

Erasmus+

KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET

- Erasmus+
- Danish Agency for Higher Education
- Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices
- Strategic Partnerships
- Strategic Partnerships for higher education
- Call 2017
- Round 1
- Grant Agreement Number 2017-1-DK01-KA203-034286
- Report Type Final
- Date of submission 16/06/2020

Henrik C. Wegener
Name of legal representative

Main content:	Report Form
Number of attachments:	10

General Information

General information about the project

This report form generated from the Mobility Tool+ consists of the following main sections:

- General Information: General information about the project
- Inactive Organisations within Project Activities
- Context: this section resumes some general information about your project;
- Project Summary: this section summarises your project and the organisations involved as partners;
- Description of the Project: in this section, you are asked to give information about the objectives and topics addressed by your project;
- Project Management
- Implementation: this section asks for information about all the stages of the project: implementation of main activities including practical arrangements, participants' profile, impact, dissemination of the results and future plans;
- Follow-up
- Budget: this section gives a detailed overview of the final amount of the EU grant you request;
- Annexes: additional documents that are mandatory for the completion of the report;

For your convenience, some parts of this report are prefilled with information from the Mobility Tool+



Inactive Organisations within Project Activities

Entity	Activity			Organisation			
	Identification	Start Date	End Date	PIC	Legal Name	Partnership Entry Date	Partnership Withdrawal Date

1. Context

this section resumes some general information about your project;

Programme	Erasmus+
Key-Action	Cooperation for innovation and the exchange of good practices
Action	Strategic Partnerships
Action Type	Strategic Partnerships for higher education
Main Objective of the project	Innovation
Call	2017
Round	Round 1
Report Type	Final
Language used to fill in the form	EN

1.1. Project Identification

Grant Agreement Number	2017-1-DK01-KA203-034286
Project Title	Transnational Alignment of English Competences for University Lecturers
Project Acronym	TAEC
Project Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	18/09/2017
Project End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	17/04/2020
Project Total Duration (months)	31
Beneficiary Organisation Full Legal Name (Latin characters)	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET

1.2. National Agency of the Beneficiary Organisation

Identification	Danish Agency for Higher Education
----------------	------------------------------------

For further details about the available Erasmus+ National Agencies, please consult the following page:

https://ec.europa.eu/programmes/erasmus-plus/contact_en

2. Project Summary

this section summarises your project and the organisations involved as partners;

If applicable, project summary at application time in English:

Please provide a short summary of the completed project. The main elements to be mentioned are: context/background of the project; objectives; number and type/profile of participants; description of undertaken activities; results and impact attained; if relevant, longer-term benefits.

Please recall that this section [or part of it] may be used by the European Commission, Executive Agency or National Agencies in their publications or when giving information on a completed project. It will also feed the Erasmus+ Dissemination Platform (see annex III of Programme Guide on dissemination guidelines).

Please be concise and clear.

As specified in the project application, the TAEC project specifically addresses the internationalization agenda of the Council of Europe with the underlying rationale to modernize higher education (HE) through design and implementation of innovative transnational practices, which will allow for transparency, transferability of academic staff qualifications, and mutual trust. The overall purpose of the project has been to develop a common framework for EMI quality assurance and support which will help both partners and HEIs across Europe to recognize the main language skills and teaching competencies needed to facilitate teaching and learning, as well as lecturer recruitment in EMI programs across different HE contexts.

The project aimed to lay the foundations for a common framework for EMI quality assurance and support, on the basis of which we could adapt local language certification and EMI training for transparency in transnational uses. The specific objectives of the proposed project were to (1) identify and differentiate between the transnational and the local EMI administrative and instructional needs of partner universities, (2) align a locally-used assessment scale with the Council of Europe's CEFR, which will allow for standardization of results, (3) compare the characteristics of the language used in teaching across different EMI contexts in HE, and (4) use the results for policy negotiations regarding EMI lecturer requirements and support. The long-term objective of TAEC was to provide the groundwork for an EMI quality assurance framework which could be applicable across European universities beyond the partner universities involved in the project.

23 researchers and teacher trainers, and 1 administrator from 5 different universities participated in three teams, each working on activities associated with a specific intellectual output. A total of 1,018 participants have benefited from the project activities and results, covering teachers from observed classroom teaching, teachers participating in EMI workshops, management, policy makers and other stakeholders to participate in meetings and discussions, colleagues and network partners being involved in discussions on project activities, participants in the TAEC conference in April 2019, as well as participants in other conferences where the TAEC results have been discussed and disseminated. Finally, the two associated partner organisations were involved in both discussions of project activities and on dissemination of project results.

The project activities include 1) the development of an EMI framework also covering the production of an EMI literature database and corpus, 2) the development of joint assessment procedures and alignment of a local assessment procedure to the CEFR scale, 3) the development of an EMI handbook and hosting of a total of 4 EMI workshops, and 4) dissemination activities such as the arrangement of the TAEC conference in April 2019 as well as presentations, articles, newsletters, and talks on the project activities and results.

Results include the following: A large annotated and searchable EMI literature database that includes 205 resources, i.e. articles, books, book chapters, chapters in proceedings, handbooks, institutional documents was designed. The entries can be sorted according to one or more categories (e.g., research methods, focus, language).

Thirty 90-120 minute EMI classes across five contexts (economics, law, IT/computer science, medicine and journalism) were observed and video recorded, and the lecturers of these classes were interviewed (see interview in Appendix). The video-recordings were transcribed, and an EMI lecture corpus was created. A panel of 12 judges participated in a three-day standard-setting workshop to align local assessment to the CEFR scale. Finally, 4 training workshops for EMI content teachers were organized at four different locations with a total of 40 participants.

The standard-setting allowed us to obtain concrete results about the minimum English proficiency level required for teaching EMI courses, as well as the linguistic and interactive skills required for successful communication. The results from the standard-setting already informed the policy development at UM. The EMI database and the EMI lecture corpus are available to researchers and practitioners who are interested in finding existing research or are willing to analyze EMI lectures. The workshops for EMI teachers were very successful. Both workshop materials and the EMI Handbook are available for future use. One of the workshop was held online with participants outside the partner universities. The multiplier participants showed great interest in using the EMI Handbook and obtaining access to the EMI database and the EMI corpus.

In our opinion the TAEC project has succeeded in developing and implementing a transnational and sustainable framework for a more qualified use of EMI practices across European HEIs.

2.1. Summary of participating organisations

Role of the Organisation	PIC of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Type of Organisation	Accreditation of organisation (if applicable)	Partnership Entry Date	Partnership Withdrawal Date
Beneficiary	999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	Higher education institution (tertiary level)		18/09/2017	17/04/2020
Partner	998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	Higher education institution (tertiary level)		18/09/2017	17/04/2020
Partner	999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	Higher education institution (tertiary level)		18/09/2017	17/04/2020
Partner	999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	Higher education institution (tertiary level)		18/09/2017	17/04/2020
Partner	999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	Higher education institution (tertiary level)		18/09/2017	17/04/2020

Total number of participating organisations

5

2.2. Associated Partners

In addition to the above formally participating organisations, did you involve associated partners in your project?

Yes

Please identify those organisations in the table below:

Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	City
TU Delft	Netherlands	Delft
Complutense University	Spain	Madrid

Please explain the involvement of those organisations and how they contributed to the achievement of the project objectives.

Renate Klaassen from Delft University (Delft) participated as an external quality assurance advisor by providing consultancy regarding the project outputs as well as providing guidance for dissemination and sustainability. She participated in a daylong transnational meeting of the TAEC Executive Committee in Maastricht in May 2018, where she provided feedback regarding the project activities at their planning stage. Klaassen's recommendations were incorporated in the further development of the planned activities, especially those related to the development of the EMI Handbook and the development of the EMI Corpus.

Emma Dafouz Milne from Universidad de Complutense (UC), Madrid participated in the project as an external quality assurance consultant. Her participation in the project was twofold: (1) she monitored the project activities ensuring that all milestones are reached, and (2) she provided consultancy related to the EMI framework-related research, which included some of her groundwork in EMI framework development. More concretely, Emma Dafouz reviewed the executed project activities and provided recommendations for revisions and further development. Moreover, Dafouz provided ideas for project visibility and sustainability after the expiration of the project period.

Both associated partners helped cross-check the potential usability and impact TAEC outputs would have on the wider EMI context in Europe, i.e., impact beyond the institutional limits of the partner universities.

3. Description of the Project

in this section, you are asked to give information about the objectives and topics addressed by your project;

Please provide a summary of your project's concrete results and achievements. Were all original objectives of the project met? Please comment on any objectives initially pursued but not achieved and describe any achievements exceeding the initial expectations.

The project met all four objectives stated in the original proposal: (1) identify and differentiate between the transnational and the local EMI instructional needs of partner universities, (2) align a locally-used assessment scale with the CEFR, (3) compare the characteristics of the language used in teaching across different EMI contexts, and (4) use the results for policy negotiations regarding EMI lecturer requirements and support.

The production and use of the outputs, EMI framework, test alignment report, and EMI handbook, as well as the project activities (i.e. three-day EMI workshops and a multiplier event), contributed to the achievement of the project objectives.

EMI Framework (IO1)

The EMI framework development helped meet the objectives related to identification of transnational and local EMI needs and the characteristics of the language used across different EMI contexts. An EMI database and an EMI corpus were designed as instruments to identify and analyze the transnational facets of the EMI framework and the English competences of EMI teachers for the purpose of the current project. However, these two instruments are also made available to researchers and practitioners beyond the project partners. The EMI database can be downloaded from the project websites and those interested in the corpus can request it by contacting the project members.

The large EMI Literature Database includes 205 resources, i.e. articles, books, book chapters, chapters in proceedings, handbooks, institutional documents. The database entries were annotated based on a number of different categories, including language of publication, type of publication (e.g., article, chapter), area of interest (e.g., policy, assessment), foci (e.g., attitudes, learning outcomes), type of research (e.g., empirical, conceptual), type of analysis (e.g., qualitative, quantitative), methodology (e.g., case study, ethnography), data (e.g., questionnaire, interview), domain (e.g., social sciences, life sciences), and information about the research questions, methodological specifications, and main findings. The database is searchable according to one or more of the above categories. To ensure the consistent application of the categories, 10% of the entries were double-coded by four coders (90% agreement).

The EMI Corpus includes 30 transcripts of videotaped EMI lectures. The corpus includes lectures from various disciplines at bachelor and Master's level. Ten percent of the annotated transcripts were double-coded to ensure consistency. Each transcript is accompanied with information about students, topics, settings, use of materials, interactivity, and delivery (see metadata in Appendix).

Interviews were conducted with all observed lecturers. They included questions about background information, teaching experience, training, classroom language use, and self-evaluation of language skills. Both the corpus and the database are accompanied by technical reports.

Technical report on test alignment with CEFR (IO2)

The second objective, which was related to standardization of certification results through alignment with CEFR was achieved through a three-day standard-setting event. The event was conducted to align an existing oral English proficiency scale for assessment of EMI teaching staff to the CEFR. The results of the scale alignment suggested that the minimum required CEFR level for EMI lecturers should be at B2+/C1- level. The technical report provides information on how the standard-setting can be performed as well as information about the minimum proficiency level. The results have already informed the policy decisions at Maastricht University and other universities beyond those participating in the project, which means that this output contributed to reaching the fourth objective, i.e. policy negotiations.

EMI Handbook and workshops (IO3)

The data collected through the development and the analysis of the EMI framework were used to produce the EMI Handbook and the EMI workshops. These proved the most useful in reaching out to different stakeholders and informing their practices, i.e. meeting the fourth objective of the project. In addition to EMI content teachers at the partner universities, the workshops attracted participants from the management (e.g., program directors, department heads, deans, EMI coordinators) and teacher trainers.

The proposed stakeholder surveys were not administered because the literature review suggested that surveys have been extensively used in EMI research and that the survey data collected before the project are sufficient for our understanding of stakeholders' perceptions and opinions. The literature review suggested, however, that a lack of corpus-based analyses exists although these type of analyses could be beneficial in identifying the characteristics of EMI lecturers' language, pedagogy, and intercultural communication. For that reason, the transnational EMI lecture corpus was designed.

In what way was the project innovative and/or complementary to other projects already carried out?

TAEC is the only project that provides analysis-based recommendations for the characteristics of the minimum oral English proficiency required for teaching in EMI courses in higher education. Until this project, the recommendations were intuitively based on the interpretations of the CEFR descriptors. Therefore, the results from the standard-setting event are groundbreaking in the transparency of language requirements for EMI teaching staff.

The TAEC Literature Database represents a tool for researchers to go beyond EMI as a local or national phenomenon. It encourages cross-national comparison and allows researchers to investigate how EMI has evolved in countries at different implementation stages and how scholarly inquiry has progressed over a period of 20 years. Being an open access resource, external contributors will be able to input information about additional settings, thus enriching our knowledge of theories, practices and current developments. Such knowledge is indispensable to move forward in EMI research and improve practices.

The TAEC EMI corpus fills a significant gap in the study of EMI allowing for more systematic investigations of EMI lecturer discourse that has been done, thus proving a valuable tool for researchers and teacher trainers alike.

The innovative approach in the design of the EMI Handbook and the workshops is that they did not provide ready-made recipes for successful communication in the EMI classroom, but they raise awareness about how to make decisions about best teaching and language use approaches taking into consideration different contextual variables (e.g., student background, course objectives, internationalization goals, classroom sizes). The handbook provides transnational examples in relation to language use, pedagogy, and intercultural communication and guides the EMI lecturers in identifying their similarities and differences with the local contexts.

What was the most relevant horizontal or sectoral priority addressed by your project?

HORIZONTAL: Transparency and recognition of skills and qualifications to facilitate learning, employability and labour mobility

What were the other relevant horizontal or sectoral priorities addressed by your project?(multiple selection possible)

- HORIZONTAL: Strengthening the recruitment, selection and induction of Educators

In case the above selected priorities are different from the ones in the application, please explain why.

They are not different.

What were the most relevant topics addressed by your project?(multiple selection possible)

- International cooperation, international relations, development cooperation
- Recognition, transparency, certification
- Intercultural/intergenerational education and (lifelong)learning

In case the selected topics are different from the ones in the application, please explain why.

3.1. Participants

Please briefly describe how did you select and involve participants in the different activities of your project.

The TAEC project focused on developing a framework and a handbook with guidelines on how to work with EMI in HEI across Europe. In order to make the project activities and results as well founded and transnationally sustainable as possible, it was necessary to involve researchers and teachers working with EMI as well as management with the interest and possibility to further develop the use of EMI at their own institutions and beyond. The project partners therefore selected and involved participants for the various project phases and activities based on interest and experience with teaching in EMI. This was done through existing contacts to other departments, by using colleagues, and by addressing interested parties through internal networks, news mails, and management. In the same way, the partner organisations themselves represented various degrees of experience with the implementation of and research within the fields of EMI across Europe.

With respect to the development of an EMI framework (IO1) a number of lecturers from the areas of economics, law,

IT/computer science, medicine and journalism were contacted regarding video recording of their classes. The selection of areas were agreed upon among the partners in order to spread across the fields of natural sciences-social sciences with a high degree of EMI, while at the same time ensuring the possibility to compare data across the fields. It was also important that both bachelor and Master's level classes were represented and that the classes were not large lectures, but smaller, seminar type classes (up to 40 students), with possibilities for interaction between teachers and students and among students.

Regarding the alignment of the TOEPAS scale to the CEFR (IO2) participants in the panel judge training (C1) consisted of project members as well as experienced TOEPAS raters from CIP. The criteria for participation were background in EMI research and/or training, applied linguistics, English for academic purposes, or linguistics, and preferably experience with the Common European Framework of Reference (CEFR).

