

Teaching Innovations

Education Lab

Guidelines and FAQs for experimenting, evidencing and sharing new practice in teaching across the INGENIUM European University.

September 2026

v1 — [date] — Shared for feedback



Co-funded by
the European Union

Contents

Executive summary	3
1. What is an INGENIUM teaching innovation?	5
1.1 What the Education Lab built, and what carries forward	5
1.2 What the Alliance is looking for	6
1.3 What belongs here, and what belongs elsewhere	6
2. Learning from the Education Lab: five examples	8
A sequence, not a single project	8
Bringing in people who are not usually in the room	8
A modest budget with a hard output	8
An innovation designed as a study	8
Research converted into teaching	8
3. The call at a glance	9
3.1 The two routes	9
3.2 The dates that matter	9
3.3 Where to get support	10
4. How to apply	10
4.1 The fast track	10
4.2 The general call, stage one: expression of interest	10
4.3 The general call, stage two: networking and matchmaking	11
4.4 The general call, stage three: the application	11
5. How to build an impactful proposal — evaluation system	12
5.1 Relevance	12
5.2 Quality	13
5.3 Impact	13
5.4 How proposals are assessed	13
5.5 Who decides, and when	14
6. Resources and funding	14
6.1 What can be requested	14
6.2 Which source pays for what	15
6.3 Institutional rules	15
7. After selection	16
7.1 The six-month window	16
7.2 The two key outputs	16
7.3 What happens to the results	16
8. Roles and responsibilities	16
9. Frequently asked questions	18
10. Related documents	19

Executive summary

These Guidelines explain how to propose and run an INGENIUM teaching innovation through the INGENIUM Annual Education Call. They are addressed to educators, researchers, and technical and administrative colleagues at the ten partner universities who want to try something new in their teaching and share what they learn.

A teaching innovation is a practice-based experiment. It is the place in the Annual Education Call for ideas that are not yet finished educational products: a method worth testing, a tool worth building, or a way of assessing that has not been tried across the Alliance before. The category continues the INGENIUM Education Lab, which funded thirty-two joint projects across three calls between 2024 and 2026, and it keeps what made the Lab work — the freedom to experiment, the requirement to work with at least one other partner university, and the obligation to share the results.

Three things distinguish it from the rest of the call. **The value of an experiment may only become clear once it has been run**, so a proposal is judged on the quality of its question rather than on the certainty of its answer. **The output is evidence, not a product**: an honest, reflective account of what was tried, what worked, what did not, and what colleagues elsewhere can take from it. And **the results belong to the Alliance**: every innovation closes with a webinar and a written account that others can use.

Teaching innovations are also a springboard. Several of the strongest collaborations now running in INGENIUM began as Education Lab projects and grew into micro-credentials, open courses, publications and Blended Intensive Programmes. If your innovation is a first step towards something larger, say so in the application: it counts.

Who can apply	Educators, researchers, technical and administrative staff at any INGENIUM partner university. Students and external stakeholders may join the team.
Minimum requirement	Colleagues from at least two INGENIUM partner universities working together on the experiment.
Duration	Six months maximum. Dissemination and promotion may continue afterwards.
Funding	Up to EUR 20,000 per project, with a maximum of EUR 5,000 per participating partner. Each partner funds its own contribution.
Two routes	Fast track: apply directly by 16 October 2026, run February–July 2027. General call: expression of interest by 13 November 2026, full application by 18 December 2026, run during 2027/2028.
Assessment	Relevance (3) + Quality (4) + Impact (3) = 10 points. Minimum 6 to pass.
Firm outputs	A closing webinar, recorded and published, and a written reflective account publishable as an open educational resource or a formal publication.
Who decides	Technical review by the mixed transition group for collaborative teaching, teaching innovations and training. Endorsement by the

	Innovation Committee (fast track) or by the Education Council with the Innovation Committee (general call).
--	---

Table 1. *The call for teaching innovations, 2026/2027 edition.*

Read alongside the *INGENIUM Annual Education Call 2026/2027* guide and the *INGENIUM Staff Academy Training Proposals* guidelines. Questions about the category: INGENIUM@xamk.fi.

1. What is an INGENIUM teaching innovation?

An INGENIUM teaching innovation is a practice-based experiment in teaching and learning, designed and carried out by colleagues from at least two partner universities. It may be tested in a classroom, laboratory, workplace, or community setting. It may benefit students directly, or it may address the pedagogical development of staff, work with industry, or engage stakeholders and the public. What makes it a teaching innovation, rather than another category of the call, is the willingness to try something whose outcome is not yet known, and the commitment to document and share what happens.

