



## PROJECT FINAL REPORT

**Grant Agreement number:** 250442

**Project acronym:** EUIMA

**Project title:** Take-up activities by universities of specific guidelines and recommendations to implement their modernisation agenda.

**Funding Scheme:** FP7-CSA-SA

**Period covered:** from 01/01/2010 to 30/06/2012

**Name, title and organisation of the scientific representative of the project's coordinator:**

Dr. John SMITH, Deputy Secretary General, European University Association (EUA)

**Tel:** 02 743 1 143

**Fax:** 02 230 57 51

**E-mail:** john.smith@eua.be

**Project website address:** <http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima>

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Executive summary .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>2. Summary description of project context and objectives .....</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1. EUIMA – Collaborative Research .....	5
2.2. EUIMA – Full Costing.....	7
<b>3. Description of main S&amp;T results/foregrounds .....</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1. EUIMA – Collaborative Research .....	9
3.2. EUIMA – Full Costing.....	15
3.3. EUIMA: Horizontal aspects .....	21
3.3.1 Human Resources .....	21
3.3.2 Dialogue with regional/national and European policy makers .....	22
<b>4. Potential impact, impact (including the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far) and the main dissemination activities and exploitation of results.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>4.1 Specific impact and exploitation of results .....</b>	<b>23</b>
4.1.1. EUIMA – Collaborative Research .....	23
4.1.2. EUIMA – Full Costing.....	25
4.1.3. EUIMA Project's Impact on EU research and innovation policy development ....	26
4.1.4. Project level: follow-up activities.....	27
4.1.5. Specific dissemination activities .....	28
<b>Annex 1: EUIMA – Use of project outcomes and dissemination activities .....</b>	<b>29</b>
1. Overview .....	29
1.1. Project webpage .....	29
1.2. Events' web pages.....	30
1.3. Newsletter .....	31
1.4. Other awareness raising activities .....	31
<b>Part A. EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand.....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>Part B: EUIMA – Full Costing .....</b>	<b>39</b>

## 1. Executive summary

The EUIMA project (European Universities Implementing their Modernisation Agenda) addressed two major elements of the modernisation agenda for European Universities: i) the sustainability of university funding, financial management and development of full costing (EUIMA-Full Costing); ii) measurement tools for the assessment of university-based collaborative research reflecting the diversity of university missions (EUIMA-Collaborative Research). A third transversal focus running through the project aimed at identifying requirements for further development of human resources and management in universities.

In the Collaborative Research part through several workshops and extensive case studies the input given by the academic and business partners showed that universities can make compatible their core missions (excellence in academic research) and successful long-term collaborative research activities. In addition, a new set of assessment indicators is emerging based on the quality of the collaborative processes in the partnership. The assessment tools identified in the project have been proposed by both academic and business partners and they can be categorized into five broad thematic areas: i) collaborative research processes; ii) competitiveness and economic growth; iii) expert services; iv) human resources and; v) sustainability of the collaboration. These tools have a dynamic nature; they evolve all along the life of the initiative, as the goals or form of cooperation change over time. Although specific to a given context and location of the initiative, some assessment tools identified in this project could be transferable to other contexts.

The EUIMA-Full Costing project contributed to the development of full costing in European universities by helping them to better identify the costs of all their activities and projects. The project demonstrated that for the achievement of full costing in European universities a number of requirements must be fulfilled. At system level, the process needs to be supported in two ways: directly through reforms of legal frameworks to enhance the financial autonomy of universities where needed, through financial support for the development and implementation of a full costing methodology, and through educational support in the form of staff training. Indirectly, public funders should incentivise the development of full costing methodologies through funding rules that allow for the reimbursement of real costs. As FP7 and several national funding programmes have shown, this can be a powerful driver for this important change process.

As a coordination and support action the EUIMA project activities (2010-2012) ran in parallel with major stages of the development of the new EC research and innovation, and education programmes planned to operate from 2014-2020. Empirical evidence from the project was brought forward at a timely stage through the various stakeholder consultations to inform the policy development process.

The outcomes of the EUIMA project have been and will continue to be fed into EUA's further work on university and business/external partner collaboration, the financial sustainability of universities and the further professional development of human resources required to meet the demands of the

modernization agenda for Europe's universities. In this way the impact of the EUIMA project has been sustained well beyond the lifetime of the project.

## **2. Summary description of project context and objectives**

The EUIMA project (European Universities Implementing their Modernisation Agenda) addressed two major elements of the modernisation agenda for European Universities: i) The sustainability of university funding, financial management and development of full costing (EUIMA-Full Costing); ii) Measurement tools for the assessment of university-based collaborative research reflecting the diversity of university missions (EUIMA-Collaborative Research). A third transversal focus running through the project aimed at identifying requirements for further development of human resources and management in universities.

The project activities provided support for mutual learning, exchange of information and drew on empirical evidence from several projects that had been undertaken by EUA and other European partners. Through a series of case studies, workshops and study visits held at different universities across Europe, involving university leadership and management, researchers, government and regional authorities, industry and business representatives, non-governmental and other funding bodies, the project promoted good practices and supported universities in implementing the modernisation agenda with regards to sustainable funding and collaborative research with external partners.

### **2.1. EUIMA – Collaborative Research**

The EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand built on experience from previous and current EUA work looking at building strong relationships between universities and industry for doctoral education and the professional insertion of doctoral holders (DOC-CAREERS & DOC-CAREERS II) as well as at the exchange of best practice in collaborative research through the Responsible Partnering Initiative. The EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand aimed also to "take up" the results and recommendations arising from the European Commission Expert Group on the Assessment of University-Based Research. From the terms of reference of the Expert Group and its report, a main issue of concern was to develop a "multi-dimensional tool" for the assessment of university-based research which would take account of present assessment tools, their strengths and weaknesses, and of the diverse research missions and contexts of Europe's universities. Such a multi-dimensional assessment tool was foreseen to be required in Europe for the following reasons:

- (i) The debate on the assessment of performance ("ranking") of university research performance has tended to have been dominated by reference to assessment tools that are focussed on measuring output from universities in terms of scientific publication citation, Nobel Prize and other high-achievement scientific awards.
- (ii) These tools are designed essentially for measurement of high performance in fundamental research in research-intensive universities. But given the public and political attention that they have commanded, all universities are being measured increasingly by them whether or not they alone are

the appropriate tools for the measurement of the achievement of excellence in the research missions of universities beyond their contribution to highly-cited fundamental research.

(iii) The definition of "Excellence" in university research has tended as a result to be confined to this paradigm whereas excellence in research manifests itself clearly also in other research missions.

(iv) Furthermore, where such ranking outcomes become influential in resource allocation to universities they take on a consequential dimension not foreseen or intended by the ranking methodology which can be potentially detrimental to the further development of the wider research missions of universities.

In this project, EUA concentrated upon collaborative research between universities and external partners from industry, enterprises and regional authorities. In particular, the project focused on assessment tools which go beyond the traditional and widely-used quantitative measurement indicators, towards better ways of measuring the more intangible aspects of research collaborations. The outcome of this approach would be a more comprehensive way of assessing university-business/enterprise cooperation, complementing quantitative outcomes with qualitative or semi-quantitative measurement tools.

Specifically, the EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand addressed the following aims:

AIM 1: Identifying indicators for the success of collaborative research

- Identifying assessment tools to ascertain the context and quality of research collaborations between universities and external partners (SMEs, RTOs, public agencies, NGOs, charities, civil society and professional bodies);
- Identifying measurement tools designed to monitor progress towards achieving collaborative research projects' aims and objectives.

AIM 2: Determining the specificity of measurement tools to the precise nature of the collaborative research in its particular context

- Engaging in consultation with all stakeholders involved (universities, external partners and users) to assess the degree of transferability of the measurement tools;
- Exploring the degree to which such measurement tools are common practice in different contexts or transferable to other contexts.

AIM 3: Support universities who wish to strengthen their collaborative research

- Promoting good practices in relation to different external partners, business enterprises, regional authorities, non-government organisations, civil society organisations, etc.

#### AIM 4: Reflect on the experience of such good practices collected on a “bottom-up” basis

- Establishing a dialogue with all stakeholders on the results of the Expert Group’s work on the development of a “multi-dimensional” research assessment tool for feedback and further refinement.

Throughout the project, the following actions were conducted:

- Setting-up a Steering Committee with an advisory role to the project;
- Launch of two calls for participation to EUA membership;
- Identification of contributing universities for case studies, workshop participation and hosting based on the expressions of interest received in response to two calls for participation within the EUA membership. The results of this process were validated by the project’s Steering Committee;
- Planning of the workshop calendar in coordination with hosting institutions and development of the workshops format;
- Organising and holding the five workshops. This involved the development of specific technical objectives for each workshop, and the overall programming and organisation of the events in collaboration with the hosting institutions;
- Conducting a series of case studies for the collection of structured information on specific collaborative research projects/programmes between selected universities and their external partners. This activity involved the design of a questionnaire specifically developed for the EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand and an extensive dialogue with the contributors of the case studies.

It should also be emphasized that in every workshop speakers were requested to undertake “double-act” presentations. These presentations incorporated the views of the two main stakeholders in the collaborative research project, involving one academic representative and one representative of the non-academic partner. This was a central element in the development of the workshops and it has significantly contributed to achieving the EUIMA – Collaborative Research project’s objectives and to the added-value of the workshops for participants.