Concerning the participants for the TAEC conference (E1) in April 2019, participants and presenters were recruited through existing networks and the European EMI networks, giving a total of 65 participants (not partners) coming from 16 countries and 49 various universities/organisations.

Finally, regarding participants for the EMI workshops (C2-C5), the participants were recruited among the lecturers participating in the video recording and other departments

UniTo contacted the lecturers for video recording in two ways. First, the EMI Lecturers at the Department of Socio-Economics and Mathematical-Statistics Science (ESOMAS) were contacted individually by a project member. The teaching staff had already attended a presentation of the TAEC project. Second, EMI lecturers at the Department of Medicine and Surgery were contacted through an informal meeting with the Head of Department, Prof. Antonio Piga, followed by a presentation during a Department meeting and finally an invitation sent by mail to all lecturers.

At UdL the lecturers for video recording and the participants for the workshops were selected from a total of four degrees. One degree targeted from the start was Audiovisual Communication and Journalism. Since 2016, and after a decisive promotion from the degree coordinator, an English strand has been offered in years 1 and 2, which has meant that there are now 10 subjects offered in English. Another targeted degree was the Bilingual Modality of the Primary Education degree. The two other degrees where we recorded lectures were the Tourism degree and the master's degree in Computer Engineering. The lecturers were also invited to participate in the EMI workshops and most had the opportunity to attend.

Participants for video recording at UM were recruited by contacting Mark Vluggen, head of Bachelor programmes at the School of Business and Economics (SBE), who provided the names of potential participants. Prof. dr. Hans H.C.M. Savelberg, Director of Education for Biomedical Sciences, at the faculty of Health, Medicine and Life sciences (FHML) also provided some teacher names.

FHSS recruited six teachers to be video-recorded and interviewed for the purposes of the WP3. Two of them were from the Faculty of Medicine, University of Rijeka, and four from the Faculty of Economics and Business, University of Rijeka. Their EMI classes were observed in the period between 14 November and 12 December 2018. Three of the teachers observed and video-recorded, two from the Faculty of Economics and Business in Rijeka and one from the Faculty of Medicine, also participated in the EMI workshops organised at FHSS.

UCPH recruited six lecturers from the Faculties of Science, Humanities, and Social Sciences (Professor=4, Associate Professor=2) to be video recorded and interviewed by contacting deans, department heads, and lecturers.

Participants with fewer opportunities: did your project involve participants facing situations that make their participation more difficult?

No

Approximately, how many persons not receiving a specific grant benefited from or were targeted by the activities organised by the project (e.g. members of the local community, young people, experts, policy makers, and other relevant stakeholders)? Please enter the number of persons here:

1018

Please describe briefly how and in which activities were these persons involved.

The number 1,018 was reached by adding participants from the TAEC conference in April 2019 (n=65) with the number of local management and research stakeholders reached at each partner institution (n=18). Adding to this number is the number of students participating in the observed classes (n=400), learning about the TAEC project as part of the briefing before the video recording. 35 participants took part in the 3-days events. In addition to this, a larger number of participants at other conferences were informed about the project activities and results (TESOL 2019, 2021; AAAL 2020; AILA 2021; ICLHE 2017; 2019; DUN 2020; LAIC 2019) - estimated to a total of 400. Finally, we estimate a total of

100 persons learning about the project activities through other meetings and dissemination activities, e.g. reading of newsletters, articles, download of EMI handbook etc.

UniTo has contacted Angela Roberta Alessandro, the UniTo contact person for Internationalization and Quality Assessment when recruiting participants for the EMI workshops, who in this way got informed about the TAEC project activities. Furthermore, UniTo has talked about the project with colleagues in the Department of Foreign Languages, Literature, Modern Cultures. One such colleague, Marcella Costa (Full Professor of German Language and Translation), who was the Vice Head for Didactics, always demonstrated great interest in TAEC. In 2019, Prof Costa became Vice Rector for International Didactics and suggested that we deliver the workshop in the academic year 2020-2021 for a larger audience.

At UdL, the Vice-rector of International Relations and Cooperation, Astrid Ballesta, the Vice-rector of Teaching Staff, Carles Capdevila, and the Vice-rector of Academic Organization, Paco García, were informed about the project three times at the beginning of the project period. Although the leadership changed with the elections in May 2019, the new Rector, Jaume Puy, showed interest in the project, and a very positive developments regarding teacher certification have occurred. Furthermore, UdL had meetings with the new director of the Institute of Languages, the institution in charge of teacher training and certification, Montserrat Casanovas Català, and a new EMI plan for the whole university is in progress that will include EMI training and a certification process for lecturers. Finally, the project members have had discussions with Montse Irun, Guzmán Mancho, Montse Casanovas and David Block, who are involved in a research project, ASSEMID, which resembles TAEC in many respects. In October 2019, Enric Llurda and Guzman Mancho requested research funding for a project that is in a way a continuation of the ASSEMID/TAEC endeavours.

At UM, in the first year of the project, the transnational project members met with Dr. Martin Paul, President Maastricht University and Jan Hupkens, Internationalisation Policy Advisor in order to present the project activities and anticipated results. The project members continuously informed Aisling Tiernan, who was then the Internationalisation Policy Advisor, as well as the leadership at the university regarding the project outcomes.

Two of the lecturers participating in the EMI workshop at FHSS have career in politics, and are members of Croatia's two most prominent political parties; two of them are also members of their respective faculty managements; and one lecturer is also the president of the Faculty Committee for International Cooperation, and member of the University Committee for ERASMUS mobility as well as member of the University Committee for Internationalisation and International Projects.

At UCPH the TAEC project and its objectives were presented at meetings with Dean Jesper Kallestrup and Vice-dean Jens Erik Mogensen at the Faculty of Humanities. The project members have also presented the TAEC project and the possibility for Erasmus+ funding for the Research Support network at the Faculty of Humanities at UCPH and at internal department meetings. Finally, UCPH as coordinator was invited to present the TAEC project at two Erasmus+ writing seminars, arranged by the National Agency.

Although students were not in the focus of TAEC, at UdL students participating in the recorded video lectures were also video recorded after they signed a consent form. An informal survey was also carried out with some of the students to learn about their EMI experiences at UdL. The involvement of students in the project enriched the project by providing the student perspective on the characteristics of EMI.

Given the importance of the project, two PhD students became interested and involved in the project activities. A Master's student will use the materials from the project to collect data for her Master's thesis project in the following year. It is expected that more students and young researchers will benefit from the project outputs in the future. Finally, UCPH hosted two trainees from UniTo during the project period.

4. Project Management

How did you ensure proper budget control and time management in your project?

The overall project management and implementation of project results were secured by the initial planning of seven inter-related work-packages (WP) as mentioned in the TAEC application. As part of WP1, the coordinator UCPH was overall responsible for ensuring a proper budget control and time management of the project. At the executive meeting and the kick-off of the project in October 2017, the partners discussed the overall way to cooperation in the project thus making the sketching up of an Memorandum of Understanding (MoU) unnecessary. Instead, the coordinator drafted Partnership Agreements, which were sent to each partner for commenting before the formal signing of the agreements, as well as a Project Handbook with guidelines and requirements regarding cooperation, planning of activities, and documentation of costs. From the beginning of 2018, these documents were ready and distributed to all partners to ensure an adequate platform for budget control before the project activities got underway.

The coordinator had a start-up meeting with the finance section of UCPH in November 2017 to ensure that the budget control followed the university policy as well as the guidelines from the National Agency (NA). As stated in the Project Handbook, the partners were asked to send invoices as a way to document the transfer of funds among the partners. Three kinds of payments were agreed upon: 1) payment of Project Management Installments at the beginning, mid and end of the project, 2) payment of lumps sums related to Transnational Meetings and Training Events/workshops when an activity had taken place, and 3) the payment of funds to cover Intellectual Outputs (IO) twice a year.

When the coordinator received an invoice, the Project Manager (PM) checked that the needed documentation was present (timesheets, signatures, etc.) and sent the invoices to payment through the central finance office at UCPH. The PM had designed a spreadsheet with the budget and the balance concerning each budget post in order to maintain an overview of the budget spent. In this sense, the PM was able to provide the Executive Committee with an overview of budget spent and budget left in order for the committee to discuss transfer of funds between budget posts and of IO days among the partners.

All costs were accounted for in the general UCPH budget system, as the PM checked and approved the invoices and then sent them on to being paid by the finance coordinator function. In this sense a two-person check was secured in the handling of all payments.

The PM was also in regular contact with administrative/finance staff at the partners regarding the payment of invoices and questions or guidelines in this regard.

All timesheets, invoices, and documentation (programmes, signatures, etc.) are available electronically for the coming five years if an audit is needed. All partners were asked to check with their own administrative units how to best secure the needed documentation for a future audit in their own countries, as they were responsible for trips and accommodation (e.g. booking of own flights, hotels).

The Project Leader (PL) at UCPH was responsible for the time management of the project, however, the timeline, milestones and objectives were discussed and agreed upon at each meeting of the Executive Committee. The PL designed a progress report system thus securing regular input and status from the partners in order to secure that all activities and results could be managed within the set project period. The progress of activities - also across the IOs - was discussed at both team meetings, transnational meetings and the meetings in the Executive Committee.

As a result of the enormous amount of data collected through the recordings and observations taking place as part of the construction of the EMI framework (IO1) and the EMI handbook (IO3), the partners discussed the possibility to extend the project period at the transnational meeting M7 in October 2019, and an extension was allowed by the NA in November 2019. The project was extended for three months, so it ended 17 April 2020 instead of 17 January 2020. This also secured the possibility to carry out the planned EMI workshop at UM as the workshop had to be postponed from November 2019 due to cancellations.

In terms of time management, each project member submitted progress reports for each output. In 2018, the progress reports were first submitted monthly, but in 2019 and 2020, they were submitted every six months. The partners used a progress report template in which they reported the specific output activities they worked on, the achievements, and the problems they encountered. The progress reports allowed to keep track of the time spent on each activity, as well as the time needed for alternative solutions. It also allowed to identify the need for redistribution of the responsibilities of each partner.

Monitoring: How were the progress, quality and achievement of project activities monitored? Please describe the qualitative and quantitative indicators you used. Please give information about the involved staff, as well as the timing and frequency of the monitoring activities.

The project had a separate work package (WP2) dedicated to quality assurance, in which monitoring was part of the WP activities. The monitoring of the project activities was led mainly by the Executive Committee (EC), which consisted of the Project Leader (PL, Slobodanka Dimova), the Project Manager (PM, Helen Sværke), and a representative from each partner university.

The monitoring was conducted as an on-going, routine process, although more formal periodical monitoring activities were executed every three months in the first year of the project, and every six months in the last year. This periodical monitoring was used for systematic collection of information for five main purposes:

1. Ensure the time plan, the budget, and the work plan are properly maintained
2. Learn from experiences to improve the activities in the following phases of the project
3. Maintain partner accountability of the resources used and the results obtained
4. Make informed decisions on the future of the project
5. Represent a basis for integrated evaluation

Each work package was lead by a member of the EC who monitored the teamwork on the output and reported on the work progress to the EC through continuous email and Skype communication. The formal monitoring consisted of output progress reports (see template in Appendix), in which each project member reported on 1) which WP activities were executed, 2) what milestones were achieved, 3) what challenges were encountered, and 4) what solutions were proposed. Based on the progress reports, SWOT analyses were performed at the periodical EC meetings in order to plan the following project activities and avoid detrimental obstacles to the project goals. A secure remote project drive was used to store the output documents and project reports, so that all project members could have access to the outputs and an overview of the current project status.

The project was periodically monitored by the external quality assurance consultants to ensure that the project participants did not overlook important milestones or possible risks and threats to the project. The consultants had access to the interim output reports, participated in the transnational meetings, and provided feedback and suggestions for the further project developments.

Evaluation: How did you evaluate to which extent the project reached its results and objectives? What indicators did you use to measure the quality of the project's results?

In terms of concrete indicators of achievement, questionnaires were used to evaluate the three-day event regarding the linking of TOEPAS with the CEFR and the three-day EMI workshops. All participants found the linking procedure informative, useful, and well-organized. The concrete results of the questionnaires are in the Linking the TOEPAS with the CEFR: Technical Report, which is available on the Project Results Platform. All participants in the EMI workshops found them useful, relevant, well-organized and informative. They found the cases from different contexts particularly eye-opening because they could identify with colleagues from other European universities. Moreover, in addition to the three-day workshops, an online version of the EMI workshop was designed and piloted with participants from other universities. The online version of the workshop allows for wider applications and sustainability of the workshops because it allows distance test administration. The success of the EMI workshops is seen from the requests for their continuation. At UniTo and FHSS, current negotiations with university managements are conducted to offer the workshops in the following years.

The EMI Handbook is published on the project partners' websites as an e-book and in a pdf form (see Project Results Platform). The content of the handbook was piloted in the four EMI workshops, and it served as the basis for their development. The handbook was promoted during the multiplier event in Copenhagen in 2019, and it raised a lot of interest among the participants. The project team received numerous requests for the handbook even before it was completed and have been in contact with two universities wanting to use the handbook for their own training of teachers. The handbook was distributed to all workshop multiplier event participants and has been used in the EMI workshops as well.

A large number of lecturers were interested in participating in the workshops (N=35) and the video recording (30), and they expressed their satisfaction with the project during the interviews.

A continuous monitoring and evaluation of project activities and results has been incorporated in the project from the beginning through the use of external advisors/consultants, discussion among partners at transnational meetings and Executive Meetings, as well as by using evaluations and feedback at the TAEC conference (E1) and evaluations from the EMI Workshops (C2-C5). The purpose of this was to secure an ongoing discussion and adjustment of both the project plan and the project activities in order to secure the highest possible quality, sustainability, and impact of the project results as possible. Project management logs and minutes from team meetings were used to measure to what degree intermediary and final objectives have been reached and projected results that were obtained.

The final indicator of the project success was the application of the project outputs by university management and

policy-makers for future decision-making activities. The project exceeded the expectations in several ways. Two sustainable instruments were designed instead of just collecting survey data: the EMI Literature Database and the EMI Corpus. These two instruments are available transnationally to EMI researchers and practitioners after the project expiration. Because the basic structure of these instruments has been established, they can be further developed by adding new and updated published resources and corpus data. Teacher trainers and researchers have already contacted us to obtain access to the database and the corpus. The availability of these instruments after the project expiration warrants the project sustainability.

If relevant, please describe any difficulties you have encountered in managing the implementation of the project and how you and your partners handled them. How did you handle project risks (e.g. conflict resolution processes, unforeseen events, etc.)?

The project team encountered several risks during the project implementation. An unforeseen event that occurred during the project was the university lock down during the Covid-19 crisis. The lockdown impacted our ability to hold the EMI workshop at UM. The team had to redesign the workshop so that it could be held online. Although the planning required additional work, the end-result was producing two versions of the workshop, which are now available for future use.

After the thorough analysis of previous research in the countries of the partner universities, it became obvious that the proposed large-scale surveys were not a priority because most studies had been based on survey research. On the other hand, the analysis also showed a lack of corpora and corpus-based analyses of teaching contexts in EMI, although these are central for transnational comparison of actual practices. Therefore, the project team decided to include activities related to corpus development and analysis in the workpackage 3 (WP3) instead of the proposed activities related to survey development and administration. Although this change incurred possible risks regarding management of resources and expertise, with careful planning, the project resources were redistributed to allow for successful completion of the activities.

