IDEAL

Integrating Data Analysis and AI in Learning Experiences

D3.1

IDEAL Learning Design

Designing the Learning Path

Educational Approach and Didactic Framework

Work Package 3: Blended Learning Offer

Prepared by

Hochschule Ruhr West – University of Applied Sciences

October 2025

Co-Funded by
the Erasmus+ Programme of
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or of the National Agency Erasmus+ – INDIRE. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. Project Number: 2024-1-IT02-KA220-HED-000251425

Table of Contents

1. Purpose and Position within IDEAL 4
1.1 Purpose and audience 4
1.2 Relationship between work packages 4
1.3 Scope and companion documents 4
2. Educational Approach and Design Principles 6
2.1 Competence orientation and contextual relevance 6
2.2 Alignment of outcomes, activities and evidence 6
2.3 Flexible access with purposeful progression 6
2.4 Blended and collaborative learning 6
2.5 Reflection and responsible exploration 7
3. From Action Fields to Learning Fields and Competences 8
3.1 Action field: context, purpose and action 8
3.2 Learning field: learning needed for purposeful action 8
3.3 Competence areas as reference points 9
3.4 Practical domains for defining action fields 9
3.5 Connecting the fields to platform topics 11
4. Didactic Patterns and Learning Activities 12
4.1 Purpose of the patterns 12
4.2 A design example 12
4.3 Choosing activities and assessment methods 12
5. Learning Pathways and Planning Scenarios 14
5.1 A pathway as a sequence of learning steps 14
5.2 Common blueprint for planning and use 14
5.3 Learning-unit structure 15
5.4 Qualification, validation and situational learning 15
5.5 Qualification pathway 16
5.6 Validation pathway 16
5.7 Modular situational-learning pathway 16
5.8 From experience to a transferable blueprint 16
6. Architecture of the Blended Learning Offer 18
6.1 Thematic resources and common structure 18
6.2 Methodology resources 18
6.3 SPIDER as awareness and orientation 18

6.4 Continuity across learning settings 18

7. Assessment, Reflection and Competence Validation 20

7.1 Distinct purposes 20

7.2 LEVEL5 and evidence of development 20

7.3 Appropriate evidence and feedback 20

7.4 Reflection and next steps 21

8. Development, Review and Adaptation 21

8.1 Collaborative development process 21

8.2 Review criteria 21

8.3 Learning from CPD and pilots 22

8.4 Maintaining coherence 22

1. Purpose and Position within IDEAL

1.1 Purpose and audience

IDEAL supports higher education educators in understanding, critically evaluating and applying artificial intelligence and data analysis in their professional contexts. The Learning Design explains how competence development, thematic resources, practical activities and reflection can form a coherent blended learning offer. It provides a shared reference for the partnership, course designers, and facilitators.

In line with the application, WP3 follows an open, modular and competence-oriented approach, including learning patterns, course and module designs, learning and action fields, and preparation for implementation. It also specifies qualification, validation, and modular situational-learning scenarios. These commitments guide the structure of this document.

1.2 Relationship between work packages

Work package	Contribution to the learning offer
WP2 – Research and competence resources	Provides the research foundation, use cases, competence framework and assessment methods informing educational choices.
WP3 – Blended learning offer	Develops educational patterns, outcomes, materials and activities; provides CPD and collaborative opportunities for application.
WP4 – Learning Suite	Makes topic content and methodology resources accessible in a persistent environment supporting learning, reflection and documentation.
WP5 – Implementation and pilots	Applies and adapts the offer in different contexts and provides evidence and experience for further refinement.

The relationship is iterative. CPD contributed to the development and establishment of content, while the platform provided workable access to this evolving offer. Pilot experience can in turn inform examples, resources and design decisions. The platform consequently combines a repository function with a topic-driven collection connecting development and implementation.

1.3 Scope and companion documents

This document explains the educational framework and the logic of learning pathways. The companion document IDEAL Course Offer (D3.2) specifies outcomes, resources, activity mappings and planning tables. IDEAL Implementation Facilitation – Implementation Facilitation and Transfer to Practice (D3.3) describes facilitation and delivery, with supporting implementation evidence. The WP4 platform report and technical and methodological guide document access and the platform offer. These references avoid repeating the same account across work packages.

2. Educational Approach and Design Principles

2.1 Competence orientation and contextual relevance

The starting point is what an educator needs to understand, do and judge in a relevant professional situation. Competence development therefore extends beyond information about AI. It includes selecting appropriate approaches, evaluating outputs, adapting teaching and explaining decisions responsibly. The WP2 framework describes development across Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes, using competence-specific reference systems.

