



Erasmus+



**HERE seminar “Modularization of curriculum”**

**Venue: Rectorate of the University of Montenegro  
April 26, 2016**

<b>9.00-9.30</b>	<b>Registration of participants</b>
<b>9.30-9.50</b>	Opening session
	<b>Prof. dr Maja Baćović</b> , Vice-rector of the University of Montenegro, <b>Vanja Drljević</b> , National Erasmus+ Coordinator
<b>9.50-10.10</b>	Modularization of curricula in Montenegro from the prospective of legislator, <b>Mubera Kurpejović</b> , Director of Directorate for Higher Education, Ministry of Education
<b>10.10-10.35</b>	Current situation with respect to the modularization of curricula at UoM, <b>Prof. Aleksandar Vujović</b> , University of Montenegro, Center for Teaching and Quality Control
<b>10.35-10.55</b>	Moduarization at private universities in Montenegro, <b>Prof. dr Milica Vukotić</b> , Univerzitet Donja Gorica
<b>10.55-11.25</b>	Modularization in the EHEA (Learning and Teaching), <b>Prof. Volker Gehmlich</b> , Fachhochschule Osnabrück–University of Applied Sciences
<b>11.25-11.40</b>	Discussion
<b>11.40-11.55</b>	Modularization in the EHEA (Learning Outcomes and Assessment), <b>Prof. Volker Gehmlich</b> , Fachhochschule Osnabrück–University of Applied Sciences
<b>11.55-12.25</b>	Discussion
<b>12.25-12.45</b>	Coffee break
<b>12.45-13.15</b>	Modularization in the EHEA (ECTS and recognition), <b>Prof. Volker Gehmlich</b> , Faschhochschule Osnabrück–University of Applied Sciences
<b>13.15-13.45</b>	Modularization in Practice (Examples and Procedures), <b>Prof. Volker Gehmlich</b> , Fachhochschule Osnabrück–University of Applied Sciences
<b>13.45-14.05</b>	Discussion
<b>14.05-15.05</b>	Group work - How to prepare a module in different disciplines
<b>15.05-15.30</b>	Discussion
<b>15.30-16.00</b>	Conclusions and recommendations
<b>16.00-17.00</b>	Lunch



### **Expert profile description**

Prof. Volker Gehmlich is Professor of Business Management at the Fachhochschule Osnabrück – University of Applied Sciences, Germany since 1972. His national and international activities include the involvement in education and training programmes of several directorates of the European Union in various functions as well as the work as Bologna Promoter and National Contact Point for ECTS – European Credit Transfer and Accumulation System. He worked in the Technical Assistance Office of the COMETT-Programme (1987-1995), is a member of the Working Group of both the European and German Qualifications Frameworks (EQF), member of the Management Committee and higher education expert to the Business Subject Area of the Project “Tuning Educational Structures in Europe” as well as consultant in the design of new international universities, faculties and study-programmes. His research activities and publications focus on internationalisation, skill needs, mobility, credits systems, lifelong learning, qualification frameworks, university-enterprise partnership and supply chain. In 2000 he was awarded the “Prize for excellence in international cooperation of higher education“ by the German Minister for Education and Research.

### **Background information**

Modular education, as we now know it, was first adopted a century ago in American higher education. Educational philosophy ensured the growing acceptance of "student-centred learning and of John Dewey's advocacy of self-realization in the pursuit of studies adapted to the individual's interest.

Harvard University introduced the elective system in 1869 to replace the set curriculum. As a result of this students were able to determine, themselves, which courses they wanted to take (freedom of learning and increased specialization options). By 1884, Harvard students had almost complete freedom of choice. In the 1890s there was a shift towards measuring progress towards a degree on the basis of the accumulation of individual courses rather than the completing of a total course of study (Burn, 1974). In the meantime other institutions were adopting similar practices. The movement towards electives was soon accompanied by increasing recognition of a need to quantify educational process, allowing students' progress along the various paths towards a degree to be assessed. The first units of measurement were the courses themselves, defined in terms of hours of classroom contact, with the measure of achievement across the varied course offerings based on a common time unit (Heffernan, 1973).

Thus emerged the credit system, the forerunner of modules, as a means of aggregating the series of varied educational experiences. Here too, one sees the origins of the view that American higher education allows students total freedom of choice, a kind of cafeteria system in which the moving tray is heaped with whatever fancy catches the mover's eye. Such was certainly not the intention. The elective/credit system's proponents saw it, not as curricular free-for-all, but as a means of breaking the stranglehold of the classical curriculum.



However the elective system was not introduced across the board in higher education, as schools gave preference to adapting to the entrance requirements /criteria of colleges and universities. By way of compensation, a number of institutions had introduced a major and minor system, where the student chose some department or group of studies in which he took a major, for example a series of courses presented by that department, and one in which he took a minor.

Today, the credit system has been used to accommodate a whole range of approaches undreamt of at its creation: self-paced courses and independent study (Ziegler, 1972; Allen & Christensen, 1974); life credits for mature students (Hill, 1975); contract learning (Lindquist, 1975), the forerunner of our negotiated learning; credit for study abroad (Haas, 1982), and developments in the direction of non-attendance (Burn, 1974) and towards award of credit by mastery of content and examination (Lorimer, 1962; Spurr, 1970), and the abandonment of letter/numerical grades for satisfactory/un-4 satisfactory (Schultz, 1973) assessments. As will be apparent, the credit system is capable of movement in virtually any direction: towards greater or less student autonomy, enhanced or reduced institutional control, greater curricular cohesion or more fragmentation.

### **Learning outcomes:**

The expert is expected to assist in sharing the experience in introducing modules in existing curriculum. The experts are also expected to give suggestions as to how the modules could be integrated as completely new form in curricula.

### **Participants targeted:**

Higher Education Reform Experts, University professors from all three universities, representatives of the Ministry of Education, rectors, vice-rectors, deans and vice-deans, director of Center for Doctoral Studies, Director of QA center, students' representatives...

### **Background documents:**

Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area (ESG)  
[http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG\\_2015.pdf](http://www.enqa.eu/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/ESG_2015.pdf)

ECTS User's Guide 2015,  
[file:///C:/Users/Ranko/Downloads/NC0514068ENN\\_002.pdf](file:///C:/Users/Ranko/Downloads/NC0514068ENN_002.pdf)

European and national Qualifications Frameworks  
<http://www.cedefop.europa.eu/en/events-and-projects/projects/european-qualifications-framework/publications>

Writing and Using Learning Outcomes: a Practical Guide by Declan Kennedy  
<http://www.procesbolonski.uw.edu.pl/dane/learning-outcomes.pdf>