project MOONLITE had already developed guidelines and tools to support institutions in the development and delivery of MOOCs, and has interviewed practitioners and policy makers on MOOCs as tools for challenges in society. These determined the outline for the conference:

- Best practice presentations on MOOCs for social inclusion and employment: the cases from MOONLITE.
- Guidelines and tools for developing and costing MOOCs.
- Policy recommendations for MOOC uptake at European, national and institutional levels.
- Drafting "The Hague declaration on MOOCs as a tool for society" for a more viable and strategic role of MOOCs.
- A networking event for participants and co-presenters.

### **Participating sister projects and invited guests**

In addition to MOONLITE presentations the organisers also invited three other projects active in the field to share experiences and bring in new perspectives:

- The Erasmus+ e-Valuate project, with a presentation on ‘Recognition of online learning in EHEA: Status and recommendations’ by Katrien Bardoel, Senior policy officer, Team International Recognition of NUFFIC.
- The Erasmus+ #Multininclude project, with a presentation ‘Pathways to success into HE’ by Edward van Os, senior researcher Inclusive Education, The Hague University of Applied Sciences.
- The Higher Education for Syrians Programme (HES), by Meri de Campos from SPARK.

In promoting the event the organisers invited selected MOONLITE and EADTU contacts; 40 policy advisers; and European Studies students. In addition the event was published through social media (LinkedIn, Twitter, and Facebook).

### The programme

The programme was announced on the partners’ websites, through social media, and through a targeted email campaign:

PROGRAM	
9:00-9:30	Registration
9:30-9:45	Opening and welcome (Timothy Read)
9:45-10:15	MOONLITE guidelines and tools (Timothy Read)
10:15-10:30	Overview of policy recommendations (John Traxler)
10:30-10:45	The #Multininclude project: Pathways to success into HE (Edward van Os)
10:45-11:15	Coffee break
11:15-11:30	The Higher Education for Syrians Programme (Meri de Campos)
11:30-11:45	Recognition of online learning in EHEA: status and recommendations (Katrien Bardoel)
11:45-12:15	Discussion on policy recommendations for MOOCs in Europe (Alastair Creelman)
12:15-12:30	Summary and closure

### Report from the conference

#### *Opening and welcome*

Unfortunately Timothy Read who was planned to cover this part of the programme was unable to attend. Alastair Creelman from MOONLITE partner Linnaeus University (Sweden) took over his role and opened the conference by welcoming participants and introducing the MOONLITE project and the project partners present.



The participants and presenters were asked whether they objected to audio- and video recording of the session for internal project monitoring. All those present gave their consent, provided that no videos would be placed on YouTube.

As an opening activity all participants were asked to briefly discuss with their neighbour the central theme of the conference: 'the potential of MOOCs as a tool for challenges in society'. After five minutes first impressions were briefly shared to set the stage for the coming activities.

### ***MOONLITE guidelines and tools***

Next Alastair presented the MOONLITE project, explained its title and underlying ideas, and the main project objectives and results so far: the cross-institutional scenario's; pathways for migrants into HE; the cost-benefit analysis tool for institutions; the 'meta MOOC'; and the project's present work on the policy report.

Based on this presentation, participants were asked to post any questions, feedback or remarks online through Mentimeter for later discussion and reference.

### ***Overview of policy recommendations***

Beatriz Sedano Cuevas from project partner UNED and John Traxler from project partner University of Wolverhampton jointly presented the main challenges in the development and uptake of MOOCs identified through the project so far. These challenges are to serve as input to the project's 'The Hague Declaration' which aims to present a set of recommendations in support of promoting MOOCs for social inclusion and societal change.

