IDEAL

Integrating Data Analysis and AI in Learning Experiences

D5.3

IDEAL Valorisation Strategy

From project outputs to sustained educational practice, responsible reuse and European collaboration

Work Package 5: Implementation Strategy

Prepared by

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

September 2026

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

Executive summary **5**

1. Purpose, scope and interpretive principles **6**

1.1 Purpose 6

1.2 Scope 6

1.3 Principles 6

2. The IDEAL value proposition and output-to-impact logic **7**

2.1 Problem and intended beneficiaries 7

2.2 Integrated pathway 7

2.3 Five reusable asset families 8

3. Evidence-informed propositions from WP2 ..... **9**

3.1 Methodological inventory and competence needs 9

3.2 Competence framework and assessment instruments 9

4. WP3 and WP4 as a transferable educational offer **10**

4.1 Modular architecture 10

4.2 Three practical adoption routes 10

4.3 Platform and access 10

4.4 Adaptation record 11

5. Pilot learning, validation and evidence limitations **12**

5.1 LEVEL5 and other learning evidence 12

5.2 Recommended verification procedure 12

6. Institutional contributions and partner-specific valorisation **14**

6.1 Institutional contribution and relevance for future reuse 14

6.2 Interpreting institutional impact and collecting supplementary evidence 15

7. Exploitation pathways and stakeholder propositions **16**

7.1 Conditions of successful transfer 16

7.2 Communication is not exploitation 16

8. IDEAL network: formats for future collaboration **17**

8.1 Proportionate network options 17

8.2 Governance options 17

8.3 Potential cluster themes 17

9. Organisational, technical and financial considerations **18**

9.1 Resource stewardship and version governance 18

9.2 Hosting and continuity 18
9.3 Financial considerations: staged and conditional 18
9.4 Funding diversification 19
10. Intellectual property, licensing, GDPR and responsible AI 20
10.1 Licence of the IDEAL materials 20
10.2 Rights register and reuse notice 20
10.3 Data protection and ethics 20
10.4 Alignment with current EU AI policy 21
11. Dissemination, conference legacy and awards 22
11.1 Communications evidence 22
11.2 Final conference: documented figures and interpretation 22
11.3 Poster contributions and awards procedure 23
12. Monitoring, outcomes and accountability 25
12.1 Indicators and interpretation 25
12.2 Suggested twelve-month outcome dashboard 25
12.3 Governance of monitoring 26
13. Risk register and mitigating decisions 27
14. Options for transition and continued use 28
15. Conditions for responsible post-project use 29
Annex A. Memorandum of Understanding — ready-to-use template 30
A1. Parties and purpose 30
A2. Areas of cooperation 30
A3. Governance and decision-making 30
A4. Intellectual property and acknowledgement 30
A5. Data protection and confidentiality 30
A6. Costs, liability and external communications 31
A7. Term, review and withdrawal 31
A8. Signatures and schedules 31
Annex B. Inter-project cluster cooperation — ready-to-use template 32
B1. Cluster identification 32
B2. Shared rationale and work programme 32
B3. Contributions and non-duplication of funding 32
B4. Content rights and publication 32
B5. Privacy, responsible AI and research ethics 32
B6. Coordination, delivery and exit 32

Schedule A — Cluster action record 33

Annex C. Asset register and adoption record templates 34

C1. Asset catalogue fields 34

C2. One-page local adoption record 34

C3. Minimum quality-review questions 34

Annex D. Conference and awards reporting — evidence note 35

Annex E. Five-question event evaluation anonymous instrument 36

Executive summary

IDEAL has generated a potentially transferable educational infrastructure for critical engagement with artificial intelligence and data analysis in higher education. Its value does not reside in one course, one platform or one set of tools, but in the relationship between a research-informed competence base (WP2), contextual and modular learning design (WP3), digitally supported access and reflection (WP4), and local implementation, assessment and dissemination (WP5). Valorisation therefore requires a deliberate transition from time-limited project production towards justified institutional use, documented adaptation, open reuse where rights allow, and accountable stewardship.

The original application envisages a European IDEAL network, a sustainability strategy covering legal and financial arrangements, an organisational architecture, a partnership agreement and a Memorandum of Understanding (MoU). It also anticipates a CPD offer for higher-education educators; wider applications in vocational education, adult education and local civic settings; reuse of learning materials; and an ongoing online platform. The consortium has agreed to continue cooperation through a voluntary IDEAL network, supported by ready-to-use MoU and inter-project cluster templates; this does not imply a new legal entity or signed agreements.

The Strategy sets out a proportionate framework for continued access and reuse: a findable and legally cleared resource collection; institutional stewardship where agreed; optional thematic exchanges among projects; local curriculum and professional-development applications; and documented reflection on uptake and learning. These are practical valorisation routes, not claims that a post-project association, new funding mechanism or formal cluster has been established.

The central implementation test is not the number of times an output is advertised. It is whether external or internal users can locate it, understand its pedagogical assumptions, lawfully adapt it, implement it in authentic settings, assess learning using proportionate methods, and report what changed. The Strategy consequently includes exploitation pathways, asset governance, a monitoring framework, an indicative twelve-month roadmap, and ready-to-use MoU and inter-project cluster templates. The seven consortium partners' differentiated contributions and institutional valorisation relevance are summarised in §6.

