

Pioneering student mobility in Central Asia: The TuCAHEA Pilot scheme

Report



Towards a Central Asian Higher Education Area



Co-funded by the
Tempus Programme
of the European Union





TuCAHEA
Tuning Central Asia
Towards a Central Asian Higher Education Area

Report

I

TuCAHEA is a large-scale Tempus “Structural Measures” project in which European and Central Asian partners cooperate to build the foundations for a Central Asian Higher Education Area. The partners use Tuning methodology to create tools for quality, transparency and visibility in a competence-based student-centred context. The partnership includes 47 partners, of which 5 are the Ministries responsible for Higher Education in Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan; 34 are Universities of those 5 countries; and eight are European Universities with long-standing expertise in Tuning and ECTS. The grant-holder is the University of Groningen; the scientific coordination is by the University of Pisa

The Consortium

European Union

Rijksuniversiteit Groningen
Università di Pisa
Universiteit Gent
Universidad de Deusto, Bilbao
Linköpings Universitet
Univerza v Ljubljani, Ljubljana
Università degli studi di Milano
Uppsala Universitet

Kazakhstan

Ministry of Education and Science, Astana
Academician Y.A.Buketov Karaganda State University, Karaganda
International Information Technology University, Almaty
New Economic University named after Turar Ryskulov, Almaty
Kazakh Leading Academy of Architecture and Civil Engineering, Almaty
Korkyt Ata Kyzylorda State University, Kyzylorda
M.Auezov South Kazakhstan State University, Shymkent

Kyrgyzstan

Ministry of Education and Science, Bishkek
Association of Educational Establishments “Education Network”, Bishkek
Bishkek Academy of Finance and Economics, Bishkek
I. Arabaev Kyrgyz State University, Bishkek
International University of Kyrgyzstan, Bishkek
Issykkul State University named after K.Tynystanov, Karakol
Jalal-Abad State University, Jalal-Abad
Kyrgyzstan-Turkey Manas University, Bishkek
Kyrgyz National Agrarian University named after K.I. Skryabin, Bishkek
Kyrgyz National University named after Zh. Balasagyn, Bishkek
Naryn State University, Naryn
Talas State University, Talas

Tajikistan

Ministry of Education and Science, Dushanbe
Avicenna Tajik State Medical University, Dushanbe
Kulob State University by name Abuabdullohi Rudaki, Kulob
Tajik Agrarian University named after Shirinsho Shotemur, Dushanbe
Tajik State University of Commerce, Dushanbe
Tajik Technical University named after academician M.S. Osimi, Dushanbe
The Branch of Lomonosov Moscow State University in Dushanbe, Branch of LMSU in Dushanbe

Turkmenistan

The Ministry of Education, Ashgabat
Turkmen State Institute of Culture, Ashgabat
Turkmen State Institute of Economics and Management, Ashgabat
Turkmenistan National Institute of Education, Ashgabat

Uzbekistan

Ministry of Higher and Secondary-Specialized Education, Tashkent
Andijan State University, Andijan
Karakalpak State University, Nukus
Namangan State University, Namangan
Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand
Tashkent State Pedagogical University, Tashkent
Tashkent Institute of Textile and Light Industry, Tashkent
Termez State University, Termez
Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology, Namangan

Pioneering student mobility in Central Asia:
The TuCAHEA Pilot scheme

Report



Co-funded by the
Tempus Programme
of the European Union

This Report is published thanks to the support of the European Commission through its Directorate General Education and Culture, by the TuCAHEA Consortium, operating as a Tempus Structural Measures Project, Project 530786-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-NL-TEMPUS-SMHES (Grant Agreement: 2012-3025).
The Report is solely the responsibility of the Consortium; the European Commission cannot be held responsible for it or for any use made of it.

ISBN 978-88-95613-29-1

© TuCAHEA 2016 (www.tucahea.org)

The materials published as part of the TuCAHEA project are the property of the TuCAHEA Consortium. They are freely available for study and use, provided that the source is clearly acknowledged.

Published by DEDIZIONI

Dedizioni is the publishing trademark of Dedalo
via Cardinal Maffi 36
56126 Pisa - Italy
info@dedalopisa.it

Production and linguistic editing:
Katherine Isaacs, Ahadhon Najmitdinov, Aimen Tasbolat

Contents

Summary, page VI

Introduction, page 1

Timeline, page 1

The Tools, page 1

- Course descriptions/catalogues, page 1

- Learning Agreements, page 2

- Questionnaires, page 2

The Procedures, page 2

- The Call, page 2

- Publicizing the Call, p. 3

- Declaration of Interest, page 4

- Full Application using Learning Agreement, page 4

- Selection procedure, page 5

- Visas and permissions, page 8

During mobility, page 8

- Travel, page 8

- Arrival, page 8

- Support and counselling, p. 9

- Study, p. 10

- Socializing, p. 11

- Language and cultural issues, p. 12

After mobility, p. 12

- Recognition, p. 12

- Dissemination /Valorisation, p. 12

The Obstacles, p. 13

- Lack of permission from authorities, p. 13

- Lack of interest (or time) on the part of students, p. 13

- Money transfer, p. 13

- Management complexity, p. 14

Overall evaluation, p. 14

- Students' opinions, p. 14

- Mobility and the CAHEA, p. 15

Conclusions, p. 15

Recommendations, p. 16

Annexes:

- A.1 Course Catalogue contents, p. 17

- A.2 Example of Course description, p. 19

- B.1 Guidelines for using the Learning Agreement, p. 20

- B.2 Learning Agreement format, p. 22

- C.1 Questionnaire for Students

- C.2 Questionnaire for the Home University Coordinators

- C.3 Questionnaire for the Host University Coordinators

- D.1 The Call

- D.2 The Declaration of Interest

Summary

The TuCAHEA Consortium (www.tucahea.org), operating in the Tempus framework to contribute to the creation of a Central Asian Higher Education Area, in the final year of its activities organised a pioneering Pilot Student Mobility Scheme. The mobility aimed at testing the competence-based tools for quality, transparency and mobility produced during the preceding years, and was also built on the premise that a Higher Education Area, as it develops its cohesion and identity, would naturally want to foster intra-regional mobility.

The Report describes the phases of the mobility scheme. It uses the responses to 57 questionnaires (19 each from students, coordinators of the home (sending) and the host (receiving) universities to show how the mobility was organised, what problems emerged and how they were solved, and gives an overall positive evaluation of the experiment.

It also provides examples of the tools used for the mobility. These can be used as models for inter-regional mobility in any part of the world, and are compatible with Erasmus plus and ECTS mobility tools.

The Report concludes with a series of recommendations for future mobility schemes.

Introduction

The present report is intended to chart how the TuCAHEA Pilot Scheme was organised and what the results were. It illustrates how the TuCAHEA consortium created the tools and the framework in which the mobility could take place. It analyses the reactions, evaluations and suggestions of the participants (students, coordinators of the sending (“Home”) universities and of the receiving universities (“Host”). The aim is to tell about a novel and important experience, and to provide information and food for reflection for the members of the consortium, and for all other interested parties. It is our hope that our Pilot mobility scheme will prove to be a model on which future larger mobility programmes can be built.

The Timeline

Date	Activity
October 2012	Beginning of the TuCAHEA project
On-going	Elaboration of Guidelines and Reference Points for 8 Subject Areas Development of mobility tools Work on Central Asian Credit Reference System
April 2014	Final decision to implement the pilot scheme
June 2014	Publication of the Call
End of September 2014	Deadline for Declarations of Interest
End of October 2014	Deadline for full Applications (3 students)
Mid November 2014	Initial selection and matching with host HEI
Mid December 2014	Final selection of students and host HEI
January/February 2014	Finalisation of Learning Agreement
End February 2015	Transfer of first half of grant
Beginning March 2015*	Departure of students
Beginning April	Students present report on activities to host coordinator for approval
Beginning April	Transfer of remainder of grant
End April	Return to home universities
May	Recognition
May – June	Evaluation of mobility
May to present	Dissemination of information about mobility

- Most students departed on or around 1 March and returned on or around 30 April 2015. Some, for various reasons, departed and returned a little later.

The Tools

Course descriptions/catalogues

One of the essential premises for successful mobility and recognition are course catalogues, or analogous detailed information packages in an agreed format. The course catalogue or information package ideally covers the entire offer of an Higher Education Institution as well as giving information useful to the incoming student on the living conditions and the services offered. In the case of the TuCAHEA Pilot mobility scheme, the participating universities could build on their experience in ‘Tuning’ eight subject areas at a Central Asian level, defining the competences to be fostered at the various higher education levels. This work formed the background on which the catalogues for pilot mobility could be developed.

In the context of the Pilot project, it was decided that each HEI would create such an information package, using a model based on the ECTS Course Catalogue, for the main Subject Area to which it was contributing in the TuCAHEA project. Some were involved in more than one, but to make it possible for the Universities to illustrate their offer in this new format, each was asked to prepare a catalogue of at least one TuCAHEA

Subject Area. Once the final selection of incoming students was made, the receiving universities were asked to make more detailed descriptions of the relevant part of their offer, to facilitate the choice of educational components by the incoming student or students.
(see **Annex A.1** for the Course Catalogue format)

Learning Agreements

Using as a reference ECTS Learning Agreements, we created a simplified format suitable to TuCAHEA, which includes the Tables A to F of the currently used European versions. We also published and discussed the ECHE principles established for European mobility, proposing them as a useful reference model for TuCAHEA, and a necessity for those HEIs that aspire to become partners in Erasmus plus international mobility.

The Learning agreement was provided in an English and a Russian version, with detailed instructions and examples of how to use it.

(see **Annex B.2** for the TuCAHEA Learning Agreement in the English versions)

Questionnaires

Since ours was a Pilot scheme, it was extremely important to receive feedback on all phases of its execution. For this reason we prepared quite elaborate questionnaires for the three main actors: students, home and host university coordinators. These were not identical, because the three typologies of respondents were involved in different ways in the various phases of the mobility. Nonetheless, the questionnaires were made as similar as possible, and all followed the same general scheme (before, during and after the mobility) and wherever appropriate the same questions were asked, in order to make possible a comparison of the answers. The questionnaires were all offered in an English and a Russian version, to facilitate the respondents.

