HERE Annual Conference Report

"Capacity building for higher education reform: the impact of collaborative international projects"

December 12-13, 2018

University of Rome, Sapienza (UNIROMA 1)

Table of contents

1. Introduction

1.1 The topic

Higher Education Reform Experts (HERE) are tasked with promoting and facilitating higher education reform in their countries. Supported by the SPHERE consortium, they meet regularly to share good practice – in seminars and study visits to European universities. At the end of each calendar year three HERE representatives per country and the heads of the national Erasmus+ offices gather in a conference devoted to a particular theme. In Brussels in 2017 they examined the role of the HERE initiative as a powerful medium for policy dialogue. The 2018 conference followed up by showcasing a number of collaborative international projects in which the HERE participate and which build capacity in national policy making and in the higher education institutions. Most of the featured projects were funded by the EU in the framework of the Erasmus+ and Horizon 2020 programmes, while some were supported by other international funding agencies.

The objective of the conference was for HERE not only to share project outcomes, but also to discuss policy impact and to reflect more generally on the notion of capacity building, as well as to explore opportunities for raising the level of synergy between projects.

Capacity building in higher education (CBHE) covers the full range of higher education policy strands woven into the Bologna Process, including governance, management and leadership, quality assurance and the delivery of student-centred academic programmes. The Bologna template has been adopted in part or in its entirety by a number of countries within and beyond Europe; the HERE countries are keen to come into alignment, to the extent that this meets their strategic, economic and cultural needs.

The Rome conference addressed these considerations in a number of ways: by plenary sessions featuring presentations by policy makers and practitioners from EU and HERE countries, with question, answer and discussion opportunities slotted into each session. Important interventions were made by speakers from the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the European Commission Directorate-General for Education and Culture, and the EU's Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA).

In addition, there were two rounds of working groups. The first round – thematic – focused on academic recognition and qualification frameworks, quality assurance, mobility and the reform of learning and teaching. The second round, which looked at social inclusion policies, adopted a regional focus on Central Asia, the Southern Mediterranean, the Western Balkans, and Eastern Europe. Finally, participants were able to view a poster[1] display detailing the aims and achievements of some twenty recent or ongoing

---

[1] See Annex II

capacity building projects.

The conference also provided an opportunity to review the activities of HERE in 2017 and of the SPHERE consortium in 2018[2].

The variety of formats, the comprehensive programme, the breadth of participation by different nationalities, the creative mix of policy makers and academics, all made for a stimulating experience, enhanced by the facilities and the hospitality generously provided by Sapienza.

This report summarises the results of a pre-survey of participants, as well as the conference presentations and discussions. It also sets out a number of conclusions. Attached in Annex I are more detailed summaries of break-out group discussions. Annex III lists all those who attended.

1.2 Objectives:

- To examine models of international collaboration and, specifically, the ways in which collaborative CBHE projects can have structural impacts on institutions as well as on national policies

- To identify synergies between projects that have similar objectives and address similar reform themes, such as quality assurance, recognition, employability, governance, autonomy, mobility and internationalisation

- To allow HERE to share the outcomes of such projects and also to discuss ways of maximising impact on policy reform

- To demonstrate in particular the role of CBHE projects in contributing to the implementation of the Bologna Process

1.3 Attendance

The conference drew 146 participants – academics, administrators, policy makers. Of these, 91 came from 22 partner countries. Seven EU Member States were represented, most notably Italy: colleagues from the host university Sapienza were joined by academics from ten other Italian universities. Of the 80+ HERE who submitted responses to the pre-survey (see below), 22 were attending a HERE conference for the first time. Participants came primarily to be acquainted with good practice in CBHE, to discuss and exchange experiences, but also to network more generally with colleagues working in different national policy environments.

---

[2] These presentations, with those of other speakers, are available at
https://supporthere.org/rome2018/page/presentations-conference-rome-2018

2. Preparation for the seminar

In order to tailor the event to participants' needs, the SPHERE team undertook a pre-survey designed to determine how the concept of capacity building was understood in different national cultures, from the points of view of both policy-makers operating at system level and academics working in the higher education institutions. The pre-survey attracted over 80 responses, 50 of which came from academics.