The seven key challenges were presented, and the audience was again asked to comment through Mentimeter, in addition to asking questions and raising issues during the presentation. The seven challenges identified and presented were:

- Improving access to MOOCs and open education
- Keeping MOOCs open and free
- The need for support in inclusive MOOCs
- Building MOOCs for social inclusion
- Recognition of prior learning and MOOC certification
- Open education policies at national and international level
- New funding and business models

Throughout the presentation the seven challenges were discussed, and related to the entries in Mentimeter. Four themes surfaced from this interaction:

- University staff teaching refugees often have no training themselves or time to learn about online resources and therefore tend to revert to traditional teaching. So there is generally a low awareness of MOOCs both among refugees and teachers. In fact, the face-to-face method is generally appreciated by refugees for reasons discussed under the next issue.
- MOOCs and online learning in general tend to hinder social inclusion. Refugees want to get in contact and interact with others, and therefore tend to value face to face teaching, together with other learners, over online self-study which is the model in most MOOCs.
- If refugees want to participate in MOOCs/online learning, they generally need a lot of support. With identifying relevant offerings; with access to and use of the technology; and

face-to-face support and tutoring. Such support will generally not come from universities, but needs to come from the community and people closer to the refugees.

- Most present-day MOOCs are pre-designed, not flexible during their offering, and fairly large and monolithic. This raised the issue of an agile development approach, in which the course evolves as it is offered, based on the needs of the learners. It was noted that MOOCs started out as ‘social MOOCs’: based on a collaborative, connectivist, organic model, but that later the ‘US-model’ for MOOCs became dominant. The Spanish-language MOOC for refugees from UNED applied the middle-way as it was developed using a design-thinking approach, involving social workers who worked with refugees. It was further remarked that the larger the cultural differences between developers and learners, the more important it is to apply a participative/agile development approach.

As a conclusion of this session the present Oxford Debate on the same topic was introduced and the participants were invited to take part.

### **The #Multinlude project: Pathways to success into HE**

This Erasmus+ project was presented by Edward van Os from The Hague University of Applied Sciences.

All EU member states know underrepresented, underprivileged groups in society and (higher) education. (Higher) education has a key role to discover talents and help to make use of them in society. The project therefore focusses on emancipation, empowerment, and inclusion of underrepresented, underprivileged groups in society and (higher) education.

The seven partners (of which three universities) work together in detecting, analyzing and sharing good examples of initiatives aiming at inclusive education. The project focuses on so-called “majority-minority communities” (in cities like The Hague, Vienna, Malmo) that suffer from below-average school performance. Guiding principles are that ‘the student’ does not exist, that all stories should be heard and considered, and that diversity should be seen as a strength. This should lead to the ‘decolonization’ of the curriculum and the creation of a learning environment in which every student has a fair chance to develop his/her talents.

The project collects case descriptions to build up a database and analysis of best practice examples of interventions with proven success in improving equity outcomes. The project is presently in its second year, and the database is almost ready to be made publicly available. The project has organised a number of webinars, and will reach out to schools and create course materials.

The main discussion topic during the presentation concerned the ‘decolonization’ of the curriculum for the underprivileged groups, where the counter argument was brought in that one of the roles of education is to help underprivileged groups understand, and become able to participate in, society as it is.

As a conclusion of the presentation Edward showed the project web site and its public resources.

### **Recognition of online learning in EHEA: Status and recommendations**

After the coffee break Katrien Bardoel, senior policy officer and member of the Team International Recognition of NUFFIC, presented the Erasmus+ e-Valuate project.

The project is carried out in cooperation between diploma recognition centers in Europe, and focuses on the recognition of 'stand-alone e-learning', including MOOCs. 'Stand-alone' in this respect means that the (e-learning) course is not offered as part of a formal, accredited, study programme. The project was triggered by students asking recognition for a (collection of) MOOCs instead of a coherent study programme; by MOOCs provided outside formal HE; and by the unbundling of content development, assessment and certification.

NUFFIC has published the 10 page policy paper 'Oops a MOOC' which outlines seven criteria on how to evaluate a MOOC, largely based on the EAR HEI manual and Bologna tools. The criteria comprise 1) the quality of the study programme (QA-framework); 2) the level of the study programme (EQF/NQF); 3) learning outcomes (DS); 4) workload (ECTS); and 5) verification of the certificate. Two additional criteria are the way the study results were assessed, and the identification method of the participant.