This can be described as an “innovation garage”: a space where an idea can be taken apart, rebuilt and tested before it becomes a finished product.

The collaboration requirement

A proposal must involve colleagues from at least two INGENIUM partner universities working together on the experiment. There is no minimum number of students, hours or ECTS. The innovation does not have to be attached to an accredited course. Everything else in these Guidelines is guidance.

1.1 What the Education Lab built, and what carries forward

The category builds directly on the INGENIUM Education Lab of the first phase. The Lab was defined as any space in which teaching and learning can be innovated or developed: an experimental, decentralised network drawing on the facilities, expertise and educational spaces of all ten partners, connecting education, stakeholders and research and innovation around real problems.

Between 2024 and 2026 the Lab ran three calls for Joint Education Lab Projects and funded thirty-two collaborations — twelve from the first call, five from the second and fifteen from the third. It looked for innovation, cooperation, multilingualism, and transferability, and it worked on a principle that is carried forward here unchanged: the idea does not have to be fully formed, because experimentation during implementation is the point.

Four features of the Lab are retained.

- **Two or more partner universities**, with each partner funding its own contribution. This kept projects moving even where institutional resources differed, and it remains the model.
- **A closing webinar**, recorded and published, so that the wider community learns from the project rather than only the team that ran it.
- **Out-of-the-box proposals are welcome**, including interdisciplinary work and proposals that do not sit comfortably in a single category.
- **Educators, students and stakeholders are actively involved** in the development or the implementation, not consulted at the end.

Three things change.

- **Shorter.** The Lab allowed nine months for implementation; teaching innovations now run for a maximum of six. Promotion and dissemination continue afterwards.

- **Clearer outputs.** The written reflective account is now a firm requirement alongside the webinar, because these accounts are what the Alliance draws on to build its evidence-based learning resources and to feed the INGENIUM Staff Academy.
- **Inside the annual cycle.** The Lab ran as a standalone autumn call. Teaching innovations now sit within the Annual Education Call, sharing its deadlines, two routes, and assessment framework with every other category.

1.2 What the Alliance is looking for

Within an open frame, five things make a proposal stronger. They recur throughout these Guidelines and they carry the most weight in the evaluation.

- **A real question.** The strongest proposals name something they do not yet know and set out how they will find out. An experiment that can only succeed is not an experiment.
- **Genuine collaboration, not parallel work.** Two teams doing the same thing in two countries and comparing notes at the end is weaker than two teams designing, running and interpreting one experiment together.
- **A link to the INGENIUM Innovation in Education Strategy.** The Alliance's pedagogical framework organises its ambition around four directions: student-centred education, excellent teaching, co-operation and co-creation, and artificial intelligence and digitalisation in education. An innovation that advances one of them deliberately is a stronger proposal than one that advances it by accident.
- **Dissemination designed in from the start.** Decide early what the reflective account will look like, who will write it, and in which languages the material will be available. Dissemination planned at the end is dissemination that does not happen.
- **A next step.** The best experiments do not end when the funding does. Say in the application if the innovation is intended as a first step towards a micro-credential, a Blended Intensive Programme, a collaborative course, a Course Catalogue contribution or a Pathway component.

1.3 What belongs here, and what belongs elsewhere

Some ideas could plausibly sit in more than one category of the Annual Education Call. The table below gives the usual routing. It is a guide rather than a gate: a proposal that arrives in the wrong category is reclassified rather than rejected, and the proposing team is told.

If your idea is...	It belongs in...	Because
Testing a new teaching or assessment practice, where the result is not yet known	Teaching innovations	This is the experimental category
Delivering an agreed teaching collaboration to students during the project	Collaborative teaching and learning	The emphasis is on delivery, not on testing
A short certified qualification aligned with the European Approach to micro-credentials	Micro-credentials	The accreditation route and the European Digital Credential differ

If your idea is...	It belongs in...	Because
A newly created short learning experience without formal accreditation	Micro-courses	New creations belong there even where they are not accredited
Training designed for colleagues rather than for students	Training proposals	These feed the INGENIUM Staff Academy — see the companion guidelines
A short intensive course abroad with a collaborative online component, at least three institutions and at least 3 ECTS	Blended Intensive Programmes	Erasmus+ rules, funding and reporting apply, and a BIP code is required
An existing course you want to open to students at other partners	Course Catalogue contributions	No joint design is required, and the semester-two deadline is 16 October

Table 2. *Routing between the categories of the Annual Education Call.*

Two clarifications follow. An innovation may deliberately prepare a future micro-credential, course or BIP — several Education Lab projects did exactly that — and it is helpful to say so. And where the experiment succeeds, the resulting material can be brought back into the next cycle as a collaboration in its own right, which is how the category feeds the wider offer.

