

International Cooperation Framework for Next Generation Engineering Students

# **CEL implementation Guide**

















## **Table of Contents**

1.	In	troduction	3
2.	Ne	ew models for experiential learning	3
3.	De	escription of CEL projects	5
4.	Im	nplementations in NextGEng	7
	4.1	CEL1-ISR	7
	4.2	CEL2-TUCN RG	8
	4.3	CEL3-Valmet	9
	4.4	CEL4-Bosch	10
	4.5	CEL 5-Valmet	11
	4.6	CEL6-UJA RG	12
5.	Re	esults and discussion	13
6.	Co	onclusions	17
Re	efere	ences	19
Ar	nex	1	20
Ar	nnex	2	24
Ar	nnex	3	30
	CEL2	2- TUCN RG	30
	CEL	6-UJA RG	31

















## 1. Introduction

The objective of this guide is to provide guidance for the implementation of Cases for Experiential Learning (CEL) projects, developed within the framework of the NextGEng project [1]. It begins by outlining how experiential learning models, created in previous European initiatives involving the partner universities, contributed to the development of CEL. It then defines what a CEL project is and explains how it should be carried out. Next, it summarizes the two rounds of implementation conducted within the NextGEng project, followed by a presentation of the main results and participants' feedback. The report concludes with key lessons learned from this experience. In addition, the CEL Guide includes three annexes:

- Annex 1 provides an example of a schedule of activities conducted during a CEL intensive week.
- Annex 2 contains sample surveys administered to students and supervisors.
- Annex 3 presents examples of results from projects proposed by research groups, specifically
   CEL2-TUCN RG and CEL6-UJA RG.

# 2. New models for experiential learning

The university partners of the NextGEng project had already been cooperating for several years before its launch, during which they worked on improving university teaching in engineering. One of the lines of action was the development of experiential learning models.

It is well known that experiential learning is a pedagogical approach where students learn by doing reflecting on real or simulated experiences to strengthen understanding and improve future practice [2]. It is characterized, first and foremost, by the **active participation of students**. Rather than being passive recipients of information, learners are directly engaged in practical tasks, projects, or problem-solving activities. Another defining feature is its **real-world relevance**. Activities are designed around authentic professional contexts or simulations that closely mirror industry challenges. A third characteristic is the **feedback**. Students are encouraged to analyze their

















experiences, identify strengths and weaknesses, and draw conclusions that will guide their future actions. Experiential learning also fosters the development of **transversal or soft skills** such as teamwork, communication, problem-solving, and critical thinking [3]. Because learners work collaboratively and often in multidisciplinary or international teams, they cultivate skills that are essential in today's labor market [4].

All of the above is present in the CEL projects and in the previous developments that inspired their origin. New models for experiential learning were first introduced in the RePCI project as multidisciplinary Real-Life Problem Solving (RLPS) [5]. Here, engineering students from the mechanical degree and from different institutions formed mixed groups to tackle challenges proposed by companies, with the company selecting the best solution. Later, in the HEIBus project, the approach expanded beyond other engineering disciplines, and even incorporated a virtual format for students unable to travel [6]. The NextGEng project has advanced the model further by involving not only company-driven challenges but also research group projects [7], [8].

The evolution of these models has led to the development of the CEL projects, a consistent model that has been widely welcomed by all project participants. Table 1 compares three experiential learning by highlighting how student groups are structured, how they work, and who proposes the project topics.

Project/Model	Number	Student	Group	Modality	Intensive	Topic
	of groups	per	characteristics		weeks	
		group				
RePCI /RLPS	2	8 (4 from	Teams formed	Mixed:	2 (one at	Company
		HEI X + 4	between two	on-site	HEI X and	
		from HEI	universities	(intensive	one at HEI	
		Y)	(Same studies	weeks) +	Y)	
			and	virtual		
			international)	(distance		
				work)		

















HEIBus / RLPS	3	6 (2 from	Teams formed	2 mixed	1 (at HEI	Company
		HEI X + 2	from 3	groups	x)	
		from HEI	universities	(on-site +		
		Y + 2	(Multidisciplinary	virtual)		
		from HEI	and	and 1 fully		
		Z)	international)	virtual		
				group		
NextGEng /	3	6 (similar	Teams formed	Mixed, no	1 (at HEI	Company
CEL		to	from 3	fully	X)	or
		HEIBus)	universities	virtual		Research
			(Multidisciplinary	groups		group
			and			
			international)			

Table 1. Comparison of structures in experiential learning models

# 3. Description of CEL projects

As mentioned before, a CEL project is a collaborative educational model that connects universities and companies through real-world problem solving. In a CEL, students from different universities and disciplines are grouped into international teams to address a challenge proposed either by a company or a research group.

The process begins with an **intensive kickoff week** at the host institution, where students receive targeted training and define their project plan. Teams then **work remotely** for several weeks, guided by academic supervisors and company experts. Finally, they **present their solutions** in a virtual seminar and the proposing organization evaluates and selects the most effective one (Figure 1).




















Figure 1. CEL project description

CEL projects combine active learning, industry relevance, and international collaboration, allowing students to apply theory to practice, develop technical and transversal skills, and experience authentic teamwork in a multicultural environment. Figure 2 illustrates the structure of a CEL project. Each CEL project involves at least 25 participants. This includes:

- At least one company or research group supervisor, who proposes the real-life case to be solved.
- Six academic supervisors, with two professors from each of the three participating universities (UJA – University of Jaén, JAMK – University of Applied Sciences, and TUCN – Technical University of Cluj-Napoca).
- Eighteen students, organized into three international and multidisciplinary teams (Group A, Group B, and Group C).

Considering the implementation of the six CEL projects, more than 150 participants have benefited

from this activity.




Figure 2. Structure of a CEL project

















# 4. Implementations in NextGEng

The six CEL projects were delivered in two rounds, each comprising three projects. The first-round projects run from February to April 2024 and the second one in the same period but in 2025. A brief summary of these implementations is now described.

#### 4.1 CEL1-ISR

ISR company proposed a topic related with the agri-food sector: the design of a machine vision system for the inspection of fruits, to be installed at the reception yard in an oil mill and it was hosted by UJA. The **intensive week** began with an institutional welcome and a project introduction by ISR representatives. Students attended two tailored seminars (on hyperspectral technology and computer vision/image processing) and participated in six project work sessions, including an image acquisition session to collect fruit images for later algorithm development. The week concluded with group presentations to supervisors and ISR representatives, outlining plans for the distance phase and draft solutions. Figure 3 shows an example of the activities carried out during the intensive week.





Figure 3. Activities during the CEL1-ISR intensive week. Left: company visit; Right: seminar with the hyperspectral system

Students valued the experience, highlighting the usefulness of the seminars, the organization of the week, and the opportunity to collaborate internationally. They suggested extending the intensive week by one or two days to allow more time for face-to-face work and group integration. Supervisors and company experts echoed these points, recommending additional working hours,

















simple group dynamics to accelerate student integration, and separating kick-off weeks for different projects. Both groups praised the motivation of the teams and the quality of ideas presented.

During the virtual work, students met three times with supervisors and company experts. Finally, students presented their final work in a **virtual seminar** on 19 April 2024. Evaluation criteria covered the quality of reports, presentations, and answers to questions.

## 4.2 CEL2-TUCN RG

The topic was proposed by the research group of Applied Mechatronics Research Laboratory, from TUCN and was hosted by this university. The main objective was the design a 3-axes GANTRY ROBOT subjected to a predefined requirement. The **intensive week** began with registration, a welcome session, and presentations on the project and its goals. A tailored lecture was delivered on Modeling Mechatronic Systems using Matlab/Simscape Toolbox. Students participated in six project work sessions, where they developed work plans, assigned team roles, generated and analyzed solution concepts, selected a final concept, and created initial virtual models. The week ended with group presentations of draft solutions and plans for remote work. A cultural and social activity in Cluj-Napoca complemented the academic program. Figure 4 shows an examples of the activities developed during the intensive week.





