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Abstract
Finnish education may be a model for Japanese universities as they look to promote active learning pedagogies. Based on observations and interviews with influential educators from several Finnish institutions, this article overviews key aspects of education in Finland, especially those related to deep learning. The role of faculty development, learning spaces, and co-teaching are also examined. Finally, a pilot course implemented at Okayama University in which the authors aimed to apply key ideas learned in Finland will be described.
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1. Introduction
Finland is known worldwide as a leader in education, partly due to its students’ consistently high scores on the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). Another reason for its reputation is that the Finnish education system seems to excel through quality, not quantity; formal Finnish schooling does not start until age seven, and teachers are known to give little homework, especially in the early years. The Finnish education system has focused explicitly on active learning, which is said to develop higher order thinking skills (HOTS), as well as other deep learning competencies, such as character, creativity, collaboration, communication, etc. (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014). Perhaps exemplifying the quality of its overall education is the fact that Finland has been relatively influential in the global economy, despite its small size (Sahlberg, 2015).

In contrast, while Japanese students also achieve high test scores on math and science tests (PISA, 2012), they study extremely long hours (including cram school) compared to the Finns. Moreover, Japanese education, including its higher education system, is not known for fostering critical and creative thinking or communication skills. Japanese higher education has also been criticized for its lack of standards and its reliance on lecture-dominated pedagogy (McVeigh, 2001; Nagatomo, 2012; Poole, 2003). The Japanese Ministry of Education, Health, Science, & Welfare (MEXT) is aware of this and has called for higher standards (Amano & Poole, 2005; Nagatomo, 2009). With its Super Global University initiative (MEXT, 2014), it has been promoting active learning and internationalization of its education through curricular reforms and faculty development activities. As a Super Global University, Okayama University has been
proactively pursuing these aims. Given the above, it seems that Finland could be considered a model for Japanese education.

Another reason why Finnish education might be an applicable model for Japan is because the two countries have similar socio-linguistic styles (Nishimura, Nevgi, & Tella, 2008). Finland is the only country in Europe with a communication style highly valuing silence, and this has led to the stereotype of the “silent Finn.” Meanwhile, the Japanese also have a reputation for silence in social interactions. Thus, it is interesting to examine how the Finns are able to excel in an active learning environment, as well as global business contexts, with such a “silent” communication style. If the Finns can succeed with increased focus on active learning pedagogies, perhaps the Japanese could as well.

With this in mind, two members of the Okayama University Learning Commons Study Group (now an informal research group which continues investigating and practicing active learning) visited Finland at the end of October, 2014 to explore the following:

- higher education pedagogy (especially, active learning and deep learning)
- faculty development and teacher engagement
- communication styles
- active learning spaces

The following people were interviewed in separate meetings:

- Seppo Tella, Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki
- Inkeri Ruokonen, Department of Teacher Education, University of Helsinki
- Seven faculty members at Aalto University
- Engagement and change in academic communities (EGE) research group, University of Tampere
- Pasi Silander, Helsinki City Education Department

In addition, we visited and observed classes, active learning spaces, and libraries at University of Helsinki and Aalto University. This article summarizes the key observations and discusses a pilot class done at Okayama University that aimed to utilize these findings.

II. Key Characteristics of Finnish Education

Deep Learning and Active Learning

Teacher education and faculty development practices in Finland have fully embraced the concepts of active learning and deep learning. New Pedagogies for Deep Learning (NPDL) is an education movement (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014; http://npdl.global/) both in and outside Finland, created by the educators who originally partnered with the business world (e.g., Microsoft, Apple) and other stakeholders to develop the concept of 21st Century Skills. These are competencies considered increasingly necessary for success in today’s global society, including the original “4Cs” of: Communication, Collaboration, Critical and Creative Thinking. NPDL has added two additional Cs: Character and Citizenship, which encompass both global and local aspects. In addition to these “6Cs,” deep learning also emphasizes Digital Competencies.

According to NPDL project members, the pedagogies required to meet these objectives are active learning pedagogies, including group discussions and collaborative tasks, as well as digital
learning. While a number of countries are now formally involved in the NDPL movement, Finland is a major player and this is affecting education at all levels throughout the country. One teacher proudly showed data showing that Finnish K-12 classrooms are the loudest in the world, which a sign that the students are actively engaged and collaborative in class. It is also a total contradiction of the country’s silent reputation. Classroom interaction and noise seem to be so influential in Finland that researchers at University of Tampere have investigated the volume of teachers’ instruction in noisy classrooms (Rantala, Hakala, Holmqvist, & Sala, 2015).