2. Learning from the Education Lab: five examples

The projects below are drawn from the three Education Lab calls. They are chosen because each illustrates a different way of using the category, and because together they show its range — from a seven-partner study to a two-partner sensor build. Full descriptions of all thirty-two projects are published on the INGENIUM website.

A sequence, not a single project

A team at Munster Technological University proposed a twenty-seven-month experiment on assessment and feedback in higher education, structured as three consecutive Education Lab applications. Phase one explored assessment practice across the partners and designed a module. Phase two, led by the University of Crete with six partners involved, delivered an eight-week, ten-credit asynchronous MOOC with materials in English, Greek, Finnish, Romanian, French and Italian. Phase three, led from Xamk, is producing a peer-reviewed open-access e-book to be launched at a conference in Rouen.

The lesson: an innovation can be designed as a sequence, with each phase earning the next.

Bringing in people who are not usually in the room

The Disruptive Media Lab, led by MTU with the University of Rouen Normandy, Xamk and the University of Skövde, created an alliance-wide virtual STEAM lab combining science, technology, engineering, arts and mathematics. Its working group brought together doctoral students, artists, scientists and specialists from outside academia. The project ran simultaneous exhibitions at three partner universities in January 2026 and documented the artworks and the process so that the practice could be shared across the Alliance. **The lesson: interdisciplinarity is not a presentational claim; it is a decision about who is in the team.**

A modest budget with a hard output

IT-EMISE, led by Xamk with MTU, assembled Internet of Things devices from readily available components to build environmental monitoring sensors that measure carbon dioxide, particulate matter, temperature, and pressure. The sensors were installed on partner campuses, integrated into existing IT and environmental courses, and the data shared between sites for students to analyse. **The lesson: an experiment does not need a large budget, and it works best when it is embedded in teaching that is already running.**

An innovation designed as a study

ActivaDos, led by the University of Oviedo with six other partners, introduced short physical activity breaks into long theoretical lectures and tested their effect through a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design with an experimental and a control group, examining attention, satisfaction, learning perception and academic performance. **The lesson: designing the evidence at the same time as the intervention makes the reflective account write itself.**

Research converted into teaching

UP2Learn, led by the University of G. d'Annunzio Chieti–Pescara with the University of Rouen Normandy and TUIASI, took the scientific results of the INGENIUM research project UP2Green on waste valorisation and CO₂ conversion and turned them into a joint micro-credential in green chemistry of three to four ECTS at EQF levels 7–8, following the

European Approach to micro-credentials. **The lesson: the category is one of the most direct routes from research to teaching, and from an experiment into another part of the INGENIUM offer.**

Where to read more

The Education Lab pages carry the full project descriptions, the closing webinar recordings and the evaluation criteria used in the previous calls. They are the best preparation for a proposal.

[Education Lab — projects, webinars and inventory](#)

[Projects from the first two calls](#)

[Fifteen projects selected from the third call](#)

3. The call at a glance

3.1 The two routes

The fast track is for innovations that are ready to run between February and July 2027. Proposals go straight to the application form, with no expression of interest. Assessment is rolling, so feasibility is analysed as each proposal arrives and teams receive an early indication. Approvals are communicated in early November 2026.

The general call is for innovations running during the academic year 2027/2028. It has three stages: an expression of interest between 14 September and 13 November 2026, a networking and matchmaking phase that overlaps with it, and a final application by 18 December 2026. The expression of interest is short, commits you to nothing, and is the route to take if you have an idea but not yet a partner.