The resulting answers (19 questionnaires from each group of respondents, 57 in all) were grouped in three macro questionnaires and form the basis for much of this report. The responses are available to the TuCAHEA partners and on request, to other interested parties, in anonymous form. The questionnaires also provided the basis for gathering information from the 8 Uzbek partners (who were not, in the end, permitted to carry out the mobility) about the selection process and the preparatory arrangements made for incoming and outgoing students

(see **Annexes C.1, C.2, C.3** for the English versions of the three questionnaires)

The Procedures

The Call

The TuCAHEA Core Group (the coordinating committee of the TuCAHEA Consortium, comprising the European partners, the representatives of the five Ministries of Education and the Country Coordinator of each partner country) finally decided in April 2014 that the time was right to implement the student mobility scheme. The tools had been elaborated and a framework for credit recognition seemed possible. In order for the mobility to take place in the second semester of the 2014-2015 academic year, we decided that it was urgent to publish the Call, and arrange the phases of the selection so as to have a clear picture, at the latest, in time for our planned Plenary meeting in November 2014.

The intervening summer months were a concern, because of Universities being closed and students not available. For this reason, and also to facilitate the selection process, we prepared a Call, in English and in Russian, which provided for several phases: presentation of a Declaration of Interest, selection of three candidates from each partner HEI who would be asked to prepare a full application including a Learning Agreement and final selection and matching of the candidates with the host universities to be carried out by the entire Consortium in November.

Further preparation of the tools including the Course catalogues and the signature of a Communiqué by the representatives of the Ministries involved took place in June 2014, during a two week study visit to Europe.

In the event, the Call was finally published on the www.tucahea.org website on 2 July, and all partners were asked to publicize it as widely as possible.

(See **Annex D.1** for the text of the call)

Publicizing the Call

We asked the TuCAHEA partner universities to publicize the Call in all ways possible, with a view not only to gathering numerous candidates for the pilot mobility, but also to making better known to students and staff alike various aspects of the project, the tools and criteria developed and the aim of building a Central Asian Higher Education Area.

In our ex post evaluation questionnaires, we asked all parties to reply in some detail about how the Pilot Student Mobility Call had been publicised. For the home coordinators we asked: “Did you place it on your University’s website? Did you meet with students or staff to present it?”; then “If you used other methods, what were they?”. Almost all universities stated they had placed the Call on their website, several had put it on the Facebook page, another on Classmates and Diesel as well; almost all had held meetings with the students either in particular departments or faculties, or in general. Several mention sending an announcement by email. One university stated that it does not use its website much, another that the website is being restructured, so other means were found: posters, announcements on bulletin boards, and announcements by the international office. One University put the announcements in the elevators. Another stated that the students do not look often at the University website, and they hoped to change this in the future, because it would be much the easiest way of contacting them. One university said that “three times per week it was announced by the microphone and two weeks broadcasted by university radio”; another that phone calls were made to alert the Deans and Heads of Departments. One university produced a booklet about the mobility scheme.

We also asked whether the method had been effective and how it could be improved in the future. All thought their method had been good and saw little to improve; many suggested that in the future they would be able to have the returnee students tell about their experience in student assemblies.

The students who were finally selected, confirm the amplitude of the efforts made to publicise the scheme.

We asked them too several questions: “How did you find out about the TuCAHEA Pilot Student Mobility Call? Did you see it on your University’s website? Did a staff member present it?”, whether the methods used had been effective, and how they would suggest improving them in the future. The responses confirm that information converged from many directions: websites, Facebook, posters, presentations, and special meetings.

How did you find out?

“By viewing the university’s website”... “на презентации программ по мобильности в моем университете”... “The coordinator told about the pilot program of academic mobility of students at the meeting with students, undergraduates and postgraduates”... “There was a paper advertisement on the wall-stands of different departments of Academy”... “отыскал полную информацию на сайте нашего университета и написал анкету заинтересованности”... “a presentation about the program Bulletin board of the international department”... “during the undergraduate elective hour” ...“presentation of the program Coordinator”... from our University information board. Moreover, staff member presented to all groups separately”... “At first I saw the information about TuCAHEA Pilot Student on our University’s announcement board then the staff member announced us about this program then presented and gave information how to apply”.

The students were satisfied with what had been done (not surprisingly, since by definition, they had learned in time about the scheme and participated in it). As regards possible improvements, they gave imaginative and thoughtful advice, and many saw an important role for recounting their own experience.

The students reflect on how to publicise a future mobility scheme:

“I think that at the initial stage, when the project is in its infancy, in my opinion, presentation and form of dissemination of information about the project, as well as booklets, pamphlets, videos about the program

will be ample measures to disseminate information about the program (this is enough at the initial stage). Then, when it begins to operate, it will be possible to hold a competition among the participants of the program, which have already been trained on it. For example, a competition for the best presentation of his trip, best video, a video review, and so on"... "A detailed story and video about mobility programs in the form of lectures with the representative of the project for a large number of students, undergraduates and postgraduates"...." I would have opened access to an ad in the newspaper of the University or in the page of each faculty at the university website" ... " I would know how to develop such mobility as a skilled student, having already taken part in such an experiment before" ... " The best way will be make the presentation and place on website of university, because students who were absent in presentation can get information in detail there".

Overall, it seems that all the Universities elaborated effective means of publicizing what they considered an important opportunity for their students. The main suggestion for future improvement is to utilise those students who have already experienced the mobility to act as ambassadors. It also seems clear, comparing answers of universities and students, that it is important to use a variety of means to inform the students. Once they become aware of the opportunity, they can find sources of information. The first step however may be social networks, personal contacts, posters, the university website, presentations by staff and so forth.

Declaration of Interest

The first path we offered to interested students was the Declaration of Interest, which according to the Call, was to be presented by the end of August 2014. Eventually we set a later deadline because many students had not returned to university in time to find out about the mobility scheme and fill out the Declaration. The Declaration was intended to be simple in form, easy to fill out, and sufficient for the TuCAHEA coordinator of each Central Asian university to make a first selection, before subjecting the candidates to the burden of preparing a full Learning Agreement.

In practice, not all HEIs used the Declaration: in the students' questionnaires we read that 11, or more than half, of the students who eventually were selected presented the "Declaration". The others either did not answer (5), or else said that they had not presented it (3). Also in the Uzbek case, one university did not use the Declaration of Interest, but passed directly to the selection stage, whereas the other 7 did use it.

In general we think that the two stage application (Declaration followed by Full Application) is advisable and useful, as it gives the home university the possibility of identifying the potentially interested students without subjecting them to the disappointment and wasted effort of preparing a full application if they have no chance of success.

(see **Annex D.2** for the Declaration of Interest)

Full Application using Learning Agreement

Each Central Asian university in the TuCAHEA consortium was invited to select the three most promising students among those who presented a Declaration of Interest, and to work with them to prepare a Learning Agreement. We also asked that the students indicate the three partner universities to which they would like to go, in order of preference. We asked them to be sure that the host HEIs they chose offered appropriate courses. The students chosen were to be of one of the eight Subject Areas for which TuCAHEA has developed competence-based Guidelines and learning outcomes.

The Learning Agreement form was furnished in English and Russian, with examples. It follows closely the most recent ECTS Learning Agreement and includes all phases of the mobility: the initial plan for study, the recognition plan, agreed modifications, the Transcript of Records and proof of recognition. The Learning Agreement had to be signed by the three relevant parties (home and host universities, and the student). The data were included in the usual ECTS format: Tables A to F.

All the students who eventually were selected and participated in the mobility used such a Learning Agreement, properly filled out and signed. We were able to ensure that this was the case by the simple expedient of not sending the first half of the student grant until we had received the completed signed Learning Agreement.

As might be expected, completing the Learning Agreements was not a simple task for anyone. Since this was the first short-term mobility to be carried out in Central Asia and, as far as we know, the first credit mobility of any kind to be carried out within the region, the universities had to come up with ad hoc rules of thumb to define what half a semester might look like in the host university, and how to recognise the work done at the student's return. At the beginning, some coordinators simply copied the examples that had been sent to them, rather than helping the students to work out a concrete plan for study at the host university and recognition at home. The European coordinating team insisted on seeing the Learning Agreements before mobility started, in order to ensure that the students had a concrete viable study plan.

In our questionnaires we asked whether Learning Agreements had been used, and in what language. The results were that every mobility had been based on a properly signed Learning Agreement. 10 students declared that they had used the Russian version, 3 the English version and 5 had used both. One student, writing in Russian said that "Я использовала русский вариант, чтобы не совершать ошибок. [I used the Russian version, so as not to make mistakes]". Another, writing in fluent English, commented: "Both versions are suitable. But, of course, Russian version would be easier for us".

Selection procedure

The selection procedure in practice was a long and drawn out process, which went through a number of phases. As explained above, the TuCAHEA coordinator of each Central Asian partner university publicised the Call, in most cases gathered the Declarations of Interest, and proceeded to single out the 3 most promising mobility candidates. Sometimes the first three did not end up being the final three, for various reasons (for example, one became pregnant and had to be substituted).

Once the three short-listed candidates had been chosen, they – with the help of the coordinators – prepared the Full Application, consisting of the Learning Agreement as explained above. Each indicated three partner institutions where he or she wanted to go. We asked each home coordinator to place their candidates in an order of preference, from 1 to 3.

This phase of the selection process was completed in time for the Consortium's Fourth Plenary and Working meeting, held in Samarkand in November 2014, where matching and distribution of the candidates to the host universities was to take place. The coordinating group considered all the candidatures, and attempted to make a selection which would guarantee that students were appropriately distributed among the host universities, that there was gender balance, that all three cycles and all eight subject areas were represented. This proved to be not easy, and completely impossible if the first person on the list of each university was to be selected.

We asked all the home coordinators to confirm their lists on the spot, and an overall provisional distribution was presented to the Plenary. On this basis, some negotiation and retouching was done, and finally on 31 December we had a list of candidates matched with hosts that came as close as possible to respecting our priorities. We had overall gender balance (although not in each single countries), all cycles and all subject areas were represented, and we had at least one student going from each country to each partner country, with two exceptions. These were Uzbekistan, which thought it could send its students only to Kazakhstan (and in the event was able neither to send nor to receive students); and Turkmenistan, which, having only one institution able to send a mobile student, could only send him to one country.

The questionnaires the home coordinators responded to dwelt on numerous aspects of the selection process. We wanted to know how many students had used the Declaration of Interest, how many had shown interest in the mobility; how many had been selected to prepare the Learning Agreement, what criteria had been used and whether they had been published. We also asked whether the coordinator had

been subjected to pressure from colleagues, parents or others. To this last question, all except one replied “No”, with some degree of surprise (“No, absolutely”, “No, of course not”). The one that answered with a simple “Yes” perhaps did so because its selection procedure was based on the opinions of its Deans.