A learning activity should begin with a meaningful educational purpose: for example, improving a learning resource, examining an assessment practice or addressing an inclusion barrier. AI or data analysis is considered in relation to that purpose. A justified decision to limit or avoid a tool can be an appropriate result, alongside a decision to use it.

2.2 Alignment of outcomes, activities and evidence

The Learning Design adopts constructive alignment: intended outcomes, learner activities and assessment should support one another. To make this principle operational, designers select an outcome, define an activity through which it can be practised, and identify evidence through which it can be discussed or assessed. Materials provide support for the task rather than serving as the only indication that an outcome is addressed.

For an outcome requiring evaluation, reading supplies background but should be complemented by evaluation of an example. For an outcome requiring design, an appropriate task produces a design or adaptation. A quiz may check relevant knowledge; an artefact and explanation can make applied judgment visible. Activities need not assess every competence in the framework. A manageable selection allows meaningful depth.

2.3 Flexible access with purposeful progression

The six topics are largely independent and can be selected according to professional needs, prior experience and available time. Flexibility concerns topic choice, order and depth. Within a selected activity, however, progression should remain clear: establish the question, explore relevant resources, act, receive feedback and reflect. Optional routes can provide this support without creating a mandatory sequence across all topics.

2.4 Blended and collaborative learning

Blended learning connects independent engagement with resources, facilitated exchange and application in practice. Its value depends on the connection between these experiences. Preparation can introduce a question or concept; a group session can test it; a later professional activity can explore transfer. Each phase should carry a task, question or output into the next.

The CPD agenda illustrates a design-thinking sequence from Empathise and Define to Ideate and Prototype, followed by presentation and pilot planning. Collaborative problem framing and prototyping create opportunities to practise problem-solving, adaptability and attention to learner or stakeholder needs. Those opportunities should be explicit in task instructions and reflection prompts.

2.5 Reflection and responsible exploration

Reflection helps educators explain what they tried, how they interpreted the result and what they would change. It is most useful when connected to a concrete decision or output. Activities should allow experimentation while encouraging scrutiny of accuracy, bias, accessibility, data suitability and the limits of AI-generated material. AI-related awareness is a legitimate initial objective; higher claims of proficiency require suitable evidence.

The visible six-topic offer places a strong emphasis on AI. The wider IDEAL remit also includes data analysis. Designers should make data-related objectives and tasks explicit where relevant, rather than assume that AI resources alone cover them. The separate platform assessments for AI and Data Analysis support this distinction.

3. From Action Fields to Learning Fields and Competences

3.1 Action field: context, purpose and action

The Action Field describes what learners should do in their working contexts. It establishes the practical situation, the people involved, the objectives to be pursued, the relevant contents and the actions required. In IDEAL, this may be a teaching, curriculum, institutional or professional-development context. The same planning logic can also be applied to civic and community projects.

An Action Field is therefore more than a topic or an opportunity to use an AI tool. It requires an analysis of the relationships between the target group, action-specific objectives, contents and actions. The starting question is what participants need to accomplish in their context and under which conditions. The role of AI or data analysis follows from that question.

Planning element	Questions defining the action field
Target group and stakeholders	Who acts, who benefits and who is affected? What experience, needs and responsibilities do they bring?
Context and challenge	Where will action take place? What problem, constraint or opportunity needs attention?
Action objectives	What should participants accomplish or improve in this context? What would a useful result look like?
Contents	Which subject matter, information, data and professional considerations are relevant?
Actions and conditions	What must participants do? What resources, time, support and access are available?

3.2 Learning field: learning needed for purposeful action

The Learning Field describes what learners should learn in a specific learning project to develop the competences needed to work and act in the Action Field. Action objectives are converted into learning objectives, expressed as desired learning outcomes relating to Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes.

This conversion makes the educational purpose explicit. Knowledge concerns what participants need to understand; Skills concern what they need to be able to do; Attitudes concern the judgments, dispositions and responsibility needed for action. Together, they connect the practical project to competence development. The learning field should be specific enough to guide activities, support and assessment.

For example, the action objective might be to adapt a teaching resource for a diverse learner group. The related learning outcomes could concern understanding the benefits and limits of AI-supported adaptation, producing and checking an appropriate resource, and exercising responsible judgment about accessibility and representation. The adapted resource is an action result; the demonstrated capability and explained decisions provide evidence of learning. This is an illustrative design example.

