T.I.M.E. Projects/ Final Report

Title of Project: Good Practices in T.I.M.E.

Acronym: GP_TIME

Coordinating institution: Universitat Politècnica de València, School of Industrial Engineering

Project coordinator: Ana Vallés Lluch (avalles@ter.upv.es)

Summary of the Project

The GP_TIME project, Good Practices in T.I.M.E., was developed within the framework of the 2025 T.I.M.E. Call for Projects and was aligned with the priority area of Curriculum compatibility mapping and programme track sharing. Its central premise was that exchange students can be considered not only as beneficiaries of international mobility, but also as privileged observers of teaching and learning practices across institutions. By comparing their home and host academic environments, exchange students are able to identify teaching methodologies, assessment systems, classroom dynamics and support conditions that they perceive as especially effective or distinctive.

The project involved four engineering institutions: Universitat Politècnica de València in Spain, Polytechnique Montréal in Canada, Instituto Superior Técnico / Técnico Universidade de Lisboa in Portugal, and Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires in Argentina. The consortium therefore brought together European, North American and Latin American perspectives on engineering education, mobility and pedagogical practice.

The main objective of GP_TIME was to diagnose, analyse and disseminate good teaching and assessment practices experienced by engineering exchange students during their mobility. Particular attention was paid to students' comparative perception of host-university courses, including how teaching methods, assessment systems and learning environments differed from those at their home institutions.

The project adopted a sequential mixed-methods design. In the first phase, a multilingual questionnaire was distributed to engineering exchange students across the participating institutions. The questionnaire collected contextual information and explored teaching methodologies, assessment methods, reasons for identifying a course as a good practice, comparison with the home institution, perceived academic and personal impact, and students' own definitions of good practice. In the second phase, focus groups were conducted or summarized at institutional level in order to refine, validate and contextualize the questionnaire findings.

A total of 200 engineering exchange students contributed to the questionnaire phase. Participants had completed at least one course at the host institution before responding, ensuring that their reflections were grounded in actual academic experience. The focus-group phase provided an additional qualitative layer by helping to interpret how students experienced teaching methodologies, assessment systems, relational dynamics and institutional support conditions.

Through this approach, GP_TIME aimed not only to identify individual examples of good practice, but also to produce a broader understanding of how effective mobility learning environments are constructed in international engineering education.

Results of the Project

The project generated a comparative analysis of teaching and assessment practices perceived as good practices by engineering exchange students. The results show that students did not associate good practice with one single pedagogical model. Instead, they valued coherent combinations of teaching methodologies, assessment formats, feedback opportunities, faculty interaction, peer cooperation and organizational support.

A first major result is that good practices were hybrid, not lecture-free. Lectures remained highly present in the courses identified as good practices, but they were usually integrated with laboratory sessions, cooperative learning, project-oriented learning, case studies and problem-based learning. This indicates that students did not necessarily value the elimination of traditional formats. Rather, they valued the meaningful integration of conceptual explanation with applied, collaborative and professionally relevant learning activities.

A second result concerns assessment. Courses perceived as good practices were characterized by multimodal assessment ecosystems. Group projects, oral presentations, continuous assessment, practical or laboratory evaluation and midterm tests often coexisted with final examinations. The evidence therefore suggests that good assessment practice was not based on replacing exams altogether, but on embedding them within broader evaluative structures that included feedback, revision, transparency and progressive improvement.

A third important finding is the existence of a relational-active core. When students' reasons for identifying a course as a good practice were interpreted through established principles of good undergraduate education, the strongest dimensions were student-faculty contact, cooperation among students and active learning. The open-ended responses and focus-group evidence reinforced the same pattern: students valued meaningful interaction with teachers, active and practical learning, feedback, participation, collaboration, mentoring and learning conditions that made engagement possible.

The project also confirmed that mobility acts as a comparative amplifier. Students did not merely identify good courses; they also interpreted them in relation to their previous academic experience. The analysis showed that comparative perception varied significantly according to students' home institution, indicating that pedagogical contrast was real but not experienced in exactly the same way from every institutional baseline. This finding supports the idea that mobility can serve not only as a student-learning experience, but also as a mechanism for institutional learning and pedagogical comparison.

Finally, the perceived impact of the identified good practices was clearly multidimensional. Students reported not only deeper academic understanding, but also stronger confidence, professional preparation, autonomy, problem-solving capacity, communication skills and intercultural adaptability. The focus-group phase helped explain how these outcomes emerged from the combination of active tasks, multimodal assessment, accessible faculty support, mentoring, peer cooperation and enabling organizational conditions.

As a result, GP_TIME proposes an integrated interpretation of good practice in international engineering mobility based on four interconnected dimensions:

1. Active and applied teaching, where lectures are integrated with laboratories, projects, cases and collaborative tasks.
2. Multimodal assessment, where projects, oral work, continuous or practical components and examinations coexist.
3. Relational support, including faculty contact, feedback, cooperation, mentoring and transparent organization.
4. Developmental outcomes, including academic growth, confidence, professional preparation and intercultural adaptation.