To the remaining questions, the responses differed substantially, but overall paint a fairly positive picture. The number of students showing interest initially varied from 3 to ‘about 100’ with the majority of coordinators indicating numbers from 7 to 20. Obviously something of an informal pre-selection occurred at this point. One coordinator wrote: “About 15 students initially showed their interest, but some of them do not know Russian, some of them had low academic records, some of them did not know how to communicate by e-mail (do not have e-mail accounts, do not know how to download the attached documents and do not know how to attach documents etc.), some of them just did not fill out the forms we requested, without any explanation”. Of those originally interested, the students who filled out the Declaration varied in number: again from 3 to 100 (The coordinator who received 100 declarations understandably comments: “More than 100, but it was inconvenient because at the end it was necessary to select only 3”). In the case of Uzbekistan, most institutions indicated that about 30 students declared their interest.

As to the method of selection of the final 3 candidates, the home university coordinators mention similar clusters of criteria: “academic records and the leadership skills” ... “GPA, university activities, and personal skills - a team-worker, responsibility, reliability, intercultural communication skills etc.” ... “motivation and activity of the University life, GPA” ... “GPA, language skills, abilities” ... “interest in the pilot programme, English language level and their capability of leading independent life without parents” ... “recommendation of Deans” were all mentioned. In general, the criteria were a mixture of academic merit and personal qualities, language abilities and apparent suitability to go abroad.

Some universities set up quite elaborate selection procedures, others seem to have chosen more ‘intuitively’. For example at one university the selection was made in two stages by “1. Submission of the necessary documents by students (letter of motivation, letters of recommendation, a transcript with grades, Certificate of English, etc.); 2. Members of the Commission (head of programs, Head of the educational department, Head of International Department) selected 3 students with high academic performance, with a good level of English, active members of the student body and social life of the academy”. Another says more simply: “We chose students from different faculties who studied well.”

Most students presented their CVs and were also interviewed.

We asked whether the selection criteria had been published and whether they included reference to “equal opportunities for men and women, for students with disabilities, or members of disadvantaged groups”. Nine respondents told us that the criteria had been published; some indicated that they were ‘known’ (“Verbally reported in study groups of the domain”; “The information was available to everyone”), whereas 5 coordinators answered with a simple ‘No’. As to equal opportunities, everyone stated that there had been no discrimination, and in proof of this mentioned that the results had been an equal number of men and women, and in one case an orphan; however it does not seem that any kind of rule mentioning equal opportunity was published.

As it was as essential part of the general selection process, we also wanted to know about how the students had selected themselves, what questions the students asked, whether the coordinators had received the parents, and what issues were discussed. We also asked students why they had applied for the mobility.

The home coordinators said that the students had many questions about basic things: when the mobility would take place, how long it would last, who the partners were, how much the grant would be, whether the host would help find accommodation. Other more specific questions were about the study programmes, the grading systems, how the selection would be made, how studies would be recognised. One coordinator says that students want to know about “the purpose of the pilot mobility”.

Parents predictably asked about the grant, about recognition and were concerned about the safety of their children while abroad. It is clear that the home coordinators dedicated much time to the parents, to explanations and to reassuring them.

Did you meet with the parents? What did they want to discuss?

"We had individual talks with the students together with their parents who showed their interests. We have spent lots of time with both of them explaining the travel, study, living conditions and so on" "objectives of the program, training and living conditions of students, and the availability and terms of medical insurance"... "issues of safety, academic procedures in home university at the time when they are abroad. Also, conditions of accommodation, tutors of host institutions, money provisions and the length of the mobility" "accommodation"... "recognition of academic work" ... "safety of staying in another country and the living conditions and nutrition, financial issues, too"... "I contacted the student's parents and told them about this project and it has a good purpose and that they need not worry about safety".

We were very keen to know whether the procedure had been perceived as fair, transparent and also clear by the students themselves. We asked if they knew how many students had applied; how many had been selected; whether the selection criteria were clear, whether they were published, and whether they included reference to equal opportunities. We also asked whether they had known that of their universities three candidates, only one would be selected by the consortium to take part in the pilot mobility. In general, their responses show that in most cases – in their perception – selection was transparent and open, although it is to be remembered that the respondents by definition were those selected, who may have had a particularly rosy view of the process.

We also asked the students what doubts and questions they had had, and these turned out to be about finances, about the political situation in the host country, but in general students were very confident: "At first, I had many questions about this project and when my coordinators of my home university explained all about this project, I took full information about it. I had no doubts about this mobility, because I know that my coordinators are responsible persons."

We inquired about why the students had originally decided to apply. Their answers were similar to those of mobility candidates in any country or world region, and went from the career aware to the adventurous to the existential. All the students took the time to elaborate on what had made them decide to apply.

Why did you apply for the Pilot mobility?

"I thought that this program could be helpful for my future career. It was thrilling for me to go to another country and study there"... "I wanted to gain experience in projects of Erasmus + international education, to increase my teacher qualifications"... "I thought that the experience of studying in another university would help to elevate my level of knowledge and skills" ... "I wanted to get a new experience in studies, communicating in another country"... "First, I like to travel, and secondly, I wanted to get acquainted with the educational system of other countries"... "I applied, because I think it's a wonderful experience. Go elsewhere, to examine in practice how the system of education works in another country, to gain new knowledge and skills"... "It's a great experience and also in another country - it's always fun! In these trips you develop as a person, make new friends, meet new people".

The selection processes employed in the pilot mobility were varied, and although carefully planned, and supported by agreed tools, documents and procedures, inevitably had some "do it as you go" aspects. We consider that it was successful, and that this was due to the hard work and sensitivity of the coordinators, as well as to the spirit of adventure and initiative of the students, and their parents' willingness to support them.

Nonetheless, we recommend for the future that all home institutions formalise their procedures, and publish the criteria used for selection, and that there be specific reference to equal opportunities, not only gender-related, but also with mention of equal opportunities for disabled persons, or persons belonging to

disadvantaged groups. At the same time, we urge them not to make overly complex rules, and to continue the all-important hands-on contact with the students.

Visas and Permissions

For the TuCAHEA mobility students who were able to carry out their plans, visas and other permissions did not represent a problem. The respondents all tell the same story. To the questions, “did you require a visa or other permission to study abroad?” we received 17 ‘No’ or ‘Her’ answers. Only two students, one from Turkmenistan and the other from Kazakhstan who went to Tajikistan said they required a visa for a two month stay. We were able to clarify, though, that the Kazakh student had actually only needed to register, so the Turkmen student alone needed a visa. Several other students commented on needing ‘registration’: one was late in registering, but the international office of the host university helped solve the issue.

Unfortunately, as has been mentioned, there was one major setback to the mobility scheme in this regard. Much time and effort was dedicated to obtaining permission for mobility to and from Uzbekistan: eventually it became clear that permission would not be granted. Neither incoming nor outgoing mobility was allowed by the responsible persons of the Ministry of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education, but this became certain only as the dates for the planned mobilities came very close. The Uzbek Country Coordinator and the European coordinating team informed the other members of the consortium, and asked for help in finding alternatives for the students who had planned to go to Uzbek universities. The friendly relations within the consortium and the generosity of the partner HEIs in the other countries made it possible to find rapid solutions, so that the mobilities could be redirected.

During mobility

Travel

Travel from one partner country to another did not seem to be a problem for any of the students. In some cases the students seemed almost offended that they had to answer questions on such a simple matter. We asked whether there had been complications, and who had arranged for the tickets. Often the answer was ‘I myself’, but in some instances the international office, the TuCAHEA coordinator, or the student’s parents had purchased the tickets or arranged for transportation by car.

The TuCAHEA mobility grant, in accordance with the decisions of the Consortium, was a fixed sum to cover both travel and costs of stay. We made an exception for particularly expensive travel (i.e. from and to Turkmenistan) and allowed an extra amount of money to defray the extra cost.

Arrival

The first days in the new environment are always very important in the mobility experience. Student mobility, as decades of Erasmus show, is always ‘traumatic’: the shock of a new culture, language and homesickness are part of the ‘trauma’ that makes mobility so valuable for personal as well as academic growth. In consideration of the brief period of time that our Pilot Mobility Scheme students would be abroad, it was particularly important that they have excellent support on arrival, to neutralise or attenuate the negative aspects of their ‘full immersion’. The partner coordinators were all aware of the importance of careful attention to the students on their arrival, and the results of the questionnaires appear to confirm that their performance was praiseworthy.

We asked the students whether someone had met them on arrival, and whether they had known where to go for their lodging and for meals. The replies were uniformly affirmative. To the question, “When you arrived in the host University, was there someone to meet you?”, only two students said they had not been met, and one of those commented, “The coordinator did not meet me, but she gave full information on the place of residence. There were no problems”.

Quite a few mention the special attention they received. Clearly the host institutions were careful to greet and help the incoming students, and gave them special personal attention.

On arrival:

“I was greeted and helped with settling in the apartment”... “I was met by the representatives of the

university”.... “My coordinator of host University organized a meeting at the airport, he sent my new groupmates to meet me and they met me with a bouquet. From the first day I felt comfortable myself as at home”... “Yes, and it was so nice of them”....”My host University coordinator met me at railway station and help to get to host University “... “the host University arranged airport pick up and met me at the airport “ ... “everything was well organized”.

There was ample information for finding the basics (from well before the beginning of the mobility), and on arrival everyone was orientated promptly, satisfied, and often truly grateful. To the question “Did you know where to go for lodgings and meals?”, the students answered: “Yes, in the early days I was accompanied by a representative of the host university”; “the supervisors from the first days placed me to the hostel for foreign teachers and showed me shops where I can buy necessary things”; “Yes. I was helped to settle in the apartment”; “I was also immediately informed and shown that next to my house there were eating places, shops and everything I might need”; “As for the food I was helped by my neighbor and classmates”. The host university students are often mentioned as contributing to a warm welcome: “Yes, when we came to dormitory, students were so nice, and they showed everything, where we can make meals, which cafeterias are nice and close to place where we live”.

Support and counselling

We were also interested in knowing how the students were supported during the mobility. We asked about contacts with the coordinator; about whether they had a specific mentor; whether they had a student “buddy”, and how often they were in contact with the coordinator of their home university. Here too a picture emerges of nearly constant contact and attention.

We learned that most saw their coordinator, or another key staff person quite regularly. Most were in regular and even surprisingly frequent contact with their home coordinator (normally by phone, email or WhatsApp). Only a few had a student “buddy”, but almost everyone commented on the helpfulness and friendship of the other students.

At the host university:

“At first I had many questions about study and I communicated with the managing chair of our faculty, also one teacher of special subjects was my supervisor”... “I met with responsible persons every day and asked about study, at the beginning of the mobility”.... “At the beginning of mobility, we had to register, have some medical analysis to have a permission to stay”... “During mobility at the start I met the coordinator of the host university almost every day to solve the problems of documentation, which were to be provided for the host university”...” [I met] two or three times a week with the Coordinator of the host university and the responsible persons”...” Constantly, the coordinator kept always in touch, personally and on phone”... “Yes, there was regular contact with the coordinator of the host university. 10 times we met the respective person from the host University”.