The principal operational qualifications concern asset-level rights (the consortium has agreed to release the IDEAL educational materials under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0), confirmed institutional stewardship of the Learning Suite by Q21 and the project website by CNR, and appropriately evidenced pilot or LEVEL5 outcomes. These matters should be resolved in the course of implementing the Strategy, without withholding the documented contribution of the project.

The defined dissemination reporting period ended on 30 September 2026. The completed consortium and AUTH activity grids, together with the 8 September final conference in Thessaloniki, provide a bounded communications and outreach record for the closing analysis. The conference has 63 documented participants (43 on site and 20 online); the poster session provides the basis for the IDEAL Award, with the selection and winner documented by the consortium.

1. Purpose, scope and interpretive principles

1.1 Purpose

This Strategy specifies how IDEAL knowledge, resources, methods and relationships can generate sustained educational, institutional and wider European value after the funded period. It is complementary to, but distinct from, the Implementation Strategy: the latter addresses how the educational approach is applied; this document addresses why others should adopt it, under what conditions they may reuse it, who will maintain it, how quality and rights will be protected, and how continued impact will be evidenced.

1.2 Scope

Its scope includes WP2 evidence and assessment assets; WP3 curricula, design patterns and facilitation resources; WP4 Learning Suite, open educational resources and guides; WP5 pilots and validation approaches; dissemination and final-event outputs; and relationships with universities, professional networks, training providers, civil-society actors and other EU projects. It covers prospective intellectual-property management, personal-data protection, governance, capacity and financing.

1.3 Principles

- Educational purpose before technological novelty: AI must support defensible educational objectives and human judgement.
- Contextual transfer, not mechanical replication: resources require adaptation for discipline, learner profile, language, institutional conditions and support capacity.
- Openness with legal clarity: share only what the consortium is entitled to license; maintain explicit attribution and third-party exclusions.
- Proportionate assessment: distinguish participation, self-reported learning, demonstrated competence change and formal validation.
- Inclusivity by design: anticipate accessibility, linguistic diversity, unequal digital infrastructure, bias and the cost of participation.
- Evidence discipline: distinguish proposal targets, early analyses, pilot claims, verified records and prospective commitments.
- Sustainability without dependency: enable offline or locally hosted adaptation where technically and legally feasible; avoid assuming continuous central funding.

2. The IDEAL value proposition and output-to-impact logic

2.1 Problem and intended beneficiaries

IDEAL addresses a gap between growing interest in AI and data-driven educational methods, on the one hand, and the uneven pedagogical, ethical and organisational capacity to use them responsibly, on the other. The WP2 targeted survey report analyses 102 university staff respondents and identifies limited institutional training and demand for structured guidance. The focus-group analysis adds concerns over academic integrity, critical thinking, inequality, privacy and the risk of substituting technical convenience for educational judgement.
Primary users are higher-education teaching staff, facilitators, students, researchers, instructional designers and professional-development units. Secondary users include vocational and adult educators, educational networks, organisational learning functions and policy intermediaries. Their interest differs: an educator may seek a single responsible-AI activity; a CPD provider needs a coherent pathway; an institution needs implementation and data-governance guidance; a network requires reusable resources and a coordination model.

2.2 Integrated pathway

WP2: evidence and competence	Inventory of AI methodologies/cases; targeted survey; focus-group analysis; four-family teaching competence framework; repository of assessment methods	Explains needs, articulates intended competences, supplies scenarios and evidence criteria
WP3: learning design	Educational framework; six-topic course offer; CPD, Datathon and facilitation pathway; action-field/learning-field design; reusable planning tables	Enables localisation, coherent learning sequences and facilitated application
WP4: learning environment	Learning Suite guide; Moodle-based topic pathways; SPIDER orientation; COL & V; LEVEL5 guidance	Provides discoverability, structured engagement, reflection and assessment opportunities
WP5: testing and transfer	Local pilots, experience reporting, implementation learning, final conference and IDEAL Award poster showcase	Generates contextual feedback, implementation narratives, dissemination and partner adoption

The link between layers is causal only when supported by implementation evidence: the existence of a competence framework does not, by itself, demonstrate competence gains; platform availability does not prove user access; a pilot report does not establish transferability across all higher-education contexts. Claims of effectiveness should reflect an identifiable intervention, evidence and limitation.

2.3 Five reusable asset families

1. Evidence and analysis pack: use-case inventory, needs analyses, critical reflection questions and contextual problem prompts.
2. Facilitator CPD pack: learning-design guide, six-topic course syllabus, facilitation activities, sample outcomes and local-adaptation checklists.
3. Learning Suite pack: topic pathways, methodological resources, platform guide, access instructions and accessibility notes.
4. Competence and validation pack: competence descriptions, suitable assessment methods, reflective evidence guidance, and LEVEL5 procedures where appropriately used.
5. Implementation and outreach pack: contextual pilot exemplars, adaptation records, dissemination evidence, conference materials and collaboration templates.

Each pack should have a public-facing description, intended audience, prerequisites, accessible formats, licensing statement, version, responsible maintainer, update date and citation recommendation. See Annex C.