Figure 4. Activities during the CEL2-TUCN RG intensive week. Left: Laboratory visit; Right: Participants welcome

















It was successfully implemented according to plan, with overall positive feedback from both students and supervisors. Social activities contributed to networking and collaboration but it was need additional face-to-face time.

After the virtual work, supervised by expert and the RG representative, students presented achieved results in a **virtual seminar** held on April 18, 2024. They were assessed according to clear criteria focused on system design, specifically addressing its advantages, drawbacks, and limitations. There were also identified areas for improvement, particularly regarding time allocation and clearer reporting guidelines.

#### 4.3 CEL3-Valmet

The Finish company, Valmet, proposed the topic: pressing manufacturing test object, with a variety of designed geometries, for new pulp-based manufacturing technology and it was hosted by JAMK. The **intensive week** included introductions, a presentation from Valmet on the project challenge, one tailored lecture on project work and iterative design, six project work sessions, a company visit to Valmet, and final group presentations. A social event was also organized. Afterward, virtual meetings with supervisors and company representatives, along with a final seminar, were scheduled. Figure 5 shows examples of these activities.





Figure 5. Activities during the CEL3-Valmet intensive week. Left: company visit; Right: project work

Both students and supervisors valued the intensive week positively. Students appreciated the guidance and lectures but felt the schedule was too short and would benefit from more days of

















face-to-face work and social interaction. Supervisors highlighted the good organization, student motivation, and collaboration achieved, while also recommending more time for group integration and project work. In general, the experience was considered enriching and well-structured, with room for improvement by extending its duration.

After the distance work, students presented their results in a **virtual seminar** on April 26, 2024. Evaluation criteria included innovativeness, report quality, and presentation performance.

There were also identified areas for improvement. Students highlighted the need for clearer and more detailed instructions for the final report, as some found the guidelines too broad. Additional support from supervisors at the beginning of the project was recommended, since the topic was wide and difficult to focus on without guidance. Supervisors noted the importance of including proper references in final reports and ensuring that oral presentations follow a clear structure with all essential sections. Another observation was to avoid overloaded slides with too many graphics or unclear explanations. Finally, they suggested incorporating simple group dynamics at the beginning to help students integrate more quickly into international teams.

#### 4.4 CEL4-Bosch

The CEL4 project, carried out with Bosch Cluj Plant, focused on evaluating screw tightening and elongation in PCB mounting operations, aiming to identify the optimal tightening range for M6 screws. The **intensive week** was hosted by TUCN and the program began with a welcome session, a project briefing by Bosch experts, and the first part of a tailored lecture on "Problem-solving in Engineering." Students were divided into international teams, defined roles, and planned their project approach. On the second day, participants visited the Bosch plant for a factory tour and continued the problem-solving training (Figure 6). The last two days were dedicated to intensive team project work, cultural activities in Cluj-Napoca, and final presentations where students demonstrated technical understanding and teamwork. Supervisors and company experts provided feedback and evaluation.

Students appreciated the balance between technical and social activities, though some suggested extending the week or receiving more technical data earlier. Supervisors and company experts also

















gave strongly positive feedback. They endorsed the student selection and team composition, found the agenda effective, and confirmed that students gained new competencies and were highly engaged. The social events were considered beneficial for collaboration.





Figure 6. Activities during the CEL4-Bosch intensive week. Left: company visit; Right: project work

Once the virtual phase of the project was completed, the outcomes were formally presented in a **virtual seminar** held on April 10, 2025. Student teams were assessed on two main aspects. First, the quality of their reports was examined, considering both strengths and weaknesses as well as the overall completeness. Second, their presentations were evaluated in terms of content, duration, clarity of development, and the ability to respond effectively to questions from supervisors. Finally, when choosing the winning group, an additional element was considered: the potential of each proposed solution for industrial application.

#### 4.5 CEL 5-Valmet

The topic was the design of a cleaning mechanism for the blade change device. The **intensive week** was organized by JAMK and it began with an introduction to the project and team formation. A tailored lecture on iterative design, which also introduced the company's targets, was delivered. Students then engaged in seven structured project work sessions, each with clear objectives. They visited VALMET facilities and JAMK laboratories, and participated in a social activity including an evening meal and sauna (Figure 7). The week concluded with team presentations where students proposed draft solutions and received feedback, followed by the scheduling of virtual meetings for ongoing supervision.

















Students and supervisors expressed very high satisfaction with the intensive week. The agenda and activities were seen as well-structured and engaging, support was valued, teamwork was effective, and the overall organization was considered excellent.





Figure 7. Activities during the CEL5-Valmet intensive week. Left: company visit; Right: project work

The **virtual seminar** took place on April 11, 2025. Students were evaluated on the quality of their reports, the content and structure of their presentations, and their ability to answer questions from supervisors and company experts, with additional consideration given to the potential for industrial application of their solutions. The strengths of the project included innovative technical proposals, effective teamwork, strong support from supervisors and Valmet experts, and high levels of student satisfaction. Areas for improvement focused on providing presentation materials earlier, offering more detailed guidance at the start of the project, and strengthening collaboration within some teams during the distance work phase.

#### 4.6 CEL6-UJA RG

The project was proposed and hosted by the INGEMER research group from UJA. The topic was focused on redesign through additive manufacturing. The **intensive week** program included two tailored seminars: one on jet engine fundamentals and mockup requirements, and another on design for manufacturing (DFM) and detailed design (Figure 8). Students also carried out CAD-CAE-CAM mockup work, completed six project sessions, and used 3D printing to create mockups. Each group presented their draft solutions, simulations, and work plans for the distance phase. Company visits to Meltio and Sicnova, both experts in additive manufacturing, and a social event in Jaén city center complemented the technical program.





















Figure 8. Activities during the CEL6-UJA RG intensive week. Left: group picture; Right: project work

Both students and supervisors expressed strong satisfaction with the intensive week. The agenda and support were highly valued, participants gained new competences, and the organization was praised, though some students suggested lighter workloads.

The final **virtual seminar** was held on April 11, 2025. Students were assessed on the quality of their written reports, the content and clarity of their presentations, and their ability to respond to questions, with additional consideration of the industrial applicability of their solutions. The main strengths highlighted were the challenging and motivating topic, the effective international teamwork, the support from supervisors, and the acquisition of both technical and soft skills. Suggestions for improvement focused on providing clearer information about the project objectives before the intensive week and extending the duration of the on-site activities to allow a more balanced workload.

## 5. Results and discussion

The comparative Table 2 shows the results achieved in the six CEL projects. The winner team in CEL1 built a complete olive quality control system that combined mechanical, pneumatic, and computer vision components into a functional design. The winner team in CEL2 designed and validated a gantry robot with advanced kinematic modeling and Matlab simulations. In CEL3, students developed a foldable box test object with pivoting action and adaptability, which was recognized as both practical and creative. The best team in CEL4 project focused on PCB screw tightening,

















identifying dimensional tolerance issues and proposing an industrially viable adjustment to housing diameter. In CEL 5, the winner team produced an innovative dual-scraper modular system with vacuum integration, considered robust, adaptable, and efficient. Finally, in CEL6, the winner team delivered diverse outputs including DEM simulations, mockups, and CFD analyses that showcased strong analytical depth.

Overall, the results confirm the effectiveness of experiential learning projects: they provide tangible technical solutions while simultaneously preparing students with the professional skills needed in engineering practice.