In our visit to universities, deep learning was ever present. While many universities may promote a mix of traditional learning and active learning as an ideal, the EGE research group at the University of Tampere strongly criticized classes which require students to memorize facts to pass a test, stating that “fact and performance-oriented” learning promotes “disturbing thinking patterns and studying habits.” Thus, it is evident that they want educators at Tampere University to make a complete transition to active learning.

Cooperative learning, project-based learning, and frequent use of active learning spaces were observed during our visits. The university classes the authors observed were very active and engaging, and the students obviously enjoyed the activities. Two teacher trainers at University of Helsinki reported that their own classes have been transformed by active learning and that the students and the teachers very much prefer the new style.

The educators often mentioned the importance of “play” and having fun in class, and indeed a great deal of play was observed, even in graduate-level courses. A stress-free learning environment is a feature of the Finnish education system as a whole. Students have more freedom in how they learn, and they have few if any high-stakes tests until the end of high school. This is in sharp contrast to student life in Japan, which seems to be characterized by a series of high pressure tests leading up to university. In Japan, the authors have observed that studying is a duty to be taken very seriously. The act of playing only seems to be considered part of an early childhood education, and may even be considered a hindrance to success at the higher levels.

Communication

Communication is also a key goal of active learning pedagogies education in Finland. As mentioned before, Finland is known for being a “silent” country with its communication style somewhat resembling Japan. While Tella, who has studied Finnish social-linguistic patterns, said the culture was changing, we did observe Finnish tolerance and/or appreciation for silence in public spaces and in our discussions with the educators; they never interrupted others when speaking and there were frequent silences between utterances. Tella believes the Finns are aware of their reputations; their social-linguistic characteristics are discussed in classes, and they think need to be aware of it in cross-cultural communication. However, the classrooms observed were very communicative, and the students were quite vocal. This may suggest that “passive” Japanese students may also change if teachers implement active learning activities.
**Integrated Learning**

Integrated learning is another key educational concept in Finland. The education system throughout the country is about to get even more integrated, as the single subject instruction approach is to be phased out of K-12 education in favor of scenario-based learning that requires students to draw on knowledge from a variety of fields in order analyze problems and find solutions (Garner, 2015).

In tertiary education, Finland is also joining others in Europe in integrating content and language classes (CLIL; Dalton-Puffer, 2011). CLIL has been found to lead to increased language-learning benefits compared to regular language classes (de Zarobe, 2015). These include improved reading and listening proficiency, receptive vocabulary, and productive fluency. CLIL also leads to development in HOTS, such as critical thinking, and more awareness of various subjects. Compared to content classes in the first language, research studies have suggested that content acquisition does not lag behind, but more research seems to be needed in this area (Costa & Mariotti, 2015).

In our meetings in Finland, educators mentioned integration, as well as a balanced education and the arts. Aalto University itself was formed from several field-specific universities (focusing on technology, art, and economics) as it is believed that multidisciplinary studies lead to innovation and creativity. In fact, at the time of our visit, Aalto University was about to bring the Art and Business campuses together so that students from both fields might work and learn side by side. The seven faculty members who discussed the transition suggested that it has presented challenges, but that they supported the decision.

**Strategy Training**

While deep learning and active learning pedagogies are expected to indirectly improve students’ critical and creative thinking skills, explicit strategy training is also important; a meta-analysis of studies on critical thinking education suggested that explicit training leads to more gains than implicit activities (Abrami et al., 2008). Educators in Finland described such direct training to develop HOTS. The Helsinki City Education distributes a teacher resource in a compact design that teachers can carry around to find various classroom activities they can utilize to promote critical thinking. The resource is color-coded so educators can quickly refer to it to find activities which address specific thinking skills.

In terms of creative thinking, a lecturer at Aalto University reported how he uses the classic SCAMPER method (Eberle, 1972) to improve learners’ creativity. SCAMPER stands for the following:

- **Substitute** (replace a part or aspect with another)
- **Combine** (synthesize ideas)
- **Adapt** (alter to meet other needs)
- **Modify** (revise the thing or idea)
- **Put to another use** (use in a different way)
- **Eliminate** (remove a part or characteristic)
- **Reverse/Rearrange** (change the order)
Researchers and educators (Bakr, 2004; Poon, Au, Tong, & Lau, 2014) who have used SCAMPER (and CoRT [Bono, 2011]) concluded that it has strong potential for K-12 students in promoting creative thinking. In more scientific studies of university students, creativity training was also shown to be effective (Chen, Jiang, & Hsu, 2005; Clapham, 1997).