Not everyone had a specific ‘mentor’ or a particular person chosen to act as a supervisor. Of the 19 respondents, three said they did not have such a person. The rest however all responded with a “Yes”, and many gave the name of the person, with answers such as this: “Yes, I had a supervisor, she helped me with the individual plan and the issues, and how I should attend classes and the duty that I must perform”. One however said that “Yes, there was a supervisor: my classmates [Да , мой однокурсники]”.

It seems that only in 12 cases was there one specific student who was assigned to the incoming student as a “Buddy”, and sometimes it is not clear from the responses whether this was an ‘assigned’ buddy, or just a special friend. Most commented on how they made many friends and were helped by many fellow students, although those who had a buddy seemed to have found him/her useful in orientation at the beginning and in making other new friends.

A buddy?

“Well, there was no so called “buddy”. Actually all groupmates were willing to help us in every way. After studies, we always went somewhere, sightseeing and so on”...” Yes, I had a student ‘buddy’. He helped

with adaptation to new environment. Also showed all places which I must to attend" ... Yes, my "buddy " in the host university introduced me and helped me adjust to a new environment" ... " In the beginning when I was introduced to the group that was going to learn [with me] I was introduced to one student, who was a friend" ... "She was the head of class and we went to University together every day" "There were many".

Study

We were very interested to know about the mobility students' experience of studies in another country. A full analysis will need to be carried out on the basis of the final recognition documents, and possibly with a follow-up interaction with each student to deepen our understanding of how the experience of sameness and difference in study organisation, methods and content affected him or her.

The questions we asked were:

- Did you attend courses/lectures during the mobility? If so which ones? Were the courses listed in your Learning Agreement? Or did you have to make changes?
- In which language were they taught? Did you have difficulties due to the language?
- Were the contents and teaching methods similar to those in your own country?
- If not, how were they different?

All the students, except one, stated that they had attended lectures. Most listed which courses they had followed and gave further comments on why they had chosen them. The one exception is a student who, because of the delays due to the uncertainty about the possibilities of mobility at an Uzbek university, ended up arriving at the host university when the first part of the courses she wanted to take were over. In this case the host university made arrangements for her to be taught personally, once again showing how seriously the coordinators and institutions took the mobility scheme, and how careful they were to give the students support.

Three students said that changes in the Learning Agreement had been made. One, rather cryptically, states that "There were no changes in the agreement, but I studied other items that the group studied" —which would seem to indicate that de facto there had been changes.

With regard to the language of study, no student had difficulties. In most cases the language of teaching was Russian, with a few exceptions. In the first place, these were the language students who had gone abroad to study English (2) or German (1). Other students commented: " [Courses] were taught in "Russian or Kazakh" languages. I did not have problems due to the language, because i spoke with them in Russian language. However Kazakh and Kyrgyz languages are similar, when they taught in their language I understood", or "At the host universities all the classes are in the Tajik language, but those that are mentioned in my Learning Agreement were in Russian". One student, from Turkmenistan, knew both Russian and Persian, both of which were of use at the Tajik host university.

We very much wanted to see how the students would reply to the final two questions, with which they were invited to compare the learning teaching approaches in the home and host institutions. Most answered in a fairly laconic way, and understandably they were unwilling to criticise either institution (with one apparent exception, a student who declared "At my university lectures are conducted with the use of presentation materials", which would seem to indicate that she found her home university superior in this regard).

Most students said that there were no, or only small, differences. Some did however comment fairly frankly on the differences they found: "Similar lessons are in the language lab with electronic board. The courses that I am attending at my host university are interesting, and I liked that there is only a small number of students in each class, so there is ample opportunity to ask questions. Courses are generally better organized and more challenging"; "More emphasis is on independent activities of individual students, which is closely monitored"; "Some were different that in every subgroup there were few students and every students has more time to answer and the teacher has more time to ask and listen to the opinion of students". In one case a student found that the assessment methods were different, in another the

student found that the host University did not use credits but rather “the old Soviet system”, although this does not correspond to what we know about that institution, which has been active for many years in the Bologna process.

Socializing

Study is not the whole story. International mobility is also of great value in creating a framework where empathy can develop, as it is based on a personal understanding of cultural differences, though the experience of friendship with individuals who have been raised in another country and culture. We asked three questions directly about making friends and establishing lasting contacts (although, as seen above under the discussion of mentoring and buddies, friends and classmates are very much present in other parts of the responses to the questionnaires too).

The questions were:

- During the mobility, did you make friends or socialize with other students?
- Did you tell them about your own university? And/or about the TuCAHEA project?
- Do you think you will be in touch in the future with students or staff of the host university?

Here it is fair to say that all the answers were positive and even enthusiastic. Every student, without exception, commented on the warmth and number of his or her new friends.

Did you make friends?

“Actually I made lots of friends during the mobility” – “I now have a lot of friends!” .. “Yes, I have got a lot of friends and future colleagues”... “Yes, I made good and even close friends and had 2 awesome months”... “Yes, I found many new friends, they are from different countries. The atmosphere in the international students’ community is amazing, everyone is very nice to each other and up for meeting new people”... “Every weekend we came together with students who live in the hostel and we have discussions. Every evening my friends invited me to their room and asked me a lot of question about history of my country and culture, traditions, holidays, people and so on. It seemed they want to know more and more about my country, that’s why one day I invited the students and made a presentation about my country”. .. “During the mobility I made many friends. They are my new group-mates in my host university, and for the short time they became for me dear persons”... “Also in my free time I communicated with foreign teachers in the hostel, I told them about our culture and country. All of them became for me best friends”.

Did you tell them about your own university? About TuCAHEA?

“Yes of course. They were interested in how and what program I chose”... “Yes, I did. I told them about my own university and made a presentation about the project and the goals of TuCAHEA”... “Yes I did, even I presented our University among my friends”... “It seems they didn’t know about the TuCAHEA project, that’s why always they ask me a lot of questions that how can we be an exchange student as I was”... “So together with my friend (she is from Kyrgyzstan, an exchange student as me) explained about the TuCahea project”... “Yes, of course. I told them about my university, about our culture, country and made a presentation about our natural environment” ...” Yes of course. They were interested in how and what program I chose”.

On the basis of the students’ answers, clearly they made strong friendships, they learned about the host people and country, and they acted as ambassadors of their own country and also felt ownership and responsibility with regard to TuCAHEA.

Unsurprisingly, their answers to the question of whether they think they will continue to be in contact with their new friends and contacts, are all positive. Most are “Да я в этом уверен [Yes, definitely]; Да я в этом уверен [Yes, I am sure]; Yes, I am not going to interrupt communication”, or even, “I am in touch with most of the students from the host University”. A few seem more dubious (“Yes, probably”; “It depends on me, how I contact with them, but I hope so, because we became close friends”) but the majority are quite sure that the friendships made in such a brief time are strong and will last (“I will never forget them and their kindness”; “If I have chance I will go there to meet with them or if they will come in my country i will meet with pleasure”).

Language/cultural issues

As in the case of the academic courses, in making friends the language used was overwhelmingly Russian. The language mentioned first by all students is Русский, Russian. Some also mention English (the students of English), Russian and English (3 students); one student used Russian and Persian, and one quite rightly declared, "I used English, Russian and Kazakh languages. Because in order to understand another nation we must know their language".

No one mentions problems with language in the social context. It would seem that all the students fitted in easily, and neither language nor national differences created problems. Only one student mentions missing her country and family, but in all other respects, she seems to have enjoyed her stay as much as the others.

After mobility

Recognition

At the time the questionnaires were filled out, not all the host universities had sent the Transcript of Records to the home universities, and not all students had already seen their studies recognised. Nonetheless, in almost all cases, according to the home coordinators, recognition was smooth. We asked first whether the receiving institution had sent the Transcript of Records, and the response was positive in all but five cases. Three of the five answered "not yet"; one said that "according all the rules of the host university transcripts are issued only after passing all the examinations and after getting results from the Testing Centre" and expected to receive the transcript in May; another that "it is expected that our student pass the exam on Skype, get an estimate, and only if the receiving institution will send a statement / transcript". Only one university seems to have adopted a 'resit' procedure: "[The] host institution sent us the transcript. But the grades were only for one rating. After arrival the student passed all exams at our university".

We asked whether the partners had sent adequate information about their grading systems. Again, at the time the questionnaires were filled out, most had, but some had not, although the coordinators seemed confident that the information would arrive: "This information will be sent together with transcript" ... "Not immediately, it takes time to get the results of examinations".

To the direct question, "Did you have difficulty in recognizing the student's work (including it in the student's transcript your university)? How did you do it?", all home coordinators said that they had been able to recognise the work carried out during mobility. No one mentioned difficulties, and some noted "As both universities use ECTS, there would not be any problems with recognition of grades" ... "Yes, we recognized credits that have been previously agreed upon" ... "In accordance with the agreements on the recognition of mobility to rating results in mobility, there were no problems with the recognition of assessments".

It was foreseen that recognition might pose difficulties, since in most cases the students only were able to attend and complete a part of the lectures and coursework (due to the brevity of the pilot mobility). Nonetheless, only in one case did the home university mention difficulties and testing: "We did not have problems in recognizing the student's work. The assessments which she received at the host University were considered in our University. For the subjects which did not coincide with host University, she took an examination here". Almost all universities said they had used credits for recognition; the exception was the institution which sent a doctoral candidate.

Dissemination/valorisation

Both home coordinators and the students prove to be enthusiastic and creative in telling about the mobility experience. The students planned to do interviews, to make presentations, to produce videos, to write articles for the press and for university newspaper, and even to appear on radio and television.

How can you tell others about your experience?

"Make a presentation. Or just tell everyone about my experience" ... "I told about my experience to my teachers, also to my group-mates: I made a conference about the TuCAHEA project, and shared my experience with other students" ... "Coming back I want to share all my experience with other students, in

order to change students, students' thoughts with my gained knowledge"... "This project helped me to improve my knowledge, being away from home, it helped me to improve my leadership skills"... "I trust it would be helpful for the students to know [about my experience]; at the same time it will encourage them to apply to the program, as they will know students like me made use of the opportunity and then came back to our country"... "I made a presentation in the optional hour, and prepared information for the university website".

We asked the students what kind of event would be organised, and found that some students imagined informal presentations, whereas others had been invited to tell about their experiences at faculty council meetings, or at meetings of specific committees. Many said they had written articles, some of which already published, usually but not always on their university website.

We asked similar questions to the home university coordinators, and found that the Kazakh partners had presented the mobility at the Tempus exhibition in Astana; that the mobility had been presented at information days, on the website, at meetings for students, by means of social networks, at workshops. In one case, "Specially for her we organized a conference and many students were invited from different faculties. There she told about this project and shared with her experience".