#### **2.2. EUIMA – Full Costing**

This strand of the project took up four key cross-cutting elements that emerged from the two respective EUA and Expert Group reports, "Towards full costing in European Universities" and "Impact of external project-based funding on the financial management of universities".

i) Implementing full costing as a strategic management tool aids universities in their goal to manage their substantial and increasing array of activities in an efficient and effective manner.

ii) There is a huge diversity in development of full costing throughout Europe, with universities in some countries having already implemented full costing, some in the process of implementation, but the majority still not able to identify the full costs of their activities in a sufficient way.

iii) There is a strong correlation between received support at national level and the development of full costing (and hence a need for a greater prominence to full costing as an issue). Coordinated national initiatives and support lead to faster development.

iv) Complex and diverse rules and inflexible implementation of rules that do not take account of national and regional contexts throughout Europe lead to further insecurity about implementing full costing and to a lack of certainty as to how to implement the process. Funding bodies should be encouraged to take into account this diversity when establishing their rules and regulations.

EUA's study showed that a large number of universities do not know how to begin the development of full costing because of many factors such as the lack of support from leadership, expertise of staff, and uncertainty about the choice of methodology and its implementation. This is often complemented and compounded by a lack of interest and knowledge at the level of the funding body. From feedback and impact evaluation of its study, EUA has noted a considerable increase in awareness about full costing and has experienced an increased demand for expertise and help.

This evidence pointed to the need for "take-up" activities to address the following aims:

AIM 1: Support knowledge exchange of experience and expertise in the implementation of full costing across Europe, while respecting the diversity of stages of development and national and regional contexts.

AIM 2: Foster a coordinated development of full costing; both internally at the institutional level by involving all relevant university staff and by ensuring the commitment of the senior university leadership; as well as externally among all relevant stakeholders; namely universities, university representative organisations, governments and funding bodies.

AIM 3: Provide feedback on how competitive funding schemes can act as important drivers and shapers of costing models at universities, and furthermore, provide policy makers in charge of funding schemes with analyses of current obstacles to inform the better design and implementation of their rules and regulations.

### 3. Description of main S&T results/foregrounds

#### 3.1. EUIMA – Collaborative Research

This section presents the main conclusions of the EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand and recommendations to practitioners involved in long-term collaborative research initiatives between universities and external partners, and European policy makers concerned with research and innovation policy development.

In order to achieve the aims outlined in the previous section, the core activities developed in the EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand related to the development of five workshops and the collection of structured in-depth case studies addressed to universities involved in long-term collaborative research initiatives. An overview of the main characteristics and outcomes of each workshop were presented in the first and in the second periodic reports, as well as in the respective deliverables of Work Package 2. An in-depth analysis of the case studies was provided in Deliverable D2.7 (also named as D2.9), along with two accompanying papers by EUIMA Senior Advisors Dr. David Livesey and Dr. Stephen Trueman.

The main cross-cutting issues emerging from the workshops and the analysis of the case studies related to five broad areas: i) the context and motivations to engage in collaborative research; ii) the outcomes, benefits and sustainability of collaborative research partnerships; iii) the process of putting collaborative research partnerships into practice; iv) the institutional support to collaborative research and organisational changes and; v) the emergence of new ways of assessing university-business long-term collaboration. The main cross-cutting elements can be summarised as follows:

- **Context and motivation to engage in collaborative research:** the regional context is an important catalyst for university-business partnerships. Universities and their external partners are driven by a variety of reasons to undertake collaborative research projects, such as increasing competitiveness for highly skilled labour and new goods and services and tackling societal challenges.
- **Benefits and sustainability of collaborative research partnerships:** increasing competitiveness and improving the degree of professionalization of human resources were pinpointed as two major benefits of collaborative research partnerships. Achieving long-term funding availability from successful collaboration and identifying and pursuing further opportunities for collaborative research projects were considered the two most important factors in order to promote the sustainability of university-business partnerships.
- **Setting-up the partnership:** the most important stages are identifying partners for the collaborative research project, negotiating the partnership, involving the research or knowledge transfer office at the university and engaging staff with different professional profiles in collaborative research, i.e. both researchers and research managers.

- **Challenges in taking the partnership forward:** raising awareness of the added-value of university-business partnerships; managing expectations among all stakeholders and finding common ground; dealing with administrative procedures and negotiating agreements; developing comprehensive collaborative research strategies at the institutional level; finding the “right people” and dealing with intellectual property rights. Overall, trust-building amongst all stakeholders – universities and their external partners – was pinpointed as the “sine qua non” requirement for the success of collaborative research initiatives.
- **Societal impact of long-term university-business partnerships:** the regional and the socio-economic impact of collaborative research should be highly valued and tools to assess the societal impact of university-business partnerships should be developed.
- **Institutional support:** the support provided by universities to collaborative research and the organisational changes undertaken by institutions are key aspects in promoting the development of successful long-term collaborative research initiatives. Overall, these aspects relate to different supporting activities undertaken by institutions, the organisation of knowledge transfer activities at the university-level, the impact of long-term collaborative research in the institution’s organisational structure and the importance of the quality of human resources involved in the partnerships.
- **Development of assessment tools for collaborative research:** universities and their external partners feel an increasing need to develop assessment tools for collaborative research. These tools should go beyond traditional “hard” indicators (e.g. number of patents, number of publications) to include more “soft” indicators, reflecting the quality of the research collaboration and the variety of collaborative research outcomes (e.g. increase of research skills and capacity, employability of master and doctoral graduates involved in collaborative research, creating and sustaining positions for researchers and research managers).

The EUIMA – Collaborative Research workshops and case studies provided further evidence on additional indicators universities and non-academic partners use when evaluating the quality of collaborative research activities. In addition, these assessment tools were shown to be dynamic and to evolve along the life-cycle of the research collaboration.

The indicators systematized in the EUIMA – Collaborative Research project can be broadly categorized into five dimensions: collaborative research projects, competitiveness and economic growth, expert services, human resources and sustainability of the collaboration. These dimensions are composed of the following indicators:

<b>Dimension 1: Collaborative research processes</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generation of competitive advantage</li> <li>• Working in a network (different from networking)</li> <li>• Multidisciplinarity</li> <li>• Access to “blue sky” research</li> <li>• Scientific productivity and excellence</li> <li>• Invention disclosures: the number of possible inventions to be considered for patenting</li> </ul>
<b>Dimension 2: Competitiveness and economic growth</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regional and national development</li> <li>• Media impact and visibility</li> <li>• Increase of research capacity</li> <li>• Return on resources investments</li> <li>• Perceptions on the collaboration (assessment of the interaction “customer” satisfaction)</li> <li>• Attracting international company/university partners</li> <li>• Social outcomes and</li> <li>• Environmental impact</li> </ul>
<b>Dimension 3: Expert services</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appointments to advisory or evaluation committees in national or international public and private organisations</li> <li>• Requests for consultancy</li> </ul>
<b>Dimension 4: Human Resources</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Impact on learning experience of students</li> <li>• Employability of graduates and master graduates</li> <li>• Industry employment of doctoral holders</li> <li>• Creating and sustaining positions for research and research management</li> </ul>
<b>Dimension 5: Sustainability of the collaboration</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Material means and infrastructure</li> <li>• Joint project applications for further research</li> <li>• “Follow-up” projects or “taking the next step”</li> <li>• Efficiency of contractual negotiations and management</li> <li>• Engaging in joint ventures</li> <li>• Attracting venture capital</li> </ul>

These indicators reflect the variety of outcomes of collaborative research that universities and their external partners should consider when designing and assessing collaborative research projects. These tools go beyond present proximal indicators, focusing on “metric” or quantitative results, to include more distal indicators, reflecting: i) different forms of collaboration; ii) different qualitative or semi-quantitative outcomes of the partnership and; iii) long-term effects of university-business partnerships in the institutions/organisations themselves and in their environment.

The choice of using some or all of the proposed indicators should depend on characteristics of the collaboration itself (e.g. type of collaborative project, its objectives and developmental stage of the

partnership) and on contextual factors, namely the region in which the partnership is embedded, the profile of the university and the profile of the company. Universities and their external partners should come to a clear understanding of the collaboration's objectives and should agree on which indicators are more relevant to assess the outcomes of their particular collaborative research project.

### **The added-value of EUIMA in relation to other European initiatives**

The EUIMA project, specifically its Collaborative Research strand, builds on several previous European initiatives in the framework of university-business partnerships. More specifically, EUIMA builds on the Responsible Partnering Guidelines (2009), in using the definition of collaborative research therein proposed, as well as on the outcomes of EUA project DOC-CAREERS (2006-2008). EUIMA also builds on the work developed by the European Commission Expert Group on Assessment of University-Based Research. In addition, the development of EUIMA ran parallel to other EUA project, DOC-CAREERS II (2009-2012).

The outcomes of EUIMA and of both DOC-CAREERS projects have contributed to the development of a comprehensive understanding of university-business partnerships throughout Europe. However, while DOC-CAREERS and DOC-CAREERS II have focused exclusively on collaborative doctoral education, EUIMA has taken a step forward and looked at more general modes of university-business research collaboration. Indeed, the scope of EUIMA has been much broader than that of DOC-CAREERS, in that it covered a wide variety of long-term university-business research collaboration initiatives (e.g. projects, programmes) and, in addition, brought to light the critical role of national-, regional- and institutional-level structures for supporting and fostering university-business partnerships, including focus on the breadth and evolving nature of knowledge transfer activities.

Thus, the joint outcomes of EUIMA, DOC-CAREERS and DOC-CAREERS II have allowed EUA to develop an empirically sound understanding of university-business partnerships, including: their various forms; their different developmental stages in varied regional and university contexts; the main motivations, challenges and benefits for universities and their external partners; and the impact of collaborative research initiatives at institutional, regional and national level.