3. Evidence-informed propositions from WP2

3.1 Methodological inventory and competence needs

The WP2 inventory describes 88 methodologies and 82 illustrative cases from 17 countries. Their valorisation value lies in cross-context exemplification: the cases can introduce design dilemmas, prompt comparisons and help a facilitator avoid presenting AI as a universal solution. Before public reuse, case metadata, attribution and the status of external links must be checked.
A case-level check of the final 82-entry inventory identifies 53 entries with a substantive field populated for accessibility and/or inclusivity (35 accessibility entries, 42 inclusivity entries, with overlap) and 12 entries with an environmental-considerations field other than “Not relevant”. Ten of the twelve environmental entries describe a more concrete environmental measure, purpose or application; two are more tentative or generic. These are overlapping, source-annotation counts, not an independently verified assessment of implemented social or environmental impact. A numbered, entry-by-entry classification note accompanies the revised Strategy.
The targeted questionnaire and qualitative focus groups converge on a pedagogical requirement: teachers need development opportunities that combine practical AI use with critical consideration of reliability, fairness, disciplinary relevance, transparency, student agency and data stewardship. These findings justify a modular entry route, but do not warrant a claim that a single course will meet the needs of every institution or discipline.

3.2 Competence framework and assessment instruments

The WP2 competence framework identifies four interrelated families: pedagogical AI integration; AI-enhanced curriculum design and assessment; ethical, inclusive and data-literate AI use; and AI-driven professional development and collaboration. The assessment repository follows these areas with methods addressing meaningful educational decisions rather than a solely technical inventory of tools. Local adopters should select relevant competences, define observable action, identify proportionate evidence and avoid treating self-confidence ratings as demonstrated competence.
A recommended documentation unit is a “competence claim”: a specified educational task, initial situation, planned learning and action, evidence from practice, a reflective account, feedback and a justified judgement about change. Where LEVEL5 is selected, its reference system and validation procedures must be used as intended. Where another assessment is more appropriate, it should be reported transparently without describing it as LEVEL5 certification.

4. WP3 and WP4 as a transferable educational offer

4.1 Modular architecture

The WP3 documents describe a relationship between action fields (authentic situations, constraints, stakeholders and intended action), learning fields (knowledge, skills and attitudes needed for competent action), learning activities and evidence. Their educational logic is not to route all participants through a single linear syllabus. The offer permits qualification/facilitator preparation, validation of learning through practice, or situationally selected modules. In all three, progression must remain intentional and documented.
The six topic areas of the course offer are: (1) Ethical Use of GenAI in Higher Education; (2) Bias and Fairness of GenAI; (3) Frameworks and Competencies; (4) Broader Impact and Institutional Perspectives; (5) Responsible Use of AI; and (6) Stakeholder Perceptions and Critical Literacy.

4.2 Three practical adoption routes

A — CPD qualification	Facilitated short course for teaching staff; combines topic resources with a local design project and peer dialogue	Named facilitator, defined outcomes, accessible content, feedback and completion/assessment policy
B — Practice validation	Staff member or team undertakes authentic design/implementation activity and documents development	Baseline, contextual task, evidence of implementation, transparent criteria and optional formal LEVEL5 route
C — Situational learning	Single discipline or institutional unit selects one or more topics to respond to a live challenge	Documented local need, justified resource selection, short evaluation and limits of transfer

4.3 Platform and access

The WP4 guide documents a Learning Suite organised around the six topic courses, two possible entry points (direct topic selection or SPIDER reflection), COL & V competence-oriented planning and the possibility of documenting development with LEVEL5. The guide explicitly cautions that demonstration accounts and guest access do not imply unrestricted course access; roles, permissions and persistence of saved work require checking in the live environment. Accordingly, the exploitation offer must not promise universal open platform entry before access is tested and approved.
The preferred accessibility model is a layered service: openly accessible landing pages and cleared downloadable resources; access-controlled interactive services only where functionally necessary; and a documented route for local adaptation. An accessibility and continuity review should examine captions, transcripts, alternative text, mobile and low-bandwidth use, keyboard operation, structured documents and multilingual orientation.

4.4 Adaptation record

Each adopting organisation should maintain a short transfer record: who the learners were; which content was reused; what was changed and why; which prerequisites and barriers were encountered; how ethical/data issues were handled; whether use required platform enrolment; and what evidence supports the claimed educational benefit. This record is intentionally lighter than a research study and can be used by resource stewards to improve the collection.