The Obstacles

Lack of permission from authorities

As mentioned above under 'Visas and permissions', a major difficulty was the refusal of the Uzbek Ministry of Higher and Specialised Secondary Education to approve the incoming and the outgoing mobility. This highlights the necessity cooperating closely with the national authorities, and ensuring that plans are understood and supported. Another difficulty was encountered in a Kyrgyz university in which, although the Learning Agreement had already been agreed and signed, the Academic Senate in the end did not permit the mobility to take place because of doubts about how recognition could be achieved.

Lack of interest (or time) on the part of students

In one Tajik institution, the students did not apply because, according to the coordinator, their programmes are very intense, and they did not think that on their return they would be able to make up the work they had missed. We may note that this was (and sometimes is still) a worry for students in Europe too; however with the development of awareness of the value of mobility, for professional careers as well as for personal culture, such worries have become quite rare.

Money transfer

As always in the Tempus framework, at least in the case of Central Asian countries, it is not easy to carry out even very simple financial operations. This is because of restrictions on all sides: in the partner countries, in the European coordinating countries and in order to abide by the EU rules.

Most students did not have personal accounts to which the grant could be sent in Euros. Since each student was to receive one half of the grant before the mobility, and the second half at the midpoint, there were 38 payments to be made. The norms introduced by European countries to fight money-laundering exacerbated an already complicated situation. When possible, money was sent to the students' accounts, and in emergencies to the coordinators' accounts to be transferred to the student. Most payments however had to be made using MoneyGram. Previously we had been able to use Western Union, but at the time of the Pilot Mobility this had become impossible. In both the cases of Western Union and MoneyGram, there are strict limits on how much can be sent by one person per week. As a result the Project Manager at the University of Groningen had to involve many other university employees to take the time and risk of carrying cash to the shops where the money could be sent.

Management complexity

More in general, the great numbers of papers to be filled out and gathered for student has resulted in daunting management complexity. Clearly, in any future larger scale mobility it will be advisable to devise on-line systems to facilitate such tasks.

Overall evaluation

The first respondents we listened to in evaluating our Pilot Mobility are the people who really made it possible, the students themselves. Their reactions at the end of the mobility were all positive, in fact very positive. In the students' questionnaires, we asked for an evaluation on a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 was very poor and 10 excellent. Almost all students answered with a 10 or even an enthusiastic 10+ with many exclamation marks and emoticons. One student gave a 7, one an 8, and four a 9 – one of the latter said “9, just because it was short, not [even] one semester”. As explained above, Tempus rules did not allow mobility for a whole semester (the maximum permitted is three months), and we decided – considering the constraints of the academic calendar and the potential difficulties of recognition in this pilot phase, to opt for two months, as one half of a semester, in order to make recognition less difficult.

On the basis of the feedback, we can confidently say that the students all had a very good opinion of the mobility. Their answers also suggest that they judged the experience positive not only for their personal knowledge and development, but also as part of a more general endeavour.

We asked all parties whether the students had had problems: there too the 57 questionnaires almost unanimously said no. The exceptions have been considered above, and were the case of the student whose course was already in phase 2 when she arrived (but the host university arranged things so that she could be tutored in substance individually); and a few coordinators mention the complications of redirecting their students because of impossibility of sending them to Uzbekistan.

We asked each student what the most interesting thing about the mobility was, and the answers received were such things as “socializing, meeting new friends”; “everything: both training and non-training activities”, comparing studies in the two countries; “dialogue” with another culture; staying in a “new country”; disciplines not taught in the own university; learning “about myself and how I interact with the world”; making “fantastic friends. Not just Kyrgyz friends either, but Kazakh, Russian, Chinese, American, etc. “. Many took the opportunity to express delight at their good luck to be able to participate and their gratitude to the coordinators. One mentioned the importance of the Central Asian countries becoming part of the Tuning process.

Students' opinions:

“it was interesting to compare studies in our and their universities, compare and gain experience”.... “It was interesting to be in a new university, a new country”... “Needless to my stay in another country was interesting”... “Learn new skills, new friends, learning new methods of teaching and laboratory research was very interesting and important”... “my time here exceeded any expectations I could have had. I learned so much about myself and how I interact with the world. I loved that I was surrounded by people who shared my curiosity and travelling passion”... “This study abroad experience teaches me to appreciate different cultures, to learn and study from different teaching strategies which will greatly improve my study habits back at my home University”... “The most interesting aspect for me was the educational system and the interesting places where I have been. Fantastic atmosphere; I got in with the local students, as well as internationals, and made some fantastic friends”.

We also asked the home and host coordinators to give their general evaluations, as well as their specific recommendations for improvement. The home coordinators in general were satisfied (“we think all was at a good level”, “the programme was well organised”, “it’s a good scheme of mobility”) or even enthusiastic (“students who participated in the project during the stay in another university [gained] new perspectives on training, new learning environments, acquaintances, expanding knowledge about the culture and traditions of the country and much more”). The suggestions were in the direction of asking for longer periods of mobility (6 months or a year); more flexibility in subject areas; the inclusion of medical disciplines; and more detailed course catalogues. One coordinator expressed concern that modules, course and credits were not identical in the host and home university: a fact well-known in all mobility schemes, which only trust and flexibility allow us to overcome.

The host coordinators were uniformly very positive in their overall evaluations (“excellent”, “very useful for the university, for our staff and students”, “very useful”, “should be extended”, “organised at the highest professional level”), and also commented on the usefulness of the experience for the host university (“it showed the weaknesses in the organization of student mobility at [our] university”, “the mobility is useful to compare curricula and teaching conditions”). Suggestions for improvement included solving housing problems, improving course catalogues, conducting a survey of students’ desiderata and lengthening the mobility period to a full semester or academic year. A specific question on whether the mobility period should be lengthened received strong approval from all partners.

We also asked whether, in the view of home and host coordinators, the mobility scheme can contribute to building a higher education area in Central Asia (the central objective of TuCAHEA). The answers here too were unanimously positive, although some obstacles were mentioned too. The need for transparency and, according to one coordinator, uniformity were mentioned. The possibility of using a common vehicular language, as we have already seen, is a facilitating factor. One brake on mobility is a reluctance of Kazakh students (mentioned by two coordinators) to study in other Central Asian countries. The particular value of the mobility and the experience of regional coordination was pointed out by coordinators of universities in remote regions.

Mobility and the CAHEA:

HOSTS: “It is useful to develop a regional mobility in the Central Asian region”; “in order to achieve our goals, we first need to develop a regional mobility in the Central Asian region, and gain experience”; “[Knowledge of the] Russian language in the Central Asian countries make it easier to organize mobility than with Europe or America, where a knowledge of English or one of the European languages is necessary”; “Regional mobility is very useful, as the main points of the conditions and requirements for the training and readiness of the graduate are very similar”, “it is useful and necessary to continue to develop regional mobility in the Central Asian region”, “it’s a very good experience, not only for students but also for the partner universities, as familiar with the process of organizing mobility as host. In [our university] we have experience in organizing student mobility under the Erasmus Mundus program, but it is one-sided, because basically, we act as the sending institution”.

HOME: “developing of mobility very useful”, “it will be useful to develop regional mobility in CA area”, “of course, it would be useful to develop a regional mobility in the Central Asian region”; “it is also an excellent experience for us, for regional Universities it will be useful for students and strengthening friendship, sharing skills”, “it would be best if we could develop it soon”.

Conclusions

We conclude that the TuCAHEA Pilot Mobility Scheme was successful, and that it was meaningful for the students themselves, and welcome and useful for both the host and the home universities.

It is also clear that the mobility was made possible by the high degree of collaboration and trust built up in the previous years between the Central Asian partners and with the European coordinating team. The difficulties that emerged when it became clear that Uzbek mobility, incoming and outgoing, would not be permitted, was solved through the generous solidarity of the host universities and the fast action of the home universities that had planned to send their students to Uzbekistan.

The tools elaborated during the TuCAHEA project, the definition of competences for the eight subject areas, the Learning Agreement -- based on the most recent ECTS Learning Agreement, adapted to the needs of the pilot scheme – the work on a credit reference system for Central Asia and so forth, were tested through the mobility, and have shown their value.

We conclude that regional mobility in Central Asia is both possible and desirable, but that it cannot be improvised. As in other parts of the world, mobility needs to be developed with great care, laying the groundwork as we have done in order for future development to be smooth and productive. This is a practical and ethical imperative, as our first duty is to the students themselves, who deserve and require

the highest possible quality in their higher education in general, to which a mobility experience can contribute in a powerful way.

Recommendations: 21 Recommendations for Good Practice

1. Mobility partners should be known personally and trusted. Mobility partnerships, at least in a pilot context, cannot be improvised.
2. Mobility schemes should use agreed tools. If these are compatible with those used in otherworld regions it will facilitate mobility, visibility and recognition.
3. A credit reference system based on student workload and compatible with ECTS is useful for recognition when mobility takes place in countries using different systems.
4. Mobility of semester length is advisable, although half a semester is feasible and valuable when shorter periods are necessary.
5. Mobility schemes should be publicised in such a way as to reach the maximum number of students.
6. Selection criteria should be published and include principals of equal opportunities not only for male and female students, but also for students with disabilities, or coming from disadvantaged backgrounds.
7. Personal interviews should be included in the selection process, and excessive paperwork avoided.
8. Students should understand the background and the purpose of mobility.
9. Both students and parents should have the chance to discuss their concerns and clarify any doubts before the final selection is made.
10. The full Learning Agreement is the key document in ensuring that the mobility process, learning activities abroad, and recognition on return are all smooth.
11. Any simplification of the constraints on money transfer from Europe to Central Asia will be welcomed by European coordinators.
12. Students should have health insurance. Both home and Host coordinators should check that they do.
13. Sensitive hospitality on the part of receiving (host) institutions is of fundamental importance.
14. It is good practice to name a specific person as academic mentor or reference point for each incoming student.
15. It is good practice to designate a specific person as student “buddy” for each incoming student. The buddy will facilitate contact with other students.
16. Specific timeframes should be set up for contact by the student with the home and host coordinators (e.g. once a week)
17. The plan of academic activities to be carried in the host institution should be prepared with great care and attention to detail. If modifications prove necessary, these should be approved promptly by the three parties concerned (the student, home and host coordinators)
18. The host university should send the Transcript of Records (Table E of the Learning Agreement) promptly at the end of mobility.
19. The home university must recognise the work done abroad completely and promptly, certify recognition in the Learning Agreement (Table F) and register it in the student’s official record.
20. Both home and host institutions should valorise the students in mobility, giving them opportunities to tell not only other students but also academics and administrative staff about their experience.
21. It is opportune to inform the relevant Ministries about the planned mobility in order to resolve any problems in time.



