

IDEAL

Integrating Data Analysis and AI in Learning Experiences

D3.2

IDEAL Course Offer

Designing the Course Offer

Syllabus, Learning Activities and Planning Scenarios

Work Package 3: Blended Learning Offer

Prepared by

Hochschule Ruhr West – University of Applied Sciences

May 2026

Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche · Aristotle University of Thessaloniki · Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca · Smart Revolution · 21 · upf. Universitat Pompeu Fabra Barcelona · HRW Hochschule Ruhr West University of Applied Sciences

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 Use of the Course Offer 3
1.1 Purpose and audience 3
1.2 Start from an action context 3
1.3 Status of the outcomes and activities 3
2. Syllabus and Resource Architecture 4
2.1 Six independent topics 4
2.2 Common structure and topic-specific variation 4
2.3 Methodology and assessment resources 5
3.Topic Profiles and Suggested Learning Activities 5
3.1 Topic 1 – Ethical Use of GenAI in Higher Education 5
3.2 Topic 2 – Bias and Fairness of GenAI 6
3.3 Topic 3 – Frameworks and Competencies 8
3.4 Topic 4 – Broader Impact and Institutional Perspectives 9
3.5 Topic 5 – Responsible Use of AI 10
3.6 Topic 6 – Stakeholder Perceptions and Critical Literacy 11
4. Connecting Outcomes, Activities and Assessment 12
4.1 Select a manageable outcome set 12
4.2 Worked alignment example 12
4.3 Knowledge checks and competence assessment 12
5. Three Course-Planning Scenarios 13
5.1 Scenario A – Qualification and facilitator preparation 13
5.2 Scenario B – Validation of learning through practice 14
5.3 Scenario C – Modular situational learning 16
6. Reusable Planning Tables and Implementation Record 17
6.1 Learning-project overview 17
6.2 Learning-unit planning template 17
6.3 Planned and actual pathway 18
7. Preparation and Adaptation Checklist 19

1. Purpose and Use of the Course Offer

1.1 Purpose and audience

The IDEAL course offer supports higher education educators and facilitators in choosing relevant AI and data-related resources and using them in purposeful learning activities. This document specifies what the six topics address, what participants are intended to learn, and how content can be connected to practical tasks, feedback and evidence. It can be used for course preparation, CPD planning and adaptation to pilot contexts.

IDEAL Learning Design – Educational Approach and Didactic Framework explains the educational principles and the relationship between Action Fields and Learning Fields. This companion document supplies the syllabus and planning formats. IDEAL Implementation Facilitation – Implementation Facilitation and Transfer to Practice will describe facilitation and delivery in greater detail, while the WP4 guide provides access and navigation guidance.

1.2 Start from an action context

Begin with what participants need to accomplish in their context. Define the target group, challenge, action objectives, relevant contents and required actions. Translate these action objectives into learning outcomes relating to Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes. Select relevant competences from the IDEAL framework, then choose topic resources and activities to support the learning project.

A topic is a resource entry point, not a complete project-specific Learning Field. One learning project may combine several topics, and a participant may use only part of a course. For example, adapting feedback for multilingual learners may involve responsible use, bias, inclusion and stakeholder perspectives. The selected task and competence focus determine the pathway.

1.3 Status of the outcomes and activities

The topic profiles present 18 learning outcomes, aligned with the topic titles of the IDEAL Learning Suite. The outcome codes are planning labels used in this document.

Each profile distinguishes available content from suggested activities. Expected outputs describe what a task could produce. Demonstrated achievement requires the work to be undertaken and reviewed against suitable criteria. A selected activity may support only some of the topic's outcomes; the plan should identify those outcomes explicitly.

2. Syllabus and Resource Architecture

2.1 Six independent topics

Topic	Content focus	Platform course
1. Ethical Use of GenAI in Higher Education	Ethical judgment, inclusion, integrity and responsible educational choices.	Course ID 5
2. Bias and Fairness of GenAI	Types and sources of bias, effects on learners and responses to unfairness.	Course ID 6
3. Frameworks and Competencies	Competence models and selection of developmental needs.	Course ID 7
4. Broader Impact and Institutional Perspectives	Institutional policy, governance and societal implications.	Course ID 9
5. Responsible Use of AI	Capabilities, limitations and practical use by educators and learners.	Course ID 8
6. Stakeholder Perceptions and Critical Literacy	Stakeholder perspectives, critical engagement and decisions about benefits and costs.	Course ID 11

The numbering follows the documented platform offer. It supports navigation rather than a required sequence. Learners can enter through a professional question or an optional SPIDER reflection and select the topics most relevant to their purpose.