5. Pilot learning, validation and evidence limitations

The proposal anticipates at least seven local pilots across four European countries, reports from participating partners, and competence development for higher-education teachers. It contains more than one formulation of quantitative targets (including six versus seven experience reports, depending on section). The final report refers to the indicators of the approved application. Consortium-wide WP5 reporting documents ten pilot activities across Italy, Germany, Spain and Greece, supported by partner experience reports. These cover AI-supported learning and assessment in university courses (CNR, UNIMIB, HRW and UPF), continuing professional development and university staff training (Q21 and SMART), and scenario-based educational design (AUTH). Their results should be interpreted in their respective contexts, drawing on each partner's final experience report.
Across the consortium, ten pilot activities were reported in Italy, Germany, Spain and Greece, using context-sensitive learning and assessment routes. CNR embedded explicit AI-use disclosure in a postgraduate data-visualisation course (159 student submissions; 107 of 159, or 67.3%, disclosed AI use). UNIMIB conducted four responsible-AI workshops with 59 Master's students using the Wisely prompt coach; HRW organised a two-round pilot with 20 computer-science students and pre/post reflection; SMART Revolution trained 58 technical and administrative staff at the University of Turin through a combined workshop and Datathon; Q21 worked with approximately 13 graduates and four trainers in a project-management CPD setting; and UPF implemented its Lantern Socratic tutor with 54 first-year physics students and two instructors. Figures are drawn from the coordinator's final-report draft and the available partner poster records; they should be read as context-specific reported outputs, not a single independently audited total. The AUTH contribution formed one further course-embedded application: 54 undergraduate students and six teaching staff developed ten scenario-based thematic-unit designs within a six-ECTS course, using portfolios and regular course assessment rather than a separate LEVEL5 certification route. Taken together, the experiences illustrate different routes from competence framing to practice: course-level disclosure, critical prompting, student-led learning design, staff development and competence reflection.

5.1 LEVEL5 and other learning evidence

LEVEL5 is the structured validation route of the IDEAL approach. Participants in the Palermo continuing professional development (CPD) course completed a LEVEL5 assessment and received a LEVEL5 certificate issued by Q21. In the pilots, partners applied the same competence-oriented logic through methods suited to their context: the SPIDER self-assessment, which is based on the LEVEL5 reference concept, pre/post reflection on knowledge, skills and attitudes, portfolios, projects, observation and feedback. These methods are consistent with the LEVEL5 approach and complement the LEVEL5 assessments, while certified totals refer only to the certificates recorded in the LEVEL5 system.

5.2 Recommended verification procedure

- Collect the final signed or partner-approved report for each pilot and confirm country, date, activity and population.

- Agree a unique participant counting rule across events, pilots and learning modules; identify non-exclusive categories.
- Separate enrolment, active participation, completion, learning-project production, assessment and validation.
- Check LEVEL5 records and consent/retention conditions with the competent assessment lead.
- Confirm whether feedback summaries permit identifiable or only aggregated public reporting.
- Issue one consolidated indicator ledger with source, version, owner, date and reconciliation note.

6. Institutional contributions and partner-specific valorisation

6.1 Institutional contribution and relevance for future reuse

The original application envisages benefits at the level of each participating organisation, not only at the level of consortium outputs (Erasmus+ application, pp. 33–37). The following concise accounts combine the partners' assigned roles with outputs documented in the project deliverables. They establish a proportionate institutional valorisation rationale, but do not claim that every anticipated organisational benefit has already been measured or independently verified.

Consiglio Nazionale delle Ricerche (CNR), Italy. As project coordinator and an educational-technology research organisation, CNR connected project management with research, digital learning technologies and dissemination. Its documented role provides a route for translating IDEAL resources into research-informed educational practice and for strengthening dialogue between research institutions and enterprises. The application specifically identifies improved research-to-business transfer as a prospective institutional benefit.

Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca (UniMiB), Italy. UniMiB coordinated the research phase of WP2 with AUTH, contributing to the methodology/case inventory and the analysis of competence needs through the targeted questionnaire and focus groups. This evidence base supports future scholarly use, curriculum development and informed teaching practice across disciplines. Its institutional contribution is most directly evidenced in the project's analytical and methodological outputs.

Hochschule Ruhr West (HRW), Germany. HRW led WP3 and prepared the learning-design, course-offer and implementation/facilitation materials. These resources offer an identifiable route from research on AI competences to teachable modules, facilitation practices and context-sensitive professional development. For HRW, the project's particular valorisation relevance lies in transferable curriculum-design experience and the scope for embedding the learning approach in existing educational offers.

Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Spain. UPF led WP5, drawing on its experience of pilot coordination and educational implementation. This gives it a central role in connecting pilot experience, institutional uptake and the broader implementation strategy. IDEAL may support further cross-disciplinary use and evidence-informed innovation within its educational and research networks; the scale of such uptake should be described from UPF's own records rather than inferred from the project plan.

Q21 — Agentur für Qualifizierungs- und Transfermanagement GmbH, Germany. Q21 led WP4 on the IDEAL Learning Suite, building on expertise in online learning infrastructures and competence-validation approaches, including LEVEL5. Its work contributes the technical and methodological means by which educators may access and apply the learning materials. The project's future value for Q21 concerns transferable platform, facilitation and validation expertise, while actual LEVEL5 certification is reported separately. Q21 hosts and maintains the IDEAL Learning Suite (https://ideal.q21.de).

SMART Revolution S.r.l., Italy. SMART Revolution co-led WP3, notably in the organisation and delivery of continuing professional development, and held responsibilities for internal evaluation and quality assurance. This positions the IDEAL course offer for adaptation in professional and

enterprise learning environments beyond university settings. The original application identifies extension of educational provision to additional companies as a potential institutional benefit, not as an already verified commercial outcome.

