

Context

Project details

Applicant organisation	UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE
Applicant organisation OID	E10209138
Project code	2022-1-NL01-KA171-HED-000073807
Action type	Mobility of higher education students and staff supported by external policy funds (KA171-HED)
Beneficiary Organisation Full Legal Name (Latin characters)	UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE
Beneficiary organisation Erasmus code (where applicable)	NL ENSCHED01
Mobility consortium accreditation number:	-
Field	Higher Education
Project start date	01/08/2022
Project end date	31/07/2025
Project duration	36 months
Project grant reported	256 682,00 €
Project grant contracted	511 322,00 €
Date of submission	25/09/2025 16:22:42 (Brussels time)

Assessment criteria

Scoring of the final report of the project

The maximum score of the final report is 100 points.

If the final report scores below 60 points in total, the NA may reduce the final grant amount for organisational support. See the relevant provisions in Annex III of the beneficiary grant agreement (parts IV and V).

For each assessment criterion, the maximum total points are indicated.

Assessment criteria for KA171 projects

<p>Implementation performance (maximum 40 points)</p>	<p>The extent to which the planned mobility activities (as set out in the grant agreement) were achieved or exceeded and how the budget/grant was efficiently used (per region), and the relevance of the beneficiary's explanations.</p> <p>The way funds have been distributed among countries within a region, especially taking into consideration the flexibility of budget transfers.</p> <p>The extent to which the realised activities reflect the internationalisation strategy of the participating organisations involved.</p>
<p>Accreditation compliance and quality (maximum 40 points)</p>	<p>ECHE compliance and quality of activities/outcomes</p> <p>The extent to which the implementation of the mobility project respects the requirements set out in the Erasmus Charter for Higher Education (ECHE) and in the Inter-Institutional Agreements (IIAs), and the relevance of the beneficiary's explanations, in particular:</p> <p>The efficient implementation of the ECHE provisions by the participating organisations and the solutions provided to any related difficulties, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach and selection of participants, including inclusion measures • Preparation and support to participants before, during and after the mobility period <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Language support • Visa and insurance • Accommodation • Mentoring, etc. • OS use and repartition • Recognition and certification of learning and mobility outcomes <p>The quality of communication and cooperation among participating organisations and plans for future cooperation.</p> <p>The satisfaction of participants with their mobility experience.</p> <p>Horizontal priorities</p> <p>The extent to which the beneficiary implemented activities related to the Erasmus+ and other policy priorities, the informal learning outcomes, and the relevance of the beneficiary's explanations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion and diversity (additional funding, etc.) • Green transition (use of sustainable means of travel, etc.) • Digital transition (development of digital competences, use of virtual collaboration as part of mobility, digitalisation of mobility management, etc.) • Participation in democratic life, common values and civic engagement (activities undertaken for incoming and outgoing participants, etc.) <p>Mobility consortium accreditation</p> <p>Question relating exclusively to mobility consortium projects: Did the national project partners of the consortium effectively and efficiently cooperate and contribute to the project in line with the approved mobility consortium accreditation application?</p>
<p>Follow-up (maximum 20 points)</p>	<p>Impact</p> <p>The impact of the project activities on participants and participating organisations, and at local, regional and national levels.</p> <p>The analytical tools used to measure impact of the activities and success.</p> <p>Sharing of the project results</p> <p>The dissemination measures taken by the participating organisations in order to share project results.</p>

Project summary

Please provide short answers to the following questions, summarising the information you have provided in the rest of the report.

Please use full sentences and clear language, and do not use acronyms. The summary you provided will be made public by the European Commission and the National Agencies.

Background and objectives

What did you want to achieve by implementing the project?

In Region 2, Technical University of Moldova aimed to modernize education via Twente's Education Model introducing nanoelectronics courses, joint teaching and lab access. The cooperation with USUST and Karazin University (Ukraine) centered on knowledge exchange in Power Electronics and Electromagnetic Compatibility, promoting mobility and sustainability in electrical engineering, especially for Ukraine's railway systems. Region 4 had a similar aim. UT and ITMO University aimed to enhance collaboration in Computer Science, Robotics, and Engineering.