Finally, a conflict in opinions occurred regarding the content and the structure of output 3 (WP5) the EMI Handbook. The conflict started due to misunderstanding of the different roles the team members had in terms of the handbook production and the different disciplinary backgrounds and previous experiences with EMI. Although the conflict prolonged the completion of the output, it was eventually resolved through numerous discussions between different group members, at Executive Committee meetings, and project team meetings. The discussions involved cost-benefit analyses of taking different approaches to completing the work on the output, as well as development of common understanding of the handbook users' needs.

5. Implementation

this section asks for information about all the stages of the project: implementation of main activities including practical arrangements, participants' profile, impact, dissemination of the results and future plans;

Please provide detailed information about the project activities that were supported by the grant for Project Management and Implementation.

As described in the TAEC application, the partners had from the beginning of the project agreed to transfer the project management grant to each partner in three installments in the beginning, middle, and end of the project period. It was our firm belief that this was the best way to secure the commitment to project management and implementation from all partners. The planning and carrying out of the project activities had been harder to carry out without the specific grant to cover the activities related to project management, administration, and dissemination at each partner university, even though each partner has also contributed with an essential co-funding of these activities.

As part of the first phase of the project, UCPH drafted a Project Handbook with all important information about the TAEC project and the guidelines for management of the project activities and resources. The handbook was adjusted and developed throughout the project period in order to give detailed descriptions of the various agreements and requirements regarding the planning of transnational meetings, intellectual outputs, and training workshops, as well as on how to discuss and agree on changes to the project activities and budget during the project period. The handbook also contained detailed information on the use of the project management budget as a supplement to the more formal Partnership Agreements which were entered into between the coordinator and each partner.

In overall terms, the budget post for Project Management and Implementation covered the costs for hosting of project meetings, project management, administration, communication and the partners' participation in the multiplier event (the TAEC conference) in Copenhagen in April 2019. The term "administration" here covers the work done by the administrative units at each partner university, who have been contributing to the effective management of the project by involving finance departments and juridical experts when settling partnership agreements, signing processes, transfer of budgets etc. Project Management was primarily carried out by the Project Leader (PL) and the administrative Project Manager (PM) at UCPH along with the finance coordinator. However, each partner was represented in the Executive Committee which was also covered by the Project Management grant. The Executive Committee had one annual meeting, often in relation to a transnational meeting, where the partners discussed the overall planning of the project activities, relations to other activities at partner or regional/national level, quality assurance (along with the invited associated partners), update of SWOT and RISK analysis, as well as the internal cooperation between the project partners.

As agreed upon before the project start, the partners were responsible for their own local dissemination activities, especially the integration of the TAEC website in the websites of the partner institution as this was regarded the best solution in order to secure sustainability of the project appearance online. The partner websites links to the website of UCPH which holds the information regarding the TAEC conference in April 2019 and where the EMI Handbook (IO3) and the Technical Report on the alignment to the CEFR scale (IO2) are available for download. These dissemination activities were also covered by the project management budget or by partners themselves as part of the local co-funding as the dissemination work will be continued and integrated into local dissemination of EMI practices long after the end of the TAEC project, thus securing the sustainability of the project results.

Each partner hosted at least one transnational meeting throughout the project, and the costs of these meetings were covered through the project management grant. The partners' own costs for travel and accommodation in connection to the meetings were covered through the travel grant, whereas the partners' co-funded travel days and time spent when participating in transnational meetings and other project activities which could not be directly linked to the production of an IO. For example, the participation in the multiplier event (E1) in Copenhagen in April 2019 which was followed by an "in-formal" transnational partner meeting as most of the partners were present anyway.

In the same way the partners have co-funded all research and dissemination activities based on the work form the TAEC project and described in appendix on Dissemination Activities as well as in the section 6 Follow-up.

From the beginning of the project, the coordinator created a secure project drive where the partners could share data in correspondence with the GDPR-regulations of May 2018. The project drive has not always been easy to access (due to migration of IT platform at UCPH) but at the same time ,this shared project drive has made it possible to share confidential data without sending it by mail.

Please describe the methodology you applied in your project.

As coordinator, UCPH was responsible for the project management and quality assurance, while FFSH was responsible for managing dissemination, and UM for managing sustainability. UCPH has been using standard project

management tools and theories throughout the project in order to plan and monitor the progress of the project and the various activities. As part of the kick-off meeting and at each meeting in the executive committee, the partners discussed the SWOT and the risk analyses in order to adjust the project to the current strategies and statuses at partner institutions and countries, as well as across European HEI. The coordinator also drafted Partnership Agreements, which were sent to each partner for commenting before the formal signing of the agreements.

As part of the preparations for the project, the partners planned the project activities through seven inter-related workpackages, all of which are integral parts of the project cycle. Workpackages 1 and 2 (WP1 and WP2) were designed for project management and quality assurance, work packages 3, 4, and 5 (WP3, WP4, and WP 5) corresponded to the three main intellectual outputs, and work packages 6 and 7 (WP6 and WP7) were designed to address dissemination and sustainability of the project. The purpose of this was to secure a shared knowledge of the project activities among the partners and to ensure the adjustment of project activities and deadlines in an agile and effective way during the project period.

Although all activities (including project management, quality assurance, dissemination, and sustainability) were planned as integral parts of the project cycle, activities directly related to the intellectual outputs of the project were covered in the WP3, WP4, and WP5. Three different teams were created to work on each of the workpackages related to the three outputs. Each team consisted of representatives from all partner universities and different project partners took the lead in the output management. The Common EMI framework development (IO1/WP3) was coordinated by the team leader from UniTo; the certification alignment (IO2/WP4) was coordinated by UCPH; and the EMI handbook (IO3/WP5) was coordinated by UdL.

In this sense, the methodology of shared responsibility and interlinked work packages supported the realization of 3 intellectual outputs and 2 outcomes, based on the work of 3 teams. Each team was managed by a team leader from one university and had representatives from a different university: the team leader from UdL managed the responsibilities for the content of the EMI Handbook, a leader from UniTo managed the work on the EMI framework, UCPH managed the assessment alignment to CEFR.

The methodologies applied for the design of the TAEC Literature Database and the TAEC Corpus, as well as the alignment of TOEPAS with CEFR are available on the Project Results Platform.

How did the project partners contribute to the project? Please detail specific contributions made by the partner organisations.

UCPH has been responsible for project management, i.e. the overall responsibility of managing the project especially regarding preparation, monitoring of the project (time planning, budgeting, meeting and communication among the partners, quality control, risk management), and evaluation of the planned activities, while all partners have been responsible for dissemination and sustainability activities at their own local, regional, and national level. However, FHSS was in charge of securing an overview of the dissemination activities, whereas UM was responsible for the development of an overall plan for sustainability and impact.

Participants from all universities have been involved in data collection (needs analyses, video recording, interviews, assessment of lecturer language performances, transcription, validation of data), as well as the design of the TAEC Literature Database, the TAEC Corpus, the EMI Handbook (IO3), and the EMI workshop materials (C2-5). The local researchers have been very important for the project as they have been able to (1) contact/reach the relevant EMI lecturers and other stakeholders at their own institutions, (2) analyze the data in relation to the specific context in which they are collected, (3) organize workshops based on local needs, and (4) cross-check similarities and differences across the contexts when designing the EMI handbook.

The project could not have been carried out without the motivation and engagement of each partner institution and in particular the project members who have committed themselves to the project activities even though work pressure has been high throughout the project period. The partners have sought to find solutions and work-arounds when experiencing changes due to external or internal factors and have been able to adjust the project plan and activities in the best way possible. Each partner has contributed with valuable input and information based on their own local and national context while maintaining a transnational perspective thus making the TAEC project activities and results reliable and relevant for HEIs across Europe.

Our associated partners have helped cross-check the potential usability and impact TAEC outputs will have on the wider EMI context in Europe, i.e., impact beyond the institutional limits of the partner universities. For example, they provided consultancy regarding the project outputs, reviewed the executed project activities, and provided recommendations for revisions and further development. The associated partners also provided consultancy regarding the project visibility and sustainability after the expiration of the project period. In other words, they helped cross-check the potential usability and impact TAEC outputs would have on the wider EMI context in Europe, i.e., impact beyond the institutional limits of the partner universities.

How did you communicate and cooperate with your partners? What are the positive and negative elements of the cooperation process? What would you improve if you were to carry out a similar project in the future?

From the time the project application was drafted, the partners communicated through email and phone calls, as well as meetings at conferences and Erasmus+ funded exchange visits. Most partners, therefore, knew each other - or at least one other partner - before entering into the project. This made the communication throughout the project easy and informal and has presumably prevented many misunderstandings.

At the kick-off meeting in October 2017, the partners discussed possible risks for the project implementation to be (e.g. lack of time or the changing of a partner), and all agreed that a open and direct communication was the best way to prevent falling behind schedule or to fall into dis-agreements on the project mission. The continued discussions on risks has been a part of the agenda for each meeting in the Executive Committee.

The partners decided from the beginning to meet as much as possible and to bring as many project members as possible to the transnational meetings in order to develop personal relations that would make it easier to cooperate when under pressure. The direct dialogues and contacts were part of the TAEC project, which ensured that most of the project partners would be interested in entering into other kinds of cooperation in the future. This close contact will also make it easier to continue the dissemination of project results at conferences through joint presentations, articles, or books, which are also described in the Section 6: Follow-up.

The project members have been in regular contact throughout the project by email, both in the Executive Committee and between project members of each IO. This correspondence has functioned swiftly and without severe problems. The partners have also communicated more informally through channels such as Slack and WhatsApp.

At each transnational meeting, the partners prioritized at least one dinner together hosted by the specific partner and funded by the Project Management Budget. The purpose of this was to partly continue conversations over dinner, but also to strengthen the relations among the partner members and to discuss other issues regarding internationalisation and language use at the partner universities.

In overall terms, the cooperation has been positive and minor misunderstandings (e.g. deadlines or disagreements on how to carry out the IO activities) have been solved through direct contact and dialogue.

In general, the cooperation was conducted in a very positive atmosphere, and we cannot identify negative elements of the cooperation process. All partners maintained open communication regarding lack of time, resources, inability to meet deadlines, or regarding other other issues could be an hindrance for the carrying out of the project activities.

If we were to do something different in another project, it would be to ensure an even better communication throughout the project regarding the objectives, the activities, and the responsibilities in order to reduce the possibility of misunderstanding.

What target groups were addressed in your activities plan? Were the target groups changed in comparison to the ones identified in the application form?

All the targeted groups included in application form were addressed:

- T1 EMI lecturers at partner and other European HEIs
- T2 Teacher trainers
- T3 Management (policy-makers) at partner and other HEIs
- T4 The EMI/internationalization research communities, organizations, and networks (e.g., ICLHE, TESOL)

The concrete outputs of this project, scale alignment and EMI Handbook, had direct impact on the EMI lecturers (T1) at all partner HEIs. The outputs offered concrete solutions regarding lecturers' oral English certification for the EMI classroom and their support and training. Lecturers were informed about the transferability of their skills, the factors influencing the EMI context, and the strategies for success. The project team included this target group every a stage of the project and established possibilities for further communication after the project was completed.

Teacher trainers (T2) were addressed because the EMI handbook and the workshops provided important material to be used for lecturer support. Some teacher trainers also participated in the workshops (either as observers or participants), but many attended the multiplier event.

University management (T3) (department heads, deans) attended some of the transnational meetings in order to learn about TAEC's outputs or had other meetings with project partners. Some of them also participated in the EMI

workshops and have expressed an interest in continuing to offer these after the project expires. The results from the standard-setting event were presented at management meetings to inform policy-making.

The results from the comparative data analyses were presented (or are accepted) to researchers and practitioners (T4) at various conferences (TESOL 2019, 2021; AAAL 2020; AILA 2021; ICLHE 2017; 2019; DUN 2020; LAIC 2019). As part of the project, the multiplier event on "EMI Practices in Europe" brought together EMI practitioners (trainers, management, lecturers) who benefited from the project results. A monograph proposal based is currently under review at Routledge. The book content is largely based on the resources included in the EMI database. An edited book that includes follow-up analyses of the EMI Corpus will be proposed to Springer.

If relevant for your project, did you use or you plan to use Erasmus+ online platforms (e.g. EPALE, School Education Gateway, eTwinning) for the preparation, implementation and/or follow-up of your project? If yes, please describe how.

All project outputs are available on the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform so that researchers and practitioners across countries and institutions can access them for their own use.

5.1. Transnational Project Meetings

This table reflects the information entered in Mobility Tool+. If you would like to change it please do it in the corresponding Mobility Tool+ section. The information presented here will be automatically refreshed after that.

Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00001
Meeting Title	M1: Kick-off meeting 4 October 2017
Description of the meeting	The TAEC kick-off meeting took place 4 October 2017 at the University of Copenhagen, Faculty of Humanities, Emil Holms Kanal 4, 2300 Copenhagen S. The evening of 3 October before the kick-off meeting, one representative from each partner participated in the first meeting of the Executive Committee in order to discuss the project objectives as well as to perform an initial SWOT and risk analysis concerning the project. Representatives were: Alessandra Molino (UniTo), Denise McAllister Wylie (UM), Xavier Martin Rubio (UdL), Branka Drljaca Margic (FHSS), Slobodanka Dimova (UCPH) and Helen Sværke (UCPH.) Agenda: Welcome by Slobodanka Dimova, CIP and introduction of project partners Introduction to Erasmus+ project partnerships by Anne Marie Logue, National Agency Administration of the TAEC project by Slobodanka Dimova and Helen Sværke: Project objectives and overall time schedule, Project handbook (meetings, time sheets, costs), Internal project communication, Planning of transnational meetings, Follow up (activity logs, progress reports, QA) Going through WP3-WP4-WP5 and related outputs Final remarks and next meeting The objectives of the meeting was achieved by forming a common understanding of the project administration as well as the work with the intellectual outputs in the three workpackages WP3, WP4 and WP5. A next meeting was decided to take place end January/start February in Turin with a follow up on the project activities. A progress reporting system was introduced where the team leaders for each WP will upload progress reports once a month to the common secure project drive. The Project coordinator has a written summary of the meeting. Participants: Alessandra Molino, Università degli Studi Torino Virginia Pulcini, Università degli Studi Torino Denise McAllister Wylie, Maastricht University Sarah Crielesi, Maastricht University Xavier Martin Rubio, Universitat de Lleida Irati Diert Boté, Universitat de Lleida Branka Drljaca Margic, University of Rijeka Irena Vodopija Krstanovic, University of Rijeka Slobodanka Dimova, University of Copenhagen Helen Sværke, University of Copenhagen Sanne Larsen, University of Copenhagen Joyce Kling, University of Copenhagen Anne Holmen, University of Copenhagen
Start Date	04/10/2017
End Date	04/10/2017
Receiving Organisation	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
Receiving Country	Denmark
Receiving City	KOBENHAVN
No. of Participants	8

Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00002
Meeting Title	M2: Project meeting Turin, February 2018