Additionally, some parallels can be drawn between the assessment tools for collaborative research found in the EUIMA project and those identified by the EC Expert Group. For example, the "Sustainability and Scale" dimension identified by the EC Expert Group, and particularly the indicators "involvement of early-career researchers in teams", "number of collaborations and partnerships" and "doctoral completions", were recurring aspects mentioned in the EUIMA workshops and case studies. Parallels exist also between the Expert Group dimension of "Research Infrastructure" and its indicators on "research active academics" and "percentage 'research active' per total academic staff" and the outcomes of EUIMA. Indeed, some indicators found in the EUIMA project point to the creation and sustainability of research and research management positions (cf. dimension 4: human resources).

However, the dimensions and indicators systematized by the Expert Group have a different scope than those identified in the EUIMA project. Whereas those from the EC Expert Group addressed research activities in general, the EUIMA project focused exclusively on university-industry research collaborations. Therefore, the level of analysis and the dimensions and indicators found in EUIMA and by the EC Expert Group tap into different constructs. In addition, the indicators developed by the Expert Group have a stronger quantitative focus, reflecting the traditional indicators used to assess collaborative research. Those developed throughout the EUIMA project, in contrast, address much more specifically the “soft” aspects of the research collaboration, i.e., the quality of the collaboration process, the structures that enable this type of collaboration and the varied human resources and skills involved in the partnership. All these factors reflect the holistic approach taken in the EUIMA-Collaborative Research strand in the identification of assessment tools for collaborative research.

It should be emphasised that these two broad categories of indicators – traditional, quantitative indicators, and new indicators with a focus on the quality of the collaboration – should not be seen as mutually exclusive. Rather, they should be conceptualised as complementary and as providing a more comprehensive and multi-dimensional perspective of collaborative research activities. This multi-dimensionality will help universities and their external partners to develop a more holistic approach towards their collaborative research activities and to better assess the added-value and potential of such partnerships.

### **3.1.1 Main messages**

The key cross-cutting issues emerging from the workshops and from the analysis of the case studies can be summarized as follows.

#### **Reconciling universities' mission in academic excellence and in collaborative research**

The input given by universities involved in collaborative research initiatives showed that making compatible universities' core mission of excellence in academic research and successful long-term collaborative research activities is possible. To achieve a good degree of compatibility between the university and its external partners, focussed institutional leadership and the provision of appropriate support structures and services is crucial - which foster a research environment that encourages researchers to engage in collaborative research and recognises and rewards its success in their future career development.

#### **Support structures enable research outreach support from single companies through to industrial districts in reinforcing their innovation capacities**

The role, structure and organisation of intermediary bodies supporting collaborative research (TTOs, KTOs, KEOs, etc.) evolve alongside the institutional commitment to collaborative research activity. In the case of well-established knowledge transfer strategies, many universities had strong mission statements linking their research objectives to the economic regional development. The most effective regional systems had developed a strong coordination between university, local politicians and industry, but the development of a clear and effective university mission statement was seen as

a key catalysing factor. Therefore, the development and efficiency of knowledge and technology transfer activity as a whole was shown to be linked to: i) the internal university “research culture” and its ability to converse with companies; ii) the external technical innovation culture, and its level of confidence in research structures as well as its capacity to invest; and iii) the level of development of the regional knowledge exchange “ecosystem”.

#### **The importance of public funding to sustain long-term collaborative research**

Universities considered that continued public funding is essential in all stages of the collaboration, from early stages of the development of ideas or discovery to late stages, leading to potentially commercial prototypes and other research outputs. Public funding was also considered essential in order to provide structural elements which are beyond the capacity of the individual partners, such as adequate infrastructure (e.g. equipment), political/policy support and regional strategies.

#### **The emergence of new tools to assess the quality of collaborative research processes**

In addition to the traditional collaborative research assessment indicators already in use, a new set of assessment indicators is emerging based on the quality of the collaborative processes in the partnership. Assessment criteria in long-term collaborative initiatives evolve throughout the life of the initiative, as the goals or form of cooperation change over time. Hence, assessment tools are dynamic. Their specific targets or degree of achievement may also be different depending on the partners' objectives and degree of maturity of the collaborative research initiative.

#### **The quality of human resources as a crucial factor in developing and taking forward collaborative research activities**

Finally, and most importantly, the outcomes of workshops and case studies showed that collaborative research experience are being progressively taken into account in assessing the achievements for the career development of university research staff, both for researchers and for research managers. Both professional profiles should be nurtured by universities and their external partners; their skills and training needs should therefore be identified and developed. Collaborative research activities were also seen as an essential asset for tailoring education to the evolving needs of the job market, maximising the employability of graduates and creating and sustaining academic, technical and support staff positions.

### **3.2.EUIMA – Full Costing**

The aim of EUIMA Full Costing was to promote the development of full costing methodologies in European universities through the exchange of good practice and peer learning. The project focused on dissemination activities promoting concepts and messages stemming from EUA's prior work on funding and the financial sustainability of universities, namely the study "Financially Sustainable Universities: Towards Full Costing In European Universities" (2008) as well as the work of the European Commission Expert Group on the "Impact of external project-based funding on the financial management of universities". During the project seven country workshops and four study visits were organised.

The following sections (3.2.1 – 3.2.4) analyse the main concepts and methodology of the activities and their outcomes. Detailed descriptions have already been included in the two periodic reports.

#### **3.2.1 Country workshops – the system level perspective**

The country workshops were national level events, bringing together international experts to work with the leadership and management of universities of the respective country as well as relevant ministries at national and regional level and funding bodies and other stakeholders. Seven workshops were held in Croatia, Turkey, France, Belgium, Austria, Poland and Germany.

The purpose of the workshops was to contribute to the implementation of full costing at universities by showing the diversity of possible approaches as well as to foster cooperation among universities and public authorities. The format of the workshops was very practical and drew on examples of good practice in the implementation of full costing in Europe which were carefully selected to suit the specific needs and conditions of universities in the respective country. They provided a forum for debate, giving participants the opportunity to discuss the framework conditions needed to implement full costing in universities and to establish a network for cooperation between institutions. Strategic issues as well as financial and technical aspects were discussed on the basis of examples from different universities of the respective country and other European countries. The workshops helped identifying concrete steps to take forward the implementation of full costing in the context of the respective higher education system.

#### **Study visits – the institutional perspective**

The four study visits offered the possibility to European university leaders, managers and administrators to learn about full costing from institutions already well advanced in the practice.

The development and professionalization of university managers and the training of those implementing full costing was the focal point of the events and selected participants had been chosen as important multipliers for full costing development at their institution.

Importantly, each study visit had a particular focus depending on the profile and the specific expertise and experience of the host institution. The University of Coimbra was selected as host for a study visit due to its recognised extensive experience with the implementation of full costing and its integrated use in the strategic management of the university as well as the strong support from the leadership. The Technische Universität Dresden was selected to host the event due to the university's extensive experience with the implementation of full costing, notably with regard to the development of a necessary ICT structure, and its leadership's engagement in the development of the process more broadly in Germany. The event had been specifically designed for those who wished to gain experience in the implementation of full costing from the perspective of a university with a broad scientific spectrum and a recognised excellent research profile.

The third study visit at the University of Birmingham was designed to enable participants to learn about the results of the most recent review of the UK full costing methodology, which was presented by experts from leading UK universities and other stakeholders. Furthermore the strategic aspects of full costing were emphasized. The final study visit at Trinity College Dublin focused on the cooperation among universities, the government and funding agencies as well as the Irish approach to implementing full costing in a nation-wide coordinated process among all relevant stakeholders.

Practical advice from different management levels at the host institutions were complemented by expert perspectives from other European universities. Participants learnt about the key strategic issues involved in setting up full costing at their university, and develop the skills required for managing this complex change process. These included how to arrange costing methodologies, to manage the data collected, and to design effective communication strategies. With a maximum of 40 participants, the study visits also provided the opportunity for peer learning and for building networks to share expertise in the future.

### **3.2.2 Current state of full costing implementation at universities in Europe**

Although the project was focused on dissemination and capacity building activities rather than data collection, a wealth of information on the current state of full costing implementation in universities across Europe as well as good practice examples have been assembled throughout the project. This resulted in the EUA publication "Financially Sustainable Universities. Full Costing: Progress and Practice." It outlines the current state of play of full costing development in European universities, the progress that has been made during the last couple of years and to illustrate the key messages for university practitioners, policy-makers and funders with good practice examples from across Europe. The online publication was widely distributed among the university community and is available on the EUA website to the wider public:

[\(http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications\\_homepage\\_list/Full\\_Costing\\_Progress\\_and\\_Practice\\_web.sflb.ashx\)](http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/Full_Costing_Progress_and_Practice_web.sflb.ashx)

#### ***System level developments***

As the analysis and the country profiles that are part of the publication show, the state of implementation of full costing in Europe is highly diverse. Even within the 14 higher education

systems for which data was collected during the EUIMA and previous projects the level of development often differs between institutions.

Mature and advanced systems are those where universities are more or less at the same level of implementation, but differ regarding the strategic use of full costing. The United Kingdom, Ireland, Finland and Sweden, who were first to initiate the process, are the most advanced systems in terms of development and implementation of full costing methodologies. Although in these countries full costing was implemented system-wide, it was done in different ways: Ireland, Sweden and the UK developed a sector-wide model through a coordinated approach based on cooperation between universities. By contrast, in Finland, individual universities developed full costing methodologies on their own in response to requirements by the ministry and the national research funding councils. In systems where full-costing methodologies are at a mature stage, several universities are using full costing data for strategic management and decision-making, as the examples of British and Irish universities illustrate.

Many universities in the Netherlands are also quite advanced in the implementation and strategic use of full costing, but there were no system-wide coordinated process or state requirements. Main drivers were a higher cost recovery for contract research, or the need for reliable financial information to support internal decision-making. Today most Dutch universities are using full costing methodologies.

Austria, Belgium (Flemish-speaking community and French-speaking community), France and Germany are in the process of implementing full costing methodologies, although differences remain between these systems. The level of development also differs strongly between universities, despite the fact that discussions on full costing have been ongoing for several years.