Project	Topic	Winner	Main Results
CEL1 – ISR	Olive quality	Group C	Complete design: mechanical, pneumatic,
	control system		and electrical calculations; fully developed and validated computer vision system.
CEL2 – TUCN	Design of 3-	Group B	H-bot system with additional belt for Z-
	axes gantry		axis; validated in Matlab.
	robot		
CEL3 – Valmet	Pulp-based	Group B	Foldable box with pivoting action and large
	manufacturing		surfaces; innovative and adaptable.
	test objects		
CEL4 – Bosch	PCB mounting:	Group C	Identified dimensional tolerances as main
	screw		issue; viable solution: increasing housing
	tightening		diameter.
CEL5 – Valmet	Cleaning	Group A	Innovative dual-scraper modular
	mechanism for		mechanism with vacuum integration;
	blade change		durable and adaptable.
	device		

















CEL6 – UJA RG	Product	Group B	A: DEM simulation; B: complete analysis
	redesign via		with mockup; C: CFD simulations.
	Additive		
	Manufacturing		

Table 2. CEL Projects Results

Table 3 shows the target quality indicators and the results achieved after the completion of the projects. All six projects reached a 100% pass rate, surpassing the target of 90%, which confirms that the academic objectives were fully met. In terms of feedback and support, results varied slightly: projects like CEL5 (Valmet) and CEL6 (UJA RG) reached excellent levels with close to or full agreement from both HEI supervisors and company experts, while CEL4 (Bosch) showed lower satisfaction from company support (63.6%), suggesting an area for improvement.

Regarding soft skills, all projects exceeded the 70% target. CEL4 and CEL5 stood out with unanimous agreement from supervisors, while CEL6 showed slightly lower figures (80%), though still above the target. For technical competences, again the projects performed well, with CEL4 and CEL5 achieving 100% supervisor agreement. CEL6 recorded the lowest score at 87.5%, still comfortably meeting the expected threshold.

Project	Q1 – Feedback &	Q2 – Pass	Q3 – Soft Skills	Q4 – Technical Competences
	Support	Rate		
Target	≥50% positive	≥90% of	≥70% students	≥70% students improve technical
	feedback from	students	improve soft	competences
	students	pass	skills	
CEL1 –	78.2% agree	100%	90.9% of	81.8% of supervisors agreed
ISR	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 86.6%		agreed	
	agree about			
	company support			

















CEL2 -	78.2% agree	100%	90.9% of	81.8% of supervisors agreed
TUCN	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 86.6%		agreed	
	agree about RG			
	support			
CEL3 -	78.2% agree	100%	90.9% of	81.8% of supervisors agreed
Valmet	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 86.6%		agreed	
	agree about			
	company support			
CEL4 -	90.9% agree	100%	100% of	100% of supervisors agreed
Bosch	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 63.6%		agreed	
	agree about			
	company support			
CEL5 —	100% agree	100%	100% of	100% of supervisors agreed
Valmet	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 100%		agreed	
	agree about			
	company support			
CEL6 –	100% agree	100%	80% of	87.5% of supervisors agreed
UJA RG	about HEI		supervisors	
	support; 92.3%		agreed	
	agree about			
	company support			

Table 3. Comparative Table – Indicators (Target vs. Achieved)

















## 6. Conclusions

The CEL projects implemented within the NextGEng framework demonstrate the successful evolution of experiential learning models. Building on previous initiatives such as RePCI and HEIBus, the CEL format has proven to be an effective structure that combines intensive kickoff weeks, distance teamwork, and virtual seminars to address real industrial and research challenges. The strengths of this model lie in its strong alignment with real-world contexts, the development of both technical and transversal skills, and the opportunities it creates for multicultural collaboration.

The structure of student groups has evolved across the different models. In RePCI/RLPS, two large groups of eight students were formed, each comprising participants from two universities within the same engineering discipline. The HEIBus/RLPS project advanced this model by creating three smaller, multidisciplinary, and international groups of six students each, including one fully virtual team. NextGEng/CEL retained the three-group structure of around six students but removed the fully virtual option, relying instead on mixed formats. This evolution reflects a clear trend toward smaller, more diverse, and flexible learning environments.

The implementation of the six CEL projects also highlighted consistent strengths. All projects achieved a 100% pass rate, exceeding the target of 90%. Students improved their technical competences and soft skills, with supervisors confirming these results across all cases.

When comparing the first round of projects (CEL1, CEL2, CEL3) with the second round (CEL4, CEL5, CEL6), clear progress can be seen. In the first round, the main challenges were related to time constraints, limited integration of international teams, and the need for clearer reporting structures. These observations were addressed in the second round, where agendas were more structured, supervisor and company involvement was more consistent, and teamwork was reinforced, leading to higher levels of satisfaction and stronger outputs. The fact that CEL5 and CEL6 achieved unanimous or near-unanimous agreement from supervisors on both technical and soft skill improvements indicates that the lessons from the first round were successfully integrated into the second.

















By contrasting the projects proposed by research groups and those proposed by companies, a clear distinction emerges. The research group projects (CEL2 and CEL6) are characterized by a strong academic innovation component, with a focus on modeling, simulation, and experimental prototyping. However, they show certain limitations in terms of practical validation and industrial maturity.

In contrast, the projects proposed by companies (CEL1, CEL3, CEL4, and CEL5) are more directed toward solving immediate challenges with direct industrial applications. Their results tend to be more easily transferable and applicable in production environments, though they involve less conceptual exploration than those driven by research groups.

In summary, the CEL projects reaffirm the value of experiential learning as an effective pedagogical strategy in engineering education. They not only foster exploratory and innovative solutions but also deliver tangible technical outcomes with clear industrial relevance, all while preparing students for professional practice in international and multidisciplinary contexts.

















## References

- [1] N. PROJECT, "NEXTGENG PROJECT NEXTGENG.EU." ACCESSED: MAY 24, 2024. [ONLINE]. AVAILABLE: HTTPS://NEXTGENG.EU/
- [2] G. TEMBREVILLA, A. PHILLION, AND M. ZEADIN, "EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING IN ENGINEERING EDUCATION: A SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW," JAN. 01, 2024, JOHN WILLY AND SONS INC. DOI: 10.1002/JEE.20575.
- [3] S. Lavado-Anguera, P. J. Velasco-Quintana, and M. J. Terrón-López, "Project-Based Learning (PBL) as an Experiential Pedagogical Methodology in Engineering Education: A Review of the Literature," Jun. 01, 2024, Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). Doi: 10.3390/educsci14060617.
- [4] A. DÍAZ LANTADA, "ENGINEERING EDUCATION 5.0: CONTINUOUSLY EVOLVING ENGINEERING EDUCATION\*," INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ENGINEERING EDUCATION, VOL. 36, NO. 6, Pp. 1814–1832, Apr. 2020.
- [5] A. KAKKO, "RESHAPED PARTNERSHIPS FOR COMPETITIVENESS AND INNOVATION POTENTIALS IN MECHANICAL ENGINEERING," 2016.
- [6] S. Satorres Martínez, D. Martínez Gila, P. Cano Marchal, A. Kakko, J. Gómez Ortega, and J. Gámez García, "REAL LIFE PROBLEM SOLVING: A SUCCESSFUL MODEL FOR HEI STUDENT-COMPANY COOPERATION," INTED2020 Proceedings, vol. 1, pp. 289–294, Mar. 2020, doi: 10.21125/INTED.2020.0133.
- [7] C. DORADO-VICENTE, R., SATORRES-MARTÍNEZ, S., JIMÉNEZ-GONZÁLEZ, J.I., MARTÍNEZ GILA, D., KAKKO, A., LUOSMA, P., LAPUSAN, C., RAD, "THE NEXTGENG PROJECT: FIRST STEPS OF AN INTERNATIONAL CO-TEACHING EXPERIENCE," IN INDOTEC 2023, 2023.
- [8] S. Satorres-Martínez, J. I. Jiménez-González, R. Dorado-Vicente, E. Muñoz-Cerón, A. Kakko, and C. Lapusan, "Sharing Strengths To Improve International Collaborative Learning and Teaching Processes in Higher Education: the Nextgeng Project," INTED2023 Proceedings, vol. 1, pp. 2600–2605, 2023, doi: 10.21125/inted.2023.0730.

