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (AUTH), Greece. AUTH coordinated core WP2 work on the IDEAL competence framework and repository of assessment methods, contributed to project dissemination, hosted the hybrid final conference at its Centre for Dissemination of Research (KEDEA), and mobilised student contributions for the poster showcase. Its contribution is especially significant because the project's conceptual resources were not confined to reporting: the AUTH experience report documents a course-embedded, scenario-based pilot in which groups used IDEAL materials to devise structured thematic units on the responsible use of AI in higher education. The local report identifies ten completed designs within a single pilot, with 54 students and six teaching staff involved (figures as reported in that source). This creates a concrete bridge between competence-framework development, curriculum design, ethically grounded learning activities and learner-produced educational artefacts. The thematic tasks addressed, among other issues, academic integrity, feedback, accessibility and inclusion, misinformation, copyright, administration and staff professional development. The experience also highlighted that resource richness requires orientation, staged checkpoints and skilled facilitation; it found that transparency and risk mapping help protect human pedagogical judgement. For AUTH, these outcomes provide a documented basis for refining academic teaching, educator development and future interdisciplinary work on AI and data literacy. Broader university-wide institutionalisation, additional adoption and enduring organisational change remain opportunities rather than verified consequences of one pilot.

6.2 Interpreting institutional impact and collecting supplementary evidence

Institutional contribution should not be conflated with confirmed institutional impact. Partner impact is best substantiated by a specific use of an IDEAL asset or approach, a named target group or unit, a demonstrable result or change in practice, and supporting evidence such as a teaching programme, attendance register, publication, institutional decision or documented adaptation. Where no such record is available, the relevant passage above expresses an evidenced contribution and a realistic valorisation route rather than an achieved outcome.

The partner-specific accounts above are consolidated on the evidence currently available at report closure. A partner may subsequently correct a material factual error or supply an independently documented example for its own records, but the completion and circulation of this Strategy are not conditional on further responses or on prospective activities. Any supplement should distinguish its date and evidence status from the project-period results summarised here.

7. Exploitation pathways and stakeholder propositions

HE educators/departments	Single module or redesign workshop tied to an authentic teaching challenge	More accountable, inclusive AI-supported teaching practice	Documented course adaptation and staff reflection
University CPD units	Six-topic facilitator pathway and train-the-facilitator pack	Repeatable staff development without complete reinvention	Scheduled cohort, trained facilitator, participant outcomes
Students / student teams	Guided case investigation, project-based design, ethical peer critique	Critical AI literacy and demonstrable educational artefacts	Team outputs, reflective learning evidence
VET/AE providers	Context-specific modules and applied project coaching	Cross-sector relevance beyond HE	Adaptation plan and evaluated pilot
Research and policy networks	Open methods, competence grid, cases and practice briefs	Knowledge exchange and comparative learning	Citations, reuse requests, joint sessions
Other Erasmus+ projects	Cluster cooperation around shared interests and exchange of learning resources	Economies of coordination, reciprocal visibility and new pilots	Signed cooperation plan and delivered joint activity

7.1 Conditions of successful transfer

For each adoption, the receiving institution should appoint a local academic/pedagogical lead and a contact for platform or resource access; conduct a brief needs assessment; choose one route; check rights, data and accessibility; run a small implementation; and record outcomes. The central consortium's role is to make these steps feasible, not to prescribe a uniform pedagogy.

7.2 Communication is not exploitation

Dissemination establishes awareness. Exploitation requires observable reuse, adaptation, integration into training offers, partnerships or sustained provision. A conference presentation and a webpage impression should therefore not be counted as evidence that an institution has adopted the IDEAL methodology. Monitoring should track dissemination and adoption as separate categories, with defensible conversion measures (e.g., verified enquiries that lead to actual resource use).

8. IDEAL network: formats for future collaboration

8.1 Proportionate network options

The project application describes a European IDEAL network and contemplates a membership-based association, voluntary membership fees and charges for commercial services. The agreed post-project follow-up is a voluntary IDEAL network with ready-to-use MoU and cluster templates. The initial network should be a voluntary collaboration platform coordinated through an MoU, not an assumed new legal person.

- Foundation phase: consortium partners nominate contact persons, register assets, agree access, approve an interim charter and sign voluntary MoUs if they choose.
- Cluster phase: participating projects and institutions form thematic cooperation clusters using Annex B; each cluster selects a narrow objective, deliverable, timetable and named leads.
- Consolidation phase: evaluate active participation, maintenance burden, demand for paid services and legal feasibility before considering incorporation or membership fees.

8.2 Governance options

A proportionate governance architecture includes a Stewardship Group (one nominated person per participating partner), a rotating coordinator, an Editorial/Quality and Ethics function for learning resources, a Technical Custodian for platform/hosting, and thematic cluster leads. The Stewardship Group should meet twice annually at minimum and retain brief decisions. A wider annual network assembly could review results and priorities once active external membership is established. These structures are recommended, not already constituted.

The group should distinguish rights to participate in decisions from rights to reuse independently licensed outputs. An institution cannot be required to join a network to exercise rights already granted under a valid open licence. Nor should a non-binding MoU be treated as authorising the disclosure of personal data or third-party copyrighted materials.