Annex A.1 Course Catalogue Contents

Part 1: Information on the institution:

- name and address
- academic calendar
- academic authorities
- general description of the institution (including type and status)
- list of programmes offered
- general admission requirements
- general arrangements for the recognition of prior learning (formal, informal and non-formal)
- general registration procedures
- ECTS credit allocation based on the student workload needed in order to achieve expected learning outcomes
- arrangements for academic guidance.

Part 2: Information on programmes

1) General description:

- qualification awarded
- level of qualification
- specific admission requirements
- specific arrangements for recognition of prior learning (formal, non-formal and informal)
- qualification requirements and regulations
- profile of the programme
- key learning outcomes
- occupational profiles of graduates with examples
- access to further studies
- course structure diagram with credits (60 per full-time academic year)
- examination regulations, assessment and grading
- graduation requirements
- mode of study (full-time, part-time, elearning...),
- programme director or equivalent.

2) Description of individual course units:

- course unit title
- course unit code
- type of course unit (compulsory, optional)
- level of course unit (e.g. first, second or third cycle; sub-level if applicable)
- year of study (if applicable)
- semester/trimester when the course unit is delivered
- number of ECTS credits allocated
- name of lecturer(s)
- learning outcomes of the course unit
- mode of delivery (face-to-face, distance learning)

- prerequisites and co-requisites
- recommended optional programme components
- course contents
- recommended or required reading
- planned learning activities and teaching methods
- assessment methods and criteria
- language of instruction.
- work placement(s)

Part 3: General information for students:

- cost of living
- accommodation
- meals
- medical facilities
- facilities for special needs students
- insurance
- financial support for students
- student affairs office
- learning facilities
- international programmes
- practical information for mobile students
- language courses
- internships
- sports and leisure facilities
- student associations

Annex A.2 Example of Course Description

COURSE PROFILE

BACKGROUND

Course Title: Power and Automation in Construction

Code: EAS 3221

Course type (elective, your choice): questions related to the engineering problems of electricity supply equipment for transmission and distribution of electricity, as well as modern technological systems of automatic control, measurement, etc.

Cycle on what is read (the cycle, the name of the program; sublayer, if applicable): first cycle - Bachelor module "basic discipline" (DB)

Year of study (if applicable): third year

Semester when the course is taught: the sixth semester

Credits: 3

First and Last Name of lecturer/s: Nurpeisova S. A.

e-mail the teacher/s: ailight@bk.ru

Language/and Learning: Russian

GENERAL INFORMATION

Learning Outcomes

Students who successfully complete the course, must demonstrate a solid knowledge of the major issues related to power supply, mains engineering, transmission and distribution of electricity, as well as modern methods of construction of automatic measurement, control, technical diagnostics, control and management of the entire electricity system security requirements. The student should have knowledge of the fundamental principles of building automatic control systems and stability criteria, as well as assessing the quality and functioning.

Upon completion of the course the student will be able to skillfully use modern means of mechanization and automation, analysis of various circuits, to understand the basic elements, devices, and circuits of automation systems, own method of calculating the basic parameters of the electrical circuits and automation devices.

Course content

The course examines issues related to the use, transmission and distribution of electricity, as well as provides information about modern methods of construction of automatic measurement, technical diagnostics, management and control theory of primary devices and automatic control devices. The course examines the basic characteristics of electrical and mechanical drives, methods of assessing the sustainability and quality of automatic systems.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Background and other details necessary for the continuation of training: This course is a prerequisite for the successful completion of compulsory block courses "Physics", "Mechanical Engineering", "Construction Machinery".

Study (contact hours, distance learning, e-learning or blended) - (mandatory / optional visit): contact hours; lectures and practical classes, independent work of students, students' independent work with the teacher.

Attendance - mandatory and verified teacher, office receptionist. The student must attend at least 75%

lecture and 75% practical classes of the total number of lectures and workshops.

Teaching methods

[specify all methods that apply]

The training process uses traditional higher education teaching methods: lectures, seminars using multimedia as an independent work of students under the guidance of a teacher, students' independent work with the elements of innovative educational technologies (case studies, essays). Also employ interactive teaching methods: role-playing, writing scientific articles and reports on student competitions and conferences, etc.

Learning activities

[insert all kinds of used]

- attending lectures
- preparation for practical training
- private lessons from textbooks or teacher synopses
- participate in discussions
- Writing essays, papers, reports, articles
- group work
- training video presentations, participate in scientific discussions, mugs
- independent work of students
- independent work under the guidance of a teacher
- course work
- visits to companies, practice

Recommended or mandatory literature:

Main Reading:

1. Konyuhova E. A. Electricity supply facilities. M.: The Academy. -2008.-320p.
2. Vodovozov A. M. Elements of automation systems. M.: The Academy, 2008.-224p.

Further reading:

3. Nurpeisova S. A. Electrical engineering and electrical equipment of buildings. Part 1-Almaty: KazGASA. - 2013.-51p.
4. Akhmetov A.K., Akhmetov A.A., Electrical engineering. - Astana. 2010.-256p.

Criteria and methods of evaluation:

[Explain the criteria by which the verification and assessment of exhibiting. Make sure that these criteria correspond to / means of verification of the results / expected learning outcomes described in the chapter "Learning outcomes" (See above.).]

Evaluation criteria: completeness of knowledge on the studied subject, ability to present the material on the topic under study, the ability to defend their point of view during the discussion, the ability to use categorical apparatus of the course when presenting the material, the ability to work with sources (select the desired sources, organize them, hold their classification, own methods retrieve the required information from the source), the ability to use interactive and innovative methods (the use of Internet resources, preparation of presentations), the possession of writing skills of independent work (essays, reports, essays) on a specific topic of the course, the implementation of the course work.

[Specify how the assessment (you can specify more than one way)]

Current: abstracts, check the spelling of written work, presentation, execution of the course work.

Intermediate: rating control (P1, P2).

Final control: Tests.

[Specify how the assessment (you can specify more than one way)]

Testing, Coursework ,Current / intermediate control

Explanation of the "grading system

Internships: Yes / No? (if yes, specify the type of internship period, the number of loans where) – No.

Annex B.1 Guidelines for using the Learning Agreement

The template of Learning Agreement requires the information that the student, the sending and receiving institutions need to agree on to carry out and ensure recognition of mobility study periods under Erasmus+.

PROPOSED MOBILITY PROGRAMME

The proposed mobility programme includes the indicative start and end months and the agreed study programme that the student will carry out during his mobility period and which the sending institution commits to give recognition upon successful completion by the student.

The Learning Agreement must include **all the educational components to be carried out by the student** at the receiving institution (in table A) and it must contain as well the set of components to be replaced at sending institution upon successful completion by the student (in table B). Additional rows can be added as needed to tables A and B.

The student is recommended to take educational components totalling or equivalent to a minimum of 30 ECTS credits per semester or 15 ECTS credits per trimester.

The set of components will be included as follows:

Component code (if any)	Component title (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the sending institution	Semester [autumn /spring] [or term]	Number of ECTS or equivalent credits
	<i>Course x</i>	...	<i>10</i>
	<i>Module y</i>	...	<i>10</i>
	<i>Laboratory work</i>	...	<i>10</i>
			<i>Total: 30</i>

The sending institution must **fully recognise the work completed contained in table A** and any exception to this rule should be documented in an annex of the Learning Agreement and agreed by all parties.

The sending institution must foresee which provisions will apply in case some educational components are not be successfully completed by the student.

All parties must **sign the document**; however, there is no need to circulate papers with original signatures because scanned copies of signatures or digital signatures are recognised.

CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL LEARNING AGREEMENT

The section to be completed during the mobility is **only needed if it is necessary to introduce changes into the original Learning Agreement**. In that case, the section to be completed before the mobility should be kept unchanged, changes should be described in this section and both parts should remain together in a single document.

Changes to the mobility **study programme** should be exceptional, as the three parties have already agreed on a set of educational components to be taken abroad and how to recognise them on the light of the course catalogues that the sending and receiving institutions have committed to publish well in advance of the mobility periods and update regularly as ECHE holders.

All parties must confirm that the proposed amendments to the Learning Agreement are approved. For this specific section, original or scanned signatures are not mandatory as agreement of the proposed amendments by email is accepted.

RECOGNITION DOCUMENT

The receiving institution commits to provide the sending institution and the student with a **Transcript of Records** according to table E and containing all the educational components agreed in the table A (and table C in case there were changes to the study programme abroad). In addition, if possible, grading distribution information should be attached to the Transcript of Records (or a web link where this information can be found). This Transcript of records must be sent electronically to the home university within 3 weeks.

Following the receipt of the Transcript of Records from the receiving institution, the sending institution commits to provide to the student a **Recognition Document** including table E and the completed table F with the recognition outcomes, without further requirements from the student, and within five weeks. The sending institution will translate the grades received by the student (when applicable) taking into account the grading distribution information from the receiving institution. In addition, all the educational components will appear as well in the student's Diploma Supplement with also the exact title that they had in the receiving institution.

LEARNING AGREEMENT FOR STUDIES

CAHEA PILOT STUDENT MOBILITY

Spring 2015

The Student

Last name (s)		First name (s)	
Date of birth		Citizenship	
Sex [M/F]		Academic year	20../20..
Study cycle (BA, MA)		Subject area, Code	
Phone		E-mail	

The Sending Institution

Name			
Faculty		Department	
Address		Country	
Contact person name		Contact person e-mail / phone	

The Receiving Institution

Name			
Faculty		Department	
Address		Country	
Contact person name		Contact person e-mail / phone	

Section to be completed BEFORE THE MOBILITY

I. PROPOSED MOBILITY PROGRAMME

Planned period of the mobility: from [month/year] till [month/year]

Table A: Study programme abroad

Component ⁱ code (if any)	Component title (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the receiving institution	Semester [autumn / spring] [or term]	Number of ECTS credits or equivalent to be awarded by the receiving institution upon successful completion

			Total:

Web link to the course catalogue at the receiving institution describing the learning outcomes:

[Web link(s) to be provided.]

Table B: Group of educational components in the student's degree that would normally be completed at the sending institution and which will be replaced by the study abroad NB no one to one match with Table A is required. Where all credits in Table A are recognised as forming part of the program at the sending institution without any further conditions being applied, Table B may be completed with a reference to the mobility window (see guidelines).

Component code (if any)	Component title (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the sending institution	Semester [autumn / spring] [or term]	Number of ECTS credits or equivalent
			Total:

If the student does not complete successfully some educational components, the following provisions will apply:

[Please, specify or provide a web link to the relevant information.]