In Austria the establishment of a commercial accounting system became a legal requirement in 2002. However, after the first move towards a common approach for a full costing methodology driven by FP7 requirements failed in 2007, individual universities are now developing their own models.

A similar development can be observed in Germany, where universities had formulated common principles in the so-called 'Greifswald resolution' in 1999, but failed to obtain the approval of the state ministers of finance. Furthermore, in some states, universities still have to use cameralistic accounting, which makes the introduction of a full costing system very difficult. The situation in Germany is therefore very diverse, with some institutions being more advanced than others.

In Belgium and France a number of universities started to develop full costing methodologies several years ago. Despite the fact that there is no formally coordinated approach at system level, universities actively exchange their experiences with the support of their respective university association/national rectors' conference. Some institutions have recently made considerable progress in terms of implementation, or have already instituted a working system. This also applies to some Portuguese universities, although in Portugal there is little support from the public authorities and funders and less cooperation between institutions. In Poland only three universities have started the implementation process, but awareness of the importance of financial sustainability has grown among universities during the last years.

In Croatia and Turkey discussions on full costing in universities were initiated with the EUIMA-Full Costing project. In these systems, universities have undergone the planning phase and some have started the implementation phase over the last couple of years. In Croatia and Turkey, universities have joined forces to develop common projects, led by the Council of Higher Education CoHE (YÖK) in the case of Turkey. The EUIMA-Full Costing project has thus had a considerable impact in participating countries and systems.

### ***Success factors for the implementation at institutional level***

Notably the good practice examples presented during the EUIMA study visits show that there are a few common success factors for the implementation of full costing methodologies at universities.

#### **1. Leadership commitment and effective communication**

The commitment of the university leadership is one of the key conditions for the successful development of full costing. Clear objectives for the implementation have to be set at the strategic level. The leadership team therefore needs to articulate a clear vision (on what it wishes to achieve). Furthermore it needs to identify potential obstacles to full costing, and proactively and systematically address them throughout the whole institution. It is the role of the leadership to promote a coordinated approach by engaging the entire university community and by communicating with the various administrative units involved in the implementation. The leadership also has a mission to communicate externally and should engage with other universities, funders and public authorities to support this complex change process with the necessary legislative and political reforms.

#### **2. Development of human resources**

In the last decade, many factors, such as new demands and activities, the evolution of universities' missions and an increasingly competitive environment have led to the transformation of the higher education sector. This change has also had an impact on the role of university leadership and the human resources and necessary skills associated with it. The same applies to the financial management of universities, and more specifically to the implementation and the use of full costing methodologies.

Both the implementation of full costing and the running and use of the system require professionally trained and experienced staff. In EUA's previous work on the implementation of full costing, knowledge-sharing between universities was highlighted as being a particularly efficient mechanism, and best suited to the sector's specific needs. During the study visits and country workshops organised in the framework of the EUIMA project, 'sector to sector' consultancy has again proved appropriate. The specificities of the education and research environment require an in-depth understanding to implement and apply full costing in a suitable way. In some cases they might need external support and consultancy, particularly in the initial implementation phase.

It is particularly important that full costing is used sensibly and in a way that does not undermine the main aims of universities' activities. Data has to be interpreted correctly so that the right conclusions are drawn. Administrative staff therefore must be able to link financial results with long-term

strategic implications and individual project decisions. This requires special knowledge and a broad range of skills, which administrative staff must have in order to apply results and communicate effectively with academic staff.

In the long term universities have to design strategies that may attract highly qualified personnel for the financial and strategic management of higher education institutions. The financial function should evolve from being a “compliance function” to a fully-fledged “enabler function” involved in the strategic development of the institution.

### **3. Common principles – different models**

Although common basic principles for full costing can be identified, different models exist as regards structure and implementation. A ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach is not appropriate. The diversity of full costing systems should reflect the diversity of institutional profiles and missions. Time allocation methodologies are a good example of the variety of possible instruments. The use of time can be identified through time sheets, staff surveys, staff interviews, staff profile creation and other instruments. The actual data used can come from different sources and be collected at different intervals. Each university has to determine the most appropriate instrument, depending on the context in which it operates. Full costing is hence a flexible tool that must be adapted to an institution’s profile.

#### **3.2.3 Key messages and recommendations for further development**

The analysis shows that considerable progress has been made in the implementation of full costing in European universities in recent years. EUA was able to contribute to this through its continuous work on the topic since the first EUA publication in 2008 (EUA 2008). The country workshops and study visits in the framework of the EUIMA project further promoted the development of full costing across European universities and provided a platform for practitioners for mutual learning through the exchange of experience and good practice. But despite these positive developments, there are still too many institutions that remain unable to fully identify their costs or use full costing appropriately and strategically. Further activities and support for the development are therefore crucial to continue the progress already made.

To ensure the further development of full costing in European universities a number of requirements must be fulfilled. At system level, the process needs to be supported in two ways: directly through reforms of legal frameworks to enhance the financial autonomy of universities where needed, through financial support for the development and implementation of a full costing methodology, and through educational support in the form of staff training. Indirectly, public funders should incentivise the development of full costing methodologies through funding rules that allow for the reimbursement of real costs. As FP7 and several national funding programmes have shown, this can be a powerful driver for this important change process.

The examples from different countries demonstrate that there are several ways to organise the implementation process and the involvement of different actors. Notably the role of public

authorities and policy makers in the process can take different forms. In the UK the so-called “buffer bodies” have strongly supported the process from the beginning. In Ireland the process was led by the universities, but supported by public funding. While in Sweden there was no additional financial support by the government, political support was provided through the acceptance of full costing methodologies by public research funding bodies.

These examples showcase further that a coordinated approach for full costing implementation can increase the efficiency of the process, also in terms of costs, as well as foster transparency and accountability resulting in enhanced trust between funders and universities. Furthermore a coordinated approach offers the opportunity to simplify funding rules and procedures, and creates the potential to develop a coherent approach among funders and to improve the funding system as a whole.

The following recommendations have been developed based on EUA’s work on full costing and the financial sustainability of universities and they were underpinned by the further collection and dissemination of information and case studies during the EUIMA project:

#### Recommendations to universities

1. Start/continue the process of full costing implementation.
2. Understand the complexity and multiple purposes of costing systems and the requirements of stakeholders and then take account of these factors in the overall design of the methodology.
3. Weigh up and then outline the multiple benefits of implementing costing systems and build awareness of these benefits within the university.
4. Use the costing system as an integrated strategic tool for planning and decision-making.

#### Recommendations to national governments

5. Recognise that universities need enhanced financial capacity to implement full costing.
6. Provide financial, technical, advisory and human resource support in implementing costing systems.
7. Grant universities the necessary autonomy to act independently.

#### Recommendations to EU institutions

8. Allow for the use of full costing methodologies to declare costs in the framework of EU funding programmes and accept nationally recognized methodologies and usual institutional practices.
9. Work towards a coherent terminology and apply these terms in a consistent fashion.
10. Increase awareness on a European, national and institutional level of the multiple benefits of full costing (e.g. through follow-up activities of the Modernisation Agenda and European Research Area policy frameworks).
11. Recognise the variation in the status of development and ability to implement costing systems within European universities and provide further help and support to enhance this ability in managing European funding schemes.

12. Further simplify the rules for new European research funding programmes, notably with regard to their implementation.
13. Foster dialogue and analyses of existing rules and practices and how they are implemented, involving representatives from universities and the relevant EU institutions to allow for an optimum grasp of the situation, to achieve more efficiency in administrative procedures and to remove unclear or conflicting regulations.

Recommendations to EU institutions and national governments and other funders

14. Balance the need for accountability with less complexity of the information required in competitive funding schemes.
15. Work towards more coherent conditions for external funding requirements on European and national level.
16. Move towards funding on a full cost basis to contribute to financial sustainability and encourage other external funders to move in the same direction.

Recommendation to all parties

17. The term “full costing” should be adopted for the time being to stand for the ability to identify and calculate all direct and indirect costs for all of an institution’s activities including projects.

### **3.3 EUIMA: Horizontal aspects**

#### **3.3.1 Human Resources**

The quality of human resources was perceived by all stakeholders involved in the EUIMA project as a crucial factor in increasing universities’ competitiveness and, more specifically, in developing and taking forward collaborative research activities and in supporting the implementation of full costing.

In the area of collaborative research, the analysis of the workshops and case studies showed the need to enhance the degree of professionalization of the staff involved in collaborative research projects, as increasingly complex collaborative research projects require a specific skill-set for researchers and for research managers. In addition, the case studies revealed that collaborative research experience is progressively being taken into account in assessing the achievements for the career development of university research staff, both for researchers and for research managers.

The activities undertaken in the EUIMA – Full Costing strand showed that both the implementation of full costing and the running and use of the system require professionally trained and experienced staff. The specificities of the education and research environment require an in-depth understanding to implement and apply full costing in a suitable way and to use it as a strategic management tool supporting the university’s long-term financial sustainability. In some cases, external support and consultancy might be needed, particularly in the initial implementation phase.

The outcomes of the EUIMA project demonstrated and placed emphasis upon the importance of the quality and degree of professionalization of human resources in universities. The skills needed for

different professional profiles involved in collaborative research and in full costing were identified and promoted through the dissemination of good practices.