Description of the meeting

The second project meeting took place 1 February 2018 in Turin. FHSS and UCPH project management had a short meeting 31 January 2018 from 17:30-19:30 about the planning of the EMI conference in April 2019 in Copenhagen. Participants: Branka Drljaca Margic Irena Vodopija Krstanovic Irena Meštrović Štajduhar Slobodanka Dimova Helen Sværke Sanne Larsen Joyce Kling Xavier Martin Rubio Irati Diert Boté Maricel Oró Piqueras Montse Irún Chavarría Denise McAllister Wylie Sarah Crielesi Alessandra Molino Virginia Pulcini Sandra Campagna Martin Solly Claudio Bendazzoli Ad 1) Welcome Ad 2) Progress report on the initial project phase by Slobodanka Dimova (Project Leader) Slobodanka Dimova (SD) announced that the 5th transnational meeting, scheduled for November 2018 in Copenhagen, will be moved to a date to be arranged, either in October 2018 or in January 2019. Ad 3) Administrative procedures and requirements Helen Sværke (HS), from CIP, presented the administrative procedures to be followed and the requirements to be met in the current stage of the project. It concerned communication, website, invoicing, timesheets, agreements and reporting. For further details please see minutes of the meeting. Ad 4) WP3 EMI Framework development Alessandra Molino (AM), team leader for O1, provided an overview of the work done and opened up a debate on the effectiveness of the research tool (i.e. shared excel file) developed to record existing literature. For further details see minutes from the meeting. The results of the analysis will be discussed in Maastricht (M3) where the data collection instruments suitable to the different HE contexts will be identified. By the Executive Committee meeting, national teams will also gather information on ethical aspects of research in their local contexts. Ad 5) WP5 EMI Handbook - Xavier Martin Rubio (XMR) The format of the handbook was discussed (paper or electronic). The project members agreed that the handbook shall be in electronic form, with a simple layout (downloadable pdf file). Links to multimedia and online materials will be included, but partners will make sure that they obtain permission for every individual whose performance (any form) is used in the handbook. Denise McAllister Wylie (DMA), leader for the ICC Section, illustrated the draft questionnaires developed to target EMI teachers, on the one hand, and ICC researchers, teachers and advisors, on the other. Virginia Pulcini (VP), leader for the Language Section, showed the two versions of this section's table of contents. The first draft of the three sections will be ready by the transnational meeting in Rijeka (M4), in September 2018. Ad 6) Update on the other WPs WP 7. Sustainability DMA, team leader for WP7, presented an overview of possible ways of disseminating information and keeping the stakeholders' interest alive after project completion. Pros and cons for each option were illustrated. Parallel webpages on each partner university's website will be established, as they can be maintained over time and are easy to access. Each partner university will localise the version developed by HS and already available on the UCPH website. Important information to be disseminated regards particularly 1) the EMI workshop and the possibility of organizing other workshops after the completion of the project and 2) the EMI handbook (we should make sure that stakeholders know about it). WP6. Dissemination The multiplier event will take place on 4-5 April 2019 (instead of 5-6 April, as stated in the project proposal). The Scientific Committee will consist of all the project participants, while the Organising Committee will comprise the Rijeka contingent and one representative from Denmark, Italy, the Netherlands and Spain. The national teams will provide the name of the local representative to Branka Drljaca Margic (BDM), team leader for Dissemination, by the 14th of February. All dissemination activities and communication materials shall include the Erasmus+ logo and the statement "the project is co-funded by the Erasmus+ program of the European Union". Ad 7) Round up, next meeting and final remarks Training activities: EMI workshops (O3/A13) The EMI workshops will take place in fall and winter 2019. More planning at the meeting i Rijeka September 2018. Ten people will be attending the workshop. Partners will have € 100,00 available per day per person attending. Part of this amount of money can be used for the creation of materials, such as printouts of the EMI Handbook. Workshops will last at least 3 days, which do not have to be consecutive but which will involve the same 10 people. The next Executive Committee meeting will take place in Maastricht (29th-30th May). The next transnational meeting will take place in Rijeka (either on 18th-19th September or on 25th-26th September). A final date will be communicated as soon as all the project members have participated in the Doodle poll.

Start Date	31/01/2018
End Date	01/02/2018
Receiving Organisation	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO
Receiving Country	Italy
Receiving City	TORINO
No. of Participants	13

Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00003
Meeting Title	M3: Meeting in the TAEC Executive Committee Maastricht 30 May 2018

Description of the meeting	<p>Meeting date 30 May 2018. Place University of Maastricht, Room 0.001, Minderbroedersberg 4-6, 6211LK Maastricht, The Netherlands Attendees: Renate Klaassen (Associate partner, Delft University), Slobodanka Dimova, Helen Svaerke, Alessandra Molino, Xavier Martin Rubio, Branka Drljaca Margic, Denise McAllister Wylie Agenda: 9.15 – 9.30 Welcome by Jan Hupkens, UM Internationalisation Policy Advisor overseeing UM's new Language Policy 9.30 – 9.45 Welcome by Denise McAllister Wylie and Yvette Froeling, Manager of the Maastricht University Language Centre. 9.45 – 10.15 Progress report on the second project phase by Slobodanka Dimova (Project Leader) 10.15 – 11.00 Administrative procedures and requirements: 1. Overview of Hours and Money Spent 2. Budget Invoicing procedures 3. Planning of Training Events 11.00 – 11.15 Coffee Break 11.15 – 12.00 Project Management 1. SWOT Update 2. Risk Analysis Update 12.00 – 12.05 Hello and welcome from Martin Paul, UM President, and Aisling Tiernan, UM Internationalisation Policy Advisor overseeing Internationalisation accreditation (CeQuint) 12.10 – 13.30 WP3 EMI Framework development: 1. Progress report and results from EMI framework analysis by Alessandra Molino (Team Leader) 2. O1/A5. Planning data collection and analysis cycle 3. O1/A6. Designing data collection instruments for the five project partners 4. O1/A7. Setting deadline for piloting data collection instruments 5. Any other business (e.g. updating excel file) 13.30 – 14.30 Lunch 14.30 – 15.45 WP5 EMI Handbook 1. Progress report by Xavier Martin Rubio (Team Leader) 2. Table of Contents overview and discussion a. How will the dataset inform the handbook? b. Handbook Format (use of video, length, number of sections, level of detail, theory versus practical use, etc.) 3. Deadlines 4. Any other business 15.45 – 16.00 Update on the other WPs 1. Progress reports by Team Leaders 2. Any other business 16.00 – 16.30 Feedback and input from Renate Klaassen 16.30 – 17.00 Round up, next meeting and final remarks. At the executive meeting it was decided to plan the C1 Panel Judge training to take place in Copenhagen in October 2018 and to arrange a transnational meeting at the same time (TM5). Furthermore, the partners agreed to invite FHSS to take part of the workshop even though FHSS was not initially planned to be part of the IO2. Funds for this was allocated from FHSSs own IO-budget.</p>
Start Date	30/05/2018
End Date	30/05/2018
Receiving Organisation	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT
Receiving Country	Netherlands
Receiving City	MAASTRICHT
No. of Participants	5
Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00004
Meeting Title	M5: Project meeting, team 2: Linking to the CEFR scale, 8 October 2018
Description of the meeting	<p>Project meeting with team 2-members taking place in Copenhagen 9 October 2018 before the C1 training event / panel judge training. At the executive meeting in Maastricht, May 2019, the partners agreed to plan the project meeting and to invite project members from FHSS to join both meeting and C1 judge panel training workshop. The surplus of transportation budget from the kick-off meeting will cover these extra costs. Participants: Alessandra Molino, Denise McAllister Wylie, Sarah Crielesi, Xavier Martin Rubio, Branka Drljaca Margic, Irena Meštrović Štajduhar, Slobodanka Dimova, Sanne Larsen and Joyce Kling. Transnational meeting M5 9.00–10.00 Purpose and procedures of CEFR alignment 10.00-11.00 M5 discussion: CEFR descriptors</p>
Start Date	08/10/2018
End Date	08/10/2018
Receiving Organisation	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
Receiving Country	Denmark
Receiving City	KOBENHAVN
No. of Participants	6
Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00005
Meeting Title	M4: Project meeting Rijeka 18-19 September 2018

Description of the meeting	<p>Meeting 19 September 2018, Room 121, University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences (FHSS), Sveučilišna avenija 4, 51000 Rijeka, Croatia. The meeting focused on 1) Progress report on the third project phase by Slobodanka Dimova (Project Leader), 2) Dissemination (conference and EMI workshops), 3) WP3 EMI Framework development and 4) WP5 EMI Handbook. Ad 1) Slobodanka Dimova (SD) gave an overview of the third project phase. A mid-project report is about to be submitted to the Erasmus+ agency. All project team members should send the signed timesheets for the past period (February to September) need to UCPH before 1.10.2018. Furthermore, discussions were made about the preparation for the data collection for phase 1 (video recording of EMI classes), e.g. regarding participant consent form and guidelines for collection, recording and storage of personal data. The planning of the upcoming O2 meeting in Copenhagen incl. the panel judge workshop (C1) was discussed and finally the progress related to the O1 EMI database was discussed. This also included definition of EMI in relation to CLIL, entries for edited books etc. Ad 2) Branka Drljaca Margic (BDM) gave an overview of the dissemination activities so far, stating that the project has been satisfactorily promoted. The dissemination activities included: announcements of the project (press releases), project presentations, creation of the project webpages on each of the member institutions' websites, conference talks (directly and indirectly related to the project), publications (indirectly related to the project), texts for the general public, and the use of social media websites (LinkedIn and ResearchGate). BDM reported on the steps that had been taken in relation to the multiplier event, the EMI Practices in Europe conference. The conference has been announced on LinguistList and the ICLHE Association website, through relevant mailing lists and personal contacts. Denise McAllister (DMA) proposed that the TAEC project should have its own Facebook page, as such a page is likely to reach a wider audience. BDM invited all team members to submit abstracts for the conference. SD reminded everyone that there will be a symposium on the TAEC project, so preferably the abstracts submitted by the team members would not be based on the TAEC project itself. SD informed the team members that the plan is to begin with the three-day EMI workshops in spring 2019, because we are to offer them to the teachers who will participate in video recording and it would be reasonable to invite them fairly soon. Considering the fact that it is not feasible to organize a workshop for three consecutive days, each local team can decide when to have three one-day workshops (e.g. in March, May and September) for the same participants. Workshops should last 5-6 hours and are intended for a maximum of 10 people. Ad 3) AM, team leader for O1, provided an overview of the work done so far and informed the team that we are going to continue with the original plan of video recording EMI lectures from the fields of economics, medicine and computer science. Discussions followed on the privacy and data issues related to recording of lecturers, criteria for the framework of the database, equipment for recording and creation of the EMI corpus (the database). Timelines for the recording and the database were agreed upon; by 20 December 2018 the corpus transcription guidelines will be piloted on a single piece of recording and by the end of January 2019, a second draft of the corpus transcription guidelines is to be produced, based on the input from the piloting stage. Finally, the deadline for finalizing transcription of all video recordings is 30 June 2019. Ad 4) Xavier Martin Rubio (XMR), team leader for O3, outlined the steps taken towards the development of the handbook and opened a discussion on the structure and style of the handbook. Based on the drafted chapters he received from each subsection, XMR drafted and presented a topic-based table of contents, instead of the previously proposed section-based one. A discussion on the aims of the handbook and the intended audience revealed that different subsections seemed to have had different understanding of the purpose and audience. It was agreed that the handbook is primarily to be used for self-study by EMI lecturers, who are proficient in language, and thus the style needs to be approachable, colleague-to-colleague. Following the discussion, it was concluded that we will keep to the original section-based plan and use the existing drafted chapters as a basis. Participants: FHSS: Branka Drljaca Margic, Irena Vodopija Krstanovic, Irena Meštrović Štajduhar- UCPH: Slobodanka Dimova, Sanne Larsen, Joyce Kling. UdL: Xavier Martin Rubio, Irati Diert Boté, Maricel Oró Piqueras, Montse Irún Chavarría. UM: Denise McAllistar Wylie, Sarah Crielesi. UniTo: Alessandra Molino, Virginia Pulcini, Martin Solly, and Claudio Bendazzoli.</p>
Start Date	18/09/2018
End Date	19/09/2018
Receiving Organisation	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI
Receiving Country	Croatia
Receiving City	RIJEKA
No. of Participants	13
Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00006
Meeting Title	M6: Transnational project meeting and meeting in the Executive Committee, Lleida 6-7 February 2019

Description of the meeting	<p>Meeting taking place 6-7 February 2019 both in the Executive Committee with associate partner Emma Dafouz (ED) from the Madrid University and in the project team as a whole, discussing in particular IO1 and IO3. Furthermore, administrative requirements and a status for the budget and hours spent were presented by project manager. Informal meeting at the evening of 5 February with other projects at the University of Lleida. MINUTES LLEIDA MEETING 6 February 2019 9 to 10.30 am - Executive meeting. Slobodanka Dimova presents the status of the project to associate partner Emma Dafouz and the discussions among the partners about EMI definitions, how to plan activities etc. 11.15 to 12.15 The executive committee updates the current SWOT and risk analyses. 12.15 pm Helen reminds us that we must write the date of the signature of the same month of the timesheet. Next timesheet ends of June. Deadline to send it mid-July. Final timesheet would be January 2020. Some issues with the secure drive (Branka, Virginia...). We have decided to transfer from Output 2 to Output 3 in the case of Maastricht, and to Output 1 for the rest. Hours devoted to development of content to the workshops are in Output 1. We could also carry out focus group discussion within the workshops, and timesheet that as part of the production of the IOs. The multiplier event is discussed. The programme is ready, and 43 presentations are confirmed. There are also 6 posters. Deadline for registration is 22nd of March. Helen reminds us that we need 50 international and 20 locals to participate in the event, and we are very close to that already. 14:30 to 17:30 pm Claudio goes over the agreements regarding transcription activities. See full summary in the project archive. Group 2: Team reports The database will be finished by February 25th; we will create new reports before March 15th 2019. Rijeka will stick to attitudes, Torino will deal with language use and policy, Lleida with learning outcomes and training, and Maastricht ICC, identity and testing. Those labelled as "multiple" will be explored by everyone (depending on which labels appear). Copenhagen carries out a chronological overview. Countries in which have not carried out research in certain areas (e.g. learning outcomes) need not be mentioned in the reports. 7 February 2019 9 to 10 am. Discussion about IO3 - the EMI Handbook. See full summary in project archive. By 15th February, the document will be in a google drive in the new order (google docs): pedagogy, language and ICC. March 1st is the deadline for comments on the google drive. 25th April is the deadline to submit new draft of the section. Montse will revise it by May 1st and the 15th May she will circulate it to Slobodanka and Martin, maybe also Denise. 10 to 11 am The workshops have to take place 3 consecutive, or non-consecutive days, during 5-6 hours each day. 10 participants in each university who have to come the three days. An external member from the university can present a topic at the workshop, but then the expenses have to be covered with the money for the workshop, which implies having less money to offer to the participants. 3000€ to cover the expenses (we can divide it as we prefer: participants, catering, lunch, invited member, etc.). Final considerations: AM explains to ED the decisions we took in relation to output 1. Rather than medicine, economics and IT, we now have 'natural sciences' and 'social sciences'. The idea is to have 3 lectures from each field per uni, and to try and have a balance of graduate and under-graduate courses. We explain what we will analyse in the data. ED points out the focus on errors has been done a lot, but CB says maybe the way lecturers pronounce specialised terminology could be an innovative focus. In terms of validity, ED suggests approaching it from a more qualitative approach. Exploratory rather than wanting representative results. The analyses of the database are mentioned. ED about the handbook: she did see more examples in the language part; she would include examples of how this has been done in a context, mostly in the ICC section. We talk about the format: probably an e-book with an ISBN. ED focuses on the relevance of sustainability and the need to contact administrative and management people at each university. DM explains her proposal to have an official presentation of the findings where we are all there. VP proposed to have fliers or cards to you can show something tangible and easy to read when we talk to these stakeholders. ED asks whether we have newsletters, but DM reminds us all we said no because we did not have news when we discussed it. Alessandra and Claudio will talk about Output 1. Slobodanka about Output 2. Virginia and Martin will present the handbook at the Copenhagen conference.</p>
Start Date	06/02/2019
End Date	07/02/2019
Receiving Organisation	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA
Receiving Country	Spain
Receiving City	LLEIDA
No. of Participants	16
Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00007
Meeting Title	Post-conference project meeting, April 2019