Language competence of the student

The level of language competenceⁱⁱ in *[the main language of instruction]* that the student already has or agrees to acquire by the start of the study period is:

A1 ☐ A2 ☐ B1 ☐ B2 ☐ C1 ☐ C2 ☐

II. RESPONSIBLE PERSONS

Responsible personⁱⁱⁱ in the sending institution:

Name:

Function:

Phone number:

E-mail:

Responsible person^{iv} in the receiving institution:

Name:

Function:

Phone number:

E-mail:

III. COMMITMENT OF THE THREE PARTIES

By signing this document, the student, the sending institution and the receiving institution confirm that they approve the proposed Learning Agreement and that they will comply with all the arrangements agreed by all parties. Sending and receiving institutions undertake to apply **all the principles of the Erasmus Charter** for Higher Education relating to mobility for studies (or the principles agreed in the inter-institutional agreement for institutions located in partner countries).

The receiving institution confirms that the educational components listed in Table A are in line with its course catalogue.

The sending institution commits to recognise all the credits gained at the receiving institution for the successfully completed educational components and to count them towards the student's degree as

described in Table B. Any exceptions to this rule are documented in an annex of this Learning Agreement and agreed by all parties.

The student and receiving institution will communicate to the sending institution any problems or changes regarding the proposed mobility programme, responsible persons and/or study period.

The student	
Student's signature	Date:

The sending institution	
Responsible person's signature	Date:

The receiving institution	
Responsible person's signature	Date:

Section to be completed DURING THE MOBILITY

CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL LEARNING AGREEMENT

I. EXCEPTIONAL CHANGES TO THE PROPOSED MOBILITY PROGRAMME

Table C: Exceptional changes to study programme abroad or additional components in case of extension of stay abroad

Component code (if any) at the receiving institution	Component title (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the receiving institution	Deleted component [tick if applicable]	Added component [tick if applicable]	Reason for change ^v	Number of ECTS credits or equivalent to be awarded by the receiving institution upon successful completion of the component
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
					Total:

The student, the sending and the receiving institutions confirm that they approve the proposed amendments to the mobility programme.

Approval by e-mail or signature of the student and of the sending and receiving institution responsible persons.

II. CHANGES IN THE RESPONSIBLE PERSON(S), if any:

New responsible person in the sending institution:	
Name:	Function:
Phone number:	E-mail:
New responsible person in the receiving institution:	
Name:	Function:
Phone number:	E-mail:

Section to be completed AFTER THE MOBILITY RECOGNITION OUTCOMES

I. MINIMUM INFORMATION IN THE RECEIVING INSTITUTION'S TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDS

Start and end dates of the study period: from [day/month/year] till [day/month/year].

Table E: academic outcomes at receiving institution

Component code (if any)	Component title (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the receiving institution	Was the component successfully completed by the student? [Yes/No]	Number of ECTS credits or equivalent	Receiving institution grade

[Signature of responsible person in receiving institution and date]

II. MINIMUM INFORMATION TO INCLUDE IN THE SENDING INSTITUTION'S TRANSCRIPT OF RECORDS

Start and end dates of the study period: from [day/month/year] till [day/month/year].

Table F: recognition outcomes at the sending institution

Component code (if any)	Title of recognised component (as indicated in the course catalogue) at the sending institution	Number of ECTS credits or equivalent	Sending institution grade, if applicable
		Total:	

[Signature of responsible person in sending institution and date]

ⁱ An "educational component" is a self-contained and formal structured learning experience that features learning outcomes, credits (where possible) and forms of assessment, such as a course, module, seminar, laboratory work, practical work, thesis preparation/research, mobility window or free electives.

ⁱⁱ For the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) see <http://europass.cedefop.europa.eu/en/resources/european-language-levels-cefr>

ⁱⁱⁱ **Responsible person in the sending institution:** an academic who has the authority to approve the mobility programme of outbound students (Learning Agreements), to exceptionally amend them when it is needed, as well as to guarantee full recognition of such programmes on behalf of the responsible academic body.

^{iv} **Responsible person in the receiving institution:** an academic who has the authority to approve the mobility programme and is committed to give students support at the receiving institution.

^v **Reasons for exceptional changes to study programme abroad:**

Reasons for deleting a component	Reason for adding a component
A1) Previously selected educational component is not available at receiving institution	B1) Substituting a deleted component
A2) Component is in a different language than previously specified in the course catalogue	B2) Extending the mobility period
A3) Timetable conflict	B3) Other (please specify)
A4) Other (please specify)	

Annex C.1 Questionnaire for the student

TUCAHEA

Tempus

Dear Student, **PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW USING A COMPUTER. The answers may be in English or in Russian, but please be sure that they are typed (not handwritten).**

PLEASE USE ALL THE SPACE YOU NEED TO WRITE FULL ANSWERS. WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE SEND IT TO:

DEADLINE: WITHIN 2 WEEKS FROM THE END OF THE MOBILITY THANK YOU!

Information on the student	
Name/Surname	
Home University:	
Host University:	
Email:	
A. The Call	
1. Publicity	How did you find out about the TuCAHEA Pilot Student Mobility Call? Did you see it on your University's website? Did a staff member present it? If you found out about the mobility scheme in another way, what was it? Do you think the method chosen was effective? If there is another such Mobility Scheme in the future, how would you publicise it? Did you understand the purpose of the mobility with relation to the TuCAHEA project?
2. Response	Why did you decide to apply? Did you present the "Declaration of Interest"? When? Did you have doubts and questions? Who did you ask? Did you, or your parents, ask for further information? (about grant money? Security? Recognition of academic work? Other?)
B. Selection	
1. Method of selection	Did other students of your university apply? Do you know how the selection was made? Do you know what selection criteria were used? Were they published? Did the criteria include equal opportunities for men and women, for students with disabilities, or members of disadvantaged groups? Did you know that after the selection by your University a further matching would be done by the whole TuCAHEA Consortium?
2. Results of the selection	Do you know how many students were selected from your university? Were they all at the same level? (Ba, Ma, PhD?) Did they come from different subject areas/disciplines? Or all from the same subject area/discipline?
C. Relations with Mobility Partner Institution	
1. Choosing the partner	Did you choose the three possible host universities in order of preference? Did the TuCAHEA coordinator help you? Or someone else? Who is the TuCAHEA Coordinator for your University? Did your or your family's ties or links with the host city or country play a role in your choice?
2. Information on the partner	Were you able to find sufficient information on the host university's academic offer? Did the partner send you a 'Course Catalogue'? Was there sufficient information available to complete the Learning Agreement? What about general information, on lodgings and other arrangements? Did you have sufficient information?
3. Response from partner	Did the host university answer you or your coordinator promptly when you had questions?
D. Preparation of the Mobility	
1. The Learning	Did you use the Learning Agreement model sent by TuCAHEA?

Agreement	<p>Did you use the Russian version or the English version?</p> <p>Were you able to fill out Table A and Table B satisfactorily with the help of the TuCAHEA coordinator?</p> <p>How long did it take to get it signed by all three parties? (you, your University and the host University)</p>
2. Visas and permissions	<p>Did you need a visa or other permissions to study abroad?</p> <p>Was it difficult to obtain them?</p> <p>Did you have to travel to obtain them?</p>
3. Grant payment and travel costs	<p>How did TuCAHEA send the grant money? To your bank account? To your Coordinator's account? Other? (MoneyGram?)</p> <p>Who arranged for the tickets? (You? Your parents? The Coordinator?)</p>
E. During the Mobility	
1. Getting started	<p>When you arrived in the host University, was there someone to meet you?</p> <p>Did you know where to go for lodgings and meals?</p> <p>Did the Coordinator of the host University meet with you?</p>
2. Contacts	<p>During the mobility period, did you have many contacts with the receiving institution's coordinator? Or with someone else? How many times did you meet with a responsible staff person at the host university?</p> <p>Did you have a special mentor or supervisor at the host university?</p> <p>Did you have a student 'buddy' in the host university?</p> <p>Did you keep in touch with the TuCAHEA Coordinator at your home University? How? By email? By phone?</p>
3. Learning activities	<p>Did you attend courses/lectures during the mobility? If so which ones?</p> <p>Were they the courses listed in your Learning Agreement? Or did you have to make changes?</p> <p>In which language were they taught? Did you have difficulties due to the language?</p> <p>Were the contents and teaching methods similar to those in your own country?</p> <p>If not, how were they different?</p>
4. Communicating at the host university	<p>During the mobility, did you make friends or socialize with other student?</p> <p>Did you tell them about your own university? And/or about the TuCAHEA project?</p> <p>What language did you use?</p> <p>Do you think you will be in touch in the future with students or staff of the host university?</p>
5. Problems?	<p>During the mobility, did you encounter any difficulties?</p> <p>What were the problems?</p> <p>Were they solved? By whom?</p>
F. After the mobility	
1. Communicating at your home university	<p>How do you think you can tell others about your experience?</p> <p>What kind of a dissemination event or activities do you think will be organised for you when you return home?</p> <p>Will there be coverage in the press, television, radio?</p> <p>Will you write an article or description of your experience for your institutional website or newspaper?</p>
G. Further comments	
1. Evaluating the mobility scheme	<p>Do you have comments or ideas on how mobility could be improved?</p> <p>Do you think it would be a good idea in the future to organise mobility for longer periods?</p> <p>Was it interesting to visit the partner country? Had you been there before?</p>
2. Overall	<p>On a scale of 1 (very poor) to 10 (excellent), how would you evaluate your mobility overall? What was the most problematic aspect for you?</p> <p>What was the most interesting aspect?</p>

Please send us any other observations you may have. Thank you!

Annex C.2 Questionnaire for the coordinator of the home institution

TUCAHEA Tempus

Questionnaire on the Pilot Student Mobility for SENDING (HOME) UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

Dear coordinator of the sending university,

PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW USING A COMPUTER. The answers may be in English or in Russian, but please be sure that they are typed (not handwritten).

PLEASE USE ALL THE SPACE YOU NEED TO WRITE FULL ANSWERS

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, PLEASE SEND IT TO:

DEADLINE: 15 MAY 2015 / WITHIN 2 WEEKS FROM THE END OF THE MOBILITY

THANK YOU!