3.2 The dates that matter

Milestone	When	What happens
Call opens	14 September 2026	Both routes open. Fast-track applications and expressions of interest can be submitted from day one. The FAQ is published and developed as questions arrive
Information sessions	From mid-September 2026	General sessions, fast-track sessions and sessions grouped by collaboration type
Fast-track deadline	16 October 2026	Applications for innovations to be run between February and July 2027
Networking and matchmaking	Late October to early December 2026	Networking sessions across the Alliance and keyword-based matching. Colleagues who have submitted an expression of interest are invited to host sessions

Milestone	When	What happens
Fast-track approvals	Early November 2026	Communicated on a rolling basis
Expressions of interest close	13 November 2026	The concepts received feed the remainder of the matchmaking phase
General call deadline	18 December 2026	Applications for innovations running during 2027/2028
Technical review	Early January 2027	Carried out by the mixed transition group, supported by the Secretariat
Selection and feedback	Late January 2027	Validation and final selection, with student representation. Feedback provided to all applicants
Fast-track implementation	February–July 2027	Selected innovations run, closing with the webinar and the written account
Review	June–July 2027	Pilot evaluation, feeding refined criteria for the first complete cycle

Table 3. *Timeline for teaching innovations in the 2026/2027 edition of the Annual Education Call.*

3.3 Where to get support

You are not expected to work this out alone. As a rule of thumb, anything institutional — how funds may be used at your university, purchasing rules, workload, local approvals — goes to your own INGENIUM local office, which knows the local answer.

General questions about the Annual Education Call go to ingenium@uniovi.es.

For finding partners, the Education Lab inventory of facilities and expertise, the CONNECT portal at connect.unich.it and the partner universities' own pages remain the most useful starting points. Contacting a colleague directly and pitching the idea works better than waiting to be matched.

Matchmaking activities and guidelines will be offered to applicants.

4. How to apply

4.1 The fast track

A fast-track proposal is submitted using the application form (Annex 2), with the fast-track route indicated at the top. It should describe an experiment that can realistically be run between February and July 2027: named partners, a clear question, an implementation plan within six months, the outputs, and the funding required at each partner.

4.2 The general call, stage one: expression of interest

The expression of interest (Annex 1) is short by design. At this stage you are not expected to have a partner, a budget or a schedule — only an idea and a reason why it is worth testing. It should convey who is proposing and in which teaching context the experiment would sit, what you want to try and what you do not yet know, whether you already have a

partner or what kind of partner you are looking for, and any constraints prospective partners should know about now. Submitting an expression of interest does not commit you to submitting an application.

4.3 The general call, stage two: networking and matchmaking

From late October to early December the Alliance runs the phase in which most partnerships are actually formed. Colleagues who have submitted an expression of interest are invited to host networking sessions on their own topic, which is the most direct way to reach the people working closest to your field. A keyword-based matching mechanism draws on the expressions of interest received.

4.4 The general call, stage three: the application

One application covers the whole project. The lead applicant submits on behalf of all participating teams and lists every partner coordinator with their university and contact details; partners do not submit separately. The application asks for the question or practice being tested, the design of the experiment and how it will be evaluated, the participating partners and what each contributes, the six-month implementation plan, the intended outputs and dissemination plan, the involvement of students and stakeholders, and the budget line for each partner.

Formal institutional endorsement is not required, but you are asked to confirm that your Head of Department or equivalent is aware of the project and of any workload or resource implications, and that everyone in the team holds a contract covering the implementation period.

5. How to build an impactful proposal — evaluation system

Before turning to the criteria, it helps to know what the assessment is measuring against. This category is not evaluated on novelty in the abstract; it is evaluated on whether the experiment advances what the Alliance has committed to.

At the highest level, Next INGENIUM commits to progressing the development of the European inter-university campus, moving international learning from something ad hoc to a standard feature of the offer. Within that, the innovation and teaching work package sets two objectives this category serves directly: to launch educational collaboration calls that take over from the Education Labs with a stronger focus on delivery, producing at least twenty-five new teaching collaborations across the Alliance, and to create INGENIUM-branded, evidence-based learning resources that show colleagues how to implement a practice rather than only introducing it. The revised INGENIUM Innovation in Education Strategy will be written from this material.

Two consequences follow for a proposer. First, an experiment that produces something other colleagues can pick up is worth more than one that produces an interesting result nobody can use. Second, a plausible route from the experiment into delivery — a course, a micro-credential, a BIP, a Pathway component — strengthens the proposal considerably, even where that route is not taken within the project itself.

Proposals are assessed against three complementary dimensions. The framework is common to the whole Annual Education Call, with the sub-criteria below adapted to teaching innovations. Points are allocated to the three dimensions rather than to individual sub-criteria; within each dimension, the sub-criteria that weigh most heavily are marked.