In Regions 3 and 9, focus was capacity building and joint initiatives grounded in Humanitarian Engineering. Partnerships like University of Zimbabwe-UT targeted healthcare asset management; Busitema University, Makerere University, and UT aimed to develop AI for crop disease detection, improving smallholder farmers' livelihoods. University of Jordan-UT partnership sought to enhance capacity addressing poverty alleviation.

In Region 5, UT and Institut Teknologi Bandung collaborated in education and research on sustainable electrification solutions in PE and Telecommunications Engineering, addressing local energy access challenges through local networks, and academic exchange.

What activities did you implement and in which countries/regions? Please highlight main achievements and challenges you encountered during implementation.

Overperformed:

Jordan

- Award: Inbound - 2 students, 2 staff, outbound - 2 staff
- Implemented: inbound: 0 students (English level barrier), 3 staff, outbound - 7 staff. 2 new institutions added

Zimbabwe

- Award: inbound - 2 students, 2 staff, outbound - 2 staff
- Implemented: Inbound: 2 students, 2 staff, outbound - 3 staff (2 PhDs, 1 professor).

Uganda

- Award: inbound - 4 students, 4 staff, outbound - 3 staff
- Implemented: inbound 5 students, 3 staff, and 5 outbound staff. Incl. 1 PhD now external at UT.

Indonesia

- Award: inbound - 2 students, 2 staff, outbound - 3 staff
- Implemented: inbound - 4 students, 4 staff, outbound - 5 staff. Used extra OS and UT funding

Moldova

- Award: inbound - 2 students, 5 staff, outbound - 3 staff
- Implemented: inbound - 0 students (Work permit/Covid-19 barrier), 7 staff, outbound 5 staff. Amendment used.

Underperformed, due to the invasion of Russia into Ukraine:

Ukraine

- Award: Inbound - 6 students, 4 staff, outbound - 3 staff
- Implemented: inbound- 1 student, 5 staff, outbound - 0 staff. One new institution added.

Russia

- Award: 43 mobilities (various).
- Implemented: none, Amendment used

Please see chapter ' Implementation and Budget' for a more detailed implementations.

Results

What were the main outcomes and impact of your project?

Institutional level - Across all countries, mobility consistently strengthened the ability of universities to (further) internationalise. This included developing joint programmes (Jordan, Zimbabwe, Uganda), improving administrative processes (Uganda, Indonesia), and enhancing research proposal capacity (Jordan, Moldova, Ukraine). Partnerships in challenging geopolitical contexts, highlighted resilience and long-term commitment to the partnerships.

Regional/Global level - Mobility contributed to regional/global integration of higher education institutions. Ukraine's collaboration supported EU priorities, Indonesia's partnership dovetailed with Horizon Europe, and African partnerships built wider regional networks. Moldova's international events elevated its regional visibility. All projects reinforced Europe's catalytic role in fostering global academic cooperation.

Individual level - Mobility consistently enhanced intercultural skills, academic competence, and employability. Staff acted as ambassadors of internationalisation (Jordan, Ukraine) and students applied research to local challenges (Zimbabwe's water access, Uganda's food security). Individuals thus became bridges connecting institutions and communities.

Participating organisations

Role of the Organisation	Organisation OID	Individual accreditation of the organisation (Erasmus code) (where applicable)	Name of the Organisation	Type of Organisation
Partner Organisation	E10220676	-	Busitema University	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10187766	-	YARMOUK UNIVERSITY	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10218535	-	Institut Teknologi Bandung	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10193641	-	University of Zimbabwe	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10192475	-	UNIVERSITY OF JORDAN	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10219128	-	Technical University of Moldova	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10081968	-	DNEPROPETROVSK NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF RAILWAY TRANSPORT NAMED AFTER ACADEMICIAN V.LAZARYAN	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10208766	-	MAKERERE UNIVERSITY	Other type of organisation
Partner Organisation	E10219038	-	APPLIED SCIENCE PRIVATE UNIVERSITY	Other type of organisation
Beneficiary	E10209138	NL ENSCHED01	UNIVERSITEIT TWENTE	Higher education institution (tertiary level)
Partner Organisation	E10175429	-	V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University	Other type of organisation

Total number of participating organisations 11