## Annex 1

Three CEL project schedules are presented as examples of activities carried out in each of the partner countries. The rest can be consulted at: <a href="https://nextgeng.eu/cases-for-experiential-learning-projects/">https://nextgeng.eu/cases-for-experiential-learning-projects/</a>.

The ISR CEL Project (University of Jaén, February 2024) combined a balanced structure of seminars, laboratory work, and presentations. After an introductory session and a tailored seminar on computer vision and hyperspectral imaging, students engaged in intensive project work, organized by teams. The agenda allocated long blocks of time for hands-on laboratory activities, complemented by discussions with supervisors. In addition, the program incorporated social activities, including a visit to ISR facilities and a networking dinner, which provided opportunities for informal interaction and cultural exchange. The project concluded with oral presentations and structured feedback, making this agenda highly intensive and enriched by social engagement.

The TUCN CEL Project (Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, February 2024) offered a slightly different balance. The agenda began with a longer introductory phase, including a specialized seminar on modeling mechatronic systems using Matlab/Simscape. Project work focused on the development of virtual models, with dedicated sessions for supervisor discussions and laboratory visits. Compared to Jaén, the workload was more evenly distributed across theory, practical modeling, and cultural activities, including a guided tour of the city center. This agenda reflected a medium-to-high level of complexity, combining technical development with cultural immersion, while maintaining steady progress in project implementation.

The Valmet CEL Project (JAMK University of Applied Sciences, Jyväskylä, February 2025) was conducted in the second round and therefore incorporated feedback from the surveys of the first round, where both supervisors and students highlighted the need for one additional day in the intensive week. The agenda reflected this improvement, offering a more extended program that allowed for deeper project development. After the initial introduction and team formation, students attended a comprehensive seminar on iterative design, directly linked to industrial practices. The schedule included visits to Valmet and JAMK laboratories, along with long sessions of project work. Social and cultural activities also played an important role, with an evening sauna event fostering

















team building and informal networking. This agenda placed strong emphasis on iterative design, practical application and industry collaboration team building and informal networking.





## AGENDA - ISR CEL Project

Event : ISR CEL Project Location: University of Jaén, Building A3 - Campus Las Lagunillas

Period: 11-15 February 2024

Sunday - 11 Feb	Monday – 12 Feb	Tuesday -13 Feb	Wednesday -14 Feb	Thursday -15 Feb
Participants arrival to Jaén	9.00-9.30 Introduction to CEL intensive week (A3-D165) 9.30-9.45 Introduction of the participants 09.45-10.30 Project topic presentation 10.30-11.00 - Coffee Break (A3-D158) 11.00 - 12.00 Tailored course (Seminar) - Computer vision foundations & Hiperspectral Images (Tecnology & Image Acquisition)( A3-D165) 12.00-13.00 Project work (labs: Group A: A3-D264, Group B: A3-D265-266, Group C: A3-D269-270) - define the team's work plan for the Intensive week - Choosing of team leader and group members roles	9.00-10.00 Tailored course (Seminar) – Image processing (A3-D165)  Discussion with Supervisors (labs)  10.30-11.30 Project work (labs)  - chose the developed concepts and further detail them  11.30 – 13.00 Image acquisition (labs)	9.00-9.30 Discussion with Supervisors (labs)  9.30-11.00 Project work (labs)  - define tasks and deadlines for the remate work period  11.00-13.00 Project work (labs)  - create the ppt for the oral presentation	Participants departure
	13:30-14:30 Lunch Break 15:00-17:00 Project work (lubs) - define multiple concepts for the proposed task - analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solutions	13:30-14:30 Lunch Break 15:00 -18:00 Project work (labs) - initial steps in developing the concepts	13:30-14:30 Lunch Break 15:00 - 17:00 - Oral presentations (A3-0365) - team A (25 min) - team B (25 min) - team C (25 min) 17:00-17:30 Feedback and discussions (A3-0365)	
7	17:30 - 19:00 ISR visit	19.00 - Social event & Dinner		



































## AGENDA - TUCN CEL Project

Event : TUCN CEL Project

Location: Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Muncil Blvd., No. 103, Building C, Room C304

Period : 12 - 16 February 2024

Monday -12 Feb	Tuesday – 13 Feb	Wednesday – 14 Feb	Thursday – 15 Feb	Friday - 16 Feb
Participants arrival to Cluj	8.45-9.00 Participants welcome and registration (Room C304) 9.00-9.30 Start of the intensive week (Room C304) Introduction to CEL intensive week Introduction of the participants 09.30 -10.20 Project topic presentation (Prof. Olimpiu Hancu) (Room C304) 10.30 - 12.30 Tailored course - Modeling mechatronic systems using Mathal/ Simscape Toolbox	8.30-9.30 Discussion with Supervisors  9.30-11.30 Project work (Lobs)  - chose the developed cancept and further detail it  11.30 – 12.30 TUCN Laboratory visit	8.30-9.30 Discussion with Supervisors  9.30-11.30 Project work (Labs) - development of the virtual model - define tasks and deadlines for the remate work period  11.30-12.30 Project work (Labs) - create the ppt for the oral presentation	Participants departure
	[Prof.Olimpiu Honcu] ] (Room C304) 12.30 Lunch Break	12-30 Lunch Break	12.30 Lunch Break	
	14.00 -16.30 Project work (Labs) - define the team's work plan for the Intensive week - Choosing of the team leader and group members roles - define 2/2 concepts for the proposed	14.00 -16.30 Project work (Labs) - initial steps in developing the virtual model  16.30 - Social event:	14.00-14.30 Project work (Labs) - prepare the oral presentation 14.30-16.00 - Oral presentations - team A (25 min) - team B (25 min) - team C (25 min) 16.00-16.30 Feedback and discussions	
	task - analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solutions	Travel to the city centre, student Guided tour of Cluj-Napoca		
		19.00 Dinner		



































## AGENDA - VALMET CEL Project in Jyväskylä

Event : Valmet CEL Project

Location: Jamk University of Applied Sciences, Rajakatu 35, Jyväskylä

Period: 10-14 February 2025

Monday -10 Feb	Tuesday – 11 Feb	Wednesday – 12 Feb	Thursday – 13 Feb	Friday – 14 Feb
Participants arrival to Jyväskylä	9:00-9:30 Introduction to CEL intensive week at D149 9:30-10:15 Introduction of the participants 10:15 -10:30 Define the teams 10:30-10:45 - Break 10:45 - 12:00 Tailored course - Project work and iterative design Project topic presentation - define the team's work plan for the intensive week - Choosing of team leader and group members roles 12:00-12:30 Transportation to VALMET	9:00-9:30 Discussion with Supervisors at FK14 9:30-12:30 Project work - define multiple concepts for the proposed task cont. - analyze the strengths and weaknesses of the proposed solutions choose the developed concepts and further detail them	9.00-9.30 Discussion with Supervisors at D149 9.30-11.00 Project work - identify and analyze the potential issues with the developed concepts and further detail them - analyze the process and propose potential solutions 11.00 – 12.00 JAMK Laboratory tour	9:00-10:00 Project work at D148 - create the ppt for the oral presentation  10:00-12:00 Oral presentations and discussions - team 1 (25 min) - team 2 (25 min) - team 3 (25 min)  12:00-12:30 Feedback and discussions
	Lunch at VALMET	Lunch at JAMK	Lunch at JAMK	Lunch at JAMK
	13:30 – 16:00  - background info and Valmet targets for the intensive week  16:00-16:30 Transportation back to IAMK  16:30-18:00 Project work  - define multiple concepts for the proposed task	13:30 -16:00 Project work - initial steps in developing the concepts  18:00 – Social event: Evening meal and sauna evening	13.30-16.30 Project work - analyze the process and propose potential solutions - define tasks and deadlines for the remote work period  16:30-18:00 Project work - create the ppt for the oral presentation	































## Annex 2

Four examples of surveys are here presented. Table 4 and Table 5, respectively, show the student and expert / supervisors surveys designed to assess the intensive week. Table 6 presents the student survey after the virtual seminar. Finally, Table 6 and Table 7, respectively, show the student and expert / supervisors surveys designed to assess the CEL projects in the virtual seminar.