Evaluation criterion	Maximum score
Relevance	3
Quality	4
Impact	3
TOTAL	10

Table 4. The scoring framework for teaching innovations. A proposal must reach at least six points out of ten to qualify for selection.

5.1 Relevance

Maximum 3 points. This criterion asks whether the experiment addresses something worth addressing.

- **The clarity and significance of the question being tested, and the honest identification of what is not yet known.** This weighs most heavily.
- **Alignment with the INGENIUM Innovation in Education Strategy and its four directions.** This weighs most heavily.
- The contribution to the European Campus, and the extent to which the experiment could not be run by one university alone.

- Societal, labour-market or community relevance, including work with stakeholders, associate partners or the Knowledge Ecosystems.
- The connection to an existing or proposed part of the INGENIUM educational offer.

5.2 Quality

Maximum 4 points. This criterion asks whether the experiment is well designed and can actually be run.

- **The soundness of the design, including how the innovation will be evaluated and what evidence will be collected.** This weighs most heavily.
- **Feasibility within six months, with a credible implementation plan and a justified budget at each partner.** This weighs most heavily.
- The depth of the collaboration: whether partners design and interpret together rather than working in parallel.
- The involvement of students, and of stakeholders or technical colleagues where the topic calls for it.
- Inclusion, multilingualism, accessibility and sustainability built into the design rather than added afterwards.

5.3 Impact

Maximum 3 points. This criterion asks what will change, and whether it will last.

- **The transferability of the result: whether colleagues at other partners will be able to use what the project produces, and how the dissemination plan makes that possible.** This weighs most heavily.
- The prospect of the innovation becoming a first step towards a micro-credential, a collaborative course, a BIP, a Course Catalogue contribution or a Pathway component.
- The number of students, staff and stakeholders reached, and the quality of what they gain.
- The breadth and novelty of the partnership, including colleagues, faculties and universities new to INGENIUM collaboration.
- The link between research and education, where the topic allows it.

5.4 How proposals are assessed

Assessment in this edition is deliberately light and enhancement-oriented. The purpose is to help good ideas become deliverable, not to rank a competitive field. Where a proposal falls short on one dimension but is otherwise strong, the assessment records what would fix it, and that feedback is returned to the team.

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Needs improvement
Relevance	A significant question, clearly aligned with the Strategy and with the Alliance's objectives	Generally aligned, with minor weaknesses	Limited alignment or unclear rationale

Criterion	Excellent	Good	Needs improvement
Quality	Well designed, feasible within six months, with evidence collection built in and genuine joint working	Feasible but requiring refinement	Significant weaknesses in design or feasibility
Impact & experimental value	A result colleagues elsewhere can use, with a credible dissemination plan and a plausible next step	Positive impact but limited evidence	Impact not clearly demonstrated
TOTAL	7.5 – 10	6.0 – 7.4	below 6.0

Table 5. Qualitative scoring rubric, used together with the sub-criteria above.

A proposal that scores below six does not qualify for selection as submitted. It may nonetheless receive a conditional approval where the assessment identifies specific changes that would make it deliverable and the team implements them. Because the call is competitive, a conditionally approved proposal receives financial support only where resources remain available once the selected proposals have been funded.

5.5 Who decides, and when

Every proposal first undergoes a technical review by the mixed transition group responsible for collaborative teaching, teaching innovations and training proposals — the current work package paired with the incoming Next INGENIUM team — supported by the INGENIUM Secretariat. The review checks eligibility, applies the criteria, records the rationale, and where appropriate proposes reclassification to another category.

- **Fast track.** Technical review is rolling, so proposals are analysed as they arrive and teams receive an early indication. Endorsement is given by the Innovation Committee, and approvals are communicated in early November 2026.
- **General call.** Technical review takes place in early January 2027. Validation and final selection follow in late January through the Education Council together with the Innovation Committee, with student representation. Results and feedback are communicated by the end of January 2027.

Feedback is provided for all proposals, whether selected or not. A proposal that is not selected may be resubmitted in a subsequent cycle; resubmission is not automatic and carries over no prior score.

6. Resources and funding

6.1 What can be requested

A project may request up to **EUR 20,000 in total**. There is no minimum, and proposals that request little or nothing are not disadvantaged.