### **3.3.2 Dialogue with regional/national and European policy makers**

In each event within the two strands of the EUIMA project an active dialogue and input from regional and national policy makers together with the university and external partners (from industry and funding agencies) was achieved. In addition, the EUIMA final event was organised in Brussels as a dialogue with European policy makers on the overall project results. Originally the event was meant as a stakeholder workshop to replace the sixth collaborative research workshop. However, it was agreed together with the European Commission that it was most timely to present and debate the project results and recommendations as a whole to European policy makers and stakeholders in order to feed them into the then ongoing discussion about the shape of future EU research and innovation funding programmes. Therefore, the EUIMA final event on “Horizon 2020 and the modernisation of European universities – Dialogue with European policy makers” was organized on 10 May 2012 in Brussels and attracted 120 participants including speakers and representatives from the European Commission, European Parliament, Member States’ Permanent Representations to the EU, universities, businesses and other stakeholders interested in research and innovation policy.

## **4. Potential impact, impact (including the socio-economic impact and the wider societal implications of the project so far) and the main dissemination activities and exploitation of results**

The following sub-sections describe the impact and main dissemination activities of the EUIMA project.

### **4.1 Specific impact and exploitation of results**

#### **4.1.1 EUIMA – Collaborative Research**

The EUIMA – Collaborative research strand contributed towards increasing awareness and sharing of good practice in collaborative research initiatives between universities and non-academic external partners. The project showcased a wide variety of collaborative research initiatives, varying not only in the areas of knowledge covered, but also in the type of external partner, the scale of the collaborative research initiative and the level of the collaboration.

Project activities aimed at sharing good practices in university-based collaborative research, presenting and discussing ways of assessing the progress and success of collaborative research initiatives and proposing measurement tools to monitor progress towards achieving aims and objectives of collaborative research activities, in addition to the traditional indicators already in use. Most importantly, the universities contributing to the five workshops indicated the following added-value that the EUIMA project brought to their institutions:

- Promoted collaborative research partnerships
- Enhanced European networking
- Highlighted main approaches towards collaborative research
- Promoted long-term collaborative research initiatives
- Raised awareness and focused on the identification of assessment tools for collaborative research
- Provided a reflective forum where universities could share their collaborative research practices and exchange views and experiences with peers from both universities and companies

The EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand sought to have strategic impact upon the work of a wide range of practitioners involved in higher education and research, industry and other stakeholders and policy makers across Europe. The project aimed particularly for impact at the institutional level, universities, employers and key bodies concerned with knowledge production and dissemination. The various impacts with the respective actors can be summarised as follows:

- European Universities: contributed to achieve greater awareness of the variety of collaborative research initiatives being developed throughout Europe; examples of good practice on the basis of which to proceed to the development or improvement of their

own programmes; improvement in regional cooperation and networking in a dialogue with different potential partners.

- Academics and external partners involved in collaborative research: greater awareness of the benefits and challenges of setting-up and taking forward collaborative research activities.
- Research and Technology Organisations (RTOs), Technology Transfer Organisations (TTOs) etc: worked to strengthen and enhance the visibility of the new “research ecology” involving closer cooperation and networking between them and universities, and companies in building better frameworks for collaborative research development and knowledge and technology transfer.
- European policy-makers at national at European levels: raised awareness on key issues in collaborative research; improvement of dialogue with all main stakeholders including universities, social and industrial partners.
- Companies and industry: greater awareness of the importance and added-value of collaborative research and its instrumental role in increasing industries’ competitive advantage; improved dialogue with universities.

The EUIMA project had an important impact in strengthening cooperation and dialogue with industry and company partners particularly through the European Industrial Research Management Association (EIRMA) being involved in the Steering Committee and advising on case studies and facilitating access to business partners through interviews or their contributions to workshops. Also each activity entailed extensive prior contact and consultation with each university and their industry/business partners. This impact can be measured in the high percentage involvement of industry and business partners in EUIMA activities, and the unique character of EUIMA workshops of always ensuring “double act” contributions from university and business partners on their research collaboration, and their engagement in the debate for the whole duration of the workshops.

Building of trust relationships and open dialogue between EUA and industry/business partners has been instrumental therefore in developing the wider range of indicators for the assessment of collaborative research and its success. This cooperation has a lasting impact through the continuing work of the informal group taking forward “Responsible Partnering Initiative” which involves EUA and EIRMA but also the European Association of Research and Technology Organisations (EARTO).

Several of the EUIMA activities held in workshops across Europe also demonstrated clearly the key role of collaborative research and innovation activities involving university and business partners (particularly SMEs) in helping to facilitate the economic and social development at the regional level. EUIMA findings, through demonstrating the importance of place and location and in avoiding “one size fit” approaches but identifying some common elements of, and indicators for, successful research and innovation activities, can valuably inform future investment of public funds for regional economic and social development.

#### **4.1.2 EUIMA – Full Costing**

EUIMA events in this strand brought together around 1000 participants from 25 different countries and offered them the opportunity to learn from best practice in implementing full costing from around 40 of the most experienced universities in Europe situated in 15 different European countries. The project thus contributed to the enhancement of skills and knowledge of university practitioners across Europe with regard to full costing implementation and use, which in the long term also supports university modernisation and financial management capacities (AIM 1). Furthermore the project fostered a coordinated approach towards full costing implementation among all important actors through the involvement of policy makers, funders and public authorities in the activities (AIM 2). Furthermore the main messages and recommendations were fed into policy processes at European and national level (AIM 3).

The impact of EUIMA Full Costing can be distinguished at the following three levels:

**(i) *National level***

In two countries (namely Croatia and Turkey) the country workshops initiated the debate about full costing, while they gave a new drive to the ongoing discussions and implementation process in the five other countries (namely Austria, Belgium, France, Germany and Poland). As a result of the workshops several universities in Croatia and in Turkey developed a common project for the implementation of full costing and adopted a coordinated approach, while also individual universities in Poland started the implementation. In France, AMUE and CPU have organised a series of events and training sessions after the country workshop in order to enhance the capacities of French universities to manage the implementation of full costing. The same can be observed in Belgium, where the Communities support their universities through staff training and workshops. In Austria the outcomes of the workshop informed the design of a new funding model based on student numbers, by exploring how full costing data could be used in this regard. In Germany the debate on full costing has been revitalised by the country workshop and brought experience from other European countries to the ongoing process in many German universities. Furthermore a renewed commitment by the German Rectors' Conference to further engage in the process was achieved.

**(ii) *Institutional level***

The four study visits allowed European university leaders, managers and administrators to learn about full costing from institutions that are already well advanced in the practice and to use the experience to implement the process at their own universities. The study visits offered each time a unique opportunity for participants to learn about a particular aspect of full costing implementation specific to the institution they went to. The event at the University of Coimbra served as a pilot study visit to build the ground for the three following study visits, to test the topics and the format in which they should best be presented in order to maximise the benefit for participants. In Dresden it was specifically looked at the impact of the implementation of full costing on the university's recognised excellent research profile and its growing collaborations with external partners. Specific

consideration was also given to the universities' central ICT structure that was developed to support the implementation of full costing throughout the institution. In Birmingham the focus laid on full costing as strategic management tool and participants got an insight into the most recent review of the TRAC (= Transparent Approach to Costing) and FEC (= Full Economic Costing) in the UK. In Dublin the particularity of a nation-wide coordinated process led by universities and supported by the government was at the forefront.

***(iii) Level of individual university staff***

Several participants took part in a country workshop and a study visit. They could thus on the one hand discuss the specific situation and conditions for full costing implementation in their country as well as get first-hand experience from an institution that is already advanced in the process. This helped them afterwards in moving forward with their own project, and also made them important multipliers of full costing development at institutional as well as system level.

The project was also successful in motivating participants in study visits from countries where no workshop took place, to convey the project's messages in their countries. The University of Coimbra in Portugal published inspired by the presentations and discussions during the study visit, a report outlining different aspects of full costing implementation at universities. The Masaryk University for instance pushed forward the discussions in the Czech Republic and organised a conference on full costing for Czech universities together with the Charles University Prague on 11 October 2012 in Brno. Experts and hosts from the EUIMA-Full Costing project (from Trinity College Dublin, the University of Amsterdam as well as EUA) were also involved in the organisation of the event as member of the programme committee and speakers. Also after the official end of the EUIMA project, the contributing experts continue sharing their expertise either by giving practical guidance to individual universities, or advising funders in the development of their programmes or giving presentations at various events.

#### **4.1.3 EUIMA Project's Impact on EU research and innovation policy development**

The EUIMA project activities (2010-2012) ran in parallel with major stages of the development of the new EC research and innovation, and education programmes planned to operate from 2014-2020. Empirical evidence from the project was brought forward therefore at a timely stage through the various stakeholder consultations, and through valuable liaison with the European Commission staff responsible for the project, to inform the policy development process.

Important contribution were made towards the debate and development of the Green Paper on "The European Research Area: New Perspectives", the EC Recommendation on "The Management of Intellectual Property in Knowledge Transfer Activities for Universities and Other Public Research Organizations" and the EC Communication on "Better Careers and More Mobility: A European Partnership for Researchers".

Furthermore the outcomes of the project were fed into policy processes at European level through official EUA statements such as: the EUA position on the EC "Green Paper" on a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding (2011); the EUA position "Smart People for Smart Growth" on the EU flagship initiative "Innovation Union" (2011); the EUA response to the consultation of the European Commission on the Modernisation of Higher Education in Europe (2011) and the EUA Input to the Debate on the Rules for Participation in Horizon 2020 (2012).

EUA had been involved in the discussions about Horizon 2020 from the very beginning and had targeted the relevant EU actors to inform the policy process. It responded to the EC consultation before the publication of the Horizon 2020 proposals and liaised with the rapporteurs of the European Parliament on Horizon 2020 and the Rules for Participation. Information sessions to provide empirical evidence from the EUIMA project were also organised for staff from the permanent representations of EU member states in Brussels.

Furthermore speakers and participants from EUIMA events gathered in an informal expert group that commented on the proposal for the Rules for Participation at the different stages and this analysis was then fed into the overall EUA input to the debate. EUA continues to be involved in various stakeholder consultations on Horizon 2020 and its implementation and provides its expertise to European policy makers.