2.1 Summary of pre-survey results

The pre-survey proposed a relatively abstract definition of capacity building – cooperation which aims to develop knowledge and know-how in higher education policy and higher education institutional practice – and invited respondents to elaborate from their different national perspectives. Some offered the short-hand European concept of 'modernisation'; others broke it down into some of its constituent elements: employability; transparent governance; internationalisation; human rights; quality; global competitiveness; staff development. These were aspects of capacity. In terms of building this capacity, emphasis was placed on making the best use of resources, identifying good practice, and achieving sustainability. Some key references remained for the most part implicit: only one respondent stressed the importance of coherent national priorities; only three out of 24 referred directly to students.

The conference participants brought with them considerable experience of CBHE. 48 out of 57 relevant respondents had been active at institutional level, with 25 out of 42 active at system level. Three quarters of the total of 82 respondents had benefitted from the Erasmus+ programme. At system level, the principal benefits were to be found in the areas of – in descending order – internationalisation, learning and teaching, and quality assurance. At institutional level, the three primary focuses were learning and teaching, internationalisation, and staff development.

When asked which factors were key to the success of capacity building projects, respondents cited the ability to exchange good practice, the involvement of relevant stakeholders and policy actors, and a training component.

The main funding bodies were reported to be the European Union, the World Bank, the German Academic Exchange Service (DAAD), USAID, UNESCO and national governments. It was not possible to rank these in terms of either volume of funding or numbers of beneficiaries.

3. Highlights from the conference plenaries

The main body of the conference had a triple focus: the sponsors of capacity building projects, principally the Erasmus+ programme; the project agenda, essentially the Bologna Process; and the projects themselves, their design, management, delivery and outcomes. Annex 1 below gives an overview of the topic-based and regional break-out discussions which ensued.

The four plenary panel sessions featured speakers from Austria, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Croatia, Egypt, Georgia, Germany, Italy, Moldova, Russia, Serbia, Uzbekistan and the European University Association. They were policy-makers, project funders, policy analysts and project practitioners, drawn from governmental and non-governmental organisations and universities.

3.1 Capacity building: Erasmus+

Italian Deputy Minister Emanuela Del Re saw professional training, with the involvement of the private sector, as the main objective of capacity building. She also stressed the importance of networking and citizenship, warning of the danger of loss of vision should the role of the humanities be weakened. Speakers from the European Commission (Claire Morel) and the Executive Agency (José Guttierez) outlined the achievements of the Erasmus+ Programme. One hundred capacity building projects have been completed, with a further 500 under way. They involve over 2,000 higher education institutions, of which two thirds are outside the European Higher Education Area; 147 projects are coordinated by partner country universities.

Building on the impressive platform put in place by the TEMPUS programme, Erasmus+ projects have delivered tangible impacts in terms of employability, intercultural and other soft skills, mobility and internationalisation, south-south collaboration and sustainability. These impacts are visible at all levels – system, institution, and in the profiles of individual students. There nevertheless exists an imbalance (Georgia is an exception) between the great majority of projects, over 500, which involve inter-institutional collaboration mainly in curriculum development, and the structural projects which operate at system level, of which there are fewer than one hundred.

The EU is therefore looking for a future portfolio of projects which are less scattered. This means a wider participation rate, a larger number of structural projects with significant input from ministries, greater alignment with national priorities, better dissemination and spill-over, more extensive deployment of blended learning to promote social inclusion, a boost to the number of projects in the humanities, and an intensification of inter-regional collaboration. It also means a stronger exercise of project ownership by institutional leaders, in contrast to the laissez-faire climate which can prevail, particularly in universities with strong traditions of autonomous Faculties.

The Commission has asked the Council and the Parliament to double the Erasmus+ budget for the next financial perspective (2021-27). If granted, the increase will allow for better integration of programme actions, within an over-arching continuity. It is hoped that more flexible cross-over with the next generation of research and innovation projects in Horizon Europe will also be possible.