3.3 Competence areas as reference points

The four types in the WP2 competence framework provide reference points for defining project-specific Learning Fields. They describe broad competence areas; they are not, by themselves, a complete description of what a particular group should learn. Designers select the relevant competences and sub-competences, then contextualise their outcomes and LEVEL5 reference systems for the learning project.

Competence area	Contribution to a project-specific learning field
Pedagogical-AI Integration	Understanding and selecting AI-supported teaching approaches with a clear pedagogical purpose.
AI-Enhanced Curriculum Design and Assessment	Developing or adapting curricula, resources, scaffolding and assessment with critical oversight.
Ethical, Inclusive and Data-Literate AI Use	Evaluating fairness, accessibility, data-related implications and responsible practice.
AI-Driven Professional Development and Collaboration	Reflecting on practice, exchanging expertise and contributing to institutional development.

The framework provides competence-specific reference systems across Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes at five developmental levels. These help specify the intended learning and interpret evidence. A thematic connection to a competence area does not mean that every competence in that area is addressed or achieved.

3.4 Practical domains for defining action fields

The seven practical domains below retain the partner's proposed structure. They help identify relevant professional situations. A project-specific Action Field adds the actual target group, objectives, contents and actions within the selected domain. Several domains may overlap in one project.

Practical domain	Examples of action objectives
Course and curriculum design	Revise a syllabus or develop a learning sequence for a defined group.
Learning materials and content creation	Create or adapt a resource for a specific educational purpose.
Teaching and learning activities	Design and test an AI-supported activity in an identified teaching setting.
Assessment and feedback	Review an assessment format or improve feedback against explicit criteria.
Inclusive and accessible learning	Identify barriers and implement suitable adaptations.
Critical evaluation and responsible AI use	Examine outputs, risks and limitations and justify decisions about use.
Institutional and professional development	Develop guidance or contribute to collegial and institutional decisions.

3.5 Connecting the fields to platform topics

Platform topics supply resources for the learning project. They are selected after the Action Field and Learning Field have been clarified. A project may draw on several topics or use only a small part of one course. The six topics do not impose six corresponding learning projects or a fixed progression.

Platform topic	Possible contribution to contextual learning
Ethical Use of GenAI in Higher Education	Ethical judgment and inclusion in a selected teaching or institutional activity.
Bias and Fairness of GenAI	Recognition and evaluation of bias in resources, practices or assessment.
Frameworks and Competencies	Selection of relevant competences and reflection on developmental needs.
Broader Impact and Institutional Perspectives	Understanding institutional and societal implications and developing arguments.
Responsible Use of AI	Purposeful practical use, evaluation and adaptation of AI-supported activities.
Stakeholder Perceptions and Critical Literacy	Understanding stakeholder perspectives and critically examining AI-related choices.

These connections indicate potential relevance. The companion syllabus and planning tables should specify which outcomes, activities and evidence support a particular project. This preserves the partner's thematic mapping while making the contextual planning process explicit.

4. Didactic Patterns and Learning Activities

4.1 Purpose of the patterns

A didactic pattern is a reusable arrangement linking a learning purpose to learner action and feedback. The partner documents identify research-based learning, chunking and initiation–response–feedback. These remain useful, while practical application and reflection make their contribution to competence development more explicit.

Pattern	Learner action and potential output	Support and feedback
Guided engagement with research	Compare a claim or example with selected research; produce a short interpretation or implication for teaching.	Provide a focused question and relevant excerpts; discuss the interpretation.
Manageable learning units	Explore a focused resource and use its central idea in the current task.	Identify core material, optional depth and the connection to the outcome.
Retrieval and explanatory feedback	Answer a knowledge question, interpret feedback and revisit a gap.	Use explanations and resource pointers, rather than scores alone.
Practical exploration and critical evaluation	Test or analyse a tool/output against a teaching purpose; record decisions and limitations.	Provide criteria, a suitable example and peer or facilitator feedback.
Challenge-based collaboration	Frame a HE challenge, develop alternatives and produce a prototype or activity concept.	Support group roles, learner needs, critique and revision.
Reflection and transfer	Explain changes in understanding or practice and define a next step.	Use prompts linked to evidence and selected competences.

4.2 A design example

Illustrative example: an educator selects Bias and Fairness to examine an AI-generated teaching resource. The intended outcome is to identify a potential bias and justify an adaptation. A short input and selected research provide background. The educator analyses the resource, records the issue, revises it and explains the decision. Peer feedback tests whether the revision addresses the concern. The original resource, annotated analysis, revision and explanation provide evidence for reflection or assessment.