2.2 Common structure and topic-specific variation

A broadly shared seven-part pattern provides orientation across topics: Introduction; Learning Goals and Competencies Addressed; Introductory Material; Research Insights; Video Discussion; Practical Tips; and Lesson Recap. The courses vary in how these functions are organised. Topic 5 distinguishes overview, chatbot, educator and learner perspectives; Topic 6 includes reflective feedback activities.

For a particular learning project, identify a small core selection of resources and label optional further exploration. The distinction between foundational and additional materials is useful for this purpose. Resource quantity alone does not establish learning value: the selection must support the chosen outcomes and tasks. Assigning every linked reading is not a default requirement.

2.3 Methodology and assessment resources

The separate COL & V course supports competence-oriented planning, while LEVEL5 supplies methodology and assessment resources. The LEVEL5 course contains distinct AI and Data Analysis assessment activities with initial and later Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes ratings and written

reasoning. The WP2 assessment repository offers task-based methods and criteria that can be adapted to a learning project.

The six thematic topics are predominantly AI-focused. Data analysis should be addressed through explicit tasks, selected competence descriptions and relevant resources where it is an objective. A course should not claim data-analysis coverage solely because participants use an AI tool.

3. Topic Profiles and Suggested Learning Activities

The following profiles provide a concise syllabus and activity bank. Resource summaries describe the reviewed course content. Every suggested task is a proposed extension or facilitated use of that content, unless the text explicitly identifies an activity present in the course.

3.1 Topic 1 – Ethical Use of GenAI in Higher Education

Open the topic course

Guiding question: How can generative AI support teaching and learning while respecting responsibility, integrity, fairness and inclusion?

Available content: The course introduces ethical and responsible AI, data protection and value-sensitive teaching. Introductory material, research on student and educator perspectives, a video discussion about student use, practical guidance and a recap quiz support reflection on educational choices.

Intended learning outcomes

- T1.1 – Evaluate the ethical implications of AI integration in different educational use cases.
- T1.2 – Explain examples of inclusive AI-supported learning and apply relevant considerations to one's own practice.

Primary connection: Ethical, Inclusive and Data-Literate AI Use. Suitable action contexts include activity design, accessibility and guidance for students.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Ethical use-case review	Choose a teaching use case; identify benefits, affected groups, limitations and responsibilities; propose conditions for appropriate use.	Short case review and justified use conditions.	Purpose is clear; implications for learners are considered; conditions follow from the identified risks and benefits.
Inclusive resource adaptation	Examine a resource for an identified access barrier; propose or test an AI-supported adaptation and review it against the learner need.	Original and adapted resource with an explanation.	The adaptation addresses the stated barrier; accuracy and accessibility are checked; limitations are acknowledged.

Assessment and feedback: The review can support T1.1; a resource adaptation can support T1.2. Peer or facilitator feedback should test the reasoning and suitability of the proposed response. The recap quiz supports understanding but does not establish inclusive design capability.

3.2 Topic 2 – Bias and Fairness of GenAI

Open the topic course

Guiding question: Where does bias arise, how does it affect educational use and what can educators do in response?

Available content: The course addresses algorithmic bias, examples of unfair decisions, social and data-related influences, research insights and a technical video. Practical guidance and a recap quiz support critical examination of AI use.

Intended learning outcomes

- T2.1 – Explain types and sources of AI bias and their effects on users and society.
- T2.2 – Describe how AI can be integrated into learning activities while accounting for possible biases.
- T2.3 – Identify potential bias in AI output and provide learners with context to interpret it critically.
- T2.4 – Evaluate the fairness implications of one's own AI use.

Primary connection: Ethical, Inclusive and Data-Literate AI Use. Related contexts include resource creation, assessment and classroom critical literacy.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Output comparison and bias review	Compare selected AI outputs or supplied examples; identify patterns of representation, missing perspectives and possible consequences for a teaching decision.	Annotated examples and a brief analysis of potential bias.	Observations are supported by examples; uncertainty is recognised; effects on the chosen learner group are explained.
Fairness review of a teaching practice	Select an existing or proposed AI-supported practice; examine who may benefit or be disadvantaged and propose changes or boundaries.	Practice review and an adaptation or justified decision.	The review connects the practice to its context; proposed responses address the identified issue.