The experience from EUIMA collaborative research fed into also the development of the new "Fast Track to Innovation" instrument within Horizon 2020 with EUA being one of the stakeholders working with the European Parliament on its development. EUIMA project showed that most of the university-industry/business collaborations studied did not involve EU funding which tended to be seen as involving a rather heavy administrative procedure with a long period before a contract was awarded. The "Fast Track to Innovation" concept sought to address these criticisms by providing an easily accessible instrument with quick decision schedules to support new and innovative ideas put forward jointly by universities/RTOs and business partners.

#### **4.1.4 Project level: follow-up activities**

The outcomes of the EUIMA project have been and will continue to be fed into EUA's further work on university and business/external partner collaboration, the financial sustainability of universities and the further professional development of human resources required to meet the demands of the modernization agenda for Europe's universities . In this way the impact of the EUIMA project has been sustained well beyond the lifetime of the project.

The EUA initiative to establish a European Platform of Universities engaged in Energy Research (EPUE) has drawn upon the methodology of EUIMA collaborative research in identifying university and industry collaboration in research and training in the energy field. Over 170 universities have now joined the platform which contributes also to the development of the EU SET-PLAN. Furthermore, the "Memorandum of Understanding" on the European Research Area signed between EUA and the European Commission DG Research and Innovation in July 2012 includes an action on university-industry collaboration and knowledge transfer in which the results and recommendations of EUIMA collaborative research are being taken forward. The most recent activities in this respect took place within the framework of the Innovation Convention in March 2014 where EUA convened two sessions (with other MoU partners) on universities' contributions to

growth through their research and innovation activities (in which EUIMA contributing partners played a part).

EUA's work on full costing is also taken further in new projects, such as the ATHENA project on "Fostering sustainable and autonomous higher education systems in the Eastern Neighbouring Area" co-funded by the Tempus Programme of the EU, where EUA together with its partners contributes to the development of university autonomy and financial sustainability (i.a. through tools like full costing) in Armenia, Moldova and Ukraine. Based on the success of the methodology of EUIMA Full Costing, a similar series of events has been developed in the framework of the ATHENA project, with the organisation of country workshops bringing together the main stakeholders at national level with policy makers and funders as well as training seminars at institutional level giving the opportunity to university staff from the partner countries to learn from the expertise of their peers at institutions in the EU.

In addition to the project events, a special session on the EUIMA project was organised at the first EUA Funding Forum in Salzburg in June 2012. The Funding Forum is a unique, inclusive platform open to all higher education funding stakeholders – universities and students, public authorities, public and private funders and partners. This event brought together around 170 participants from 27 countries. At the Forum, a EUIMA stocktaking session offered the opportunity for participants to the EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshops and Study Visits to present an update on the progress achieved in developing and implementing full costing methodologies in their institutions.

#### **4.1.5 Specific dissemination activities**

The EUIMA project has benefitted from the extensive experience of the EUA in disseminating project outcomes and communicating with its large membership base which has allowed the project to reach to the wider higher education and research communities across Europe - more than 800 EUA member universities, 34 rectors' conferences and numerous university and research organisations and networks. To do this, various communication channels were used throughout the project, including dedicated websites for the project and its events, newsletter articles, targeted, mailings to various contacts as well as other tools which have engaged relevant stakeholders. All these have been instrumental in both promoting the projects' events and gaining active participation of the relevant actors as well as for widely disseminating the project's outcomes and findings

Detailed list of dissemination activities undertaken in the framework of the EUIMA project are presented in Annex 1.

## **Annex 1: EUIMA – Use of project outcomes and dissemination activities**

### **1. Overview**

Dissemination activities represented an inherent part of the EUIMA project's work and its events, which aim to foster the take-up of expertise and good practice cases in the two respective fields of interest in the project. To support these activities, additional dissemination activities were undertaken by both strands of the project to raise awareness and visibility of the project.

Benefiting from the extensive experience of the EUA in disseminating project outcomes and communicating with its large membership base allowed the EUIMA project to reach to the wider higher education and research communities across Europe, including more than 800 EUA member universities, 34 rectors' conferences and numerous university and research organisations and networks. To do this, various communication channels were used throughout the project, including dedicated websites for the project and its events, newsletter articles, targeted press releases, mailings to various contacts as well as other tools which facilitated engaging relevant stakeholders. All these have been instrumental on the one hand in promoting the projects' activities as well as for disseminating the outcomes and findings resulting from the project's events.

#### **1.1. Project webpage**

As one of the main dissemination channels used, the common EUIMA website was set up early in the project offering a platform for publicising information about the project and its developments. The web page is divided into various sections, which includes separate pages for each project strand and the project team. The project pages continuously achieve high viewing rates and top the list of EUA's pages. The links to these web pages with details on viewings are provided in the table below. The figures refer to the whole project period from 1 January 2010 until 30 June 2012.

<b>Web page</b>	<b>Web address</b>	<b>Total views</b>
EUIMA	<a href="http://www.eua.be/euima">http://www.eua.be/euima</a>	5,875
EUIMA-Full Costing	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-full-costing.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-full-costing.aspx</a>	8,173
EUIMA-Collaborative Research	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research.aspx</a>	2,971

The pages of each project strand contain the descriptions of the projects' rationale and objectives and provide links to all relevant reports of the EUA and the European Commission. One of the key functions of these web pages was also to allow the publication of the Calls for Expressions of Interest. Furthermore, the web pages also provide a list of the project's activities, which were regularly updated to reflect developments, and include links to the pages set up for individual events organised under the project.

## 1.2. Events' web pages

Events web pages were created as a useful resource for the events' participants and offer a useful tool to disseminate the contributions and other outcomes of each event. The EUIMA-Collaborative Research used individual event pages to promote the programme of the workshop and provided links to presentations which are published after the event.

Under the EUIMA-Full Costing strand of the project, events' pages were developed with a special software tool which allowed including more information aimed at the larger audiences taking part in the workshops. The event web pages also included the workshop programmes, and provided access to the registration facility, where interested persons could apply directly to participate in the workshop. Furthermore, practical information about accommodation, transport and accessibility were also provided for the benefit of the participants. Following the completion of each event, presentations by all stakeholders were made available on these pages.

<b>CR workshop: Tampere</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/euima-workshop-2-tampere-university-of-technology.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/euima-workshop-2-tampere-university-of-technology.aspx</a>
<b>CR workshop: Karlstad</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/presentations-from-karlstad-workshop-3.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/presentations-from-karlstad-workshop-3.aspx</a>
<b>CR workshop: Torino</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/Presentations-from-Torino-Workshop-4.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/Presentations-from-Torino-Workshop-4.aspx</a>
<b>CR workshop: Cambridge</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/Presentations-from-Cambridge-Workshop-5.aspx">http://www.eua.be/eua-projects/current-projects/euima/euima-collaborative-research/Presentations-from-Cambridge-Workshop-5.aspx</a>
<b>CR special session at EUA annual conference: Warwick</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_John_Goddard.sflb.ashx">http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_John_Goddard.sflb.ashx</a> <a href="http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Enrico_Macii.sflb.ashx">http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Enrico_Macii.sflb.ashx</a>
<b>FC country workshop Belgium:</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Belgium.aspx">http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Belgium.aspx</a>
<b>FC country workshop Austria</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Austria.aspx">http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Austria.aspx</a>
<b>FC country workshop Poland</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Poland.aspx">http://www.eua.be/Country-Workshop-Poland.aspx</a>
<b>FC country workshop Germany</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/events/past/2011/EUIMA_Full_Costing_Country_Workshop_Germany/Home.aspx">http://www.eua.be/events/past/2011/EUIMA_Full_Costing_Country_Workshop_Germany/Home.aspx</a>
<b>FC study visit Dresden</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/study-visit-dresden.aspx">http://www.eua.be/study-visit-dresden.aspx</a>
<b>FC study visit Birmingham</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/study-visit-birmingham.aspx">http://www.eua.be/study-visit-birmingham.aspx</a>
<b>FC study visit Dublin</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/study-visit-dublin.aspx">http://www.eua.be/study-visit-dublin.aspx</a>

<b>Session on European Funding at the EUA annual conference</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Marcin_Palys.sflb.ashx">http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Marcin_Palys.sflb.ashx</a>  <a href="http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Thomas_Estermann.sflb.ashx">http://www.eua.be/Libraries/EUA_Annual_Conf_2012_Warwick/FINAL_Thomas_Estermann.sflb.ashx</a>
<b>EUIMA project final event</b>	<a href="http://www.eua.be/events/past/2012/euima-project-final-event/home.aspx">http://www.eua.be/events/past/2012/euima-project-final-event/home.aspx</a>

### 1.3. Newsletter

A key dissemination activity undertaken by both strands of the project was also the use of the EUA newsletter tool, which reaches more than 10.000 subscribed persons and institutions, including EUA collective members (national rectors' conferences, university networks) as well as a large range of staff in European universities, research organisations and other networks.

Moreover, the newsletter proved to be a valuable resource for disseminating Calls for Expressions of Interest. This allowed to successfully reach a large number of interested institutions and individuals, and helped to foster their involvement in the project. Moreover, the newsletter was also used to disseminate the outcomes of all EUIMA events through short articles produced following each event. The stories provided a link to the event's web page where participants could find more details and use all the resources presented at the event, therefore achieving maximum outreach and impact.

### 1.4. Other awareness raising activities

EUA's vast experience in running projects in higher education was also crucial in developing tools to raise awareness about the aims of the EUIMA project. To do this, a range of promotional material was created to increase the visibility of the project. As a good example, the EUIMA project brochure was distributed at EUA's events and other external opportunities to maximise the reach throughout Europe. A stand-alone roll-up was specifically designed to be used in EUIMA events.