As in the Education Lab, **each partner funds its own contribution** from its own INGENIUM allocation. This is a deliberate design choice: it keeps projects moving where institutional resources differ, and it means each team negotiates its own budget with its own institution rather than waiting for a central transfer. Be prepared to discuss openly

within the team if a partner cannot secure the full amount requested, and to adjust the scope accordingly.

Costs typically requested include short mobility between partners, materials and consumables, equipment directly required by the experiment, platforms and tools, and the costs of involving students or stakeholders in the work. **Expenses for external stakeholders are considered case by case** and should be described and justified in the application.

6.2 Which source pays for what

What is being funded	Usual source	Notes
Mobility between partners for the experiment	INGENIUM project funds	Never Erasmus+ KA131. Mobility is not a requirement of the category
Materials, consumables and equipment	INGENIUM project funds or institutional resources	Subject to the purchasing rules of the partner university concerned
Platforms, tools and licences	INGENIUM project funds	Where required by the experiment and justified in the application. Only in approved by the partner institutions
Involvement of external stakeholders	INGENIUM project funds, case by case	Describe the role and the cost in the application
Staff time and compensation	Institutional rules apply	Whether staff time can be bought differs by partner; see the institutional FAQ at your own university

Table 6. Funding sources for teaching innovations. The separation between INGENIUM project funds and Erasmus+ KA131 is strict.

6.3 Institutional rules

Each partner publishes its own rules on how the funding can be used — travel, purchases, compensation — in an institutional FAQ, available from 14 September 2026 for the fast track and updated for the general call in October. Consult it before building a budget, and route institutional questions to your INGENIUM local office rather than to the Secretariat, which cannot answer on partners' behalf.

7. After selection

7.1 The six-month window

Implementation runs for a maximum of six months from the agreed start date: February to July 2027 for fast-track projects, and within the academic year 2027/2028 for projects selected through the general call, with the start date proposed by the team.

Six months is enough for a well-scoped experiment and not enough for an open-ended one, which is why the application asks for the implementation plan in some detail.

Dissemination and promotion may continue after the window closes; the experiment itself should not.

Exceptions can be made in well-justified cases. The information should be included in the application.

7.2 The two key outputs

A written reflective account. An honest description of what was tried, what worked, what did not, and what colleagues elsewhere can learn from it. It should be written so that another team could repeat or adapt the practice. It may also be published as an open educational resource or developed into a formal publication. This is the output that feeds the Alliance's evidence-based learning resources and the revised Innovation in Education Strategy.

A closing webinar. Hosted and recorded by the team within a month of the end of the implementation period, and published on the INGENIUM website. The webinar covers the problem addressed and why it matters, the approach taken, how the collaboration between partners worked in practice, the results to date, and whether the cooperation will continue. Time for discussion and audience questions is expected, not optional.

7.3 What happens to the results

Reflective accounts and webinar recordings are compiled under the Staff Academy Training Hub and made available to staff across the Alliance, together with materials from partner universities and the Knowledge Ecosystems. Where an innovation has produced something ready to be taught, the team is encouraged to bring it back into the next annual cycle as a collaborative course, a micro-credential, a Course Catalogue contribution or a training proposal for the Staff Academy. Teams are also invited to present at Staff Academy and Education Lab webinars, and at the INGENIUM Conference.

The INGENIUM Community Questionnaire is administered to participating staff and, where relevant, students, and the results feed the Alliance's quality assurance system.

8. Roles and responsibilities

A teaching innovation is lighter than a Pathway or a joint programme, and its governance is correspondingly light. What matters is that responsibilities are clear between the participating teams, that someone is accountable for the outputs, and that the project is connected to the structures that support and monitor it.

Role	Responsibility
Lead applicant	Assembles the team, submits the application, coordinates the project, is the contact point for the Alliance, and is responsible for the closing webinar and the written account. Must hold a contract covering the implementation period
Partner coordinator	The counterpart at each participating university. Co-owns the design, secures the local budget line, and ensures the experiment can be run locally

Role	Responsibility
Students and stakeholders	Participants and, wherever possible, partners in the design. External stakeholder costs are agreed case by case
Head of Department or equivalent	Aware of the project and of its workload and resource implications. No formal endorsement signature is required at application stage, but it is really important that the discussion takes place before applying.
Mixed transition group	Carries out the technical review and shapes the guidance for the category, pairing the current work package with the incoming Next INGENIUM team
Innovation Committee	Endorses fast-track proposals on a rolling basis, and validates general-call proposals together with the Education Council
INGENIUM Secretariat	Coordinates the call, supports the technical review, publishes the FAQ, routes queries and organises networking and matchmaking
INGENIUM local offices	First point of contact at each partner for anything institutional: use of funds, purchasing, workload, local procedures

Table 7. Roles in the teaching innovations category.