Assessment and feedback: Use an explanation or knowledge check for T2.1, contextual planning for T2.2, annotated analysis for T2.3 and a practice review for T2.4. Identifying an apparently biased output does not by itself prove the model's underlying cause or general bias rate.

3.3 Topic 3 – Frameworks and Competencies

Open the topic course

Guiding question: Which competences matter for a particular educational challenge, and how can they guide learning and reflection?

Available content: The course brings together AI competence perspectives and frameworks, including the IDEAL Competency Framework, DigCompEdu and other models. Conceptual and research resources support comparison; practical tips and a recap page linking to an external quiz provide further orientation.

Intended learning outcomes

- T3.1 – Identify competences relevant to AI integration and critical engagement in higher education.
- T3.2 – Compare one's current knowledge and competences with those needed for purposeful and sustainable integration in teaching.

Connection: competence selection across the four IDEAL competence areas, including curriculum design and professional development.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Contextual competence selection	Define an Action Field; select one or two relevant competences; formulate the needed learning in Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes.	Competence selection with contextual learning outcomes.	The selection follows from the action objectives; the outcomes are usable for task design and review.
Starting-position reflection	Use the selected competence descriptions to describe current experience, examples and development needs.	Initial reflective account and a focused learning goal.	Judgments are supported by examples; the learning goal identifies a realistic next step.

Assessment and feedback: The selection supports T3.1 and the reflective account supports T3.2. A framework comparison or quiz can check conceptual understanding. A self-rating is a starting judgment, not independent proof of competence.

3.4 Topic 4 – Broader Impact and Institutional Perspectives

Open the topic course

Guiding question: How do institutional and societal conditions shape responsible AI integration in higher education?

Available content: The course addresses AI in teaching and institutional processes, research on education and faculty perspectives, governance and policy examples, and wider societal and economic effects. A section on institutional perspectives and policies complements practical discussion and a recap quiz.

Intended learning outcomes

- T4.1 – Explain relevant institutional and societal implications of AI in higher education.
- T4.2 – Compare arguments supporting or questioning AI integration in educational contexts.
- T4.3 – Contribute informed perspectives to discussions within or across institutions.

Primary connection: AI-Driven Professional Development and Collaboration, with pedagogical and ethical links according to the task.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Institutional decision brief	Select a proposed institutional use; compare benefits, constraints, stakeholders and support needs; formulate a reasoned recommendation.	Short decision brief with options and limitations.	Arguments are relevant to the context; affected groups and implementation conditions are considered.
Structured stakeholder discussion	Present the brief, respond to a contrasting position and revise the recommendation where appropriate.	Discussion notes and a revised recommendation.	The participant engages with alternative arguments and explains the resulting decision.

Assessment and feedback: The brief supports T4.1 and T4.2; discussion provides an opportunity to practise T4.3. Peer or facilitator observation can complement the artefact. A policy example is material for analysis, not automatically the institution's applicable policy.

3.5 Topic 5 – Responsible Use of AI

Open the topic course

Guiding question: When is AI useful for an educational purpose, and how can its use be tested and critically adapted?

Available content: The course contains four substantive sections: Overview of AI, Generative Chatbot, For Educators and For Learners. It addresses capabilities, overreliance and limitations, prompting and teaching strategies, and critical use in study. The learner section concludes with a recap quiz.

Intended learning outcomes

- T5.1 – Explain appropriate purposes and limits for AI use in learning offers.
- T5.2 – Describe different methods of AI application and integration.
- T5.3 – Develop or improve a learning offer, activity or syllabus using AI with independent critical oversight.

Connections: Pedagogical-AI Integration; AI-Enhanced Curriculum Design and Assessment; and responsible use within Ethical, Inclusive and Data-Literate AI Use.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Purposeful tool trial	Choose a teaching task and criteria; test an AI-supported approach or analyse a supplied example; compare its usefulness with the original purpose.	Trial record, selected outputs and a reasoned use decision.	The purpose precedes tool selection; outputs are checked; benefits and limitations are evidenced.
Learning-activity redesign	Adapt an existing activity with AI support; identify what learners should do, how feedback works and where human judgment is needed.	Original and revised activity plan with commentary.	The revision supports the intended learning; responsibilities, risks and learner support are clear.

Assessment and feedback: A tool trial can support T5.1 and T5.2; redesign supports T5.3. Use the educator or learner resources according to the audience. Assess the pedagogical reasoning and output, rather than proficiency with one brand of tool.