The project are also widely promoted through other EUA events as well as external speaking opportunities involving EUA staff, who feed the outcomes of the project into policy discussions at both national and European level. Among such contributions it is worthwhile to point out the input provided to the debate about the future EU framework programme for research and innovation, to which EUA has contributed throughout the process and keeps contributing at various occasions and informs the policy processes notably based on outcomes of the EUIMA project. Among these activities it is worth mentioning EUA policy positions, such as "EUA position on the EC consultation document on the "ERA Framework" (2011)", the "EUA position on the EC "Green Paper" on a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding (2011)", "Working together towards financial sustainability for European universities (April 2011)" and the "EUA Input to the Debate on the Rules for Participation in Horizon 2020 (May 2012)". Furthermore EUA is continuously in contact with the EU institutions (EC, EP and Council) to inform the decision-making processes.

In addition, good practice examples of the project were presented at the EUA Annual Conference at the University of Warwick (United Kingdom) on 22-23 March 2012. Outcomes of the Collaborative Research and Full Costing strands were presented in two different sessions:

- EUIMA – Collaborative Research outcomes were presented in the Working Group Session I, in Thematic Track 3: Collaborative Research (23 March 2012)
- EUIMA – Full Costing outcomes were used as input in the Working Group Session I, in Thematic Track 1: European Funding (23 March 2012).

Besides this, a special EUIMA stocktaking session was organized at the EUA Funding Forum in Salzburg (Austria) on 11 and 12 June 2012 (described above under WP3).

Interviews to media were also regularly given to specialist as well as to general national media, reflecting the findings of the project. In certain cases, media coverage has also been sought proactively to promote the project and its activities to targeted audiences.

The following sections present in more detail the specific dissemination activities in each one of the project's strands – Collaborative Research and Full Costing.

#### **Part A. EUIMA – Collaborative Research strand**

The two sub-sections that follow describe and list in detail the activities which have been undertaken by EUA for the use of the EUIMA-Collaborative Research project outcomes and the dissemination actions: events, communication and dissemination tools.

##### **A.1. Use of project outcomes**

The outcomes of the EUIMA project have been widely used in EUA activities related to research and innovation and particularly in researchers training, employment opportunities and researchers' careers. These can be classified as follows:

- A. Policy Consultations with the European Commission and the European Parliament
- B. Input into EUA and EUA-CDE Policy Declarations and Positions
- C. Participation in dedicated EU R&I Stakeholders Fore policy dialogue
- D. Linkages with EUA-CDE activities
- E. Linkages with other EUA projects

## **A. Policy Consultations with the European Commission and the European Parliament**

### **A.i. Participation in European Commission consultation meetings and expert groups**

Presence of EUA in Expert Groups and Ad-hoc Meetings organised by the European Commission in relation to doctoral programmes, researcher's careers, Modernisation Agenda, EIT, ERC, Horizon 2020, etc., including:

- Expert Subgroup on "Human Resources and Mobility Steering Group" (Brussels, 11/01/2011);
- Brainstorming on Modernisation Agenda (Brussels, 25/01/2011)
- Consultation on Common Strategic Framework (Stakeholder meeting; Brussels, 01/03/2011);
- Meeting with Anders Floodstrom, EIT working group, 29/03/2011);
- Contributions to the ex-ante impact assessment for the rules for participation of the Common Strategic Framework for Research and Innovation (Brussels, 28/04/2011);
- ERA Framework – Meeting with Stakeholders (Brussels, 21/06/2011);
- Common Strategic Framework (CSF) for Research and Innovation – Energy (Stakeholders' workshop; Brussels, 23/06/2011);
- Brainstorming on the Modernisation Agenda at DG EAC (Brussels, 25/01/2012);
- Expert Subgroup on "Skills" (Brussels, 02/02/2012);
- Horizon 2020: The Parliament (Brussels, 13/11/2012);
- Science Europe High Level Workshop on ERA, (Brussels, 20-21/02/2013);
- ERAC working group on Knowledge Transfer (Brussels, 13/03/2013);
- Horizon 2020 – Marie-Curie Actions-COFUND Stakeholder meeting (Brussels, 20/03/2013);
- Workshop on implementation of Horizon 2020 (Brussels, 22/04/2013);
- MoU SHOs meeting on ERA Monitoring (Brussels, 03/05/2013).

### **A.ii. Strategic dialogue with European Institutions and Initiatives**

- Meeting with Robert-Jan Smits of DG Research and Innovation (Brussels, 25/02/2011);
- Meeting with Mr Wolfgang Burtscher, Deputy Director EC RTD (Brussels 20/07/2011);
- European Commission ERAC seminar (Brussels, 13/09/2011);
- Workshop "Enhancing and focussing EU international cooperation in research and innovation: A strategic approach" (Brussels, 13/03/2012);
- EPP Group hearing on Horizon 2020 (Brussels, 06/06/2012).

## **B. Input into EUA and EUA-CDE Policy Declarations and Positions**

Reference to the outcomes of the EUIMA is always included in all relevant EUA and EUA-CDE policy statements:

- Salzburg II Recommendations: European Universities' Achievements since 2005 in Implementing the Salzburg Principles, 21<sup>st</sup> October 2010;
- Smart People for Smart Growth: Statement by the European University Association on the EU Flagship Initiative "Innovation Union" of the Europe 2020 European Strategy for Smart, Sustainable and Inclusive Growth", 3<sup>rd</sup> February 2011;
- European University Association (EUA): EUA position on the EC "Green Paper" on a Common Strategic Framework for EU Research and Innovation Funding; 10<sup>th</sup> May 2011;
- EUA position on the EC consultation document on the "ERA Framework", 30<sup>th</sup> November 2011;
- Memorandum of Understanding between the European Commission and the European University Association, 17<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

## **C. Participation in dedicated EU R&I Stakeholders Fora policy dialogue**

Participation in dedicated European policy development dialogue included meetings and events organised by the Responsible Partnering Initiative partners (EUA, EARTO, EIRMA, ProTon) and with other bodies such as the European Institute of Innovation and Technology and the European Science Foundation.

- The Responsible Partnering Guidelines published in 2005 were thoroughly revised and re-published in 2009. The Responsible Partnering Guidelines were used as a framework document for the EUIMA project. In particular, the definition of collaborative research proposed in the document was used in EUIMA.
- Responsible Partnering Initiative – Core Group Meeting with EARTO and EARMA (Brussels, 11/07/2011, 29/09/2011)
- Responsible Partnering Initiative – Core Group Meeting (Brussels, 10/01/2013)
- Horizon 2020 – Science Business Policy Bridge (Brussels, 27/03/2012)
- Member of the Advisory Panel to the FP7 Project called "European Laboratory for Modelling the Technical Research University of Tomorrow" (Ulab) – 2011-2012 (meeting on 02/11/2011; the 2<sup>nd</sup> Advisory Panel Meeting was hosted by EUA in Brussels, 01/06/2012).

The work of EUIMA is reflected also in other projects and initiatives developed by EUA and EUA-CDE:

#### **D. Linkages with EUA-CDE activities**

- Continuous mutual update of and input to activities between in EUA Research and Innovation unit and EUA-CDE, normally between Dr. Lidia Borrell-Damian and Dr. Thomas Jorgensen.
- Participation of EUA Research and Innovation staff (Dr. John H. Smith, Dr. Lidia Borrell-Damian) in EUA-CDE Steering Committee meetings when relevant;
- Participation of EUA Research and Innovation staff (Dr. John H. Smith, Dr. Lidia Borrell-Damian) in EUA-CDE workshops when relevant.

#### **E. Linkages with other EUA projects**

- EUA project funded by the Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) called “Promoting Collaborative Doctoral Education for Enhanced Career Opportunities (DOC-CAREERS II)”. This EUA project was closely linked to EUIMA, as collaborative doctoral education is one specific example of university-business cooperation.
- EUA Project funded by the Life Long Learning Programme called “Mapping University Mobility of Staff and Students” (MAUNIMO).
- EUA rankings review project: participation of Dr. Lidia Borrell-Damian in the editorial board meetings. This project has resulted in two EUA publications:  
“Global university rankings and their Impact” (2011):  
[http://www.eua.be/pubs/Global\\_University\\_Rankings\\_and\\_Their\\_Impact.pdf](http://www.eua.be/pubs/Global_University_Rankings_and_Their_Impact.pdf)  
“Global university rankings and their impact – Report II” (2013):  
[http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications\\_homepage\\_list/EUA\\_Global\\_University\\_Rankings\\_and\\_Their\\_Impact\\_-Report\\_II.sflb.ashx](http://www.eua.be/Libraries/Publications_homepage_list/EUA_Global_University_Rankings_and_Their_Impact_-Report_II.sflb.ashx)

#### **A.2. Dissemination activities**

Benefiting from the extensive experience of the EUA in disseminating project outcomes and communicating with its large membership base has allowed the project to reach to the wider higher education and research communities across Europe, including more than 800 EUA member universities, 34 rectors' conferences and numerous university and research organisations and networks. To do this, various communication channels were used throughout the project, including dedicated websites for the project and its events, newsletter articles, targeted, mailings to various contacts as well as other tools which have facilitated engaging relevant stakeholders. All these have been instrumental on the one hand in promoting the projects' activities as well as for disseminating the outcomes and findings resulting from the project's events. Specifically, these include:

- A. Dissemination events: Presentations/Chair of sessions in conferences and events
- B. EUA Newsletter
- C. Interviews and input to external projects
- D. Input to specialised media

#### **A. Dissemination events: Presentations/Chair of sessions in conferences and events**

EUA is regularly invited to present outcomes of the project to raise awareness of collaborative doctoral education issues and discuss on implications for policy development.