8.3 Potential cluster themes

- Responsible AI assessment, feedback and academic integrity in higher education.
- Inclusive, accessible and multilingual AI teaching practices.
- Competence-oriented CPD and evidence-based validation of educator learning.
- AI and data literacy in VET, adult learning and professional education.
- Critical AI literacy, environmental impact and stakeholder governance.

Clusters are proposed mechanisms for cooperation among projects and institutions—not formally created IDEAL structures. Partner identification, approval, scope and external communications require explicit consent.

9. Organisational, technical and financial considerations

9.1 Resource stewardship and version governance

A post-project register should list each output's owner/custodian, canonical title and location, file and version, licence or rights status, formats, update obligation and broken-link contact. Public-facing learning assets should use stable URLs where possible and clear archiving rules. Materials that become outdated rapidly, particularly screenshots, platform instructions and AI-tool descriptions, should carry visible review dates. Foundational methodology and competence resources can be reviewed less frequently, but require versioned amendments when legal or educational assumptions change.

9.2 Hosting and continuity

The IDEAL Learning Suite (https://ideal.q21.de) is hosted and maintained by Q21, while the official IDEAL project website (https://www.project-ideal.eu/) is hosted and maintained by CNR. Minimum continuity requirements are: inventory and export of core digital assets; domain and administrator access; documented access-control roles; an agreed service contact; backups and recovery testing; periodic link/accessibility tests; disclosure of expected running costs; and a plan for critical staff turnover. Where central interactive services cannot be financed sustainably, the consortium should prioritise a durable static resource collection and downloadable/portable learning materials.

9.3 Financial considerations: staged and conditional

A — Essential archive	Host public information and cleared static resources within existing institutional capacity	Low, but requires named technical custodian and annual review	Approved institutional hosting and rights register
B — Supported community	Archive plus limited facilitator clinics, community meetings and local adoption advice	Moderate staff time; potential in-kind contribution	At least two active institutional stewards and documented demand
C — Service development	Structured CPD delivery, bespoke facilitation or platform services with transparent costing	Higher staff/technical cost and possible contractual liability	Costed business case, licences, procurement/tax/legal review and partner approval

The application's reference to voluntary network fees and administrative charges for commercial use is a possible financing idea, not proof of an agreed charging regime. Any fee should apply to defined value-added services or membership benefits, not to restrict rights to an openly licensed resource.

An operating budget should include hosting, updates, accessibility, moderation, facilitation, privacy compliance, technical support and coordination; no amount is projected until responsible partners provide actual cost estimates.

9.4 Funding diversification

Plausible future support mechanisms include institutional in-kind contribution, integration into existing CPD programmes, joint proposals under European or national calls, sponsored activities consistent with academic independence, and cost-recovery for facilitated services. Each opportunity needs a partner-owned business case and clear rules preventing preferential access to publicly funded open resources where such access would contradict the adopted licence.

10. Intellectual property, licensing, GDPR and responsible AI

10.1 Licence of the IDEAL materials

The application refers both to CC BY-SA and to "non-commercial use". To remove this ambiguity, the consortium has agreed to release the original IDEAL educational materials under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 licence (CC BY-NC-SA 4.0). The materials can be freely reused and adapted for non-commercial purposes, with attribution and under the same licence. Other uses can be agreed with the partners.
A workable default, subject to ownership and third-party rights, is to publish original consortium-owned educational materials under the agreed open licence with attribution and the required European Union funding acknowledgement. Exclude externally licensed images, software, third-party course resources, confidential partner data, student works lacking explicit permission, recordings without necessary rights and any asset whose ownership remains unresolved. The licence of Moodle software or another technical component must be evaluated separately from the licence of educational content.

10.2 Rights register and reuse notice

The rights register should identify the legal owner(s), authors, contributions of employees and learners, external materials embedded, original publication, licence version, attribution statement, permitted adaptations, third-party exceptions and accessible file version. Users should receive a reusable attribution example and clear instructions for marking adaptations. Approval responsibility remains with rights holders and partner legal services; an MoU cannot retroactively create copyright ownership that a partner does not possess.

10.3 Data protection and ethics

Before any continued use of the Learning Suite, participants' accounts, logs, learning evidence, reflective texts, survey responses or validation data, the actual data controllers and processors should be identified, with a documented lawful basis and purpose. The post-project service requires appropriate privacy notices, defined access roles, retention and deletion rules, security controls, records of data flows and appropriate processor arrangements where required. Published experience reports should use aggregation or anonymisation where practicable and should not reuse identifiable learner work without a lawful basis and necessary permissions.
The GDPR review should address collection limitation, purpose limitation, data minimisation, transparency, retention, access rights, transfers and safeguards. Where AI services are integrated into teaching or platform workflows, the adopting institution should assess supplier terms, information security, bias, accessibility and the protection of student and staff data. Users should be instructed not to paste personal, confidential or protected learner information into unapproved third-party AI tools.

10.4 Alignment with current EU AI policy

Article 4 of Regulation (EU) 2024/1689, as amended in 2026, addresses measures supporting AI literacy for staff and persons dealing with AI systems on behalf of providers or deployers. IDEAL's pedagogical, ethical and contextual approach may support organisational AI-literacy activities; participation in IDEAL should not be advertised as certification of legal compliance. Any regulatory mapping requires a separate institutional applicability assessment.