3.2 Capacity building: the Bologna Process

As for the capacity building agenda, this is provided on a regularly updated basis by the communiqués which follow each ministerial meeting of the Bologna Process. It is relevant for partner countries, whether or not they are part of the European Higher Education Area or candidate countries for EU accession. Speakers from government ministries in Croatia, Moldova and Serbia illustrated the extent to which CBHE projects have helped moved their higher education systems into alignment with Bologna.

The most recent ministerial summit in Paris in 2018 reported progress in implementation, albeit unevenly distributed between countries and action lines. Ministers re-stated key commitments, such as recognition of academic qualifications, still far from automatic, and pointed to the unfulfilled obligation to adopt the European approach to the quality assurance of joint degrees. They set up a system of inter-governmental peer learning groups, to assure that these and other commitments, notably the three-level qualification frameworks, would be speedily operationalized across the board. The commitments will accordingly loom large in the specifications of projects funded by Erasmus+, as well as in the indicative criteria for technical assistance missions within SPHERE.

In addition, and in line with EU thinking on Erasmus+, the Bologna Process is set to encourage more effective integration of research and teaching, the comprehensive adoption of learning-outcome-based approaches to course design, and a greater investment in digital and blended learning. It will also seek to improve the transmission of good policy and practice between ministries and institutions.

3.3 Capacity building: project design and delivery

A definition of CBHE proposed during the first plenary – 'sustainable knowledge transfer and exchange' – was refined in subsequent discussion. Funding bodies necessarily worked within a relatively abstract framework of values and operational feasibilities; country-based speakers saw CBHE much more in terms of policy content, whether it was internationalisation, employability, or alignment with the European Higher Education Area.

So important was context that it was difficult to generalise. On the question of the composition of project consortium membership, for example, context outweighed all other considerations. Should projects be bilateral or multilateral ventures? Should partners be predominantly European? How wide should the range of stakeholder participants be? It depended on the intended outcomes and the best way to achieve them. In turn, the intended outcomes were determined by local and national context.

This said, it was in the logic and the intention of the conference that it should go beyond relativism. Referencing everything to its immediate context inhibits the sharing of good practice and offers no guarantee of transnational convergence. It tends to undermine the usefulness of cross-border benchmarking and puts at risk the gains in transparency achieved over recent decades. It is within the wider policy environment of the Bologna Process and Erasmus+ that it is possible to identify the directions which CBHE should take and the principles which should underpin it. Conference participants therefore focused on factors which would increase the resonance of individual projects. These included:

- Observing the first principles of project design: mapping the terrain to be covered; confirming proof of concept and embarking on team building prior to the start of the contract period; establishing frameworks for dialogue and interaction by the key stakeholders; mobilising relevant support services; setting priorities, timeframe and monitoring processes; plotting well in advance the roadmap to sustainability.
- Ensuring that project outcomes maximise the mutual readability of relevant aspects of the different national systems. Insofar as projects need to find compromise solutions when, for example, credit accumulations mechanisms are incompatible, these solutions can – with the support of actors at system level – be scaled up for road-testing in wider operating environments.
- Encouraging institutional leaderships to give full support to project coordinators. This means creating an internal culture receptive to project initiatives, for example by setting up staff development programmes. It means calibrating institutional strategy in such a way as to favour multiplier effects beyond the institution – for example, by deploying teacher training courses to build the capacity of the secondary sector from which many future students will come.
- Paying greater attention to dissemination, in order to facilitate follow-up by other project teams, as well as to inform policy-makers beyond national frontiers. The publication of project outcomes to local and national audiences is important but insufficient; innovative practice and ground-breaking collaborations need to be brought to the attention of the international higher education community.
- Promoting blended learning which has the potential to reach beyond its intended target population. While throughout the duration of the project the target audience might necessarily be limited, the post-project phase would give the opportunity for digital learning materials to be distributed more widely, enhancing dissemination and sustainability.

Such measures, however, presupposed an optimal degree of synergy between system and institution. But in this, for many participants, lay the crux of the problem. The misalignment of aspirations and activities at system and institutional levels sometimes points to a lack of common vision, rather than – or as well as – inefficiencies in system management. In no country could, or can, it be guaranteed that government and academia will cooperate within a framework of shared values. Nonetheless, as the speaker from Georgia pointed out, some measure of political will is indispensable. Hence the importance, stressed frequently during the conference, of dialogue between ministries and sector representatives, in order to reach agreement at least on achievable objectives, such as internationalisation, employability or widening participation.