The survey questions were useful for gathering information on the qualitative indicators of the activities carried out within the framework of the NextGEng project

99/25, 18:13	WP4 - Cases for Expenential Learning Projects - Intensive Veleik - Students' Survey - Round 2	26905,1010	WHI - Cases for Expension Leaving Projects - Ottomina Week - Students Survey - Reunt 2
WD.	4 - Cases for Experiential Learning	2.	2. I work on topic: * Tick all that apply
	가는 사람이 아니라 이번 어떻게 하는 것이 되었다면 하는 것이 아니라 하는데 되었다면 하는데 없어 아니라 한 사람이 없다는데 하는데 다른데 아니다.		
Proj	ects - Intensive Week - Students'		CILS-Valoret "Automatic or semi-automatic cleaning to be developed for the doctor
Sun	vey - Round 2		blade change din/ice*
This que	stionnaire must be filled out by the students participants in the NextGEng work 4 - Deadline: 24th February 2025		CELE-ILIA RG Viedesign via AN <sup>o</sup>
* Indicates	required question	1.	3. At which HEI (University) are you studying? *
Internation (NextGEng	al Cooperation Framework for Next Generation Engineering Students	TI	
	<b>3</b>	4	4. Which study program are you taking? *
2	NextGEng	в.	Intensive week
		5.	5. The proposed agenda was well-structured and effective *
A. Individu	ual student's data		Mark only one aval.
1 112			Strongly agree
1. 1. Lan	n member of group: *		☐ Rather agree
200	that anoly		A STATE OF THE STA
Tick all	arms aggreg.		Neither agree nor disagree
7/ck all			Rather disagree

















The Count Development of the County of the c	10	0. The internalve week was a good preparation for the distance project working.*  Mark only one oval.  Bittongly agree Bather agree Neither agree Strongly disagree  10. The social activities provided opportunities to connect with other participants Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree Rather agree Neither agree Neither agree Strongly agree Bather agree Neither agree Neither agree Neither agree Neither agree Rather disagree  11. The batance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval.  Strongly disagree  11. The batance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree Bather disagree  13. The batance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval.  Strongly disagree  Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree Bather disagree
y die oud  regly ingen  filter agen met dissigne  filter agen met dissigne  filter agen met dissigne  regly dissigne  filter agen met dissigne  moght filteragen  moght mogh	10	Mark only one oval  Bittongly agree   Rather agree   Reither signe oor disagree   Rather disagree   Strongly disagree   Strongly disagree   Strongly disagree   Strongly disagree   Strongly agree   Strongly agree   Rather agree oor disagree   Neither agree nor disagree   Strongly agree   Rather disagree   Strongly agree   Rather disagree   Strongly agree   Strongly agr
may appea for ague for ague for ague for ague for dague		Strongly agree   Rather disagree   Rether agree   Rether agree   Rether agree   Rether disagree   Strongly disagree   Rether disagree   Strongly disagree   Rether disagree
ther agree the disagree  the flagses  the flagses  the flagses  the flagses  the flagses  the particular and these. I level thave gained new competencies relabel to "  of tigos.  or the particular and these and the particular and the particu		Rather agree   Neither sgree oor disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly agree   Rather agree   Neither agree nor disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disag
ther apper nor disagree  regly disagree  to leaving activities. I leaf I have gained new competencies related to "  of topic.  y one cost.  regly agree  the apper nor disagree  the disagree  regly disagree  the post of disagree  the disagree  the post of disagree  the signee  the signee  the signee  the signee  the signee		Rather agree   Neither sgree oor disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly agree   Rather agree   Neither agree nor disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disagree   Sitrongly disagree   Rather disag
the learning soft-live. I levil I have gained new compelencies related to " of topic.  of topic.  of the cost  crypt agree  the signer  the disagree  the disagree  the disagree  the disagree  the crypt principles  crypt principl		Neither signe opt disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  10. The social activities provided opportunities to connect with other participants.  Mark only one oval  Strongly agree Rather agree Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree Rather agree Rather agree Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree
the featuring activities. I feel I have gained new competencies related to - * of tigos.  I display agree  the agree in disagree  the agree in disagree  report by HEI-dupervisors and/or company research group was helpful +  y agree tool.		Rather disagree  Bitrongly disagree  10. The social activities provided opportunities to connect with other participants Mark only one oval Strongly agree Rather agree Rother agree or disagree Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval Strongly agree Rather agree Rather agree Rather agree Rather tagree
the learning activities. I final I have gathed new competencies related to " of logic.  Triply rapre time agent for disagree the spine of disagree the disagree triply agree too agent triply agree too agent triply agree too agent		Strongly disagree
of topic.  Triply agree  for agree for discappee  for discappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply agree  t		10. The social activities provided opportunities to connect with other participants  Mark only one oval  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social scfivities was appropriate  Mark only one oval  Strongly agree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree
of topic.  Triply agree  for agree for discappee  for discappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply agree  t		Mark only one oval  Strongly agree  Rather agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Natter agree  Rather disagree  Stather disagree  Stather disagree
of topic.  Triply agree  for agree for discappee  for discappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply diseappee  triply agree  t		Mark only one oval  Strongly agree  Rather agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Natter agree  Rather disagree  Stather disagree  Stather disagree
crop's pages ther agree in disclosures the dayon the disclosure they disclosure the agree the agree the agree the agree the disclosure	11	Strongly agree Rather agree nor disagree Rather disagree Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval. Strongly agree Ratter agree Ratter agree Natther agree nor disagree  Stather disagree
crop's pages ther agree in disclosures the dayon the disclosure they disclosure the agree the agree the agree the agree the disclosure	n	Strongly agree Rather agree nor disagree Rather disagree Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval. Strongly agree Ratter agree Ratter agree Natther agree nor disagree  Stather disagree
the agree for disagree for disagree for disagree for disagree support by HEI-dupenvisors and/or company research group was height + y are over for agree for agree for agree for agree for agree for disagree for disagree for disagree for disagree	11	Rather agree Neither agree nor disagree Rather disagree Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate Mark only one oval. Strongly agree Ratter agree Neither agree nor disagree Rather disagree Rather disagree
The appear for disagree  regiv finagree  apport by HE) supervisors and/or company/research group was height t  orac cost  regiv agree  the appear one disagree  the disagree  the disagree	13.	Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social sofivifies was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Strongly egree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree
that disages regly disages support by HEI-supervisors and/or company research group was helighal.* y one coal. The agree too disages the disages	11	Ratter disagree     Strongly disagree     11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate     Mark only one oval.     Strongly agree     Ratter agree     Neither agree     Neither agree     Ratter disagree     Ratter disagree     Ratter disagree     Ratter disagree
ongly minagen  apport by HEI-aupervisors and/or company/research group was helipful *  y-am oval.  onely agree  the agree too disagree  the disagree  the disagree  the disagree	n	Strongly disagree  11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Silvengly agree  Ratter agree  Netter agree  Ratter disagree  Ratter disagree
apport by HEI-aupervisors and/or company/research group was heligible * or one coul traffy agree the agree too disagree the disagree the disagree	11	11. The balance between learning and social activities was appropriate  Mark only one oval.  Strongty agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree
y ama ovali origin agree the agree the agree besidongum	11	Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Ratter agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Gather disagree
y ama ovali origin agree the agree the agree besidongum		Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Ratter agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Gather disagree
orally agree the agree the agree the depen on disagree her designee		Strongty agree   Rather agree   Neither agree   Neither agree   Eather disagree   Sather disagree
the agent of tragent of tragens has disagree		Rather agree Neither signen nor disagion Gather disagree
Ter uper on daugee her daugen		Neither agree nor disagree Chather disagree
ho dragne		C Rather disagree
		C Strongly disagree
1974 - Canada de Esperanta Casarag Proposa - reservad Prisa - decident Survey - Passe S		
all, I am satisfied with the intensive week experience.		
che oval		
righy agree		
her seg on		
fler agree not diorgive.		
her strapes		
ryk diagos		
Milwing area is scale for whitee, obesit of improvement, conflicts.		
	following area is space for whitee, sizes of improvement, conflicts, so etc. sefering for the intensive Villess	