In applying these criteria to lead to recognition it was found that the main challenges are the time required to retrieve the relevant information on the course/MOOC; and the fragmented responsibilities at HEIs for admission and/or exemption which makes it difficult to identify the responsible people – who are not always familiar with e-learning.

At present the eValue project is working on three tools: 1) an online learning information tool for recognition professionals and to support the development of institutional policy; 2) a position paper for e-learning providers on what to do if you want your MOOC to be accreditable; and 3) together with European Students Union develop a manual how to pre-assess MOOCs. These tools will become available after the summer.

The recommendations to MOOC developers and providers to facilitate recognition are: 1) refer to generally accepted Bologna tools, like ECTS and NQF and define learning outcomes when developing your MOOC; 2) prevent information on course content and learning outcomes from being lost, e.g. by using unique course codes or online badges; and 3) integrate stand-alone e-learning in internal and external quality assurance processes.

### **The Higher Education for Syrians Programme**

The Higher Education for Syrians Programme (HES) was presented by Meri de Campos from SPARK. SPARK is an NGO founded in Amsterdam in 1994, with the aim to develop higher education and entrepreneurship to empower young, ambitious people to lead their conflict affected societies into prosperity.

HES is supporting Syrian and Palestinian refugees to enjoy access to higher education and to become community, business and national leaders of the future. It was started in 2016 in Syria, Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Palestine, and Kurdistan Region. It has so far provided 4500 scholarships and its target is to have 7500 graduates by 2021 with Bachelor degrees, vocational/TVET degrees, technical diplomas, and short courses.

Despite having completed this education, people still are unprepared for the labour market (lack soft skills), lack opportunities to help them into employment and internships, and face difficulties to start a business. In response SPARK is now piloting its Post Scholarship Programme (PSP) which will tackle the needs of 5000 refugee students who have graduated through a SPARK scholarship through a range of activities: offering them entrepreneurship training; help with internships and job placement; provide targeted trainings on e.g. C.V. writing, LinkedIn, presentation skills; matching

student & existing training programmes (like IT coding, nursing, etc.); business plan competitions; facilitating access to finance; and 1-on-1 coaching.

In these activities SPARK is experimenting with online tools and resources in support of its face-to-face activities. The conclusions so far:

Pros: the learner/entrepreneur can adjust the pace at which (s)he wants to learn; easy access to resources in case (s)he missed the face-to-face session or to would like to refresh their knowledge after the workshop; Business Plans created online in the format required by the financial institution/investors/Chamber of Commerce are really useful; it is efficient (cost-wise); trainers can easily monitor online progress. There are also problems: accessibility, often participants do not have access to computers with internet; and participants lack the commitment to attend webinars.

The discussion after the presentation mainly focused on the pragmatic and agile approach SPARK applies in using online and social media tools as a means to find the right mix between face-to-face and online learning/services.

### **Summary and closure**

As a closing activity the collected Mentimeter contributions were scanned and discussed. Three issues (re)surfaced:

Agile development. The need to apply an agile development approach when developing MOOCs/online courses for refugees to secure that their needs are really addressed.

Social inclusion. The social aspect is very important: refugees want to meet people, not study online on their own. Therefore it is always necessary to build in face-to-face elements.

Do not over-estimate the importance of MOOCs in the lives of refugees. Refugees face many practical problems in their lives, and MOOCs will only be able to contribute to solving a small part of these.