EUA is permanently promoting the outcomes of the EUIMA project in relevant activities in the field of research, doctoral education and university-industry collaboration, including links with EUA-CDE and the Responsible Partnering initiative. This is normally done in the form of dedicated presentations adapted to each audience. During the project, the following dissemination events took place:

- University-Business Forum (Brussels, 23/03/2011)
- Conference on “Training, Career and Mobility of Researchers” (Hungarian Presidency of the Council of the European Union; Budapest, 28-29/06/2011)
- CRUE Sectorial I+D Conference “XIX Jornadas de Investigación de las Universidades Españolas”, presentation entitled “University-business relations, regional innovation and doctoral education in collaboration with businesses and other external partners” (Málaga, 27-28/10/11)
- Horizon 2020, Science Business Policy Bridge meetings (Brussels, 27/03/2012)
- The role of innovative universities in smart specialisation, ECIU Workshop Scottish House, (Brussels, 13/04/2012)
- European Business Summit (Brussels, 26/04/2012)
- Entrepreneurial Universities conference (Münster, 26-27/04/2012)
- Good Practices and Learnings from the EIT- Linking Business, Research and Higher Education (Copenhagen, 25-26/06/2012)
- OECD Roundtable: “Universities for skills, entrepreneurship, innovation & growth” (Paris, 20-21/09/2012)
- ProTon Europe, Annual Convention “From a tech transfer approach to a knowledge exchange approach”, presentation entitled “European universities in partnerships for knowledge exchange and innovation: strategies and outcomes” (Liège, 21/09/2012)
- Delegation of Umeå University visiting EUA, presentation entitled “EUA in research, innovation and doctoral education” (Brussels, 29/10/2012)
- Cyprus Presidency Conference on ERA “Completing the European Research Area in the context of the Innovation Union – Boarding Time”, presentation entitled “Mobility and Employment

“Fostering Innovation – Perspectives in University and Non-University sectors” (Nicosia, 14-15/11/2012)

- Danish Association of Research Managers (DARMA) visits Danish EU Research Office (DANRO), presentation entitled “The relationship between EUA and ERA – EUA in research, innovation and doctoral education” (Brussels, 28/11/2012)
- University Business Forum (Brussels, 04-05/06/2013)

## **B. EUA Newsletter**

The EUIMA team used the newsletter to disseminate the outcomes of all EUIMA Workshops through short articles produced after each event. The stories provided a link to the web page where participants could find more details and use the presentations of the event, therefore achieving maximum outreach and impact. During the second period of the project, the following notes on EUIMA activities have been published.

- Note on the First EUIMA-Collaborative Research Workshop (website announced on 14/10/2010)
- Note on the Second EUIMA-Collaborative Research Workshop (website announced on 24/02/2011)
- Note on Third EUIMA-Collaborative Research Workshop (website announced on 26/05/2011)
- Note on Fourth EUIMA-Collaborative Research Workshop (website announced on 17/11/2011)
- Note on Fifth EUIMA-Collaborative Research Workshop (website announced on 14/12/2011)
- EUIMA project Final Event: Horizon 2020 and the Modernisation of European Universities – Dialogue with European policy makers (website announced 01/03/2012)
- Note on Report from EUIMA Project Final Event with European Policy Makers (website announced 24/05/2012)

## **C. Interviews and input to external projects**

Dr. John H. Smith and Dr. Lidia Borrell-Damian also gave numerous interviews to specialist journalists, to general national media and to other organisations, disseminating evidence gathered through EUIMA and DOC-CAREERS II on university-business cooperation. These included:

- Interview with The Chronicle of Higher Education by Aisha Labi (06/09/2010)
- Interview with The Chronicle of Higher Education by Karin Fisher (02/09/2010)
- Interview with Chemistry World Magazine (26/09/2011)

- Interview with Todd Davey for Hippo Project (29/10/2010)
- Interview for the MCA interim evaluation with Vitalis Nakrosis (11/05/2012)
- Interview with Centre for Organisational and Human Resources Research of University of Ljubljana, Contribution to EMCOSU Project (30/05/2013)
- Interview on EIT study on synergies (Brussels, 18/02/2013)

#### **D. Input to specialised media**

The outcomes of the project have also been used as input to the following article:

- Business groups rally round Horizon 2020 (Research Europe, 25/10/2012)

## Part B: EUIMA – Full Costing

The following table includes the most important dissemination activities of the EUIMA Full Costing strand.

Type of activities	Main leader	Title	Date	Place
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop Croatia</i>	16 June 2010	Zagreb
Presentation	EUA	<i>Presentation by Thomas Estermann on “Full Costing and the financial sustainability of universities” at the annual conference of EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators)</i>	21 June 2010	Ljubljana
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: “EUIMA Country Workshop sets the first milestone for the implementation of full costing in Croatia”</i>	18 June 2010	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop Turkey</i>	27 September 2010	Ankara
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: EUIMA Workshop drives implementation of full costing in Turkey</i>	30 September 2010	Brussels
Presentation	EUA	<i>Presentation by Thomas Estermann on “Financial sustainability to ensure future activities” at the AEC Annual Conference (Association européenne des Conservatoires, Académies de Musique et Musikhochschulen)</i>	05 November 2010	Warsaw
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Study Visit to the University of Coimbra</i>	13-15 December	Coimbra
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: “First EUIMA Study Visit highlights best practices in implementing full costing”</i>	16 December 2010	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop France</i>	14 January 2011	Paris
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: “3rd EUIMA country workshop makes an important contribution to the implementation of full costing in France”</i>	20 January 2011	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop Belgium</i>	4 February 2011	Brussels
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: EUA Country Workshop in Belgium fosters cooperation between communities on the implementation of full costing</i>	24 February 2011	Brussels

Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop Austria</i>	28 February 2011	Vienna
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: "Fifth EUIMA - Full Costing workshop contributes to discussions on reforming the higher education funding system in Austria"</i>	10 March 2011	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Workshop Poland</i>	13 May 2011	Warsaw
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: "EUIMA-Full Costing Country workshop promotes collaboration among universities in implementing full costing in Poland"</i>	26 May 2011	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Study Visit to Technische Universität Dresden</i>	20-22 June 2011	Dresden
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: "Second EUA study visit showcases the implementation of full costing at TU Dresden"</i>	07 July 2011	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Study Visit to the University of Birmingham</i>	25-27 October 2011	Birmingham
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: Full costing is key for 'financial salvation': Report from EUIMA Study Visit to the University of Birmingham</i>	03 November 2011	Brussels
Presentation	EUA	<i>Presentation by Enora Bennetot Pruvot (EUA Programme Manager) on « Le remboursement des coûts indirects dans la recherche universitaire en Europe » at a seminar of CURIF (Coordination des universités de recherche intensive françaises)</i>	16 November 2011	Paris
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Country Workshop Germany</i>	9 December 2011	Berlin
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: German universities discuss importance of full costing strategies and Horizon 2020 proposals</i>	14 December 2011	Brussels
Workshop	EUA	<i>EUIMA-Full Costing Study Visit to Trinity College Dublin</i>	23-25 January 2012	Dublin
Other	EUA	<i>EUA newsletter article: "Effective communication is key for successful full-costing implementation: last EUIMA study visit"</i>	2 <sup>nd</sup> February 2012	Brussels
Conference	EUA	<i>EUA Annual Conference</i>	22-23 March 2012	Warwick
Presentation	EUA	<i>Presentation on "The financial sustainability of European universities" at the PLA on higher education funding</i>	16-18 April 2012	Ghent
Conference	EUA	<i>EUIMA Project Final Event: Horizon 2020 and the modernisation of European universities – Dialogue with European policy makers</i>	10 May 2012	Brussels
Publication	EUA	<i>EUA input to the Debate on the Rules for Participation in Horizon 2020</i>	10 May 2012	Brussels

Press release	EUA	Press release to disseminate the EUA input to the Debate on the Rules for Participation in Horizon 2020	10 May 2012	Brussels
Other	EUA	EUA Newsletter article on EUIMA Project Final Event: "EUA promotes full costing in Horizon 2020 Rules for Participation"	11 May 2012	Brussels
Presentation	EUA	Participation of Enora Bennetot Pruvot (EUA Programme Manager) in the panel discussion on the rules for participation in Horizon 2020 at the Netherlands House for Education and Research	16 May 2012	Brussels
Presentation	EUA	Participation of Enora Bennetot Pruvot (EUA Programme Manager) in the roundtable discussion "ERA in Action Session on Simplifying Horizon 2020" organized by SwissCore (Swiss Contact Office for European Research, Education and Innovation)	23 May 2012	Brussels
Presentation	EUA	"Full Costing and Horizon 2020", presentation by Dr. John H. Smith at the hearing of the European People's Party at the European Parliament	6 June 2012	Brussels
Conference	EUA	EUA Funding Forum: EUIMA Stocktaking Session	11-12 June 2012	Salzburg
Other	EUA	EUA newsletter article: "EUA's views on the European Parliament's draft report on the Rules for Participation in Horizon 2020 - the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation (2014-2020)"	22 June 2012	Brussels
Publications	EUA	Article by Thomas Estermann on "Kostenrechnung als tragende Säule der nachhaltigen Finanzierung von Hochschulen" in publication of the Unifinanz Conference 2012	Published in September 2012	Berlin
Presentation	EUA	Presentation by Enora Bennetot Pruvot (EUA Programme Manager) about Full Costing and the financial sustainability of universities in relation to Horizon 2020 at the annual conference of EARMA (European Association of Research Managers and Administrators)	09-11/07/2012	Dublin
Publication	EUA	Publication assembling good practice examples of full costing implementation in universities across Europe	Finalised in 2012, published beginning 2013	Brussels