Information on the student	
Name/Surname	
Home University:	
Host University:	
Email:	

A. The Call	
1. Publicity	How did you publicise the Pilot Student Mobility Call? Did you place it on your University's website? Did you meet with students or staff to present it? If you used other methods, which were they? Was the method you used effective? How would you do it next time? Did you explain the purpose of the mobility with relation to the TuCAHEA project?
2. Response	How many students showed interest? How many filled out the "Declaration of Interest"? What questions did the students ask? Did you have contact with their parents? What issues did they want to discuss? (the grant money? Security? Recognition of academic work? Other?)
B. Selection	
1. Method of selection in your University	How did you select your candidates? Did you receive pressure from your colleagues or friends? What elements did you consider / which criteria did you use? Did you publish the criteria? Did the criteria include equal opportunities for men and women, for students with disabilities, or members of disadvantaged groups?
2. Results of the selection	How many students did you select? Three as was suggested? Or fewer? or more? Were they all at the same level? (Ba, Ma, PhD?) Did they come from different subject areas?
C. Relations with Mobility Partner Institution	
1. Choosing the partner	How did you choose the mobility partners? Or did the students do it? Did the student's/parents' family ties or links with the host city or country play a role in the choice?
2. Information on the partner	Were you able to find sufficient information on the partner's academic offer? Did the partner send you a 'Course Catalogue'? Was there sufficient information available

		to complete the Learning Agreement?
3. Response from the partner		Did the partner university answer you promptly when you had questions ?
D. Preparation of the Mobility		
1. The Learning Agreement		Did you use the Learning Agreement model sent by TuCAHEA? Did you use the Russian version or the English version? Or both? Were you able to fill out Table A and Table B satisfactorily? How long did it take you to get it signed by all three parties?
2. Visas and permissions		Did your student need a visa or other permissions to study abroad? Was it difficult to obtain them?
3. Grant payment and travel costs		How did TuCAHEA send the grant money? To your account? To the student's account? Other? (MoneyGram?) Who arranged for the tickets? (you? The parents? The student?)
E. During the Mobility		
1. Contacts		While the student was abroad, did you keep in touch with him or her ? By email? By phone? During the mobility period, did you have contacts with the receiving institution's coordinator? Or with someone who was responsible for the student? Did you see the student's report on the first part of his/her activities, presented to obtain the second grant payment?
2. Problems?		Did the student have difficulties to your knowledge? What were the problems? Were they solved? By whom?
F. After the mobility		
1. Recognising the Student's work		Did the receiving institution send you a Transcript of Records? Or was there a different form of recognition? Did the partner send you information about grading? Or about other aspects of the host institution's system? Did you have difficulty in recognizing the student's work (including it in the student's transcript your university)? How did you do it? Did you use credits?
2. Communicating the student's experience		Did your student tell others about the experience? What kind of a dissemination events or activities did you organise? Was there coverage in the press, television, radio? Is there an article or description of the experience on your institutional website?
G. Further comments		
1. Evaluating the mobility scheme		Do you have other comments or ideas on how mobility could be improved? Do you think it will be possible in the future to organise mobility for longer periods? Towards some partner countries? Or towards all?
2. Potential for a CAHEA		Do you think it will be useful to develop regional mobility in the Central Asian area? Do you think it will improve the possibilities of cooperation with European Higher Education Institutions?

Please send us any other observations you may have. Thank you! Katherine and Ingrid

Annex C.3 Questionnaire for the coordinator of the host institution

TuCAHEA Tempus

Questionnaire on the Pilot Student Mobility for RECEIVING (HOST) UNIVERSITY COORDINATORS

Dear coordinator of the receiving university,

PLEASE ANSWER THE QUESTIONS BELOW USING A COMPUTER. The answers may be in English or in Russian, but please be sure that they are typed (not handwritten).

PLEASE USE ALL THE SPACE YOU NEED TO WRITE FULL ANSWERS

WHEN YOU HAVE COMPLETED THE QUESTIONNAIRE, **PLEASE SEND IT TO:** y.van.der.meer@rug.nl and k.isaacs@unipi.it

DEADLINE: 15 MAY 2015 / WITHIN 2 WEEKS FROM THE END OF THE MOBILITY

THANK YOU!

Information on the student	
Name/Surname	
Home University:	
Host University:	
Email:	

A. Preliminary relations with Mobility Partner Institution	
1. Request from the sending institution	Did the sending institution contact you directly? Did the student or the student's parents contact you? Did you have enough information about the student to know whether he/she could be accepted?
2. Information on your offer	Was there sufficient information on your website to guide the students' choices? Did you send your partner a 'Course Catalogue' for the specific Subject Area? or make it available on your website?
B. Preparation of the Mobility	
1. The Learning Agreement	Did you, your partner and the student use the Learning Agreement model sent by TuCAHEA? Did you use the Russian version or the English version? Or both? Were you able to fill out Table A and Table B satisfactorily? How many times did you send it back and forth? How long did it take you to get it signed by all three parties?
2. Visas and permissions	Did the student need a visa or other permissions to study at your institution? If yes, was it difficult to obtain them? Did you give the student support to get the visa or permission?
3. Grant and travel costs	Do you think the student's grant is sufficient for the mobility period? Was your University able to offer or to help find affordable housing?
C. During the Mobility	
1. Contacts	When the student arrived, did you see him/her immediately? Did you arrange to introduce the student to other students or to colleagues? What kind of help did you give him/her? (advice on studies, practical matters, local customs, other?) During the mobility period, how often did you see the student?
2. Midpoint declaration	After one half of the mobility, did the student bring you his/her diary/notebook and ask you to make a Declaration that his/her work was satisfactory?

		How did you judge the results of the student's efforts?
	3. Problems?	Did the student have difficulties to your knowledge? What were the problems? Were they solved? By whom?
	4. Other observations	Do you have other comments about the student's capabilities, commitment, the difficulties he/she faced? Did you organise an information event, or some activity to raise awareness of the mobility student and of TuCAHEA?
D. At the end of the mobility		
	1. Recognising the Student's work	Did you fill out the Transcript of Records and give it to the student? Or did you send it to the partner institution? Was it difficult to describe what the student had accomplished and how well he/she performed? Did you use credits or some other measure of work load in the Transcript of records?
E. Further comments		
	1. Evaluating the mobility scheme	Overall, how do you judge this experience? Do you have other comments or ideas on how mobility could be improved? Do you think it will be possible in the future to organise mobility for longer periods? From some partner countries? Or from all?
	2. Potential for a CAHEA	Do you think it will be useful to develop regional mobility in the Central Asian area? Do you think it will improve the possibilities of cooperation with European Higher Education Institutions?

Please send us any other observations you may have. Thank you! Katherine and Ingrid



CALL FOR PILOT STUDENT MOBILITY CANDIDATES

The TuCAHEA Consortium in the Tempus framework hereby publishes the call for a pilot regional student mobility program

The deadline for Declaration of interest: 15 September 2014

The final deadline for Application: 15 October 2014

Published: 2 July 2014

The TuCAHEA Consortium comprises 33 Central Asian Higher Education Institutions, 1 Higher Education Association, 8 European Universities and the Ministries of Education of Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan.

It is constituted to carry out the TuCAHEA project, reaching the objectives and abiding by the obligations deriving from its contract with the European Commission, which supports it morally and financially.

TuCAHEA "Towards a Central Asian Higher Education Area: Tuning Structures and Building Quality Culture" is a Structural Measures Project (2012-2015) supported by the European Commission through DG EAC, Tempus Programme (Project 530786-TEMPUS-1-2012-1-NL-TEMPUS-SMHES), Grant Agreement: 2012-3025.

Among its objectives TuCAHEA has that of testing the competence- and learning outcomes-based quality, mobility and recognition tools, through short term regional student mobility.

The TuCAHEA pilot mobility student will study full-time at a Central Asian host University belonging to the TuCAHEA Consortium (see table below), in a country other than his or her own, for about two months: from the beginning to the half-point of the Spring Semester courses in the academic year 2014 - 2015. The student will study the equivalent of 15 ECTS credits, or ¼ of an academic year.

The mobile student will receive full recognition for the work successfully completed at the host institution.

He or she will receive a grant from the TuCAHEA project of 2000 euros, for travel and subsistence*.

*In exceptional cases when the travel to and from the host institution is particularly expensive this sum may be increased slightly.

Application Phase 1: Declaration of Interest

To this end the Consortium hereby invites students enrolled in the TuCAHEA Central Asian partner Universities to present a Declaration of Interest in participating in the mobility scheme.

The Declaration of Interest, presented using the Form included in **Annex 1** of this Call should be given to their own TuCAHEA Coordinator, whose name and email address appears in the table below. **The deadline for presenting the Declaration of Interest is 15 September 2014.**

All students enrolled regularly in the partner Universities in the following Subject Areas are eligible to present the Declaration:

1. Business and Management
2. Economics
3. Education
4. Engineering
5. Environmental protection and Food Safety
6. History
7. Language
8. Law

Application Phase 2: Full Application

Each partner University will select up to three candidates who will be invited to prepare a Full Application during the month of September.

Each candidate must indicate **three TuCAHEA Central Asian partner institutions** in a country other than his or her own which he or she is interested in attending for the first half of the Spring semester of the academic year 2014-2015, i.e. from January/February 2015 to March/April 2015 according to the academic calendar.

The Full Application will include a formal **Learning Agreement** as modified and adapted by TuCAHEA (a draft is provided in Annex 2; the final version will be furnished to the selected candidates by the TuCAHEA coordinator of the home university by 1 September 2014).

The Full Application will be based on the information included in the Course Catalogue prepared by the host universities and made available by 1 September 2014. **The deadline for presenting the Full Application is 15 October 2014.**

The final selection of the Full Applications and allocation of the students to the host Universities will be made by the Consortium in November 2014.

[The complete list of partners and contacts was included here]

For further information, please contact the TuCAHEA Project Team:

Katherine Isaacs (isaacs@stm.unipi.it)

Ingrid van der Meer (y.van.der.meer@rug.nl)

Viktoriya Kolp Panchenko (v.kolp@stm.unipi.it)



PILOT STUDENT MOBILITY SCHEME

Declaration of Interest

I, the undersigned:

Name: _____

Surname: _____

Date and place of birth: _____

Citizenship: _____

Address: _____

(Cell) phone number: _____

Email address: _____

University: _____

Degree Programme: _____

Year: _____

Subject Area: _____

declare that I wish to participate in the TuCAHEA Pilot Student Mobility Scheme, and to study during the first half of the Spring Semester of the academic year 2014-2015 at another Central Asian TuCAHEA University, in a country other than my own.

At present I indicate, in order of preference, the following three Institutions, although I am aware that I can change my choices on the basis of the information which will be provided by the single institutions by 1 September 2014:

1) _____

2) _____

3) _____

My motivations for applying are the following:

My linguistic competences are as follows:

Language	Level written	Level speaking	Level understanding	Certification (if any)

I understand that if my pre-candidature is selected, I will be asked to prepare a Full Application, including a complete Learning Agreement, which I must submit by 30 September 2014 to the TuCAHEA Coordinator of my University.

I annex a copy of my exam booklet.

Signature: _____

Date: _____