Table 4. Survey for the students in the intensive week

















	There are recommon and a production of the production of the common of t
WP4 - Cases for Experiential Learning	3. 3. The exection of the students use good. *
Projects - Intensive Week - Company-	Affaith only mee inval.
이 집에 가장 하는 것 때 그리지 않는 얼마나를 하는 것이 되었다. 그리고 있는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이다.	C timple upon
experts and HEI-supervisors - Round 1	C Nother agree
This approximation round for filled out by contract a separate and HEI supervisors of the Assetting work packups 4 Experienced Cosmo - December 1200 Petropoly 2004	To Fair agree on Grapes
The state of the s	C Hulter Goapee
	Charge sugre
constables of Consecution Processors for New Generalize Engineering Streets	
(WestElby)	
	A. 4. The mintage of the learns wan good. *
	Main only one suid
-1-	
Nov+CEna	C littingly squee
NextGEng	Challes agent
	for their again was change or
	NATIVE ENGINE
	C Ittirgly (Lugrov
A. Sethishad data	5. S. There were no problems or discussions arrong the learn mentage. "
1. I I was involved in the tigary ?	Mark only one sret
Total of Marriage to	C Hooph agen
CBC 1 dist Streege at an other quality covers system?"	C hates agree
CELETICAL Trings of a Excest SANTON ACROT (SDR)	To the approximations
IELS Virtual "Savige of a last phint for a prevent frame transfect and promise"	C Native dissiples
	C Streets diseases
2. 2 For which surgary (HE) do you work?	- W. F. W. F. W. S. W. S
S. S. Lee, Assert couldn't Lieb at Nov	
B. Imposition week	
B. Internation week	
(B) legeration week	
(B) lightership week	
6. If. This given ballored inclumes yeers undestandable. *	S. B. Liston We inserting posits of
B. Tim given labored inclume were understandable.      All Tim given labored inclume were understandable.      Also don'y one grant.	4. It is how the warring posits."
6. If. This given ballored inclumes yeers undestandable. *	4. It. Union the rearring poets. " Mark only none mark.
6. II. This gives labbled inclume yers unabsoluntiable. * Admit and one musi.	Mark only me eral.
II. The given balance instance years undestantiable. *  Mank only one must.  Ithingsh spine.	Mark oxy man e w.C.  Claim sple sprea  Charten agree
E. This gives labored instance were unblestandable. *  Mark only one mul.    Marigh spine	Mach only man area.    Store gift suprect   Start suprect out Clargerer   The Flex suprect out Clargerer
E. The given labored instance were undestantiable.*  Allow only one crue  Others specific  Therefore specific  Feel Year agreement diseases.	Mach only man and.    Stranging upon   Software agree   Toolfeer agrees on disagree   Idelteer planging
E. The given labored instance were unabsolventiable. ?  Admit only one creal.  Othersphospes  Full or against angles on Granges  In the capies on Granges  Intelligent Granges	Mach only man area.    Store gift suprect   Start suprect out Clargerer   The Flex suprect out Clargerer
E. This gives labbased instance were undestandable.*  Mack only one cred.      Stance by upon     Forther agree     Fort For agree our dangine     Stance Confine     Thomps dangine     Thomps dangine	Mach only man and.    Stranging upon   Software agree   Toolfeer agrees on disagree   Idelteer planging
6. II. The given ballowed instance overs unabsorberstable. *  Mark only one creat.  Strange spine.  Full or agree on dangers.  Sold of the company of the property of the property.	Mark only one eral.    Storegis spee   Suffer spee on Coopee   Haller Elaque   Ottorigis (Storages)
E. This gives labbased instance were undestandable.*  Mack only one cred.      Stance by upon     Forther agree     Fort For agree our dangine     Stance Confine     Thomps dangine     Thomps dangine	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singular on disagree   Attack singular on the spice of th
A. The given labored inclures even unabsoluntiable. *  Mark only one cred.  Things upon  Things upon  Things upon thingses  Things Exagore	Mark only one eral.    Storegis spee   Suffer spee on Coopee   Haller Elaque   Ottorigis (Storages)
M. The given labbred instance year understandable. *      Adeal only one creat.     Interrupt open.     Traffer agence on changes.     Interrupt observe.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singular on disagree   Attack singular on the spice of th
II. The given labored inclues yers undestantiable. *      Xhark cody one must.      Ithingh squee     Training squee on Chapter     Training squee on Chapter     Training squee	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singular on disagree   Attack singular on the spice of th
6. E. The given labbred instance years understandable. *  Make day one crus.  Othersh agree  Traffer Europee  District Europee  District Europee  Traffer Europee  District Europee  Traffer Europee  District Europee  Traffer Europee  Notice Specification  Failure Agree  Notice Agree  Notice Agree  Notice Agree pictingee  Notice Agree pictingee	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
E. The given believed instance overs understantishin. *  Mark only one creat.      things super.     Forther super.     Holler super.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
6. III. This gives failured instance years undestantishin. *  Adent only one must.  Understands again  Trailine again  Total trailine stangue  Total	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
E. The given believed instance overs understantishin. *  Mark only one creat.      things super.     Forther super.     Holler super.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
E. The given believed instance overs understantishin. *  Mark only one creat.      things super.     Forther super.     Holler super.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
S. The given belowed instance overs understandable. *  Mark only one creat.  Inthersph spine  From the open on dampine  Storage dampine  Storage dampine  To the treatable of the Markovine woold you officially. *  Mark only one over!  Storage dampine  From the open of dampine  Notice open open  Notice open of dampine  Notice open open  Notice open	Mach only may a real.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree on disagree   Indian indianane   Other spice on disagree   Other spice on disagree
M. The given belowed instance overs understandable. *  Makely only one creat.      Stange super.      Notice suppre.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice     State spice on disagree   Inditive spice on disagree   Inditive singularies on disagree   Attack singularies   Other spice so disagree   Inditive singularies on disagrees on
6. II. The given bakined instance years undesobanisable. *  Makel only one must.  Interrupt supres.  The fire agree on changes.  Interrupt shapes on thoughes.  Interrupt shapes.  The treatable of the Memory mode was efficient. *  Makel only one avel.  Interrupt shapes.  The treatable of the Memory mode was efficient. *  Makel only one avel.  Interrupt shapes.  The proposed inerring restroothings in these to rec. *  Makel only one avel.  Interrupt shapes.	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree     Notifier includes   Other poly includes
6. II. The given labbred inclues yers undestantiable. *  Mank only one must.    Italian again   Italian again   Italian super our fanges   Italian super	Mach only may a real.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree on disagree   Indian indianane   Other spice on disagree   Other spice on disagree
6. II. The given fastered inclues yets undestantiable. *  Make only one must.    Ithingh spine   Refer yets out they're   Not the spine   Not the spine out they're   Not	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree     Notifier includes   Other poly includes
M. The place belowed instance year understandable. *  Make only one creat.    things space	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree     Notifier includes   Other poly includes
6. II. The given fastered inclues yets undestantiable. *  Make only one must.    Ithingh spine   Refer yets out they're   Not the spine   Not the spine out they're   Not	Mark poly may a ref.    State spice or disagree   Teather agree     Notifier includes   Other poly includes