This example can be used independently or within a facilitated course. It does not require completion of all six topics. It also illustrates why resource variety is not enough: the educational contribution comes from the action, criteria, feedback and explanation.

4.3 Choosing activities and assessment methods

The WP2 Assessment Tools repository already provides task-based methods, including AI-enhanced lesson design, microteaching, tool-evaluation portfolios and instructional redesign commentary, with

examples and rubric criteria. Designers can select and adapt these rather than create a new assessment catalogue. Selection should consider the outcome, workload, learner context and available facilitation.

No single pattern is sufficient for every outcome. Knowledge checks can support conceptual understanding; design and evaluation tasks make application visible; collaborative activities provide opportunities for exchange. The activity plan should state which function each element serves.

5. Learning Pathways and Planning Scenarios

5.1 A pathway as a sequence of learning steps

A learning pathway translates an Action Field and a Learning Field into a purposeful sequence of learning steps or units. It connects intended outcomes with contents, methods, activities, resources, assignments and learning time. It also identifies support, feedback and opportunities to gather evidence. The sequence can be adapted to participants' needs and revised during implementation.

The same structure supports planning and reflection on experience. Before implementation, it describes what is intended. During and after implementation, it helps explain what was undertaken, what changed and what outcomes were supported by evidence. Reporting questions inform the design from the beginning without turning the learning process into a reporting exercise.

5.2 Common blueprint for planning and use

The following blueprint provides a common logic beneath the three application scenarios. It is a reusable design proposal, rather than a record of completed implementation. The steps can be combined, revisited or shortened to suit the learning project; they do not each require a separate session.

Step	Design purpose	Planning and experience record
1. Establish the action field	Clarify participants, context, challenge, action objectives, contents and actions.	Record the starting situation, intended practical result and relevant conditions.
2. Define the learning field	Translate action objectives into learning outcomes in Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes; select competences and reference systems.	State the intended learning and the basis for interpreting development.
3. Design the pathway	Arrange learning units, methods, activities, media, assignments, time and support.	Explain how each step contributes to an outcome and prepares for subsequent action.
4. Implement and document	Carry out activities, use resources, support participation and gather appropriate evidence.	Record actual activities, outputs, feedback and adaptations to the plan.
5. Assess and reflect	Review evidence against intended outcomes and selected reference systems.	Distinguish targeted from achieved outcomes; explain limits, difficulties and participant or facilitator learning.
6. Adapt and transfer	Identify what to retain, change or apply in another context.	Draw practical recommendations and define next steps.

Across these steps, designers consider inclusion and accessibility, suitable tools and data, and the support participants need. If AI is used to assess learning or provide feedback, the plan should also explain human oversight, transparency and how relevant risks will be addressed. These choices should be reported according to what occurred.

5.3 Learning-unit structure

Each unit should have enough detail to be delivered and adapted by another educator. A concise planning table can use the fields below. Detailed templates and populated examples belong in the companion course-planning and CPD documents.

Field	Information to include
Step number and title	Position in the pathway and purpose of the unit.
Content	The theme, example, information or data used.
Learning objective / outcome	What participants should understand, do or develop, linked to the Learning Field.
Method and activity	What learners do and how facilitation or collaboration is organised.
Media and resources	Relevant topic sections, materials, tools and access arrangements.
Assignment / expected output	The task and the resulting artefact, decision, performance or reflection.
Learning time and support	Indicative workload, feedback and inclusion or accessibility support.
Evidence and assessment	What will be collected or reviewed, using which criteria or reference system.

During implementation, the planned sequence becomes an experience record through notes on the actual steps, materials used, outputs, changes and feedback. Intended and achieved outcomes remain distinguishable. Where competence development is assessed, the account identifies the method and evidence used rather than relying on completion alone.

5.4 Qualification, validation and situational learning

The application identifies three course-planning scenarios. They use the common blueprint with different starting points and purposes. The following routes should be specified and adapted in the companion planning tables; they are not presented as three verified implementations.

Scenario	Use of the common blueprint	Intended result
Qualification	Start from preparation needs for a professional or facilitator role; combine selected outcomes, guided practice, collaborative work and follow-up application.	Preparation to apply and facilitate the IDEAL approach, with appropriate assessment and documentation.
Validation	Start from an existing or ongoing activity; reconstruct its Action Field, define relevant competences and review evidence of development.	A justified account of competence development and recognition through the applicable procedure.
Modular situational learning	Start from a specific challenge; define the needed learning, select resources and undertake a focused task with reflection.	A useful response to the challenge and identified learning, without a necessary qualification objective.