Many speakers – from the platform and the floor, from partner countries and EU Member States – bemoaned the gap between legislation and implementation. They raised the questions of the nature of the chain of command, the difficulties of eliminating the tensions between bottom-up and top-down initiatives, the need to reconcile divergent perceptions of what is desirable and what is feasible.

As the conference proceeded, the debate settled into discussions of governance and reciprocity: in other words, the vertical relationships between system managers and institutions, and the horizontal relationships between the providers and recipients of CBHE.

3.3.1 Governance

The discussion of governance focused on the issue of institutional autonomy. If the mode of institutional governance is key to the smooth articulation of system and academic practice, does it follow that governance projects should take priority over other CBHE activities? Are they the necessary precondition for the successful delivery of, for example, curricula reform? Must academic autonomy, to be really effective, be backed by high levels of autonomy in financial and human resource management? Are measurable levels of autonomy good indicators of the likely success or failure of institution-based CBHE projects?

Speakers from the European University Association and Moldova presented EUA's Autonomy Scorecard[3] methodology, the implications of which were clear. Both institutional and system capacity can be built, but only if between government and higher education sector there is trust. Trust, however, depends on a division of labour which, when negotiated and respected, allows each party a certain freedom of action underwritten by transparent mechanisms of accountability.

European practitioners pointed to the difficulty, arising notably in universities in which Faculties have significant academic, financial and legal autonomy, of ensuring that institutional strategy is effectively implemented and that CBHE project work is embedded within it.

3.3.2 Reciprocity

The discussion of reciprocity called forth strong views. It was felt that a world in which all universities and higher education systems would be able to give, receive and give in return, as equal partners, was a distant prospect. At the same time, there was resistance to the terminology of donor and beneficiary – imported from the discourse of development economics – when applied to CBHE. Capacity building is not a one-way process; mutual, if not identical, benefits accrue to all project partners. In general, motivations are shared: to strengthen an internationalisation strategy; to exchange good practice; to expand the horizons of staff and students; to project institutional identity; to deepen research contacts.

---

[3] https://www.university-autonomy.eu/

Specific benefits predictably are tied to context, which may be distinctive institutional missions, regional (sub-national) priorities, unique selling points, opportunities generated by unusual sets of circumstances. In productive projects, there will be benefits which are intended, as well as those which are unintended and which perhaps open the door to new initiatives.

3.3.3 Social inclusion

In the body of the conference, social inclusion was alluded to principally in the discussions of blended learning. Digital materials and delivery systems clearly offer scope for extending catchment beyond institutional and national barriers, to the point where the limitations may be only linguistic and financial. They have an evident role in widening participation.

It was in the regional break-out sessions, however, that the conference sharpened its focus on this topic (see section 1.2 of Annex I). Here participants were able to address the basic issues of principle. Which are the partially or wholly excluded social groups that need assistance and encouragement to enter higher education? Is there a reliable transnational definition of disadvantage? How is it tackled by systems and institutions? On the ground, much valuable work is being done, but the variation between regions is such that much also needs to be done at an overarching policy level – if, for example, variously disadvantaged students are to be able to enjoy cross-border mobility.

4. Conclusions and recommendations

While contexts are multiple, the conference proved that good CBHE practice is identifiable. It can therefore be exchanged, adapted to national and local need, sustained by consensus and renewed. This is true in relation to the vexed question of the gap between legislation and implementation, between policy formulation at national (system) level and its effective delivery by higher education institutions. It is here that capacity has to be built in the first instance. If this does not happen, there exists the permanent risk that reforms at system and institutional levels fail to reinforce, or actively undermine, each other.

- It is crucially important to develop a national CBHE policy framework.
- The policy framework should be negotiated between government and sectoral bodies representing all higher education stakeholders (institutional leaderships, academics, administrators, students), together with other interested parties, notably the social partners.
- Negotiations should cover access to funding, accountability, prioritisation of action lines, timeframes for planning, delivery, monitoring and reporting.
- The policy framework should generate reform roadmaps which identify synergies, both concurrent and sequential, and which are reinforced by dissemination activities with a measurable multiplier effect.