**Reflection**

Reflection was another key term that was used frequently by the educators we met describing Finnish pedagogy. Candidates at the University of Helsinki Department of Education are required to develop their own teaching methodology, through research, practice, and reflection, which they must explain and defend before they are allowed to graduate. Being a reflective learner is also an integral part of Deep Learning (Fullan & Langworthy, 2014), and reflection seems to be taking place at all levels of Finnish education including students, teachers, administrators, and policy makers.

Increasing reflection on one’s learning and academic engagement are also key focuses of the EGE research group at Tampere. They have developed the Nexus self-evaluation questionnaire for students and the faculty to determine how engaged students are in their learning. Reflection is key for educators and administrators as well. The educators we interviewed often mentioned how they are always trying to improve. Despite the achievement and reputation of its education, the continuous reforms by the Ministry of Education are further signs of the importance of reflection and improvement in Finland society.

**III. Solutions for Programs with Traditionally Teachers**

Not all teachers have gotten on board with active learning pedagogies in Finland. As in Japan, until recently faculty in higher education often had no training in pedagogy and many still do not know the benefits and methods of active learning pedagogies. Despite the stereotype of having a country full of superb teachers, some teachers in Finland continue to teach in a traditional, teacher-centered lecture style. The educators interviewed mentioned that many teachers are either reluctant or unable to change, similar to the situation in Japan and other countries. Solutions discussed in Finland are mentioned below.

**Faculty Development**

Silander, of the Helsinki City Education Department, believes that traditional teachers need to be “de-programmed” and that they need to learn about the learning process from scratch. For example, teachers must first understand that students retain more content if they are applying it, teaching it, or actively considering it. They also need to learn the pedagogies which lead to deep learning.

Such reflection on learning and pedagogy was also mentioned by members of the EGE research group at the University of Tampere. At this university, there are professors whose full-time duty is to improve pedagogy at the university. Instead of lecturing university professors how to teach, their Introduction to University to Pedagogy course models the teaching they want to promote with plentiful interaction and collaborative projects. The professors read about pedagogy
and student engagement, have online discussions, develop a presentation collaboratively, and reflect on how to implement activities in their own courses. The pilot course started in 2013 and is now held twice a year for faculty and once a year for graduate students. While all new professors need to take the course, it is optional for experienced faculty. However, the EGE research group thinks the long-term professors need the training more, and it is encouraged for them.

**Active Learning Spaces**

In lecture classes in which active learning is not done for various reasons, one solution is to have discussion groups or labs outside of class in learning commons. These may be led by teaching assistants or the students themselves, as we described in our previous article (Fast, Prichard, Morioka, & Rucynski, 2014). The universities visited had impressive libraries and learning spaces. The University of Helsinki has spectacular learning spaces in libraries and other campus buildings (e.g., the School of Education) which make having group discussions and utilizing technology easy.

**“Slide-by-Slide”**

An EFL instructor at Aalto University described another model to use with traditional teachers: the “slide-by-slide” model. A teacher who has some pedagogical qualifications (a TESOL degree, which typically includes instruction on active learning) attends a content class of a professor who cannot or will not use active learning pedagogies. The “active” teacher who is attending the class has no expertise in the subject area, but he actually leads a third of the classes using active learning pedagogies, such as discussions and tasks. Therefore, the students get knowledge and expertise in the lecture classes, and they can apply it and hopefully develop deep learning skills in the discussion-based classes. Moreover, the content teacher may also learn the benefits and methods of new pedagogies.

**IV. A Pilot Course at Okayama University**

In the fall of 2014, the authors, along with two other members of the Okayama University Learning Commons Study Group, John Rucynski and Akemi Morioka, held a pilot course at Okayama University to implement many of the pedagogical ideas promoted in Finland. The course, entitled “Thinking and Communication Skills for a Global University,” took place in Okayama University Library’s new Learning Commons, which is one of the university’s new and experimental active learning spaces. Students from all faculties, as well as international students were invited to attend the non-credit course. Over twenty signed up, and roughly half the students were from overseas.