11. Dissemination, conference legacy and awards

11.1 Communications evidence

The dissemination period for this closing analysis ended on 30 September 2026. In the source records available at closure, the consortium dissemination grid contains 32 identifiable substantive completed entries before blank or example rows, and the separate AUTH grid contains three substantive records: a PIMA Bulletin article, a PIMA webinar contribution and an ESREA-RENADET blog post. The two inventories have not been independently reconciled for overlap, and therefore yield 32 consortium-grid entries plus three separately recorded AUTH entries—not a defensible total of 35 unique actions. The final Thessaloniki conference is described separately below; it should not be added mechanically if already represented in a dissemination grid.
Qualitatively, the grids show a multi-channel dissemination mix spanning academic and professional presentations, conference contributions, articles, podcasts, partner and project websites, online posts and outreach through existing educational networks. This distribution is appropriate for reaching research, teaching and practitioner communities, while the AUTH records are distinctive for linking dissemination to adult education and broader professional-learning networks. Reporting conventions vary in date formats, activity granularity, source links and estimates of audience reach; some figures describe potential circulation rather than confirmed individual engagement.
Consequently, the records support an account of breadth and diversity of communications, not a deduplicated total reach, a verified stakeholder conversion rate or proof of institutional uptake. Dissemination evidence should remain analytically separate from the actual reuse, adaptation and educational outcomes discussed in the valorisation sections of this Strategy.
IDEAL achieved documented visibility across several communication formats and transnational professional settings, and the final hybrid event supplied a substantive capstone linked to project outputs. The partners' dissemination grids document these activities.

11.2 Final conference: documented figures and interpretation

The IDEAL Final Conference and Award was organised on Tuesday, 8 September 2026, at the Centre for Dissemination of Research (KEDEA), Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Final reporting records 43 face-to-face and 20 online participants, a documented total of 63 (with the organiser excluded from the online count). The hybrid format allowed partners and stakeholders from different countries to follow the event online, while the on-site audience included students, teachers and researchers. The restricted attendance list and Zoom participation record are the appropriate sources for the numerical claim and should not be reproduced publicly with personal identifiers.
The final circulated programme scheduled the event from 09:00 to 14:30 EEST and developed a coherent progression from project rationale to implications for continued use. After registration and opening remarks from George K. Zarifis and Davide Taibi (joining remotely), sessions addressed the IDEAL perspective on responsible and inclusive AI/data-analysis competences; mapping of use cases, needs, focus-group/survey findings and assessment methods (AUTH); learning-design patterns and the modular offer (Hochschule Ruhr West, remotely); resources and the IDEAL Learning Suite (Q21, remotely); and the testing of pilot experiences, learning projects and validation (UPF, remotely). Scheduled coffee and lunch intervals provided space for informal exchange, while the closing

synthesis brought implementation, sustainability, transfer and future use into the same conversation.
The IDEAL Final Conference brought together partners, learners and educational stakeholders to discuss the results of "Integrating Data Analysis and AI in Learning Experiences" and the challenges of translating AI/data literacy into responsible teaching practice. The hybrid event was hosted at AUTH's Centre for Dissemination of Research (KEDEA) and concluded at 14:30, following the programme. The confirmed attendance total was 63 participants, comprising 43 participants on site and 20 on Zoom. These figures reflect the event registration and online participation records.
The event's purpose was not merely to display project outputs, but to interpret the relationship among the WP2 research base, competence framework and assessment methods; the WP3 blended learning offer; the WP4 Learning Suite; and the piloting, transfer and sustainability work of WP5. The programme concluded with a poster showcase and a synthesis of practical steps for future educational uptake. The conference poster collection subsequently provides a basis for the IDEAL Award.
41 of 43 onsite participants completed anonymous paper questionnaires (95.35% response rate). For relevance and presentation quality, 35 respondents selected 5/5 and six selected 4/5, yielding a mean of 4.85/5 for each item (97.07% of the maximum score). All 41 selected 5/5 for both the poster showcase and overall satisfaction. Nineteen respondents supplied optional written comments highlighting relevance, informative presentations, practical ethical/inclusive AI examples and organisation. The transcribed 41-row response workbook and separate evaluation report accompany these results.
The final programme also included a poster showcase: a poster-walk presentation intended to bring participant and partner learning designs, pilot experiences and practical AI-related projects into view for both the local audience and remote partners. Its particular pedagogical value was to give an accessible, concrete counterpart to the more conceptual sessions and to connect discussion of competence frameworks with learner-produced design choices. The subsequent concluding session addressed possible continuation and the wider exploitation of IDEAL results.

11.3 Poster contributions and awards procedure

The consolidated archive contains 22 files, comprising 16 numbered student poster files and six additional project, overview or partner-pilot files. One of the six is a general IDEAL project overview, rather than a distinct competitive contribution.
The original award indicator specified a baseline of ten and a target of fifteen applications. The 22 archived files provide an inventory of submitted applications. The poster material was reviewed subsequently against six educational criteria set out below; a reasoned shortlist prioritised an external participant group, the University of Turin technical and administrative staff pilot cohort, represented by SMART Revolution's poster. The consortium confirmed this recommendation and awarded the IDEAL Award to this cohort. The selection note documents the criteria, the shortlist and the rationale of the decision.