Description of the meeting	<p>Meeting post multiplier event in Copenhagen, 5 April 2019, 14:00-16:00. • University of Copenhagen: Slobodanka Dimova (SD), Joyce Kling (JK), Sanne Larsen (SL) • University of Rijeka: Branka Drljaca Margic (BM) • University of Turin: Alessandra Molino (AM), Claudio Bondazzoli (CB), Virginia Pulcini (VP), Martin Solly (MS) • Maastricht University: Denise McAllister Wylie (DM), Sarah Crielesi (SC) • University of Lleida: not present Ad 1) Remaining projects meetings • The next meeting in Turin in the Fall 2019 is tentative scheduled for the 1 and d October. This will have to be sent round to all project members for confirmation. • We also discussed the possibility of a final project meeting in January 2020. Dates to be agreed upon. Ad 2) Impressions from the conference • Presentations of high quality, positive atmosphere, good pace, no inner and outer group. • BM will draft a paragraph about the conference for JK to put in the ICLHE newsletter • Both the handbook and the framework generated positive interest by our two main groups of stakeholders. • Handbook and workshops: a) we should do needs assessment for the workshops, but we can also rely on the interview from TAEC data collection if some of the participants are recruited there, b) we need to clarify the purposes and intended uses of the handbook • Framework: we should make sure to incorporate the research we have become aware of through the conference • We also discussed whether it would be worthwhile publishing proceedings from the conference. SD was approached by Diane Pecorari, who is one of the series editors of Routledge Studies in English Medium Instruction. VP suggested that EUROLEX instead, which is an online book of articles. General agreement, though, that conference participants might not want to publish there as they will opt for peer-reviewed publications. There was agreement to submit a proposal for Routledge and aim for agreement in Turin for the next project meeting. Ad 3) Impact As we are a little behind plan in terms of impact, responses from the post-conference survey could be used for this purpose. We should also: 1. collect feedback from the workshop participants 2. try to reach out to management in all partner universities. Maastricht noted that they had already achieved quite a lot in this respect. 3. consider drafting results of alignment for the Rector's colleges at each site 4. draft brochures with outputs that can be shared with stakeholders at the universities 5. try to reach out to the pedagogical centres All of this needs to be done in the Fall 2019. Ad 4) Framework, transcription and workshops • Framework: • We have to allow for adding more literature to the database and at the same time we have to stop entering at some point. Alessandra will send out a mail with instructions and a deadline for submitting new entries. We agreed as the following: • The date of publication for articles that are entered extends to 2018. Articles from 2019 and onwards will not be included. • Each site needs to check the remaining number of hours that they have to work on this output. [SD will include this in the e-mail below regarding hours in general] • Deadline for re-entry: End of June • Transcription: • Rijeka does not have hours nor available hands for transcription of videos, but will transcribe the interviews. The other project members need to check their hours for this in addition to the hours for the framework. SD will send out an –email to all sites and project members. • The deadline for video data collection is June 1st.. • Workshops: • Tentative dates for workshops were discussed (second half of September for Rijeka, November for Turin). We agreed on September 15 as the deadline for announcing the dates for workshops. • We also discussed whether we would still want to have project members go around for the workshops. There was agreement that this is a good idea as it lends credibility to the workshops. Before we make the final decisions regarding this and start coordinating, we need the dates for the workshops to be settled on. We should develop the materials for the workshop as a group as well to make sure that we exchange knowledge on this. No travel arrangements/participant costs to be covered for this post-conference TM, as all participants paid their own hotels and travel to and from the conference, as part of the co-funding of the project.</p>
Start Date	05/04/2019
End Date	05/04/2019
Receiving Organisation	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
Receiving Country	Denmark
Receiving City	KOBENHAVN
No. of Participants	10

Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00008
Meeting Title	M7: Project meeting, Turin 8-9 October 2019
	<p>Transnational project meeting and meeting in the Executive Committee 8-9 October 2019. Participants: Alessandra Molino, Virginia Pulcini, Martin Solly, Claudio Bendazzoli, Stefania Cicillini / Xavier Martin Rubio, Maricel Oró Piqueras, Montse Irun Chavarria / Denise McAllister Wylie, Sarah Crielesi, Emma Bendall / Branka Drljaca Margic, Irena Vodopija Krstanovic / Joyce Kling Soren, Sanne Larsen, Slobodanka Dimova, Helen Sværke. Minutes Executive Committee meeting: Helen Sværke (HS) presented an overview of the hours and days spent and the remaining ones. Part of Lleida and Rijeka's hours will be transferred to Torino to finish the transcriptions. Hours from Lleida will also be used for the organization of last meeting in January. EMI workshops: The hours spent planning and preparing the workshops can be included in the timesheet. They belong to both O1 and O3, as the workshop is a way of testing the Handbook. The last meeting will take place the second week of Januarv 2020. Both Lleida and Maastricht are available to host the event. Lleida</p>

Description of the meeting

offered to finance the meeting with IO days, but the final decision on the place and funding for the meeting need to be verified by the partners TAEC Erasmus+ project partners. after M7. If UM organizes the meeting, it is going to be in Brussels, which is a hub city easy to reach for most participants. However, further checks are also needed to know whether the UM team can have travel money for their trip. [In subsequent email exchanges right after M7, UCPH ascertained that the UM team can get travel money (€575) for their trip to Brussels from the project. Coffee breaks can be covered with UM's project management money (the participants will pay for dinner themselves if UM doesn't have funds for that). TAEC doesn't have to pay to use meeting rooms in Brussels, which were provisionally reserved for January 14-15, 2020.] The final project reports (O1/O2/O3) will be planned during the last meeting in January 2020. They must be submitted two months after the end of the project. Internal project reports have to be updated. We decided to only produce quarterly reports. The last one was in June 2018, meaning that the next one will cover the period July-October 2018. SD will send an email about when the reports are due. Project evaluation The strategies we identified to measure the impact of the project are the following: 1. Putting links to the EMI handbook and the literature database and adding a counter to each. In this way, we will know how many times the files were downloaded. This will be done by each partner country in the project webpage on their university website. 2. Collecting the workshop evaluation forms filled in by the lecturers attending the EMI workshops. Denise McAllister Wylie (DMA) delivered a presentation of the main sustainability initiatives already implemented, the ones that will be implemented and others that could be in the future (see slides in Appendix 2). With reference to the proposal of exporting the TOEPAS at other partner universities, Slobodanka Dimova (SD) said that it is possible for UCPH to go and train local language teachers who can then administer the TOEPAS at partner universities. However, interested institutions need to make sure that they have the money for the training as well as for offering the test regularly. EMI Handbook: Producing the final version; publication online The handbook will be uploaded on each partner's project website. As is, the file looks amateurish, so the proposal was made to hire professional graphic designers to produce a proper electronic book. AM will look for a graphic design agency in Turin. The money for the job will be taken from UniTo's research funds. Xavier Martin Rubio (XMR) pointed out that creating an electronic book would take time; as a consequence, the lecturers who have already attended the workshop might not be able to download it for a long time. To overcome this problem, it was decided that a polished beta version of the handbook would be uploaded. SD pointed out the need to create a citation line for the handbook, the database and the corpus. Project meeting on IOs covered the following: WP3 EMI Framework development 1. Analysis of the database and its future 2. Transcription of video recordings: a. taking stock of the situation b. feedback on the guidelines and specific issues c. checking and standardizing transcriptions 3. Interviews and field notes WP3 EMI Framework development 1. Developing tools for the analysis of the database 2. Division of labour 3. How to report the analysis 4. Deadlines WP1 EMI Handbook 1. Producing the final version 2. Publication online EMI workshops 1. Sharing experiences and feedback from Rijeka and Lleida 2. Materials 3. Any other business (e.g. financial matters) A final round-up, update on other WPs, next meeting, any other business with all.

Start Date	08/10/2019
End Date	09/10/2019
Receiving Organisation	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO
Receiving Country	Italy
Receiving City	TORINO
No. of Participants	17

Meeting ID	34286-TPM-00009
Meeting Title	TM8 - extra transnational project meeting - end of project

The partners planned a final extraordinary meeting to take place in Brussels, 13-14 January 2020. This meeting was funded through allocation of 55 days from the budget of Intellectual Outputs, University of Lleida. 1) Project status by Slobodanka Dimova: Two things are still pending: the transcripts and corpus. Then some data analysis should be possible but we are running low on time. Regarding UM analysis, Denise would like to have a look at the videos from an ICC perspective; however, the cyber-attack has caused a backlog of UM work so it's unlikely UM team will be able to do much during this time. Slobodanka stressed we should finish the basics before we do other analysis of interest. As the database is now complete, we can use it for further research if we so wish, but we should reference it. Regarding the handbook, Alessandra contacted someone who could help us with that, but nothing concrete has happened yet. Helen will check with UCPH graphic department. Slobodanka further clarified the possibility of circulating the handbook: Beta version in PDF is available, but we should make it clear to recipients that it is only a Beta version. Also, she clarified that it will only be an ebook: printing a version was never in the budget. Slobodanka suggested having a counter both for the ebook, as well as for the CEFR. Those who know how to do this, please forward the information to others. Montse suggested slideshare and some other alternatives, as PDF can be easily downloaded, converted to Word and then also edited. Regarding workshops. UM workshops are the only ones that still need to take place. but

Description of the meeting	<p>these will also involve UM partner universities. Workshops are in the planning phase; due to the cyber-attack things are slow, and UM should know in the coming weeks. Turin has also started funding application for more workshops as the original ones were such a success and caught the attention of the Vice Rector. Referring back to UM executive meeting last year, Renate Klaasen was also present. She was very interested to hold the workshops in Delft, which could be something worth pursuing. 2) Group 1: CEFR Norming Session Slobodanka Dimova, Branka Drljača Margić, Denise McAllister Wylie, Alessandra Molino, Virginia Pulcini, Stefania Cicillini, Montse Irún Chavarría, Joyce Kling, Sarah Crielesi. Review of how the CEFR norming session went last time: looking at overall evaluation while looking at different aspects. Last session we familiarized ourselves with the scales, this session is the same: see what is the most salient feature of each level and each aspect, and how is this different to the one below or above. 3) Group 2: Transcription Standardizing Claudio Bendazzoli, Maricel Oró Piqueras, Sanne Larsen, Emma Bendall, Irati Diert. 4) Executive Committee meeting: Slobodanka Dimova, Branka Drljača Margić, Denise McAllister Wylie, Alessandra Molino, Helen Sværke, Xavier Martin Rubio (via Skype) Output Days allocation: • Norming hours can be allocated against either Output 1 or Output 2. • Agreed that days allocated to specific people were only guidelines and not set in stone. Hours can be moved within the group where needed so long as we don't exceed overall hours. • 55 days moved from budget to host Brussels meeting. • Helen gave breakdown of days transferred and days left for each university until 17th April. • Rijeka and UM low on days left. Days used presented until 30th November. Remaining allocation is from 1st December. • UM only have 29 days left but they may already have been used during December's transcriptions. Action: Denise to ask team to submit December timesheets to see if UM need extra days. Budget for workshops • €1500 of €3000 budget remaining from UniTo workshops (5 participants). This can be transferred to Outputs e.g. UM. Maastricht still need to hold workshops and confirm numbers. Same can apply. • Recommendation that late Feb / early March should be the latest for UM's workshops. Transfer of budget between partners • Up to 20% transferable Reporting and invoicing • Project extended to 17 April. • Deadline for timesheets 30 April for soft copy – don't need to be signed at this point. Post signed version to Helen. • Due to processing of reports etc., final payments to universities could be as late as September. Action: All exec comm. Members to ensure deadlines are met. Mobility Tool Completion for final report Helen presented the first draft of the final report as sent to all partners by email. The writing starts now and partners were asked to contribute with details regarding activities regarding dissemination and sustainability as well as information regarding the recruitment of participants for the EMI workshops etc. Action: All Exec comm. Members to send workshop, video, management, etc. participants info. in draft by beginning March</p>
Start Date	13/01/2020
End Date	14/01/2020
Receiving Organisation	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT
Receiving Country	Belgium
Receiving City	Brussels
No. of Participants	15
Total Number of Participants	103

5.2. Intellectual Outputs

This table reflects the information entered in Mobility Tool+. If you would like to change it please do it in the corresponding Mobility Tool+ section. The information presented here will be automatically refreshed after that.

Output Identification	O1
Output title	Transnational EMI framework
Description of the intellectual output	<p>This intellectual output represents a research report on a large-scale, comparative mixed-method study examining the EMI contexts applying a transnational EMI framework. The objectives of this output are the following: -Identify common areas of research related to EMI in European HE -Investigate comparatively HEIs at different stages of EMI implementation -Develop a common framework for EMI in HE -Inform stakeholders about transnational vs. context-specific features of EMI In order to achieve these objectives, a thorough analysis of previous research in the countries of the partner universities was conducted. The collection of resources needed for such analysis resulted in a development of a searchable, annotated database that can be used for various analyses of previous findings. The database could be continuously updated after the project ending to add new resources that become available. The analysis of the database showed a lack of corpora and corpus-based analyses of teaching contexts in EMI, although these are central for transnational comparison of actual practices. Therefore, a corpus with lecture transcripts was</p>

	developed and analyzed in the work project 3 (WP3). Thirty lectures (six from each partner) were video recorded, transcribed, and annotated. The transcript annotations were double rated in order to validate the transcripts and to ensure consistency. The video recordings were rated for oral English proficiency using the aligned CEFR scale with the Output 2, and then 10 randomly selected video recordings were analyzed using a number of fluency variables.
Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	18/09/2017
End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	17/04/2020
Available Languages	Dutch, Spanish, English
Available Medias	Publications, Dataset
Leading Organisation	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO
Participating Organisations	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA, UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT, SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI, KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET

Output Identification	O2
Output title	A model for relating local EMI language certification to the CEFR
Description of the intellectual output	<p>This output is a technical study report presenting the procedure, the analysis, and the results from linking of a locally-developed scale for oral English proficiency to the CEFR through a standard-setting procedure recommended by the Council of Europe (2009). The report will be an open education source (OER) including tools for future analyses of similar types. The Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment (Council of Europe, 2001), known as the CEFR, provides a common basis for the description of language courses, syllabuses and qualifications. Since CEFR allows for comparison of language tests based on common reference point (the set of six levels, A1 to C2), the Council of Europe published the recommended methodology for relating tests to the CEFR in the Manual "Relating language examinations to the Common European Framework of Reference for languages: Learning teaching and assessment" (2009). The Manual promotes transparency among language qualifications and validation of claimed equivalence to the CEFR. The objectives of this output were: - Align the local certification assessment scale with the CEFR scale following the recommendations provided in the Manual (Council of Europe, 2009) using the benchmark standard-setting method as that is the most appropriate method for holistic, performance-based assessment (see Chapter 5 of the Manual). -Provide step-by-step technical report on the alignment procedure for the oral English certification for EMI lecturers, which can be used for alignment of other assessments. -Inform stakeholders (management, lecturers) about the meaning of local results in relation to CEFR. -Establish transnational uses of an oral English certification assessment.</p>
Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	18/09/2017
End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	17/04/2020
Available Languages	
Available Medias	Other, Event, Text File
Leading Organisation	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET
Participating Organisations	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA, SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI, UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO, UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT

Output Identification	O3
Output title	EMI Handbook
Description of the intellectual output	<p>This intellectual output is a handbook outlining the fundamental areas that an EMI teacher training and support curriculum should include. The main objectives of this output are: -Identify and collect different EMI training practices in one place -Present the relationship between different EMI factors and EMI practices -Create materials which can be used transnationally for EMI lecturer training and support -Assist the current EMI training programs in their curriculum development -Represent the basis for development of new EMI curricula (UniTo and other HEIs) The primary audiences of the handbook are EMI lecturers and EMI trainers who would like to become aware of the characteristics of the EMI teaching context. The handbook is intended for use as a self-reference guide or as a supplement in EMI teacher training programs. Except for some sections of the second part of Language Use in the EMI Classroom that focus on improving language, the handbook is intended for all EMI lecturers, regardless of whether English is their mother tongue or not. The goal is that via self-reflection and analysis, lecturers are able to make informed decisions about their language uses and, sometimes, teaching approaches based on examples and cases about different EMI experiences. All materials have been developed on empirical data from EMI classrooms and have been tested and adjusted with EMI lecturers from universities in the countries of the project</p>

Description of the intellectual output	<p>participants: Denmark, the Netherlands, Italy, Spain, and Croatia. The handbook does not offer standardized solutions to the challenges and the dilemmas in the EMI classroom because what could be considered a good solution for one context may not be relevant for another. Instead, the handbook offers examples, possibilities, and guidelines that help readers make informed decisions for their own contexts. The handbook features reflection questions and reflection points, recommendations, and self-evaluation. Each part provides opportunities for EMI lecturers to reflect on different topics in relation to their own language, teaching, and communication practices. Various dilemmas and challenges that EMI lecturers encounter in the classroom are also discussed and recommendations about how to deal with the challenges are offered. Case scenarios taken from real EMI classrooms exemplify the dilemmas and challenges discussed. Each part ends with self-evaluation, which helps readers consolidate the information and focus on the most important takeaways. Although the content in the handbook logically progresses from one topic to another, the three parts and their subtopics can serve as independent units. Therefore, the EMI lecturers and trainers can focus on the part they find most relevant for their context or cover each part in different orders. For example, they may want to focus only on teaching considerations in the EMI classroom because they would like to consider how to adjust their teaching approaches considering different classroom factors, or their classroom has become increasingly international so they are more interested in intercultural communication (ICC). However, the inseparability of these three areas (teaching practices, language uses, and intercultural communication) is acknowledged by frequent cross-referencing among the three parts.</p>
Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	18/09/2017
End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	17/04/2020
Available Languages	
Available Medias	
Leading Organisation	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI
Participating Organisations	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA, UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT, KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET, UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

5.3. Multiplier Events

This table reflects the information entered in Mobility Tool+. If you would like to change it please do it in the corresponding Mobility Tool+ section. The information presented here will be automatically refreshed after that.

Event Identification	E1
Event Title	EMI Practices in Europe
Description of the multiplier event	<p>The “Transnational Alignment of English Competences for University Lecturers (TAEC)” project team arranged the conference “EMI Practices in Europe” at the University of Copenhagen, Denmark, on 4-5 April 2019. The aim of the conference was to provide a forum for discussion among academics, teacher trainers, EMI teachers, curriculum developers and policy makers interested in the field of English-medium instruction. In recent years, universities across Europe have seen a significant expansion in English-medium instruction (EMI). Among the reported benefits of EMI are improved student and teacher proficiency, better preparedness for the global market, bigger job prospects, broader professional collaboration, greater visibility and higher university rankings. However, questions are increasingly raised about the implications of EMI for the quality of teaching and learning, and concerns have emerged regarding its implementation. Given the diversity of academic contexts and the complexity of EMI practices, the conference aimed to develop a clearer understanding of this global phenomenon, generate new insights from research or day-to-day practical experience in teaching content through English, and promote quality assurance in EMI. In total 42 sessions with presentations from all over Europe and 6 poster presentations was part of the programme, following a call for papers in Winter 2018-2019. Furthermore, the TAEC project held a project symposium with the presentation of the project and the overall activities and results. The participants in the conference had the opportunity to discuss the project activities with the project partners at an "open sessions" and the project partners had valuable input through these discussions. Ute Schmidt from the University of Vienna gave the opening plenary session and David Lasagabaster from the University of the Basque Country gave the final plenary session. As part of the conference, the TAEC project produced a conference bag, a book mark, a flyer about the EMI workshops and an folder about the TAEC project activities as well as stickers, all with the TAEC and the EU Logo. Furthermore, attendants from CIP/UCPH were wearing T-shirts with the TAEC and the EU logo during the conference. As part of the TAEC project symposium the outputs 1-3 were presented, and the technical report from Output 2 was shown as accessible on the project website. In total 86 participated in the conference. Out of which 60 participants came from international and 5 from Danish universities or HEIs not part of the TAEC project group. The participants from outside the partner institutions were divided among 49</p>

organisations, covering 16 countries from across Europe from Estonia, to Sweden, Finland, across Great Britain, Germany and Austria to Spain and Italy. Furthermore, a Turkish and a Chinese university was represented as well. The budget originally covered 20 national and 50 international participants and the TAEC partners were very pleased with the high number of international participants. In total 21 participants from the project partners participated in the conference. The project partners from the University of Lleida did unfortunately not have the opportunity to participate due to other obligations. The evaluations from the conference showed a high degree of satisfaction (90%) with both the organisation and the topic of the conference. 67% of the participants sent back the evaluation form, stressing that they were very pleased with the many different perspectives represented at the conference as well as the balanced mix of theory and practice in the various sessions. The online information about the conference is still to be found on the conference website: https://cip.ku.dk/english/events/previous_events/taec-conference-2019/ Further information covering programme and evaluations is compiled in the appendix named "Erasmus+ TAEC conference April 2019". After the conference, the attending project partners held a short transnational project meeting discussing the finalizing of the EMI Framework (database) and Handbook as well as the planning of the EMI Workshops to take place at the partners in Autumn 2019.

Country of Venue	Denmark
Start Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	04/04/2019
End Date (dd-mm-yyyy)	05/04/2019
Intellectual Outputs Covered (using Output Identification number)	O3;O2;O1
Leading Organisation	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI
Participating Organisations	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET

5.4. Learning/Teaching/Training Activities

This table reflects the information entered in Mobility Tool+. If you would like to change it please do it in the corresponding Mobility Tool+ section. The information presented here will be automatically refreshed after that.

Activity No.	C1
Field	HE
Activity Type	SP-HE-SHORT
Description of the activity	<p>UCPH hosted the first training event in October 2018 which was a panel judge training event in order to apply the CEFR scale for assessment of oral English proficiency of EMI lecturers (IO2). The program consisted of three stages distributed on the three workshop days. Stage 1) was familiarization with the CEFR descriptors. Stage 2 was benchmarking between CEFR and TOEPAS scale. Stage 3 consisted of Standardization, including judgement and discussions of the CEFR levels compared to the TOEPAS scores. The output of the three day workshop was a technical report including a description on how to align the two scales to another. The technical report was disseminated at the TAEC website of UCPH and the other partners as well as at the TAEC conference in April 2019. You can find the event schedule of the workshop and on the Project Results Platform "Linking the TOEPAS with the CEFR: Technical report" you can find the technical report. The technical report is also available on the partner websites. The participants consisted of seven project members and four existing TOEPAS raters employed at CIP/UCPH. The training event took place in at UCPH, 9-11 October 2018, following the partner meeting M5. At the executive committee meeting in Maastricht, May 2018, the partners had agreed to invite project members from the partners to the C1 together with local panel judges from UCPH in order to build on existing knowledge on both EMI, CEFR and TOEPAS. The costs for the coverage of transportation for partners outside DK was covered through transfer of surplus from other transnational partner meetings.</p>
Country of Venue	Denmark
No. of Participants	11
Participants with Special Needs (out of total number of Participants)	0

Accompanying Persons (out of total number of Participants)	0
Is this a long-term activity?	No
Funded Duration (days)	33
Participating Organisations	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET, UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO, UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT, UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA, SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI

Activity No.	C2
Field	HE
Activity Type	SP-HE-SHORT
Description of the activity	<p>The C2 EMI workshop took place at the University of Turin (UniTo) at 15, 22 and 29 November 2019 covering Language, Pedagogy and Intercultural Competences, presented by Branka Drljaca Margic (FHSS), Slobodanka Dimova (UCPH), and Denise McAllister Wylie (UM), respectively. In total 10 participants were registered for the three workshops, however, only five participants were present all three days. In agreement among the partners at the TM8 in Brussels, January 2020, the surplus budget funds were re-allocated to cover 10 days at UM. As stated in the application the main goals of the workshop were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural issues of students and teachers in EMI • Relate local contextual factors to EMI characteristics • Brainstorm sustainable support strategies for teachers and students <p>The participating teachers/researchers from UniTo were recruited in three ways: 1) The lecturers who had been video recorded were invited to take part in the workshop. Two of them were available on the dates given; 2) Other EMI Lecturers working at the Department of Socio-Economics and Mathematical-Statistics Science were contacted individually; 3) The workshop was also announced through a mailing list of lecturers who had already taken part in other EMI training activities. Evaluations from the workshops showed a high degree of satisfaction with all three workshop days, in particular the many practical examples, the focus on pronunciation, and the tips and tricks e.g. on management of interaction between students etc. As points for improvements were mentioned the need for (more) practical examples e.g. through production of videos for teachers at UniTo. Citation from workshop participant: "I liked the case studies and the tips and I think they can be useful for teaching in general, independent of the language".</p>
Country of Venue	Italy
No. of Participants	5
Participants with Special Needs (out of total number of Participants)	0
Accompanying Persons (out of total number of Participants)	0
Is this a long-term activity?	No
Funded Duration (days)	15
Participating Organisations	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO

Activity No.	C3
Field	HE
Activity Type	SP-HE-SHORT
Description of the activity	<p>The EMI workshop C3 took place at the University of Rijeka, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Sveucilisna Avenija 4, HR-51000 Rijeka, Croatia on three separate days: 12 September 2019, 18 September 2019 and 24 September 2019 with the participants listed below. The workshop covered the three areas of the EMI Handbook; Language, Pedagogy and Intercultural Competences. Slobodanka Dimova (UCPH) presented the workshop on pedagogy whereas Denise McAllister Wylie presented the workshop on Intercultural Communication. As stated in the application the main goals of the workshop were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural issues of students and teachers in EMI • Relate local contextual factors to EMI characteristics • Brainstorm sustainable support strategies for teachers and students <p>The evaluations from the workshop show a high degree of satisfaction with each workshop day and topic, as the participants found it interesting and relevant to learn more about EMI concept, how to improve interaction with students, and how to apply the useful tools and tips to the international</p>

	classroom. Citation: "The topics were very useful because we got to express ourselves a lot, which, in my experience, very few workshops do."
Country of Venue	Croatia
No. of Participants	10
Participants with Special Needs (out of total number of Participants)	0
Accompanying Persons (out of total number of Participants)	0
Is this a long-term activity?	No
Funded Duration (days)	30
Participating Organisations	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI

Activity No.	C4
Field	HE
Activity Type	SP-HE-SHORT
Description of the activity	<p>The C4 three-day- training workshop took place in the Polivalent building of the Campus Primer d'Octubre of Universitat de Lleida on three separate days: 26 June, 17 September and October 1 2019, covering the three areas of the EMI Handbook: Pedagogy, Language and Intercultural Communication, respectively. Of the total of 15 participants, 10 were present all three days. As stated in the application the main goals of the workshop were to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural issues of students and teachers in EMI • Relate local contextual factors to EMI characteristics • Brainstorm sustainable support strategies for teachers and students. <p>Evaluations from the workshop show a high degree of satisfaction with the organisation of the workshops regarding time for discussion and questions and for the presentations given. We counted with Claudio Bendazzoli from UniTo for the language session, and with Sarah Crieseli for the Intercultural Communication session, something that was very much appreciated. Participants found the material relevant and useful for their teaching and would have liked to have had this kind of workshop as an introduction before starting teaching in English at UdL.</p>
Country of Venue	Spain
No. of Participants	10
Participants with Special Needs (out of total number of Participants)	0
Accompanying Persons (out of total number of Participants)	0
Is this a long-term activity?	No
Funded Duration (days)	30
Participating Organisations	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA

Activity No.	C5
Field	HE
Activity Type	SP-HE-SHORT
Description of the activity	<p>The C5 three day training workshop was planned to take place at the University of Maastricht first in November 2019, and then postponed to March 2020. However, due to the Corona-virus the workshop was re-designed to take place as an online workshop, in agreement with the National Agency (Denmark). The budget for the training event was therefore moved to cover IO budget at UM in agreement with the other TAEC-partners. The three online days covered the three areas of the EMI Handbook; Language, Pedagogy and Intercultural Competences, respectively. As stated in the application, the purpose of the EMI workshop was to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Raise awareness of linguistic, pedagogical, and cultural issues of students and teachers in EMI • Relate local contextual factors to EMI characteristics • Brainstorm sustainable support strategies for teachers and students <p>Participants were teachers/researchers from UM as stated below: Fjaere van der Stok, FPN Eveline Persoon, CES Marieke van Paassen, Lanuqaqe Centre Meredith Brandt, Marketing and</p>

Description of the activity	<p>Communications Erman Atak, Political Science Nhan Nguyen, Toxicogenomics Sarah Hiley, Language Centre Junhua Chen, Maastric Clinic UM developed a format for the online workshop which can be used by the other partners in the future. In short, UM asked the the participants to watch an introductory video and to read a chapter of the handbook each week for discussion in three one-hour online group discussions via Zoom. UM had a license for zoom, meaning that there would be no problem when using this platform. The call quality was high and I was able to easily share the slides with participants At the first workshop, participant introductions taking up much of the first half of the session. For future us an introductory group discussion should take place first, before the group discussions in relation to the chapters, to allow people to get to know each other, discuss their experience, and explain why they are taking part. After the workshop topic summary was sent out. For the second and third workshop, participants were invited to send the topics/questions they wanted to discuss in advance. After each session, a topic summary was sent out. UM found that the sessions went really well and there was rarely a lull in conversation. All participants contributed from their own experience. The one observation held by all at the end of the workshop was that they would have enjoyed more time to discuss the topics but understood that with COVID19 restrictions in place, this was more difficult. However, in future online sessions should be 1.5. hours long where possible. The evaluations from the workshop show a high degree of satisfaction with the online form. The participants liked the opportunity to discuss topics and questions that were of common interest across the university. At the same time, the language centre at UM got feedback for future courses in language issues, pedagogy and intercultural competences. Finally, it was very useful for the project to try the workshop format out in an online version as this could be the basis for future development of the workshops at each partner institution. Citation "The reflections and case studies are very useful. I would emphasize on them and make little groups in the breakout rooms so everyone can discuss them. Change participants (cultural backgrounds) for every case study or give a case study to each group to prepare for the next session."</p>
Country of Venue	
No. of Participants	0
Participants with Special Needs (out of total number of Participants)	0
Accompanying Persons (out of total number of Participants)	0
Is this a long-term activity?	No
Funded Duration (days)	0
Participating Organisations	

5.5. Participants in Learning/Teaching/Training Activities

5.5.1. Participants' Profile

For each activity, please describe the background and profile of the participants involved in the learning, teaching or training activities. How were the participants selected, prepared and supported? If relevant, please describe any practical arrangement set for the participants, including training, teaching or learning agreements.

The participants for the panel judge discussion (C1) in Copenhagen, October 2018, consisted of project members with experience in teaching EMI lessons and experienced TOEPAS raters from CIP, as agreed upon at the Executive Meeting in Maastricht, May 2018 (TM2).