- It should have access to relevant evidence-based research in order to conduct accurate needs analyses and to ensure the viability and the effective targeting of CBHE reforms.
- The policy framework should sit within a legal framework which grants the necessary autonomy to higher education institutions, without which they will be unable to translate national initiatives and priorities into sub-regional and local contexts.
- Institutional autonomy should incorporate essential components: academic, allowing academics to realise their professional competences in course and project design; financial, allowing institutions to blend external and internal funding in the most efficient way, and on a pluri-annual basis; in terms of human resource management, allowing them to run appropriate staff development programmes and to adapt individual workloads and timetabling to the best advantage of CBHE activities.

The conference also concluded that effective CBHE has to resonate beyond national borders. HERE countries and Bologna signatory countries are all committed to the promotion of mobility and the readability of qualification frameworks. While their reform processes may start from different points and move at different speeds, they are intended eventually to align.

- The in-country policy and planning processes should therefore be conducted in the light of agreed inter-governmental and international objectives.
- This implies that they should be transparent and open to outside scrutiny.
- Ministries and institutions should maintain and widen the channels through which they can export and import good practice and relevant research.

Finally, the conference concluded that international project consortia, such as those funded by Erasmus+, are instrumental in ensuring that in-country CBHE remains in synchrony with the reform momentum at supra-national level.

- Projects, whether bi- or multi-national, should sit within policy frameworks which are consistent with the over-arching objectives of the Bologna Process.
- Proof of concept discussions between potential project partners should be based on reliable needs analysis and the identification of attainable outcomes.
- In view of the importance of the collective responsibility for project delivery, they should incorporate comprehensive team-building measures as early as possible.
- They should make explicit the mutual – but not necessarily identical – benefits which will accrue to all partners, in order to strengthen the group dynamic and to maximise the chances of enduring sustainability.
- They should agree in advance how, when and by whom the impact of their project will be measured. They must be able to specify how capacity has been increased or enhanced, referenced against the relevant policy framework.
- Project partners should ensure that their intended activities are well embedded in the international strategy of their institutions and that they have the full support of their senior

management, as well as access to the full range of relevant services. This is particularly important in universities which have a strong tradition of Faculty autonomy.

The conference welcomed the proposed improvements to the Erasmus+ Programme (see page 6 above). It trusts that in working out the detail of its mechanics, the European Commission will take note of the conference recommendations, specifically where synergies and system-institution articulation are concerned. The decision to increase the number of structural projects in proportion to joint university projects will provide a good opportunity to define both in such a way as to strengthen their linkage and to eliminate dysfunctions.

5. Annexes

Annex I – Summaries of break-out sessions

There were two rounds of break-out sessions, both designed to review the scope, range and outcomes of capacity building projects. The first session followed plenary 1, which had updated participants on the implementation of the Bologna Process, and took the form of round-table discussions on four topics: recognition and qualification frameworks; quality assurance; mobility; learning and teaching.

In the second round, participants split into regional groupings: Central Asia, Southern Mediterranean, Western Balkans, and Eastern Europe.

The conference organisers thank the facilitators – Michael Gaebel, Katherine Isaacs, Ahmad Jammal, Declan Kennedy, Romina Kniaz, Rafael Llavori, Aleksandra Nikolić, and Enora Pruvot – for their valuable contributions.

1.1 **The topic-based sessions**

What emerged clearly was that for the most part, capacity building projects funded under TEMPUS and Erasmus+ had achieved their intended outcomes. Some were undertaken in order to expand and strengthen the existing capacity of, for example, quality assurance agencies, or to develop new capacity, such as the accreditation of joint degrees. Some had been conceived as pilots, to be scaled up once problem areas had been identified.

It was clear, too, that the targeted technical assistance missions delivered by the SPHERE consortium could, when used judiciously, have a positive effect on project design and delivery. It might be by an initial stimulus, a mid-project nudge, or a follow-up timed to consolidate and sustain.