Table 5. Survey for expert & HEI supervisors in the intensive week

















WP4 - Cases for Experiential Learning	CONTRACTOR CONTRACTOR OF THE PROPERTY OF THE P
Projects - Evaluation - Students' Survey	3. 3. At which HEI (University) are you studying?"   (ii) Desirious
- Round 1	Mark only one real.
NOUTIGE 1  The quarter make too 6 lief out by the shadons, participants with the ESS provide.	○ HAN
inspirite a	C)JMK
Pediatra regard paraties	C HON
INVENTIONAL Consention Framework for Next Consention Engineering Stratestic (Next Engl	4 A VMXID Multir program are you taxing? *
(11,628-40)	The state of the s
•^•	
	B. Darring distance project working
NextGEng	
	5 . 5. The support by HEI-supervisors was height
•••	Mark only one out.
	C trench spre
A. lunividual ouderfo data	Notice ages
	C hitter agreeate chapter
1. 1 Lare member of group.*	C Native Eleagues
Torotherape	C inn styrkrapee
□A □	
14	6. 6. The support by the company/research group experts was helpful. *
De	Mari one ann out
	C Bright spin
2. Z Ework co-ropic: *	C Hotte ayer
York of Armagyly	C he fat approxis danger
CELT-Rift Tomoger of an above speaking narrow dysterm?	C futor pages
<ul> <li>Del.3-100% "lension of a linear Color IV (COO) (2006)</li> <li>Disch-Worlet "lension of a line states to a precurational manufacturing process."</li> </ul>	☐ ttrough daugram
209/25, 15.16 WP4 - Cases for Experiential Learning Projects - Evaluation - Students' Survey - Round 1	Statis, 1915. WH. Days in Economy Learning Styles. Endurine. Steamer Strap., State 5.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*	<ol> <li>10. The given ways to contact ad other team members were sufficient.</li> </ol>
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.	<ol> <li>10. The given ways to contact at other twent metabers were sufficient.</li> <li>Mant only one and</li> </ol>
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree	10. 10. The given verys to contact at other treet monthers were sufficient.   Stant only one creat  Others by super.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree	TO, TO. The given verys to contact ab other treen monthlers were sufficient. +  &fact only one cred.  © through upon  Trainer agree.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree	10. 10. The given verys to contact a5 other tream members were sufficient. †  After only one creat  Strongt agree  Training agree  Pair the agree
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree	TO, TO. The given verys to contact ab other treen monthlers were sufficient. +  &fact only one cred.  © through upon  Trainer agree.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree	10. 10. The given verys to contact ad other tream members were sufficient. †  About only one crub  Brongh agree  Politics agree  History dropper
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient.*  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree	10. 10. The given verys to contact ab other tream members were sufficient. +  After only one cred.  Directly upos  Failure upos  Failure upos  Hittler daugue  Strangle daugue  Strangle daugue
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *	10. To great verys to contact at other treat members were sufficient. †  Afait only one cred.  Differigh upos  Faither spice  Neither upos for disagree  Strangle disagree  Strangle disagree  Th. The great verys to contact the HEI-loperreacts work outboard. *
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.	10. The given verys to contact ab other tream members were sufficient. †  & Standy one cred.    Dimmight upper   Faither agree   Heither agree   Lister douglee   Standy dawgee   Standy one double the HEI dependency work outboard, *  & Standy one double
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree not disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree	TO. TO, The given verys to context ab other tream monthless were sufficient. *  Shark only one creat  Other given  Trained sugges  Paid the sugges  State disagree  Unique disagree  This first ways to disagree  Unique disagree  This given ways to context the HEI-superisons were subblent. *  Man only one seet  State only one seet
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree not disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very offen with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree	TO. The given verys to contact at other tream members were sufficient.   Stands only one end  Others sizes  Truther sizes  Partition appear  Station disagree  Station disagree  This tream with the HEI departments work outfloand.   About only one dust  Station disagree  Station appears with the HEI departments work outfloand.   Station disagree  Station appears
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree not disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree on disagree	10. To given verys to contact at other treem monthers were sufficient. +  fidant only one end.    Strongly appeal   Butter agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Strongly dawgree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Ferther oppins our discippins
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my tearn members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree	10. 10. The given verys to contend ab other treat monthless were sufficient. *  Manifel supre.  Trained supre.  Trained supre.  Trained dangere.  Strangle changere.  11. 11. The given verys to content the HEI respectators were outboined. *  Material supre.  Strangle agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree not disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree on disagree	10. To given verys to contact at other treem monthers were sufficient. +  fidant only one end.    Strongly appeal   Butter agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Strongly dawgree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Hallier agree     Ferther oppins our discippins
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my tearn members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree  Rather disagree	10. 10. The given verys to contend ab other treat monthless were sufficient. *  Manifel supre.  Trained supre.  Trained supre.  Trained dangere.  Strangle changere.  11. 11. The given verys to content the HEI respectators were outboined. *  Material supre.  Strangle agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.  Hatter agree.
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree ord disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree ord disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree	10. TO, The given verys to context at a their tream months were sufficient.   districtly supple  Districtly
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my tearn members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.	10. The given verys to content ab other tream mony-times were sufficient. *  Many by one creat  Others of super  Daths super  Hather super  Strangle changes  Strangle changes  Strangle changes  Th. The given verys to content the HEI respectance voice outbolded. *  Mank only one seet  Strangle agree  Hather super  Hather super  Strangle disagree  Hather super  Strangle disagree  Hather super  Strangle disagree  Strangle disagree  10 strangle disagree  Strangle disagree  11. The given were an decopyer  Strangle disagree  12. 12. The given were to content the company-experts were sufficient *  Mark only one credit
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my tearn members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *	10. 10. The given ways to contact the other treat many determinent. *  Many designs  Trained suppos  Halles suppos to strong se  Halles disagree  Strongle classing  Strongle classing  11. 11. The given ways to contact the HEI respectators we're outboiled. *  Material suppos  Strongle agree  Halles agree  15. 12. The given ways to contact the company-experts were sufficient *
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather alsagree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree	10. The given verys to contect at other tream members were sufficient. *  deant only one creat    Strongle agree     Butters agree     Hatter agree     Bits and begins     Bits agree     Bits agre
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree	10. The given verys to content ab other tream meryders were sufficient. *  deart only one creat    Strongle ages     Dathite super to strong se     Hatter daugue     Strongle class se     Strongle capes     Strongle class se     Strongle capes
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Rather agree or disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree or disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly agree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  9. Gather agree  9. Gather agree  9. Gather agree  Rather agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Neither agree or disagree	10. The given verys to content at other treem members were sufficient. *  dead only one end  (through upon  Faither agree  Faither stages  through danges  through danges  This primer verys to content the HEI departments work outflowerd. *  dead only one dust  (through upon  Halles agree  Faither agree  Faither separate output  The primer separate output  Faither separate output  The primer separate output  This primer ways to content the company-experts were sufficient. *  Merk very one end  This primer degree  Faither agree
7. 7. The meeting times were sufficient. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Strongly disagree  8. 8. I met very often with my team members *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree nor disagree  Rather disagree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Strongly disagree  9. 9. The work could be easily split. *  Mark only one oval.  Strongly agree  Rather agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree  Neither agree  Neither agree  Rather disagree	10. The given verys to content ab other tream meryders were sufficient. *  deart only one creat    Strongle ages     Dathite super to strong se     Hatter daugue     Strongle class se     Strongle capes     Strongle class se     Strongle capes

