3.6 Topic 6 – Stakeholder Perceptions and Critical Literacy

Open the topic course

Guiding question: How do different groups understand AI, and how can educators support critical participation in decisions about it?

Available content: The course includes stakeholder and societal contexts, studies of teacher and student perceptions, and critical AI literacy. Two Moodle feedback activities address historical analogies and a benefits-versus-costs comparison. A recap quiz provides a further learning check.

Intended learning outcomes

- T6.1 – Identify stakeholders relevant to AI integration and discussion in higher education.
- T6.2 – Plan meaningful involvement of relevant stakeholders in AI-supported learning development.
- T6.3 – Critically evaluate AI integration, outputs and associated changes and challenges.
- T6.4 – Design opportunities for students to develop critical AI literacy.

Connections: Pedagogical-AI Integration; Ethical, Inclusive and Data-Literate AI Use; and AI-Driven Professional Development and Collaboration.

Suggested learning activities

Activity	Learner task	Expected evidence	Review criteria
Stakeholder and assumptions map	Choose an educational use case; identify affected groups, perspectives and assumptions; propose how their views will inform design.	Stakeholder map and an involvement plan.	Relevant groups are identified; assumptions are distinguished from collected feedback; involvement has a clear purpose.
Critical-literacy activity design	Use a perception study, analogy or benefits/costs prompt to design a learner discussion or analysis task.	Activity instructions, prompts and expected learner evidence.	Learners have opportunities to question claims and weigh consequences; criteria and support match the group.

Assessment and feedback: The map supports T6.1; the involvement plan supports planning towards T6.2, while actual involvement needs implementation evidence. Analysis supports T6.3 and the designed activity supports planning towards T6.4. Report any delivered teaching separately from the proposed plan.

4. Connecting Outcomes, Activities and Assessment

4.1 Select a manageable outcome set

A learning project should identify a small set of outcomes that participants can practise and demonstrate within the available time. Record the relevant outcome codes, the selected competence and the contextual Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes focus. A multi-topic project does not need to assess every outcome from every course.

Activity outputs and competence development are related but distinct. A prototype may show that a group produced an idea; an individual's competence account requires evidence of their contribution, reasoning and performance. Satisfaction and participation can inform evaluation but do not substitute for evidence of learning.

4.2 Worked alignment example

Illustrative project: an educator adapts an AI-generated teaching resource for a multilingual learner group. The action objective is to produce a suitable resource. The Learning Field concerns responsible adaptation, recognition of bias and inclusive judgment. The plan selects T1.2, T2.3 and T5.3, supported by relevant IDEAL competences.

Learning focus	Activity and resources	Evidence and feedback
Knowledge – explain relevant limitations and inclusion concerns	Review selected ethics, bias and responsible-use material; explain the considerations for this learner group.	Short explanation reviewed for relevance and accuracy.
Skills – identify an issue and adapt the resource	Annotate the original resource, revise it and check the revision against criteria.	Original, annotations and revised version; peer or facilitator review.
Attitudes – exercise responsible judgment	Explain trade-offs, respond to feedback and justify use, further revision or non-use.	Reflective commentary grounded in the decisions and revisions.

Where LEVEL5 is used, the selected reference system guides assessment and initial/later reasoning. A single successful task does not automatically imply progress to a particular level. The review considers the evidence and the participant's starting position.

4.3 Knowledge checks and competence assessment

Topic quizzes and recaps provide retrieval and feedback. Task-based evidence supports applied outcomes. The WP2 repository can inform methods such as lesson design, microteaching, evaluation

portfolios and redesign commentary. Explain the selected criteria before the task and allow an opportunity for revision when appropriate.

SPIDER supports awareness and orientation. It is separate from the defined assessment and validation process. Course completion, knowledge-check results, competence assessment and certification should be reported as distinct outcomes. Certification follows the relevant procedure; it is not an automatic result of completing the six topics.

5. Three Course-Planning Scenarios

The scenarios below translate the common pathway blueprint into usable course-planning examples. They cover qualification, validation and modular situational learning. They are proposed plans for adaptation, with resource selections and evidence that must be confirmed for the actual delivery. Their timings do not establish an agreed course workload or qualification credit.

5.1 Scenario A – Qualification and facilitator preparation

Purpose: prepare HE educators or facilitators to plan and apply an IDEAL learning project. Participants define an Action Field, select competences, experience guided exploration and collaborative design, and prepare transfer into practice. The plan uses the five-day CPD agenda as its programme backbone while adding explicit links to outcomes and evidence.