All the projects discussed by the round-tables related to one or other of the Bologna action lines. Success depended on a variety of factors, almost all conditional on context. In principle, it was easier to prompt relevant change in partner countries where the higher education system still bore the mark of colonisation by Western European nations, notably Britain and France. These had features which were recognisably present in the Bologna template. Partner countries with practices originating in the Soviet higher education system, substantially different from the West, found reform to be more challenging.

It mattered, too, whether a particular project was one of only a few and relatively isolated, perhaps because it was too far ahead of its time, or whether it was swept along in a tide of reform stimulated by government and embraced by all stakeholders.

The concept of project synergy was not a simple one. To determine in advance that a number of synchronous projects will reinforce each other may be over-optimistic. It is easier to look for consecutive synergies, ensuring by effective monitoring that sequential projects increase capacity by incremental, measurable and sustainable steps.

The four round-tables considered that the key determinant of success lay in the managed articulation of change at system and institutional levels. The discussion of mobility provided a good example. The familiar difficulties surfaced: visa problems; course delivery in English; inappropriate duration of placements; recognition. More concerning was the awareness that these were sometimes attributable to lack of staff engagement in the universities, itself resulting from the gap between legislation and implementation.

The working group on quality noted the same problem, this time in respect of the weakness of internal quality assurance in systems which had nominally and formally adopted the European Standards and Guidelines on Quality Assurance. Participants who discussed qualification frameworks, meanwhile, had also experienced difficulties, notwithstanding the usefulness of the European Qualification Framework for lifelong learning. They thought it important that a national framework be conceived as a top-down initiative, but that in order to secure the buy-in of the institutions the top-down working party had to include co-opted members who were independent of government.

Common to all four groups – particularly when the discussion turned to student-centred learning and learning outcome-based curriculum development – was the conviction that reform cannot proceed effectively without systematic staff development at institutional level.

1.2 The regional working groups

Widening access and raising participation rates have been the object of regular calls and commitments by the Bologna ministers, whether in response to demands for greater equity or labour market needs. For the second break-out round, the focus was narrowed to a consideration of social inclusion. Each regional group was asked to examine the definitions of social inclusion current in different national

legislations and to report the extent to which it was prioritised. Was there a strategic framework in which higher education institutions could address real and perceived inequities? Did capacity building projects have a role to play in the past and in the future? At what level – system or institution – should they be designed and delivered?

In most regions there were formal definitions of inclusion inscribed in legislation. These concerned primarily economic, geographical and physical disadvantage; gender was a much less frequently cited criterion, and ethnicity not at all, although religious diversity was a relevant factor in the Southern Mediterranean. The definitions did not necessarily translate into strategic action plans. In Eastern Europe, it was often the case that rigid regulatory frameworks inhibited effective interventions. In Central Asia, depending on the country, more or less levels of provision were in place, but with different degrees of prioritisation, such that no general picture could be extrapolated. In the Southern Mediterranean there were also many initiatives, targeting for example women and refugees; however, these were local rather than national and did not derive from over-arching strategies. Likewise in the Western Balkans, no comprehensive approach existed. Nonetheless, good practice had been passed down from Yugoslavia, where employability had been the major consideration.

At institutional level, project work featured efforts to promote student support, staff development in learning and teaching techniques, the use of blended learning as a means of reaching a wider catchment area, and other initiatives more loosely couched in terms of outreach and social engagement.

While some projects had tackled inclusion directly, more frequently it had been mediated through actions designed to promote entrepreneurship and employability. It was felt in one group that Erasmus+ projects should make inclusion a much stronger transversal requirement. The groups concluded that there existed two categories of problems. The first concerned political and academic will, which was dependent on clear strategic thinking embraced by all stakeholders and without which there could be no effective roadmap to implementation. The second, also contingent on political will, concerned methodology: how to define the groups that might be regarded as under-represented in higher education and how to map them among the wider population.