The content of the course was mainly organized by Prichard, Rucynski, and Fast. Prichard delivered active, workshop-style classes at the beginning of the course, in which the students explicitly practiced critical and creative thinking skills. Approaches learned in Finland, such as SCAMPER, were implemented successfully. Next, Rucynski led lessons on communication, specifically intercultural communication issues that often occur in Japanese with non-Japanese encounters. Morioka provided language support during all lessons in the pilot course.
and made sure communication between the students went smoothly.

The latter third of all lessons, whether they dealt with thinking or communication, were dedicated to applying the students’ newly learned thinking and communication skills to a specific issue: how to make Okayama University more global. This is a real-world issue that the university has been grappling with, but it seems the students had few chances to get involved. Back at the University of Tampere, the authors were told how throughout Finland students almost always play a part in academic decision-making, having seats on committees, where their opinions are just as valued as teachers or administrators. With this in mind, Fast designed a scenario-based activity in which the students brainstormed, suggested, discussed, and finally refined their ideas for making the campus more global. They then put their final ideas into a resolution: a list of twenty-one recommendations (see Appendix). This was produced in two languages (and with very little teacher intervention) and hand delivered to the Okayama University President.

Overall, the pilot class was deemed a success by the teachers, observers and most importantly, the students who participated. The course was highly active and engaging, due to its student-centered, project-based approach, which was facilitated by the learning commons environment. Students were also able to employ digital technology by using library laptops and online software like Google Docs to collaboratively refine their ideas. Moreover, as there was no testing and no grades, there was also no extrinsic pressure, which added to the relaxed nature of the class.

When informally interviewed, it was interesting to note the different reactions to the class by the Japanese and non-Japanese students. While all were interested in the project of making Okayama University more global, the international students preferred the workshops on intercultural communication and occasionally noted that the scaffolding activities that took place in the thinking workshops were not necessary for them. Meanwhile, the Japanese students for the most part reacted in the opposite and stated that the thinking workshops were most helpful. This indicates that more direct instruction of thinking skills in particular, might be well-received by Japanese students.

V. Conclusion

In this article, we have described the various educational approaches we observed in Finland that Japanese education institutions, specifically Okayama University, might be able to use as a model and implement. We discussed the various pedagogical approaches we observed including, active learning, deep learning, the importance of play, CLIL and reflection. We have also provided suggestions as to how these pedagogies might be implemented when dealing with more traditionally-minded teachers. Finally, we described our own initial attempts at implementing our Finland findings in a pilot course.

It should be noted that the authors are aware of recent criticisms that too much credit is being given to the Finnish Education system, and to some it is known pessimistically as the Finnish Fairytale (Oates, 2015). In Finland, the authors were often reminded by the Finns themselves that their education system was far from perfect, and thus they continue to try to improve it by experimenting with the inclusion of deep learning and technology, for example.
Moreover, while flattered, the Finns are not entirely comfortable with their role model status. Still, the fact remains that we did discover many important educational concepts that are ideally suited for Japan, and we have thus tried to share them in this paper. We are very thankful for what we have learned from our Finnish friends, and hope these lessons will be of valuable to our colleagues in Japan as well.
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Appendix

Okayama University
Global University Student Resolution

Global: Meaning communication and collaboration with diverse nationalities; worldwide interconnected communities with a willingness to understand, accept and celebrate differences of culture, expression, and thinking.

Recognizing that Okayama University is the leading academic institution in the Prefecture and should be a leading Global center in the prefecture. And that Okayama is a suitable place for international students because it is an attractive, local, safe, and temperate area.

Noting with regret that Japan has fallen behind other countries in producing global citizens. According to statistics, the number of people studying outside Japan fell 10 percent annually between 2006 and 2010, and may still be falling.

Understanding that in order to create global citizens it is necessary to encourage communication between many people of different backgrounds, thereby gaining diverse, new and valuable insights into both Japanese and worldwide issues.

Emphasizing that with its international resources, Okayama University be a key player in bringing together people who will create a more global Japan. These people, Japanese and international faculty and students of Okayama University, can together contribute to strengthening the link between the global world and Okayama using English and other languages.

Demanding that Japanese and international students and faculty be allowed to work together to help mold Okayama University into a leading Global institution in Japan.