At 12.00 the conference was closed and Alastair thanked all participants and presenters for their contributions, and pointed them to the collected presentations, comments and pictures on <https://padlet.com/alacre/hague>

## References

- Barcena, E., Sedano Cuevas, B., Bick, M., Camilleri, A.F., Creelman, A., Henderikx, P., Kluijfhout, E., Löwe, C., Traxler, J., Traeger, C., Zourou, K. (2019): *The Hague Declaration: Establishing MOOCs as a tool for societal change*. Retrieved from <https://eadtu.eu/home/policy-areas/open-education-and-moocs/news/474-the-hague-declaration-establishing-moocs-as-a-tool-for-societal-change>
- Camilleri, A. F. (2019): *Cost-Benefit Analysis for MOOC provision*. Retrieved from <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/cba>
- Class Central MOOCwatch, April 2017: Retrieved from <https://www.classcentral.com/report/moocwatch-april-2017-shrinking-free/moocwatch-april-2017/>
- European Commission (2013): *'Opening up Education' - Making the 21th century classroom a reality*. Retrieved from [https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release\\_SPEECH-13-747\\_en.htm](https://europa.eu/rapid/press-release_SPEECH-13-747_en.htm)
- Jansen, D. & Goes-Daniels, M. (2016): *Comparing Institutional MOOC strategies - Status report based on a mapping survey conducted in October - December 2015*. Retrieved from [https://eadtu.eu/images/publicaties/Comparing\\_Institutional\\_MOOC\\_strategies.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/images/publicaties/Comparing_Institutional_MOOC_strategies.pdf)
- Jansen, D. & Konings, L. (2017): *MOOC Strategies of European Institutions. Status report based on a mapping survey conducted in November 2016 – February 2017*. EADTU. Retrieved from [http://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC\\_Strategies\\_of\\_European\\_Institutions.pdf](http://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC_Strategies_of_European_Institutions.pdf)
- Kluijfhout, E, Henderikx, P. & Ubachs, G. (2019): *MOOC status in European HEIs - with special reference to opening up education for refugees*. Status report based on a survey conducted in April-June 2019. EADTU. Retrieved from [https://eadtu.eu/documents/MOOC\\_status\\_in\\_European\\_HEIs.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/documents/MOOC_status_in_European_HEIs.pdf)
- Mulder, F., & Jansen, D. (2015): *MOOCs for Opening Up Education and the OpenupEd initiative*. In: C. J. Bonk, M. M. Lee, T. C. Reeves, T. H. Reynolds (Eds.). *The MOOCs and Open Education Around the World*. New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. Retrieved from [http://www.eadt.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/OpenupEd\\_-\\_MOOCs\\_for\\_opening\\_up\\_education.pdf](http://www.eadt.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/OpenupEd_-_MOOCs_for_opening_up_education.pdf)
- NUFFIC (2018): *Oops a MOOC! Dealing with eclectic learning in credential evaluation*. Retrieved from <https://www.nuffic.nl/documents/321/oops-a-mooc.pdf>
- Traeger, C. & Löwe, C. (Eds.): *Exploiting MOOCs for Access and Progression into Higher Education Institutions and Employment Market*. Retrieved from <https://moonliteproject.eu/outputs/exploiting-moocs-for-access-and-progression-heis-and-employment/>
- Ubachs, G. & Konings, L. (2018): *MOOC Strategies in European Universities. Status report based on a mapping survey conducted in December 2017 – May 2018*. Retrieved from [https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC\\_Strategies\\_in\\_European\\_Universities.pdf](https://eadtu.eu/documents/Publications/OEenM/MOOC_Strategies_in_European_Universities.pdf)
- Patru, M. & Balaji, V. (Eds.) (2016): *Making sense of MOOCs: A guide for policy makers in developing countries*. Retrieved from [http://oasis.col.org/bitstream/handle/11599/2356/2016\\_Guide-on-MOOCs-for-Policy-Makers-in-Developing-Countries.pdf](http://oasis.col.org/bitstream/handle/11599/2356/2016_Guide-on-MOOCs-for-Policy-Makers-in-Developing-Countries.pdf)

Read T., Sedano B. & Barcena E. (2018). *Tailoring Language MOOC design for migrants and refugees*. In T. Read, S. Montaner & B. Sedano [eds] *Technological Innovation for Specialized Linguistic Domains: Languages for Digital Lives and Cultures Proceedings of TISLID'18*. Mauritius: Éditions Universitaires Européennes, 383-396. <https://bit.ly/2DBoESP>).