5.5 Qualification pathway

This route supports educators or facilitators preparing to apply IDEAL in their professional setting. Initial discussion clarifies the role, practical challenge and starting experience. Selected competences are translated into outcomes and a supported sequence of preparation, practice, collaborative development and application. Expected outputs and follow-up assessment are defined from the outset.

The CPD agenda provides a programme reference: introductory and practical exploration, tool-focused group work, design thinking, prototype development, presentation and pilot planning. These phases can be described using learning-unit tables and linked to the participants' Action Fields. The CPD document should distinguish the programme design from actual delivery, resulting outputs and assessment.

5.6 Validation pathway

This route starts from learning through practice, such as developing a resource, facilitating a session or implementing a pilot. The activity's context, objectives and actions are established, and relevant competences and reference systems are selected. Artefacts, observations, feedback and reflection support initial and later ratings and their reasoning. Retrospective accounts should identify the limits of recall and available evidence.

The experience account explains what was undertaken and what supports the assessment. It can also capture the facilitator's own professional learning, separately from participant development. Validation does not require all six topic courses to be completed; certification depends on the applicable assessment and recognition procedure.

5.7 Modular situational-learning pathway

This route begins with a particular HE question, for example improving feedback for a learner group. The user defines the action objective, identifies the necessary learning and selects relevant topic material. A focused activity produces a result that can be reviewed against the original purpose. Reflection identifies the usefulness of the outcome, limitations and a next step.

Users may enter a topic directly or use SPIDER for awareness and orientation. A short pathway still benefits from clear objectives, a task and review of its result. Formal validation is optional and requires a separately defined assessment process.

5.8 From experience to a transferable blueprint

A pathway becomes useful for others when its experience record explains the context, what participants did, which resources supported them, the outputs and evidence, and the adaptations made. Recommendations should show what can be reused and what depends on local conditions. A

short narrative can communicate the project experience, while the structured pathway preserves the detail needed for adaptation.

Experience reporting should therefore inform planning and improvement without becoming the pathway itself. A completed report does not establish competence development unless it contains appropriate evidence, and a proposed blueprint should not be described as demonstrated practice. The detailed pilot reporting remains part of the implementation account.

6. Architecture of the Blended Learning Offer

6.1 Thematic resources and common structure

The WP4 offer comprises six separate thematic Moodle courses, supported by the methodology courses Competence-Oriented Learning and Validation (COL & V) and LEVEL5. Topic 3 includes the IDEAL competence framework. The topics can serve individual exploration, course preparation and practical activities.

The broadly shared topic pattern comprises Introduction; Learning Goals and Competencies Addressed; Introductory Material; Research Insights; Video Discussion; Practical Tips; and Lesson Recap. Individual courses vary. The partner's earlier template groups resources into foundational and additional materials, followed by an interactive quiz. This can inform core and optional resource selection within the implemented structure; it should not be presented as an identical description of every live topic.

A recap can support retrieval, reflection or further exploration. Topic 3 uses a recap page linking to an external quiz, and Topic 6 includes reflective feedback activities. Designers should describe the activity actually provided.

6.2 Methodology resources

COL & V supports planning from a contextual challenge through competence selection, activity design, evidence and reflection. LEVEL5 provides the reference-system and assessment perspective. These resources complement thematic content: selecting a topic answers what to explore, while selecting a learning and assessment approach explains how that exploration becomes purposeful practice.

6.3 SPIDER as awareness and orientation

The IDEAL SPIDER questionnaires provide role-specific reflection for educators, students and administrative staff. They are designed primarily to raise awareness of AI-related practice and identify areas for exploration. The educator introduction links its profile to relevant platform topics. The project identifies LEVEL5 as the conceptual basis; a SPIDER profile itself is not a competence certificate.

SPIDER is an optional entry point. Users with a clear question may start directly in a topic. In a facilitated setting, profile discussion can help articulate needs and select a task. A separate, defined assessment process is required when competence development is to be documented or validated.

6.4 Continuity across learning settings

Preparation, facilitated work and later application should share a question or artefact. For example, an educator can review resources before a workshop, develop a teaching concept with colleagues, test an adapted version in practice and return with evidence and reflection. This is an illustrative route.

Implementation reports should describe which steps were undertaken and how resources were adapted.

The platform supplies a persistent foundation for access and documentation. The CPD and pilot documents supply the contextual account of facilitation, decisions and outcomes. Technical availability should not be treated as evidence that every resource was used or every competence developed.