The project therefore suggests that impactful mobility experiences do not arise from isolated pedagogical innovations, but from the alignment of methodology, assessment, interaction and support within a coherent learning ecosystem.

Project outputs and dissemination

The project produced several outputs directly related to the original work plan:

- a multilingual questionnaire for exchange students;
- a dataset based on 200 engineering exchange-student responses;
- institutional focus-group summaries;
- an integrated analysis of questionnaire and focus-group evidence;
- a synthesis of good teaching and assessment practices in international engineering mobility;
- presentation materials for the GP_TIME project meeting and dissemination activities;
- an extended paper submitted to EDULEARN 2026;
- a journal manuscript currently being prepared for submission.

The original application anticipated questionnaire analysis, focus-group findings, selection of best practices, demonstration or dissemination sessions, and an open-access publication or conference contribution. The work completed during the project has addressed these objectives through a mixed-methods empirical study, dissemination materials and academic publication outputs.

One important dissemination action was prepared for **Polytechnique Montréal in May 2026**. The GP_TIME team developed a presentation for the project meeting on 6 May 2026 and for a carousel-style activity during the PolyMTL Teaching Day on 7 May 2026. This activity was designed to present the project rationale, methodology, institutional contexts, main results and conclusions, while encouraging discussion with teaching staff about the transferability of good practices.

Academic dissemination is also being developed through an extended paper for **EDULEARN 2026** (https://iated.org/edulearn/), entitled *Multimodal Alignment in International Engineering Mobility: Mixed-Methods Evidence from 200 Exchange Students*. This contribution places particular emphasis on the focus-group phase, highlighting how it helps interpret the pedagogical and organizational conditions behind the questionnaire patterns.

In parallel, the consortium is preparing a **journal manuscript** entitled *Multimodal Pedagogical Alignment in International Engineering Mobility: Evidence from a Four-Institution Consortium*. This manuscript develops the questionnaire-based analysis more extensively and is oriented towards engineering education, teaching practices, and assessment. For this reason, it would fit well with journals such as European Journal of Engineering Education, Active Learning in Higher Education, Innovations in Education and Teaching International, IEEE Transactions on Education, International Journal of Engineering Education, or other similar outlets focused on engineering education and teaching innovation.

Beyond this journal manuscript, the consortium has also identified the **potential of the questionnaire as a reusable monitoring instrument**. With some refinement, it could be used over time to follow the perceptions of exchange students at the end of their mobility stay. It could also be administered to regular students, making it possible to compare their perceptions of teaching and assessment practices with those of students who have had international experiences.

The consortium has also begun to analyse **questionnaire responses disaggregated by university and student group (incoming and outgoing)**. Although these results should be interpreted with caution because subgroup sample sizes are unequal, they make it possible to identify strengths, understood as the most prevalent reasons for considering a course a good practice, and weaker or less visible dimensions in each case. On the strength side, the picture is fairly coherent: instructor interaction and critical thinking, collaboration, active participation, and connection with real-life situations appear repeatedly across groups.

On the weaker side, some categories tend to remain less prominent across several groups. These include interdisciplinary or cross-cultural approaches, support for different learning styles, reflection-oriented assessment, and challenge- or time-management-related items. Interdisciplinarity appears as a weakness in six of the eight subgroups and may deserve further consideration in a subsequent step beyond the project.

These preliminary disaggregated results were reviewed during the project meeting and were considered promising for further analysis. The consortium therefore sees value in continuing to analyse the remaining questionnaire responses from this perspective. This additional analysis could potentially lead to a later publication, for example in a conference contribution or workshop format.

Further dissemination within the T.I.M.E. network is already planned through participation in a **workshop at the upcoming T.I.M.E. General Assembly**, which will take place at Doshisha University (Japan) from 30 September to 3 October 2026.

Target group/s and impact

Exchange students

The project directly benefits exchange students by giving visibility to their academic experience and recognizing them as informed evaluators of teaching and learning practices. Rather than treating mobility feedback only as satisfaction data, GP_TIME shows that students can provide meaningful comparative insight into teaching methodologies, assessment systems and learning environments.

The results can help future exchange students better understand the academic value of mobility, including not only intercultural exposure but also pedagogical enrichment, professional preparation, confidence-building and academic development.

Teaching staff

For teaching staff, GP_TIME provides evidence on the types of methodologies and assessment systems that students perceive as effective in international engineering contexts. The findings suggest that students value courses where theoretical grounding is clearly connected with applied work, collaboration, feedback and professional relevance.

The project also shows that innovation does not necessarily require abandoning traditional teaching or assessment formats. Lectures and final exams can still be part of good practice when they are integrated into broader active, applied, feedback-rich and student-supportive learning ecosystems.

Academic and international coordinators

For programme directors, international offices and institutional coordinators, GP_TIME offers a way to use mobility as a source of pedagogical intelligence. Exchange students' comparative experience can help institutions identify strengths, detect areas for improvement and understand which practices may be transferable across academic contexts.

The project is particularly relevant for international engineering programmes and double-degree pathways, where curricular compatibility, assessment expectations and teaching cultures can differ significantly across institutions.