We the Japanese and International Students of Okayama University Recommend the following:

Student International Studies:

1. Using the university's global grant, provide more scholarships to study abroad for both domestic and international students so that they can finance their study. Also, encourage students to apply for scholarships to study abroad by more aggressively advertising all scholarships available.

2. Create undergraduate and/or graduate programs taught only in English targeting international students who are not proficient in Japanese, and local students who would like to study other subjects in English.
3. Greatly increase dormitories and/or new spaces where both domestic and international students can live together. Sharing living spaces should greatly increase Japanese students’ cultural awareness as well as provide international students more exposure to Japanese language and culture.

4. Encourage and accommodate study abroad for all students by giving credit for overseas study whenever possible and integrating study abroad programs into ordinary University curriculum. By 2025, have 30% of all Okayama University students participating in overseas programs before graduation.

5. To enable more international students in the classroom, reserve spaces for them in each faculty; set up alternate entrance criteria for international students as necessary. Aim for international students to make up 10% of each faculty by 2025.

Curricular:
6. More actively encourage international research between more universities, teachers, and students at the undergraduate and graduate level.

7. Offer a World Studies degree with focuses in different countries and languages. This will help increase the reputation of Okayama University as a university that offers globally focused curricula.

8. Make it a requirement for those pursuing degrees in a foreign language to study abroad, especially those who plan to become language teachers.

9. Promote more active learning, critical thinking and communication using real life issues in new and current Okadai classes in all faculties. Provide teacher training as necessary.

10. Create English for Special Purposes (ESP) and Japanese for Special Purposes (JSP) learning classes to help international and Japanese students. For example, create Keigo learning classes, Business English, etc.

Community Involvement:
11. Encourage clubs and circles to reach out to and accept international students. Create an easily accessible club and circle directory (online and in the Global Partners Office), available in at least English, and advertise it to all international students.

12. Provide semi-annual international leadership conferences, seminars, workshops, and training that encourage diversity and communication for students and the community that provide the opportunity for them to have fun, learn, and solve problems together.

13. Coordinate with other organizations, such as Okayama International Center, AGORA, etc., to provide more on and off campus opportunities for international and local student involvement in events, festivals, service work, internships, etc.

14. Partner with surrounding high schools to allow college students to mentor high schoolers. Create activities that Japanese High school students, Okayama University students and international students can do together to expose high schoolers to a more international and collegiate environment.

Faculty and Staff:
15. Hire more qualified international teachers for various subjects besides languages.

16. Include qualified international teachers and staff in influential committees and offer more chances for them to join administration and leadership roles to provide more perspectives and ideas in university decisions.
17. Include students of Okayama University in important committees to involve the student body in more large University decisions.

18. Encourage Okayama University faculties to require all applicants take an English entrance examination.

**L-Cafe:**

19. Translate the official Okayama University website to English and other languages. Allow L-Cafe Japanese and international student staff to design and run a website for current and prospective students. Allow international students to participate and to help create translations of the website in many languages. Through this website provide easily accessed information on the surrounding community, clubs, festivals, holidays, and volunteer opportunities.

20. In addition to continuing to employ international students as teachers and conversation partners, employ Okayama University students to speak Japanese with international students in the L-Cafe and international dorms during weekdays. Designate a “Nihongo Corner” where students can freely teach and learn Japanese.

21. Create more L-Cafe venues across campus and increase activities and events for Japanese and international students.

---Japanese Version---

岡山大学をグローバルにするためには

学生提案書

＜前文＞ preamble

グローバル： 多様な国籍の人々とコミュニケーションをとり、協力し合うこと。文化、表現、考え方の違いを理解し、受け入れ、称えようとする世界規模のコミュニティのこと。

岡山大学は県をリードするアカデミックな学究大学であり、岡山県をグローバルにする中心的役割を果たすべきである。

岡山市および岡山大学は、世界に誇れる場所であり教育機関である。また、岡山は魅力的で、地域の、安全で温暖な地域であることから留学生にとって良い場所である。それを宣伝するべきである。

日本は諸外国に比べて、グローバルになっていない。海外で勉強する日本人の数は 2006 年から 2010 年にかけて 10%ずつ減少しており、これままではいけない。

様々な背景を持つ人々とのコミュニケーションをとることは、経済的にも文化的にもグローバルな社会にとって必要不可欠である。

岡山大学はそれを活かして、日本をグローバルにするためのキープレイヤーになることを目指す。

岡山大学は日本をより国際的にする人々とともに自らの国際的な資源を使って、カギとなる主体になりうることを強調する。岡山大学の学部と日本人学生と留学生は、英語やその他の言語を用いて、ともに世界と岡山の間のつながりを強力なものにすることができる。