		1		
76607, 1916	Wit. Lean to Common Learning Roads. Extension. Street Street, Section 13, In the following once is agree for wishes, Gees of improvement, conflicts.	50000		
140	shallenges etc. referring to the distance working	76	Will Leavis Common Leaving Traces. Exclusion Shares Surry, Secret 18. I recall decontracted participation in this type of project to my fellow.	
	1 PCP 1 TOP 1 7 X 11 X 11 X 1 X 1 X 1 X 1 X 1 X 1 X		students.	
			Mark only one axet	
			☐ Street spe	
			Rather agree	
			Chrither agree nor deagon:	
G.	After Final Report		Hother-disagene	
			Ctomply dampine	
14.	14.1 am satisfied with the work of my teem *			
	Mark only one-snal	17	17. In the following area is space for system, ideas of improvement, conficts.	
	□ though ages		shallenges als: telerring to the final report	
	C Refer ages			
	Notifier agree our disagree			
	Rather dangere			
	☐ Borglediages			
18.	15: 1 would you be part of another project *	D.	Overall evaluation	
	Mark any one and	11490		
	2000 (150 Paris)	10.	10. In the following area is space for wishes, conflicts, studyingers, and ideas of	
	_ strongs upon		improvement of the whole first round project.	
	Faster agree			
	Netter some or deagree	1		
	Notice that the same of the sa			
	Chargle disagree			
bests, and		_		
	Will Deprive Expenses terms from Endudies. Secure Song, Securi the following lines is appear for year Top-2-points of what was ready good.			
14. 14.01	the populationers in stone int form 100-3-boule in Aust was used Bood			
Thank yo	watery much for completing the leadback quantition raise!			
	The contract to parties posted on endowed to Dough.			

Table 6. Survey for students after the virtual seminar

















WP4 - Cases for Experiential Learning	<ol> <li>The timefable of distance project working was efficient.</li> </ol>
	More only one coal
Projects - Final Report - Company-	teorgh spre
experts and HEI-supervisors - Round 1	Father agence
This quarternal is much to 4 Ref but by company Asperts and HSI supervisors of the	Melities agree not disagree
Northing work pushage 4 Experiented Cases	father discapse
* Production of States and States	□ Moregh disagree
INNOVATIONAL COORESTANT Framework for tWest Committee Engineering District III	
(Next)Eigt	4. 4. The Brist result of feets A was good. *
	Mark only one coal
	C Strongly egow
Nov+GEna	Teller agent
NextGEng	Meether agree nor divagree
•00	☐ hathy disagree
	O Horagh Caspine
A temperatural data	
a. miremarana	8. S. The this result of fuers th was good. *
1. 1. I was Provined II the Road; "	Must only one out.
Tol white some	☐ Moragly agree
GRIT-DE Vestgrid access quality cortex against	Tather spine
CELD TOOM Through of a 2-ware SANTOV HOSOT (DSR)	Shiften agree for disagree
GES Worset "Besign of a test phases for a promong based manufacturing promon".	Office diagram
	C Morraly Charges
2. 2. For which company (HE) do you world *	
The state of the s	
B. Distance project working and find reports	
6. 6. The fraireaut of sear C was good. *	
Mark only one most.	<ol> <li>It is the following even is apace for violes, blees of improvement, conflicts, challenges etc. referring to the distance working and the final squat.</li> </ol>
training upon	
The the appearan danger	
Listing Eagure	
Ottorigh shapper	
2 7 Students have argroved they soft solds point in teams, propers and give	10. 10. In the following area is against for your Top-3-points of what were really good.
presentation)	
Mark only-one-mal.	
Consulty eagler	
G Richer agree	
Torte agressi diager	25 CHR - 0 - 25 - 12 PRANCES - 20 - 20 - 2 - 25
C Hother Enigene	Thank you very much for completing the feedback question value?
through diagram	Consequence of the contract of
THE PART OF THE PA	
8. 8. Statement have improved their technical competences on the project tope. "	The contract is contract and militaria to finish.
	Specific Forms
6 8 Students have improved their technical competences on the angest topic. "	TET
8. 8. Students have improved their lacknool competences on the project topic. " Mark and time and time.	TET
B. Students have improved that historical compatences on the project lague. "  Mask any are onl.  Through again.  Indian again.  The the reparation danger;	TET
B. Students have improved fruit technical competences on the project topic.   Mark only near and.  Thirthy again.  Student again.	

Table 7. Survey for experts and HEI supervisors after the virtual seminar

















## Annex 3

The following annex presents the results of students from the winning solution of project CEL2-TUCN RG and CEL6-UJA RG. For confidentiality reasons, only the CEL projects whose topics were proposed by research groups from the university partners are shown.

#### **CEL2-TUCN RG**

As mentioned in subsection 4.2, this project was focused on the design and development of a three-axis gantry robot (3GR) under strict limitations: the use of no more than three fixed motors and a single transmission. The main innovation of the winner group was the implementation of a ball-chain transmission system, which enabled smooth vertical movement of the gripper using only one transmission. This solution emphasized efficiency and simplicity, achieving functionality while minimizing the number of components. The robot integrated a standard H-bot configuration with this novel transmission approach.




Figure 12. CAD model for the three-axis gantry robot (3GR)

To ensure feasibility, the team B carried out digital modeling and simulations with SolidWorks and SimScape. These tools were used to design, analyze, and validate the kinematics and overall performance of the robot. Figure 12 shows the CAD model of the robot. Key advantages were: reduced mechanical wear and heat generation, improved smoothness of movement, and the ability to test and refine the design virtually prior to building. However, some limitations were identified:

















the robot's load capacity is restricted to a maximum of 20 kilograms, and no real-world experiments with heavy loads were conducted within the project's timeframe.

#### CEL6-UJA RG

The project developed a transparent combustion chamber mockup for wind tunnel testing, aimed at enabling airflow visualization through tracers and Particle Image Velocimetry (PIV). The winner team designed and manufactured a 3D prototype using SolidWorks and combined plexiglass with 3D-printed parts to create a modular and low-cost solution. The iterative design process addressed issues such as misaligned or incorrectly shaped holes and turbulence management. The CAD model (Figure 13) illustrates the final mockup design and enclosure, showing its modular construction and integration of plexiglass panels.




Figure 13. CAD model for the transparent combustion chamber

Airflow simulations were central to the validation process and Figure 14 shows one of the final simulations.

Materials and manufacturing methods were also studied in depth. It were compared ABS, PLA, PETG, Smart Glace, and resin as candidate materials. The transparency results and post-processing techniques are presented in Figure 15.




















Figure 14. Airflow simulation





Figure 15. Prototypes to assess transparency

The team successfully produced a functional and low-cost combustion chamber mockup, spending under 15 euros on materials while overcoming issues like printing defects, structural inaccuracies, and simulation limits. Although the prototype still needs improvements in transparency and experimental validation through PIV testing, the project met its core goals. It showcased effective teamwork, creative use of CAD and CFD tools, and innovative manufacturing methods, marking an important step toward practical educational prototypes in aerospace engineering.