T.I.M.E. network

For the T.I.M.E. Association, GP_TIME contributes to the network's mission by strengthening the academic dimension of international mobility. The project supports curriculum compatibility mapping and programme track sharing by identifying not only structural similarities or differences, but also pedagogical practices that students perceive as valuable across institutions.

The project also reinforces the role of T.I.M.E. as a framework for cross-institutional learning. By bringing together universities from Spain, Canada, Portugal and Argentina, GP_TIME has generated evidence that can inform discussion on teaching quality, student experience and transferability of good practices within the network.

Sustainability of the programme

- The sustainability of GP_TIME lies in the fact that its methodology, instruments and results can continue to be used beyond the formal project period.
- First, the questionnaire and focus-group guide can be reused or adapted by other T.I.M.E. institutions interested in analysing teaching and assessment practices from the perspective of exchange students. This creates the possibility of expanding the study to additional universities, disciplines or mobility pathways.
- Second, the project provides a framework for integrating student mobility feedback into institutional quality enhancement. The results show that exchange students' comparative perspective can help identify practices that are not always visible from within a single academic system.
- Third, the model emerging from GP_TIME can inform future pedagogical development initiatives. The four interconnected dimensions identified — active and applied teaching, multimodal assessment, relational support and developmental outcomes — can serve as a basis for discussion among teaching staff, international coordinators and academic managers.
- Fourth, the project opens the door to future collaborative research within the T.I.M.E. network. Possible future developments include longitudinal studies of mobility impact, inclusion of faculty perspectives, comparison across additional institutions, and analysis of how identified good practices can be adapted to different curricular and cultural contexts.
- In this sense, GP_TIME is sustainable not only as a completed research project, but as a methodological and conceptual framework for future work on pedagogical quality in international engineering mobility.

Project expenses

The expenditure charged to the T.I.M.E. grant was concentrated on two categories directly linked to project dissemination and consortium activity.

First, €400 were allocated to the registration fee for EDULEARN 2026, supporting the academic dissemination of the project results through the extended paper entitled *Multimodal Alignment in International Engineering Mobility: Mixed-Methods Evidence from 200 Exchange Students*.

Second, the grant supported the travel expenses related to the GP_TIME activities held at Polytechnique Montréal for members of the UPV and ITBA consortium teams. These expenses included transport, accommodation and flight tickets associated with their participation in the project meeting and dissemination activities in Montréal.

No expenses were charged for the time devoted by consortium members to project activities, including coordination, data collection, data analysis, preparation of materials, writing and dissemination work. These contributions were provided in kind by the participating institutions and project members.

Likewise, no expenses were charged for the support provided throughout the project by international offices, administrative staff and other institutional services. Their contribution was nevertheless essential for student contact, questionnaire distribution, logistical coordination, focus-group support and the preparation of dissemination activities.

Therefore, the executed expenditure should be understood as covering the direct external costs of dissemination and consortium mobility, while a significant part of the project implementation was supported through in-kind institutional and staff contributions.

Members of the consortium

- Universitat Politècnica de València, Spain — Coordinating partner
- Polytechnique Montréal, Canada
- Instituto Superior Técnico / Técnico Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
- Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires, Argentina
- T.I.M.E. Association, France — network support and dissemination

Key Staff (Name, Position, E-mail)

Name	Position / Institution	E-mail
Ana Vallés Lluch	Project coordinator, School of Industrial Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València	avalles@ter.upv.es
María Pino Sancho Fernández	Vice-Dean for Innovation and Educational Improvement, School of Industrial Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València	msancho@iqn.upv.es
Javier Sanchis Sáez	Vice-Dean for Internationalisation, School of Industrial Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València	jsanchis@isa.upv.es
Esperanza M. García Castelló	School of Industrial Engineering, Universitat Politècnica de València	egarcia1@iqn.upv.es
Julie Defretin	Strategic Advisor (Europe) and T.I.M.E. Coordinator, Polytechnique Montréal	julie.defretin@polymtl.ca
Judith Cantin	Director of Center for Teaching and Learning, Polytechnique Montréal	judith.cantin@polymtl.ca
François Guibault	Director of Graduate Studies, Polytechnique Montréal	francois.guibault@polymtl.ca
Marcelo Perotti	Professor and Coordinator of the Physics Area, Department of Exact and Natural Sciences, Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires	mperotti@itba.edu.ar
Germán Moyano	Director International and University Affairs, Instituto Tecnológico de Buenos Aires	gmoyano@itba.edu.ar
Rui Mendes	Director of International Affairs, Instituto Superior Técnico Lisboa	rui.mendes@tecnico.ulisboa.pt
Sandro Santos	International Affairs Area, Instituto Superior Técnico Lisboa	sandroterreirosantos@tecnico.ulisboa.pt

Acknowledgements

The GP_TIME consortium gratefully acknowledges the support of the T.I.M.E. Association throughout the project. Special thanks are due to Gwenaëlle Guillerme, Secretary General of T.I.M.E., for her support, guidance and contribution to giving visibility to the project and its outcomes. The consortium also thanks the participating institutions, international offices, teaching innovation units, academic staff and exchange students who contributed to the questionnaire and focus-group phases.