岡山大学をグローバルにするためには、岡山大学生と留学生、日本人教職員と外国人教職員が意見交換し協力し合って働きかける必要がある。

これを実現するべく、我々は以下の項目を提案する。

＜学生の国際学習のために＞

1. スーパーグローバル予算を使って、岡山大学生と留学生の両者の留学を更に促すような奨学金制度を作るべきである。そして、受け取ることのできるすべての奨学金を今よりも積極的に宣伝することで、学生に奨学金への応募を勧めるべきである。
2. 日本語が流ちょうでない留学生及び、英語で講義を受けたい日本人学生の為に、英語のみで行われる学部や大学院プログラムを作るべきである。
3. 日本人学生と留学生の両者が共に住むことのできる新しい寮を増築するべきである。住空間を共有することは日本人学生に文化についての見識を増し、同時に留学生の日本語並びに日本文化の理解に大きな効果を挙げるとだろう。
4. 可能な限り単位互換を可能にし、留学を既存のカリキュラムに取り込むことで、全学生の30%が卒業までに留学を経験することを、2025年までに達成する。
5. 各学部に留学生が入りやすいように、留学生が日本人学生と同じ講義をより多く受けられるようにし、各学部に留学生が正規学生として入学できる枠を設ける。必要に応じて留学生独自の入学基準を設ける。2025年までに各学部の10%を留学生が占めることを目標とする。

＜カリキュラムについて＞
6. 岡山大学、教員、本科生並びに院生による海外の大学との学術交流を活発的に行う。
7. 様々な国や言語について学ぶ国際専攻を新設する。この専攻はグローバル人材を育成するカリキュラムを有している大学としての岡山大学の評価を上げる。
8. 外国語の学位取得を目指している学生、特に学校の教授を目指している学生に対して留学を必修にする。
9. 全ての学部で現在の生活の問題を題材とした、単なる講義ではなく、受講生が積極的に自ら学び、異なる視点から物事を見る視点を養い、他者と意見を交わすようなクラスを増やす。同時に教員の養成も必要である。
10. 目的に応じた専門的な英語・日本語のクラスを作る。例えば敬語クラスやビジネス英語クラスなど。

＜社会参加について＞
11. クラブ、サークルが留学生を受け入れることを奨励する。双方の情報を最低限英語で作り、全ての留学生に提供する。
12. 学生と地域に対して多様性とコミュニケーションを推奨する。一緒に楽しみ、学び、問題を解決していく国際的なリーダーシップ会議、セミナー、ワークショップ、トレーニングをセクターごとに提供する。
13. 岡山大学が、日本人学生、留学生がイベント、フェスティバル、地域奉仕活動、インターンシップに参加できるように岡山国際センター、AGORA等の期間と協力し、より多くの大学内外での機会を提供する。
14. 高校と連携して、大学生が高校生の指導を行うようにする。日本の高校生、大学生、留学生が一緒にできる活動の場を提供し、高校生が国際的な大学環境を経験できるようにする。

＜学部と職員について＞
15. 言語以外の様々な分野において、正規の外国人教授をより多く雇う。
16. 大学の運営を行う機関並びに会議へ正規の外国人教員とスタッフを参加させ、日本にはないリーダーシップ論や多くの視点を取り入れる。
17. 学生が大学の決定に関わる為に、学生委員会を設け大学の委員会に参加させる。
18. 岡山大学の受験生全員を対象に二次試験において英語を受験することを強く推奨する。

＜L-cafeについて＞
19. 岡山大学の公式ウェブサイトを日本人学生、留学生が協力して多言語に翻訳する。また、L-カフェのウェブサイトを通じて学生が、学内及び地域の学生支援関連施設、日本国有の祭事、祝祭日、更にボランティア活動の募集などの情報を容易に入りできるようにする。
20. 外国語学生のために留学生をチューターとして雇うのと同様に、日本人学生も日本語学習のチューターとして、L-カフェや留学生寮などで語学学習の機会を設けるために雇う。そして、L-カフェに学生が自由に日本語を教え・学べる「日本語コーナー」を設置する。
21. 日本人学生と留学生の交流の機会を増やすために、L-cafeのような国際交流の場所をキャンパス内に増設する。