The participants for the EMI workshops (C2-C5) at each partner university were selected based on their experience with teaching of EMI classes and their interest in learning more on the subject. Before each workshop, the participants received an agenda of the three workshop days. At the workshops, the EMI handbook was presented - often by the partner having written the specific section. The partners had agreed that when possible, they should attend each others workshops as teachers in order to be able to engage in discussions with the local participants and thus also giving a more transnational perspective to their own practice at home. The costs for inviting partners to teach the workshops were covered by the budget for the workshops. Otherwise, the budget covered costs for transportation, lodging, and subsistence, for the workshop participants.

The participants for the EMI workshops at UniTo in November 2019 were recruited in three ways: 1) lecturers who had been video recorded, 2) other EMI Lecturers working at the ESOMAS, and 3) announcement through a mailing list of

lecturers who had already taken part in other EMI training activities.

At UdL, the lecturers for the video recording and the participants for the workshops were selected from a total of four degrees: Audiovisual Communication and Journalism, Bilingual Modality of the Primary Education degree, Computer Engineering and Private Law. The lecturers were also invited to participate in the EMI workshops, where most of the lecturers attended one or more of the workshops.

The selection and recruitment of lecturers for EMI workshops at UM took place over two semesters, the final semester of academic year 2018-2019 and the first semester of academic year 2019-2020. During the initial recruitment phase, the participants of the recording sessions were offered a place in the workshop, which would take place in semester 1 of the 2019-2020 academic year, with most participants showing interest. In addition, the remaining places were advertised via the UM online news facility, UM News, and on the UM TAEC webpage. Most places were filled at that time and the workshop was scheduled to take place 12/11, 28/11 and 12/12. However, as the dates drew closer, a number of participants could no longer attend all three sessions or any of the sessions due to their heavy workloads. Eventually, only two people were available to attend all three days so a decision was made to reschedule the workshops to Semester 2 of the 2019-2020 academic year. The second phase of recruitment took place when some of the candidates for the original workshop dates were also unavailable to take part in the rescheduled workshop. New participants were reached by contacts within the university, including Jan Hupkens, Head internationalization policy advisor for UM, as well as advertisement on UM News and on the UM TAEC webpage. A week before the first session was to take place, however, COVID19 restrictions were put in place, preventing any face-to-face activities taking place at the university. The format had to be revised and replaced with an online format.

FHSS recruited six lecturers to be video recorded and interviewed for the purposes of the WP3, two coming from the Faculty of Medicine and four from the Faculty of Economics and Business. Three of the lecturers observed and video-recorded, two from the Faculty of Economics and Business in Rijeka and one from the Faculty of Medicine, also participated in the EMI workshops organised at FHSS. In addition, the workshops were attended by 2 teachers from the Faculty of Medicine in Rijeka, 3 from the Faculty of Economics and Business, and 2 from the Faculty of Engineering.

UCPH recruited six lecturers from the Faculties of Science, Humanities, and Social Sciences (Professor=4, Associate Professor=2) to be video recorded and interviewed by contacting deans, department heads, and lecturers. Despite the response from all these stakeholders, it was difficult to find disciplines and courses that followed the common selection criteria across all partner universities. Therefore, the team canvassed the course catalogs across disciplines to identify potential candidates for the project. All contacted lecturers responded positively, but quite a few could not be involved because of planning logistics.

Lectures from all universities signed consent forms in which they were informed about the type of data collection, analysis, and use will be applied (see Appendix). The lecturers agreed to participate because the project would help them with their own professional development, and also because they could use project materials to foster professional development in their own units.

5.5.2. Participants' Recognition

Did your project make use of European instruments like Europass, ECVET, Youthpass, ECTS etc. or any national instruments/certificates for recognition or validation of the learning outcomes of the participants in the learning, teaching or training activities?

No

5.5.3. Intensive Study Programmes - Invited teachers

This section doesn't apply for this project

6. Follow-up

6.1. Impact

What was the project's impact on the participants, participating organisations, target groups and other relevant stakeholders?

Multiplier event participants evaluated the event positively. They found the project results informative and the outputs useful for their contexts. We have received a number of requests for further information, access to materials, and collaboration from colleagues from different universities.

The EMI workshops had a great impact on participants. The workshops allowed them to create collaborative networks across different departments at the university, as well as to exchange experiences and practices with colleagues from other universities. The workshops attracted a number of participants from the university management (deans, program directors) who will disseminate TAEC materials in their own units. Workshop participants found the transnational perspectives of cases with specific examples of practices across different contexts useful and applicable to their own contexts.

The project raised community awareness about the strengths and weaknesses of EMI and informed Language Policy decisions. Our partners from UM used project findings to contribute to policy decisions at their university. Colleagues from other universities have contacted us regarding the possibilities to present TAEC findings to their university managements regarding local policy developments.

First assessment alignment for oral English tests of staff. It is a groundbreaking achievement that will influence further developments in this area and enhance transnational transparency of results.

What was the impact of the project at the local, regional, European and/or international levels? Please provide qualitative and quantitative indicators.

The previously mentioned impacts is measured using different methods relative to the level of impact and the groups the project targets.

In terms of the level of impact, TAEC results have been influential at local, European, and international level. At the local level, UCPH has already started using the TAEC assessment alignment (IO2) to report the scores from the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS). EMI lecturers have benefited from the EMI handbook and workshops, and their use will be extended after the project period in UniTo and FHSS. TAEC has served as the foundation for application for new research and material development projects at UdL and UM.

At the European level, the test uses can be extended transnationally due to negotiations of the test implementation in France and Sweden. An extended transnational use of the TAEC alignment results is also expected to influence the decisions regarding required minimum proficiency level for teaching staff at universities. In terms of the EMI workshops and the EMI handbook, UM and FHSS will start negotiations with their partners from the Young Universities for the Future Alliance (YUFE) for their implementation. Several European universities have already adopted the EMI handbook for their EMI teacher training courses. The EMI framework, represented through the literature database and the corpus, has already been applied by European researchers and teacher trainers to support their research and teacher training projects.

At international level, the transferability of the outputs has also been visible through the adoption of TAEC materials at other institutions. As part of the virtual course in June-July 2020, "Teaching Content and Language Integrated and Online", at Unisinos, Porto Alegre, Brazil, two sections of a month-long online course to professors working with English as a Medium of Instruction and teachers from the Language Center to develop their competencies in teaching online integrated content and language courses. Material developed in the TAEC project will be utilized to help Unisinos professors and teachers to have a better understanding of CLIL and additional online methodologies that enable them to offer successful online courses in EMI or language center courses.

In terms of target groups, on the other hand, TAEC has had an impact on all groups that the project targeted.

The impact of the common EMI framework on T4 (EMI organizations and networks) is measured through the number of articles and reports showing the extent of framework adoption in EMI research and needs analyses. So far, TAEC results have been presented in 78 research outlets presented to 400 colleagues: articles, conference presentations, book chapters, and posters.

The impact of the EMI Handbook on T2 (teacher trainers) is measured through the number of downloads of the handbook and number of requests for EMI workshops.

The effects on partner university collaboration (T1 lecturers and T3 management) is measured by the number of projects, collaborative activities, staff exchange and common certification procedures following the project period. The university partners have continued their collaboration after the project period working on a monograph and an edited book that will be produced with the use of the TAEC materials and resources. The project partners are planning to apply for further funding to develop internet platforms for the database and the corpus.

In the long run, the impact of TAEC will be measured by the level of adoption of TAEC core values in HEIs' language policy and strategic planning, as well as the level of recognition of certification models based on the basic quality tenets proposed by TAEC. The current negotiations with local university management, adoption of TAEC materials at other European universities, and use of TAEC materials in teacher training outside Europe are good indicators about the long term potential of the project outcomes.

How did the project contribute to the achievement of the most relevant priorities as indicated in the description section?

TAEC effectively addressed the two most relevant priorities: 1) Transparency and recognition of skills and qualifications to facilitate learning, employability and labor mobility, and 2) Strengthening the recruitment, selection and induction of educators.

TAEC's goals were related to the internationalization agenda of the Council of Europe with the underlying rationale to modernize higher education (HE) through design and implementation of innovative transnational practices which will allow for transparency, transferability of academic staff qualifications, and mutual trust. HE internationalization has been implemented through a rapid increase of English-medium instruction (EMI) programs across Europe, which has raised concerns regarding (1) the linguistic competencies of non-native English speaking lecturers and (2) the implications of EMI for the instructional quality, international faculty and student recruitment, as well as local student retention at HE institutions in non-anglophone countries. Consequently, lecturers' English proficiency is under scrutiny and universities are developing language policies for quality assurance, which are enforced by implementation of internal assessment procedures and EMI training support.

Before TAEC, assessment procedures had been developed and used only locally, at institutional level and overlooked issues related to lecture mobility. TAEC allowed for transnational analyses of linguistic, pedagogical, and intercultural communication competences of EMI lectures and their implications for instructional quality in HE. Such analyses help us understand the transferability of lecturer qualifications and skills across contexts and facilitate teacher training for improved instructional practices.

TAEC laid the foundations for a common framework for EMI quality assurance and support, on the basis of which we can adapt local language certification and EMI training for transparency in transnational uses. The specific objectives TAEC achieved were (1) identification and differentiation between transnational and local EMI needs of partner universities through thorough examination of published resources as well as analyses of actual lectures across the contexts, (2) alignment of a locally-used assessment scale with the Council of Europe's CEFR, which allows for standardization and transferability of results and for strengthening lecturer recruitment, (3) comparison of the characteristics of the language used in teaching across different EMI contexts in HE based on EMI corpus data, and (4) application of the project results for policy negotiations regarding EMI lecturer requirements and support. The long-term objective of TAEC is to provide the groundwork for an EMI quality assurance framework which could be applicable across European universities beyond the partner universities involved in the project.

6.2. Dissemination and Use of Projects' Results

To whom did you disseminate the project results inside and outside your partnership? Please define in particular your targeted audience(s) at local/regional/national/EU level/international and explain your choices.

A detailed dissemination plan was developed at the TAEC kick-off meeting in the fall of 2017, based on the dissemination and uses preliminary outline described below. The plan provided specific information about (1) the relevance of the intellectual outputs for the identified target groups, (2) the communication methods with the target groups, (3) the accessibility of materials for target groups, and (4) the relevant conferences, meetings, and networks for dissemination of the project results during and after the project period.

The preliminary plan for the project result dissemination and use was outlined based on the relevance of the project contributions for each of the identified target group. The main contributions of this project are the common EMI framework, the scale alignment, and the EMI Handbook. Therefore the target audiences are defined as:

- T1 EMI lecturers at partner and other European HEIs
- T2 Teacher trainers
- T3 Management (policy-makers) at partner and other HEIs
- T4 The EMI/internationalization research communities, organizations, and networks (e.g., ICLHE, ACA)

The concrete outputs of this project, scale alignment and EMI Handbook, were disseminated to EMI lecturers (T1) and teacher trainers (T2) at all partner HEIs through the EMI Workshops as well as through the output availability at each partner's university website. At international level, materials were disseminated to teacher trainers also through presentations at the multiplier event (the conference) as well as through the websites.

University management (T3) (department heads, deans) attended some of the transnational meetings at partner universities in order to learn about TAEC's outputs. The results from the standard-setting event were presented at management meetings to inform policy-making at partner universities. At international level, some teacher trainers from other universities who attended the multiplier event requested the access to the outputs so that they could present them to their university leaderships during local policy discussions.

At international level, the results from the comparative data analyses were presented (or are accepted) to researchers and practitioners (T4) at various conferences (TESOL 2019, 2021; AAAL 2020; AILA 2021; ICLHE 2017; 2019; DUN 2020; LTRC 2021; LAIC 2019; BAAHE 2019). As part of the project, the multiplier event on "EMI Practices in Europe" brought together EMI practitioners (trainers, management, lecturers) who benefited from the project results. A monograph proposal based is currently under review at Routledge. The book content is largely based on the resources included in the EMI database. An edited book that includes follow-up analyses of the EMI Corpus will be proposed to Springer.

Researchers and scholars in EMI and internationalization have the opportunity to use the TAEC Literature Database for thorough and systematic literature reviews given the multiple annotations and categorizations of the numerous database entries. Researchers can also use the TAEC Corpus, which contains transcripts of actual lectures, for transnational analyses of classroom communication in EMI settings. Scholars can find information about the database and the corpus and request access through each partner's university website and the Project Results Platform.

What kind of dissemination activities did your partnership carry out and through which channels? Please also provide information on the feedback received.

The following list gives an overview of the dissemination activities taking place in the TAEC project, see also appendix on Dissemination Activities on the Project Results Platform.

1) Announcements of the project (n=23)

Dissemination activities concerning the announcement of the project covers both internal newsletters, announcement to management, publishing of websites and request for announcements in various conference papers and newsletters.

2) Presentations of the project (n=50)

Dissemination activities concerning presentation of the project covers both local seminars, meetings with management and conference talks.

3) Poster presentations of the project (n=2)

4) Conference talks

Conference talks directly linked to the project (n=10)

Conference talks indirectly linked to the project (n=22).

5) Publications (n=16):

1. Cicillini, S. (in preparation). English language entry requirements in EMI degree programmes at bachelor level in Italy.

2. Drljača Margić, B. and Vodopija-Krstanović. Forthcoming. The benefits, challenges and prospects of EMI in Croatia: An integrated perspective. In Dimova and Kling (eds.), Integrating content and language in multilingual universities. Berlin: Springer.

3. Kling, J. (2019) English as a medium of instruction. The International Research Foundation (TIRF) Language Education in Review Series (LEiR).

4. Drljača Margić, B., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. (2019). (Micro)teaching through the medium of English: University content teachers' practice and learning. In Brala-Vukanović, M., & Memišević, A. (Eds.), Language and its effects (pp.

29-41). Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

5. Molino, A. (2019). Lexical bundles in EMI lectures: An exploratory study. To be submitted to *Textus. English Studies in Italy*. Bernardini, S. and Mair, C. (eds), "Investigating Englishes with corpora: variation, contact, translation".
6. Drljača Margić, B. (2018). Prebacivanje jezičnih kodova u visokoškolskoj nastavi: stavovi i iskustva sveučilišnih nastavnika [Translanguaging in higher education: University teachers' attitudes and experiences]. In Stolac, D. (Ed.), *Zbornik u čast Mariji Turk [Studies in honour of Marija Turk]*, 73-87. Rijeka: Biblioteka časopisa *Fluminensia*.
7. Drljača Margić, B., & Tulić, I. (2018). Teaching staff's critical perspectives on English-medium instruction: The case of a Croatian higher education context. In Brala-Vukanović, M., & Memišević, A. (Eds.), *Language in research and teaching*, 73-84. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
8. Drljača Margić, B., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. (2018). Language development for English-medium instruction: Teachers' perceptions, reflections and learning. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 35. 31-41.
9. Henriksen, B., Holmen, A., & Kling, J. (2018). *English medium instruction in multilingual multicultural universities*. Oxfordshire: Routledge.
10. Molino, A. (2018). "What I'm speaking is almost English": A corpus-assisted study of metadiscourse in English-medium lectures at an Italian university. *Education Sciences: Theory & Practice*.
11. Campagna, S. (2017). English-mediated instruction in Italian universities: A cuckoo nest scenario?. In Boggio, C., & Molino, A. (Eds.), *English in Italy: Linguistic, educational and professional challenges* (pp. 143-159). Milano: FrancoAngeli.
12. Dimova, S. (2017). Life after oral English certification: The consequences of the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff for EMI lecturers. *English for Specific Purposes*, 46(C), 45-58.
13. Drljača Margić, B., & Vodopija-Krstanović, I. (2017). *Uncovering English-medium instruction: Glocal issues in higher education*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
14. Kling, J. (2017). English medium instruction and the international classroom. In Snow, A. M., & Brinton, D. M. (Eds.), *The content-based classroom: Perspectives on integrating language* (pp. 216-227). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
15. Larsen, S., & Holmen, A. (2017). Towards more languages for more students at the University of Copenhagen: The interplay between local and global drivers of change. *CASALC Review*, 2, 132-144.
16. Molino, A. (2017). Repetition and rephrasing in physical sciences and engineering English-medium lectures in Italy. In Boggio, C., & Molino, A. (Eds.), *English in Italy: Linguistic, educational and professional challenges* (pp. 182-202). Milano, Italy: FrancoAngeli.