Target group: HE educators and colleagues preparing to facilitate local activities. Entry information: professional context, prior experience, access needs and a possible challenge. Competence focus: select a manageable combination of pedagogical integration, curriculum design, responsible use and collaboration. The selection should match the role rather than imply coverage of the entire framework.

Phase	Learning purpose	Activities and resources	Expected output / evidence
Preparation	Clarify needs and starting position.	Describe the context and challenge; optional SPIDER; select competences using Topic 3 and the framework.	Action Field outline and initial reflective account.
Day 1 – Empathise	Explore AI relevance in HE and understand user needs.	Introductory input, case discussion and practical exploration; selected Topics 5 and 6.	Contextual observations and a clarified challenge.
Day 2 – Define	Frame the problem and select a purposeful approach.	IDEAL resource orientation, tool-focused group work and design thinking; select ethics/bias material as needed.	Problem statement, intended outcomes and use criteria.
Day 3 – Ideate and Prototype	Develop and examine a learning response.	Group prototyping using selected topic resources and competence-based planning.	Prototype, activity concept or adapted resource; contribution notes.
Day 4 – Present and Plan	Test the rationale and prepare pilot organisation.	Present outputs; receive feedback; revise and organise a local activity.	Revised concept and feedback record.
Day 5 – Prepare Implementation	Translate the concept into a workable pathway.	Plan pilot steps, methods and documentation; evaluate the CPD experience.	Learning-unit plan, evidence strategy and next steps.
Follow-up	Apply, reflect and assess development where used.	Implement in the chosen context; gather evidence; review selected competences and adaptations.	Experience account and justified assessment, if undertaken.

Timing: the CPD in Palermo was held over five days with sessions of different length. Preparation and follow-up should be agreed locally and added to the workload record.

Facilitation: support problem framing, competence selection, practical exploration and peer critique. Clarify group roles and collect individual reflection where individual development is assessed. Resources should be available in advance, with alternatives for participants who cannot access a particular tool.

Assessment: review the learning-project plan and relevant outputs against explicit criteria. Follow-up assessment can consider implementation evidence and initial/later LEVEL5 reasoning. The implementation document should record the actual programme, participants, outputs and deviations from this plan.

5.2 Scenario B – Validation of learning through practice

Purpose: document and assess learning developed through an existing or ongoing activity. This route is appropriate when an educator has already adapted a resource, facilitated an activity or implemented a pilot and wants to examine the associated competence development. It does not require a new six-topic course.

Target group: educators, facilitators or pilot participants with a relevant practice to review. Entry information: activity context, available evidence and the assessment purpose. Select one or two relevant competences and a consistent reference system. The route can validate existing learning without presuming a positive change in every dimension.

Step	Learning and assessment purpose	Action / support	Output
1. Reconstruct the Action Field	Establish what was intended and undertaken.	Describe context, participants, objectives, timeline and actual actions.	Practice description with limitations of recall.
2. Define the Learning Field	Identify the learning relevant to the practice.	Select competences and Knowledge, Skills and Attitudes descriptors; consult Topic 3 and LEVEL5.	Contextual competence and outcome focus.
3. Assemble and review evidence	Support a judgment about development.	Select artefacts, observations, feedback and reflection; use suitable assessment methods.	Evidence set with an explanation of relevance.
4. Assess and reflect	Compare positions and justify the judgment.	Discuss initial/later ratings and reasoning where applicable; identify discrepancies and uncertainty.	Documented assessment and next developmental step.

Indicative review workload: approximately two to four hours where evidence is already organised; more may be needed for a complex activity or incomplete records. This is a planning estimate for documentation and review, not the duration of the underlying learning. Agree the actual workload and support before use.

Assessment: distinguish self-assessment from facilitator-supported or other review. Group outputs should be accompanied by evidence of individual contribution where needed. Retrospective initial ratings should be identified as such. Certification, where applicable, requires the designated validation and recognition process.

5.3 Scenario C – Modular situational learning

Purpose: address a specific HE challenge through a short, focused learning project. Illustrative challenge: deciding whether AI-supported feedback is appropriate for a writing activity. The action objective is a justified feedback approach; the learning concerns tool limitations, fairness and pedagogical design.

Target group: an individual educator or a small teaching team. Suggested focus: T5.1 and T2.4, with a limited design component from T5.3. Select relevant sections of Responsible Use and Bias and Fairness; use ethics or stakeholder material only where the context requires it.