Annex II – Poster display

The following CBHE projects contributed to the poster exhibition which remained open throughout the conference:

Application Reference Number	Year	PCs	Applicant Country Code	Application Title	Acronym	Applicant name
561485-EPP-1-2015-1-AT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	XK, AL	AT	Curriculum Development joint European Political Science MA	euroPS	PARIS-LODRON-UNIVERSITAT SALZBURG
561495-EPP-1-2015-1-AT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	UZ, KG, KZ	AT	Implementing a Central Asian Centre for Teaching, Learning and Entrepreneurship	CACTLE	WIRTSCHAFTSUNIVERSITAT WIEN
561536-EPP-1-2015-1-UK-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	UA, BY	UK	Development of a network infrastructure for youth innovation entrepreneurship support on fablab platforms	FABLAB	BUCKINGHAMSHIRE NEW UNIVERSITY
561547-EPP-1-2015-1-IL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	IL, GE	IL	Developing programs for Access of disadvantaged groups of people and Regions to higher Education	DARE	UNIVERSITY OF HAIFA
561561-EPP-1-2015-1-ES-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	2015	AM, BY, RU	ES	Development of approaches to harmonization of a comprehensive internationalization strategies in higher education, research and innovation at EU and Partner Countries	HARMONY	UNIVERSIDAD DE SEVILLA
561586-EPP-1-2015-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	AL, BA, RS, ME	RS	Enhancement of HE research potential contributing to further growth of the WB region	Re@WBC	UNIVERZITET U NISU
561590-EPP-1-2015-1-SK-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	KZ, UZ	SK	Enhancing Competencies of Central Asian Universities in Agricultural Policy focused on Environmental Protection & Land Management	ECAP	SLOVENSKA POLNOHOSPODARSKA UNIVERZITA V NITRE
561651-EPP-1-2015-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	JO, PS, MA, EG	IT	A bottom-up approach for opening up education in South-Mediterranean countries	OpenMEd	UNIMED - UNIONE DELLE UNIVERSITA DEL MEDITERRANEO

561655-EPP-1-2015-1-RS-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	2015	RS	RS	Institutional framework for development of the third mission of universities in Serbia	IF4TM	UNIVERZITET U KRAGUJEVCU
561695-EPP-1-2015-1-UK-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	XK	UK	Entrepreneurial Universities for Industry Alliances	EUFORIA	STAFFORDSHIRE UNIVERSITY
561820-EPP-1-2015-1-DE-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	MD	DE	Creating Moldovan E-network for promoting innovative e-teaching in the continuing professional education	TEACHME	FACHHOCHSCHULE DES MITTELSTANDES (FHM) GMBH
561981-EPP-1-2015-1-LB-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	2015	LB	LB	Professional Standards Framework for Excellence in Teaching and Learning in Lebanese Universities	E-TALEB	UNIVERSITE DE SAINT ESPRIT-KASLIK AUTORITE RELIGIEUSE
573533-EPP-1-2016-1-DE-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2016	GE, IL, PH	DE	Action Research To Innovate Science Teaching & Career Orientation	ARTIST	UNIVERSITAET BREMEN
573640-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2016	KZ, KG, TJ, IN	IT	STrengthening Network EdUcaTiOn,Research and Innovation in Environmental HeALth in Asia	TUTORIA	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI MILANO
573778-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	2016	TN	IT	TUnisian Network for Employability and Development of Graduates' Skills	TUNED	CONSORZIO INTERUNIVERSITARIO ALMALAUREA
574055-EPP-1-2016-1-IT-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2016	UZ	IT	Development of Master Programme in Renewable Energy Sources and Sustainable Environment	RENES	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DELL'AQUILA
574064-EPP-1-2016-1-LT-EPPKA2-CBHE-SP	2016	UA	LT	Structuring cooperation in doctoral research, transferrable skills training, and academic writing instruction in Ukraine's regions	DocHub	VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS
561810-EPP-1-2015-1-JO-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	DZ,JO,MA,TN	JO	Modernising human Resource management In South mediterranean higher Education (Rise)	Rise	Princess Sumaya University for Technology
573997-EPP-1-2016-1-ME-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2016	ME	ME	Enhancement of study programs in Public Health Law, Health Management, Health Economics and Health Informatics in Montenegro	PH-Elim	University Donja Gorica
561636-EPP-1-2015-1-IL-EPPKA2-CBHE-JP	2015	IL	IL	Creative Leadership & Entrepreneurship - Visionary Education Roadmap	CLEVER	Shenkar Academic College