7. Assessment, Reflection and Competence Validation

7.1 Distinct purposes

Element	Purpose and evidential limit
Topic quiz or knowledge check	Supports retrieval and understanding; does not alone demonstrate applied skills and attitudes.
Formative feedback	Supports revision during learning through peers, a facilitator or explanatory responses.
Competence assessment	Interprets performance, artefacts and reflection against a selected competence/reference system.
Validation	Makes a documented judgment or recognition through the procedure adopted for the activity.
Certification	Records an outcome through the applicable certification process; not an automatic consequence of quiz completion.

The application links LEVEL5 certification to participation and subsequent follow-up assessment. The Learning Design therefore separates course completion from competence development and its recognition. The specific certification arrangements should be stated in the implementation documents.

7.2 LEVEL5 and evidence of development

The WP2 reference systems describe Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes at five developmental levels. A learning plan selects an appropriate competence and interprets its descriptors in context. The platform contains separate H5P assessment activities for Artificial Intelligence and Data Analysis, with initial and later ratings and written reasoning. The selected reference system should be consistent with the competence being assessed.

An assessment account should describe the activity and context, explain the initial position, record relevant experience and evidence, and justify the later rating in each dimension. An unchanged rating can be a valid result. Ratings should not be increased simply because the participant attended a course or completed a task.

7.3 Appropriate evidence and feedback

Evidence may include a lesson plan, annotated tool output, prototype, implementation record, observation, peer feedback or reflective account. Its relevance depends on the competence. For skills, an artefact or observation can show application; an explanation can support interpretation of knowledge and judgment. Attitudinal reflection should be grounded in choices and conduct rather than inferred from a quiz score.

The assessment repository offers methods and criteria for this process, but their availability does not establish their use or validated reliability. Facilitators should explain criteria and discuss discrepancies between self-ratings and evidence. Self-assessment and facilitator-supported assessment should be identified accurately in reports.

7.4 Reflection and next steps

Reflection closes a learning cycle by considering what changed, what remains uncertain and how learning will be applied. Suggested prompts include: What decision did I make and why? What evidence supports my account? What did feedback change? What can I transfer, and what requires further support? The answers inform subsequent learning as well as documentation.

8. Development, Review and Adaptation

8.1 Collaborative development process

The partner documents describe a five-stage iterative process involving developing and reviewing teams. This provides a useful, shared workflow.

Stage	Design responsibility
Collection	Identify relevant resources, use cases and potential activities linked to competence needs.
Clustering	Group material by competence, outcome and topic; distinguish core and optional resources.
Development	Prepare resources and task instructions, feedback and assessment arrangements.
Review and revision	Use a separate reviewer to examine clarity, coherence, usability and alignment; revise identified issues.
Holistic check	Review connections across topics, pathways, CPD and platform; resolve unnecessary overlap or missing links.

This is a process account and design expectation. Records of partner assignments, review comments and revisions are needed when reporting which steps were completed. The content-development process should remain distinct from the participant's learning process, even though both involve feedback and iteration.

8.2 Review criteria

Review should test whether an intended outcome has an appropriate activity and whether assessment addresses that outcome. It should also consider manageable workload, clarity of instructions,

suitability for the audience, accessibility, resource provenance and reuse conditions. Variety of media or the number of resources should not be used as a substitute for these checks.

A thematic map should indicate intended contribution and potential gaps. Terms such as “fully addressed” require a clear basis in outcomes, tasks and evidence. Reviewers should distinguish the presence of a topic from coverage of a competence, and coverage from demonstrated participant achievement.

8.3 Learning from CPD and pilots

CPD and pilots can inform refinements by showing where participants needed support, which tasks produced useful evidence and how resources worked in different settings. Reports should connect observations to a specific design decision, such as simplifying instructions or changing an activity. Claims about competence development should be supported by the assessment used.

The CPD took place in Palermo from 27 to 31 October 2025, instead of Germany in September as planned in the application. Its delivery and results are documented in the CPD report (D3.4).

8.4 Maintaining coherence

The final WP3 package should use consistent topic names, competence references and assessment terminology. The three planning scenarios should be traceable to their tables and materials. Hackathon outputs and CPD evidence should be linked to the learning offer where they contributed. Resource updates can then be made without claiming a complete redesign or repeating platform documentation.

Co-Funded by
the Erasmus+ Programme of
the European Union

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or of the National Agency Erasmus+ – INDIRE. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.