Step	Purpose	Task and resources	Expected output
1. Define	Clarify the educational need and criteria.	Describe learners, the feedback purpose and conditions; identify existing approaches.	Brief Action Field and use criteria.
2. Explore	Understand relevant capabilities and risks.	Read/view a small core selection from Topics 5 and 2; discuss a question or knowledge check.	Relevant considerations and an initial decision hypothesis.
3. Test and adapt	Examine the approach against the criteria.	Use suitable sample material or supplied outputs; compare feedback and identify revisions.	Annotated output and a proposed feedback approach.
4. Review and transfer	Decide what to use and what remains uncertain.	Seek peer feedback; justify use, revision or non-use; identify a next implementation step.	Decision and short reflection.

Indicative workload: 30 minutes defining the context, 45 minutes exploring resources, 60 minutes testing/adapting and 45 minutes reviewing—approximately three hours in total. These estimates apply to this illustrative task and should be adjusted for the materials, participants and support available.

Assessment: the decision and its evidence can be sufficient for formative review. Formal validation is optional. If competence development is assessed, select the reference system and evidence process at the beginning. Use suitable sample data and materials for the exercise and clarify the conditions for any later classroom implementation.

6. Reusable Planning Tables and Implementation Record

6.1 Learning-project overview

Complete the overview before selecting the detailed learning units. It provides a common record for any of the three scenarios.

Planning field	Information to record
Title and responsible facilitator	Learning-project title, institution and responsible person or team.
Scenario and target group	Qualification, validation or situational learning; participants, prior experience and access needs.
Action Field	Context, stakeholders, action objectives, contents, required actions and conditions.
Learning Field	Selected competences, contextual Knowledge/Skills/Attitudes outcomes and relevant topic outcome codes.
Practical result	What participants should produce, change, decide or implement.
Resources and methods	Core and optional materials, tools, facilitation and collaboration.
Time and support	Unit workload, schedule, feedback, inclusion and accessibility arrangements.
Evidence and assessment	Expected evidence, criteria, reviewers and any LEVEL5/validation arrangements.
Transfer	Next application, follow-up responsibility and review point.

6.2 Learning-unit planning template

Use one row per learning step. Record core resources precisely enough for another facilitator to find them. The table below is a blank working template, not a completed course plan.

Step / title	Outcome and content	Activity / resources	Assignment / evidence	Time / support
Step 1	[Selected outcome; content focus]	[Method; resource or topic section]	[Learner task; expected output; feedback]	[Workload; facilitation; access support]
Step 2	[Selected outcome; content focus]	[Method; resource or topic section]	[Learner task; expected output; feedback]	[Workload; facilitation; access support]
Step 3	[Selected outcome; content focus]	[Method; resource or topic section]	[Learner task; expected output; feedback]	[Workload; facilitation; access support]

6.3 Planned and actual pathway

During and after delivery, add an implementation record. Keep the original plan so that changes can be understood. The record connects the pathway to the experience-report logic without substituting a report for learning or assessment.

Record	Questions to answer
Actual activities and resources	What was undertaken, by whom, when and using which materials or tools?
Outputs and evidence	What was produced or observed? What supports an individual or group learning claim?
Changes and challenges	What differed from the plan, why, and how did facilitation respond?
Inclusion and accessibility	Which barriers arose and what support or adaptation was used?
Assessment and feedback	Which methods were used, what did they show and what limitations remain?
Outcomes and transfer	Which intended outcomes are evidenced, which remain uncertain and what should happen next?

Detailed pilot reporting belongs in the implementation documentation. Here, the record makes planning and revision traceable and supports reuse by another educator. Personal learning by the facilitator should be distinguished from participant learning.

7. Preparation and Adaptation Checklist

Before delivery, confirm the practical purpose, selected competences and outcome set. Check the current resources, permissions and tool access; identify core material and manageable workload. Explain tasks, outputs and review criteria, and arrange feedback and appropriate inclusion support.

For reused resources, check provenance and conditions for reuse. External resources should be selected for relevance and quality; availability through a link does not itself establish open licensing. If a resource or tool is unavailable, use an appropriate alternative that serves the same outcome.

Where AI supports assessment or feedback, explain its role and the human review process. Where LEVEL5 is used, agree the competence, reference system, evidence and rating process. Record which proposed elements were delivered, then revise the plan using the experience and evidence collected.

The final course package should retain the partner's syllabus and resource work, add only the activity and planning detail needed for use, and remain consistent with the Learning Design, CPD documentation and platform guide.

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.