In addition to this, 3 texts for the general audience has been published and dissemination of TAEC has been published on ResearchGate, Twitter and LinkedIn pages.

In general the feedback on the dissemination activities has been positive. After the multiplier event and the conference presentations, we have received a number of inquires regarding the materials produced as part of the project outputs. For instance, the University of Amsterdam and the Radboud University, Nijmegen requested the EMI handbook to be used at workshops for EMI teachers even before the final version was produced.

Erasmus+ promotes an open access requirement for all materials produced through its projects. In case your project has produced intellectual outputs/tangible deliverables, please describe if and how you have promoted free access to them by the public. In case a limitation was imposed for the use of the open licence, please specify the reasons, extent and nature of this limitation.

All outputs produced during the project are freely available to public through the partners website and the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform. The TAEC alignment report, the EMI Handbook, the TAEC Corpus Report, and the TAEC Database Report can be downloaded from each partner's project website. Information about the TAEC Literature Database and the TAEC Corpus is also available on the website, those who are interested in obtaining a copy of the database will be able to download it from the partners' project website. By contrast, the corpus will be available upon request to the project partners.

The participants of the multiplier event were informed about the availability of the intellectual outputs. Public is informed about the availability of the outputs at conference presentations and professional meetings and networking.

6.3. Sustainability

What are the activities and results that will be maintained after the end of the EU funding, and how will you ensure the resources needed to sustain them?

1. Develop a strategy for transferability to other HEIs. All activities related to the project were designed based on the transferability premise. In fact, the main goal of the project is understanding the common EMI factors and understand how they can be used to establish competence and skill transferability across different HEI contexts. Therefore, we managed to extend the uses of the materials and outputs beyond the five partners, which we hope will lead to even further expanded uses.

UCPH has already started using the TAEC assessment alignment to report the scores from the Test of Oral English Proficiency for Academic Staff (TOEPAS). The transferability of the outputs has also been visible through their adoption at other institutions e.g. the course “Teaching Content and Language Integrated and Online”, at Unisinos, Porto Alegre, Brazil, as mentioned under 6.1. Impact. Material developed in the TAEC project will be utilized to help Unisinos professors and teachers to have a better understanding of CLIL and additional online methodologies that enable them to offer successful online courses in EMI or language center courses.

Finally, UM and FHSS will start negotiations with their partners from the Young Universities for the Future Alliance (YUFE) for implementing the EMI workshops and the EMI Handbook.

2. Ensure that stakeholders are aware of the project and the project results. This was achieved by having representatives of some stakeholder groups on the team right from the beginning of the project. They communicated with their groups through briefing reports regarding progress and preliminary results.

Several partners (UM, UniTo, FHSS) have started negotiations with their university managements to offer the EMI workshops on annual basis. The International relations office FPN at UM will use the EMI workshops to create a TAEC best practices booklet for FPN. At UniTo, negotiations were conducted with the Vice Rector for International Didactics to deliver the EMI workshops in the academic year 2020-2021 for a larger audience. Three workshops, each aimed at 10 lecturers, were proposed to be held in October 2020, January 2021, May 2021. The workshops' content will be similar to the TAEC EMI workshops: one focusing on Language, one on Pedagogy, and one on Intercultural Communication. The TAEC Handbook will be used as a reference book. The formal approval of the proposal is expected in the near future. The Covid-19 emergency may slightly alter the plans, but the experience with the online version of the workshop at UM is useful and may be implemented if necessary.

3. Ensure long-term availability and accessibility of materials. Access to the reports, the database, the corpus, and the handbook are available on partner HEI websites. Since some of the project team members are also EMI teacher trainers, they ensure that the handbook is used in their programs. Each partner has responsibility to maintain their local website, which allows for continuous resource availability from multiple access points.

4. Maintain continued conference and network presentations based on project results. The EMI framework has been promoted at conferences and networks so that researchers working with EMI can refer to it when designing their own studies. A number of conference presentations were accepted and will be given in 2021. More conference presentations are expected in the following years, given the partners' plan to use the transnational TAEC corpus for further research.

5. Design new research and analyses based on the EMI framework. The researchers involved in TAEC will use the database and the corpus as the basis to conduct further research studies in the field in order to capture the permutations of factors affecting EMI implementation, maintenance, and success. The TAEC Literature Database and the TAEC Corpus are valuable resources for research after the project ending. A monograph that is largely based on the resources included in the EMI database is currently under review at Routledge, and an edited book that includes follow-up analyses of the EMI Corpus will be proposed to Springer.

Given the usefulness of the literature database and the corpus for future research, project partners will apply for funding to develop an internet interface for the database and the corpus. The internet interface could also be used to update the database and the corpus by adding new entries and transcripts from the five partner countries but also to expand them to other countries in Europe and beyond.

6. Take policy-related and training actions using the project results. TAEC involved experts in language policy in academia so that in all the activities, the project can address current issues with the development and implementation multilingual language policies at HEIs. These experts led the actions that need to be undertaken so that the project results are meaningful for stakeholders involved in language planning and policy.



7. Budget

this section gives a detailed overview of the final amount of the EU grant you request;

7.1. Budget Summary

PIC of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Project Management and Implementation	Transnational Project Meetings	Intellectual Outputs	Multiplier Events	Learning/Teaching/Training Activities				Special Needs Support	Exceptional Costs	Exceptional Cost Guarantee	Total (Calculated)
							Total EU Travel Grant	EU Individual Support	Linguistic Support Grant	Exceptional Costs (Overseas Countries and Territories Travel Costs)				
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	14,000.00	12,075.00	48,923.00	0.00	0.00	2,100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	77,098.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	7,000.00	7,475.00	12,728.00	12,500.00	0.00	3,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	43,003.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	7,000.00	10,350.00	37,949.00	0.00	0.00	3,300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	58,599.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	7,000.00	9,200.00	79,822.00	0.00	0.00	1,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	97,822.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	7,000.00	9,200.00	55,912.00	0.00	0.00	300.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	72,412.00
Total			42,000.00	48,300.00	235,334.00	12,500.00	0.00	10,800.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	348,934.00

7.1.1. Project Total Amount

Project Total Amount Reported (Calculated)	348,934.00
--	------------

Please provide any further comments you may have concerning the above figure.

The total balance of the TAEC project at the end of the project period amounts to EUR 348,934, corresponding to a 0.48% excess of the project budget of EUR 347,269. The remaining EUR 1,665 will be covered by the coordinator UCPH as co-funding.

When planning the project, the partners agreed to divide the project management budget among all partners, as this funding would be used to cover administrative tasks, communication, project management and time spent for travelling to project meetings etc. which could not be covered by any other budget posts but which at the same time is an essential part of any successful project implementation. This budget post has been fixed.

The rest of the budget posts were distributed among the partners based on the original application and listed in each Partnership Agreement but at the same time it was stressed that transfer among the budget posts and partners could be agreed upon when needed.

During the project period a number of transfers and corrections to the original budget has been agreed upon among the partners. The changes and adjustments have been agreed upon at meetings in the Executive Committee or by mail correspondence based on input and calculations from the coordinator.

Transnational meetings:

The partners from UniTo had originally planned with five project participants but due to illness this was reduced to four project participants at the first couple of transnational meetings. Later however, a new project member from UniTo joined the team.

At the same time, the Project Manager from the coordinator participated in more meetings than originally planned in order to be able to discuss administrative guidelines e.g. at the second transnational meeting in Turin (TM2) and project budget adjustments at the meeting in Lleida (TM6).

In agreement among the partners UM and UdL invited more project participants to assist with the activities connected to IO1 and IO2, thus leading to a need for more project participants to participate in meetings.

Furthermore, a final extraordinary transnational meeting took place in January 2020, funded by IO-budget from UdL.

Finally, the partners agreed to invite project partners to the Panel Judge IO2-event in Copenhagen in October 2018.

In this way the budget for transnational meetings went from originally planned EUR 40.825 to EUR 48.300.

Intellectual Outputs:

During the project the partners have agreed to transfer IO-days both among the three IOs and among the partners.

This has been due to the fact that UdL and UM had the possibility to bring in more project members whereas UniTo and FHSS had to adjust their number of project members due to illness, retirement and job transfer.

When introducing new project members to the team, an emphasis has been laid on experience with teaching and research within EMI.

Furthermore, it was agreed upon among the partners that FHSS should be part of the IO2 - which was not planned as part of the original application.

Finally, UdL had the possibility to transfer 55 days from their IO-budget to the common budget for transnational meeting in order for all partners to participate in a final extraordinary project meeting in Brussels in January 2020 (TM8).

Multiplier Event:

The original budget for the Multiplier Event was based on participation from 20 local participants (EUR 100) and 50 international participants (EUR 200).

In total 86 participated in the conference. Out of which 60 participants came from international and 5 from Danish universities or HEIs not part of the TAEC project group (consisting of 21 persons).

The budget has thus been exceeded with EUR 500. The partners were very pleased with the high a number of international participants.

As most of the partners participated in the TAEC conference in April, a post-conference transnational meeting was arranged but with no coverage of the travel costs etc. as the partners could not obtain funding of their own participation in the TAEC conference.

7.2. Project management and implementation

PIC of the Organisation	Role of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Total
999991043	Beneficiary	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	14,000.00
999838559	Partner	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	7,000.00
998542057	Partner	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	7,000.00

999975911	Partner	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	7,000.00
999861936	Partner	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	7,000.00
			Total	42,000.00

7.3. Transnational Project Meetings

PIC of the Sending Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Total No. of Meetings	Total Number of Participants in All Meetings	Distance Band	Grant per participant	Total (Calculated)
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	1	100 - 1999 km	0.00	0.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	4	0 - 99 km	0.00	0.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	4	100 - 1999 km	0.00	0.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00

999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	5	0 - 99 km	0.00	0.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	1	100 - 1999 km	575.00	575.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	0.00	0.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	3	0 - 99 km	0.00	0.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	3	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,725.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	2	100 - 1999 km	575.00	1,150.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	1	4	100 - 1999 km	575.00	2,300.00
						Total	48,300.00

7.4. Intellectual Outputs

PIC of the Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Output Identification	Category of Staff	No. Of Working Days	Grant per Day	Total (Calculated)
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	O1	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	278	214.00	59,492.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	O1	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	190	137.00	26,030.00

				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	O1	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	163	241.00	39,283.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	O3	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	112	74.00	8,288.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	O3	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	54	137.00	7,398.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	O3	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	57	241.00	13,737.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	O3	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	37	241.00	8,917.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	O2	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	33	137.00	4,521.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	O1	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	52	74.00	3,848.00

				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	O2	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	20	241.00	4,820.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	O2	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	8	74.00	592.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	O1	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	146	241.00	35,186.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	O2	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	3	214.00	642.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	O2	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	12	241.00	2,892.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	O3	Managers	0	0.00	0.00
				Teachers/Trainers/Researchers/Youth Workers	92	214.00	19,688.00
				Technicians	0	0.00	0.00
				Administrative support staff	0	0.00	0.00
				Total	1257		235,334.00

7.5. Multiplier Events

PIC of the Organisation Organising the Event	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Event Identification	Country of Venue	No. of Local Participants	Grant per Local Participant	No. of Foreign Participants	Grant per Foreign Participant	Total Amount (Calculated)
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	E1	Denmark	0	100.00	0	200.00	0.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	E1	Denmark	5	100.00	60	200.00	12,500.00
Total					5		60		12,500.00

7.6. Learning/Teaching/Training Activities
7.6.1. Travel

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.6.2. Individual Support
7.6.2.1. Short-term Learning/Teaching/Training Activities

PIC of the Sending Organisation	Name of the Organisation	Country of the Organisation	Activity No.	Activity Type	Participants (Without Accompanying Persons)			Accompanying Persons			Total (Calculated)
					Funded Duration (days)	No. of Participants (without accompanying persons)	Grant per participant	Funded Duration (days)	No. Of Accompanying Persons	Grant per Accompanying Person	
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	C1	Short-term joint staff training events	3	1	300.00	0	0	0.00	300.00
998542057	SVEUCILISTE U RIJECI, FILOZOFSKI FAKULTET U RIJECI	Croatia	C3	Short-term joint staff training events	3	10	300.00	0	0	0.00	3,000.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	C1	Short-term joint staff training events	3	1	300.00	0	0	0.00	300.00
999838559	UNIVERSIDAD DE LLEIDA	Spain	C4	Short-term joint staff training events	3	10	300.00	0	0	0.00	3,000.00

999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	C1	Short-term joint staff training events	3	1	300.00	0	0	0.00	300.00
999861936	UNIVERSITA DEGLI STUDI DI TORINO	Italy	C2	Short-term joint staff training events	3	5	300.00	0	0	0.00	1,500.00
999975911	UNIVERSITEIT MAASTRICHT	Netherlands	C1	Short-term joint staff training events	3	1	300.00	0	0	0.00	300.00
999991043	KOBENHAVNS UNIVERSITET	Denmark	C1	Short-term joint staff training events	3	7	300.00	0	0	0.00	2,100.00
Total					24	36	Total	0	0	Total	10,800.00

7.6.2.2. Long-term Learning/Teaching/Training Activities

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.6.3. Linguistic Support

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.6.4. Exceptional Costs (Overseas Countries and Territories Travel Costs)

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.7. Special Needs Support

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.8. Exceptional Costs

This section doesn't apply for this project

7.9. Exceptional costs - Guarantee

This section doesn't apply for this project

8. Annexes

additional documents that are mandatory for the completion of the report;

Please note that all documents mentioned below need to be attached here before you submit your form online. Before submitting your report to the National Agency, please check that:

- All necessary information on your project have been encoded in Mobility Tool+
- The report form has been completed using one of the mandatory languages specified in the Grant Agreement.
- All the relevant documents are annexed:
- declaration of Honour, signed by the legal representative of the beneficiary organisation.
- the necessary supporting documents as requested in the grant agreement.
- you saved or printed a copy of the completed form for your records.
- you have uploaded the relevant results on the Erasmus+ Project Results Platform:

List of uploaded files

- TAECE appendix_Erasmus+ TAECE conference April 2019.pdf
1.58 Mb
5 hours ago
- TAECE_Dissemination activities_April 2020.pdf
0.57 Mb
5 hours ago
- 2017-1-DK01-KA203-034286-DeclarationOfHonour-10062020085819_.pdf DOH
0.25 Mb
5 days ago
- TAECE RESEARCH PARTICIPANT CONSENT FORM.pdf
0.13 Mb
18 hours ago
- Pedagogy and Language Workshop Agenda.pdf
0.14 Mb
18 hours ago
- Pre-meeting material CEFR_final.pdf
0.59 Mb
18 hours ago
- MONITORING THE PROGRESS OF THE PROJECT.docx
0.03 Mb
18 hours ago
- INDIVIDUAL MONTHLY PROJECT PROGRESS REPORT.docx
0.01 Mb
18 hours ago
- 2018_10_18_O1_post_observation_interview.pdf
0.15 Mb
18 hours ago
- 2018_10_18_O1_corpus_metadata.docx
0.13 Mb
18 hours ago