9. Frequently asked questions

► **How developed does the idea need to be?**

Less than you might think. The category exists precisely because the added value of an experiment may only become clear once it has been run. What the assessment looks for is a clear question, a sound design and a realistic six-month plan, not a guaranteed result.

► **Can the innovation fail?**

Yes, and an honest account of an experiment that did not work is a legitimate output. What is not acceptable is an experiment that is never documented. The reflective account and the closing webinar are the two firm requirements.

► **Can I apply if I am not academic staff?**

Yes. Educators, researchers, technical and administrative colleagues may all lead a proposal, provided they hold a contract at a partner university covering the implementation period. Students and external stakeholders may be full members of the team but not lead applicants.

► **Is mobility required?**

No. Mobility is funded where the experiment needs it, and many strong Education Lab projects ran without it. Where mobility is used, it comes from INGENIUM project funds and never from Erasmus+ KA131 (Section 6.2).

► **How much can we ask for?**

Up to EUR 20,000 per project, with a maximum of EUR 5,000 per participating partner. Each partner funds its own contribution from its own allocation. There is no minimum (Section 6.1).

► **What happens if a partner cannot secure the full amount?**

Discuss it openly within the team and adjust the scope. This was the practice in the Education Lab and it is retained: the aim is to let good ideas move forward even where resources differ between institutions.

► **Which route should I use?**

If the experiment can run between February and July 2027 and the partners are confirmed, use the fast track. If it runs during 2027/2028, or if you are still looking for partners, use the general call (Section 3.1).

► **I do not have a partner yet. Can I still apply?**

Yes. Submit an expression of interest to the general call describing what you are looking for. Your concept then enters the matchmaking phase and you can be invited to host a networking session on your own topic. The Education Lab inventory and the CONNECT portal are also useful for finding colleagues directly.

► **What is the difference between this category and collaborative teaching and learning?**

A collaborative teaching initiative delivers something to students during the project. A teaching innovation tests and documents a new practice, and delivery to students may follow the project rather than happen within it (Table 2).

► **Can an innovation lead to a micro-credential or a BIP later?**

Yes, and it is worth saying so in the application. Several Education Lab projects were explicitly designed as preparatory work for a micro-credential, a MOOC or a BIP, and that trajectory counts under the impact criterion.

► **Can I apply if I already take part in the Staff Academy or another INGENIUM initiative?**

Yes. Mention it in the application, since connections between initiatives are a strength rather than a duplication.

► **Do I need my Head of Department to sign the application?**

No formal endorsement signature is required. You are asked to confirm that your Head of Department or equivalent is aware of the project and of its workload and resource implications.

► **Where do the results go?**

The webinar recording is published on the INGENIUM website and the written account is compiled under the Staff Academy Training Hub, where it is available to colleagues across the Alliance (Section 7.3).

► **Am I compensated? Do I get the work resources from INGENIUM?**

Compensation policies are implemented according to institutional rules. In this call, you are generally not expected to receive direct compensation for the hours dedicated to it, but direct expenses related to the implementation are covered by the call.

Have a question that is not covered here? Contact INGENIUM@xamk.fi for the category, or the INGENIUM Secretariat at ingenium@uniovi.es for the call as a whole.

10. Related documents

These Guidelines should be read together with the following companion documents, all available from the call website.

- **The INGENIUM Annual Education Call 2026/2027.** The overall structure of the cycle within which this call sits, including all categories of collaboration, the resourcing framework and the governance of selection.
- **INGENIUM Staff Academy Training Proposals: Guidelines and FAQs.** The companion category, covering training and pedagogical development proposals for the Staff Academy.
- **INGENIUM Collaborative Teaching and Learning: Guidelines and FAQs.** The category for teaching collaborations delivered to students during the project.
- **The INGENIUM Innovation in Education Strategy.** The Alliance's pedagogical framework, currently being revised through Next INGENIUM.
- **The INGENIUM Student Cycle and Student Calendar 2026/2027.** How the opportunities created through this call reach students.