1. **Relevance to IDEAL**: Whether the contribution addresses identifiable AI/data-analysis competences and meaningful higher-education or professional-learning needs.
2. **Pedagogical quality**: Whether aims, learning activities, facilitation and assessment or reflective evidence form a coherent, usable learning design.
3. **Critical and ethical AI use**: Whether privacy, reliability, bias, transparency and accountable human oversight are treated as operational safeguards.

4. **Inclusion and accessibility**: Whether the design responds to diverse participants, accessibility barriers and equitable opportunities to engage.
5. **Originality**: Whether the educational approach offers a distinctive, contextually justified idea or thoughtful adaptation rather than tool novelty alone.
6. **Transferability:** Whether another educational provider could realistically adapt the approach, with sufficiently clear tools, conditions and lessons.

The leading nomination was the Technical and Administrative Staff Pilot Cohort of the University of Turin (UniTo), presented through SMART Revolution's "AI and Data Literacy Beyond the Classroom" poster. The poster records 58 staff and a professionally situated model combining an AI/data-literacy workshop, authentic institutional challenges, the IDEAL Datathon and SPIDER competence reflection. It provides a concrete account of educational value and potential transfer to other universities. The award recipient is the non-consortium University of Turin pilot cohort. The other prioritised contributions were the CNR/UniMiB student data-visualisation disclosure pilot, and UNIMIB's responsible-AI Master's workshops.

The selection rationale rested on alignment with IDEAL, coherent pedagogical practice, explicit attention to responsible AI, consideration of participant needs, originality in connecting training with a real Datathon, and realistic transferability.

As a valorisation mechanism, the conference combined an international consortium perspective with local student involvement, allowed direct comparison of project research, learning design, platform resources and implementation experience, and provided a visible point of departure for responsible reuse. Its most defensible legacy lies in traceable presentations, poster artefacts, programme documentation and subsequent adoption opportunities, not in a claim that conference attendance alone created lasting impact. Publication or reuse of identifiable student posters, photographs or recorded discussions requires appropriate permissions and rights checks.

12. Monitoring, outcomes and accountability

12.1 Indicators and interpretation

WP5 local pilots	Minimum 7 pilots, 4 EU countries	Partner-approved list: date, site, learning route, materials, evidence and report
Teacher development	At least 70 HE teachers; indicator table 70 baseline / 80 target participants	Unique participant register by activity and status, with definition of "improved competence"
Assessment/validation	Indicator table 40 baseline / 70 target assessments and validations; text also mentions 40–60 LEVEL5 certificates	Disaggregate assessments, validations and actual issued LEVEL5 certificates
Experience reports	Sections state 7 expected reports, indicator table says 6 baseline / 6 target	Ten experience reports collected in deliverable D5.1
Final conference	70 baseline / 100 target	63 documented actual (43 in person; 20 online), source attendance records
Award applications	10 baseline / 15 target	22 poster-related files (16 numbered student poster files plus six overview/partner-pilot files).
Network partners	100 baseline / 150 target in WP5 indicators	Institutional and project partners that opt in to the voluntary network

The final figures are reported in the final report together with their sources.

12.2 Suggested twelve-month outcome dashboard

- Access: number of public assets with cleared rights, stable URLs, accessible alternative formats and maintained links.
- Engagement: verified external enquiries, resource consultations and facilitator participation; separate web analytics from identifiable users.
- Adoption: number of institutions running a documented IDEAL-derived activity, with country, discipline and context.
- Quality: user-reported relevance, clarity, accessibility, adaptability, critical/ethical framing and overall usability.
- Learning: number of documented learning projects and separately reported assessments and formal validations.
- Partnerships: MoUs signed, active clusters, joint outputs and evidence of sustained activity.
- Continuity: dated platform/access check, changes implemented, resources withdrawn or archived, and costs met within agreed capacity.

12.3 Governance of monitoring

Where institutions continue to use IDEAL resources, proportionate reviews can distinguish output satisfaction, access continuity and actual educational impact. The completed Strategy already consolidates the dissemination record to 30 September 2026 and the final event of 8 September. Later voluntary partner accounts may be archived as subsequent examples of adoption, clearly dated and source-linked, but should not be represented as activities completed within the closed dissemination period or used to hold up this report.

13. Risk register and mitigating decisions

Unclear ownership or mixed licensing	Resources cannot be lawfully advertised as open	Rights audit, exclusions, approved licence and attribution; owners/legal services
Platform service or staff discontinued	Broken access, lost progress or assets	Archive/export, technical custodian, backup, annual budget; host institutions
Uneven pilot/validation documentation	Overstated effectiveness and weak audit trail	Final evidence ledger and distinction of claim types; WP5 reporting leads
Network established only nominally	Inactive partnerships without adoption	Light MoU, short action plans, dated review and right to exit; Stewardship Group
Data-protection or AI-tool misuse	Legal and ethical exposure	Privacy and supplier review, minimisation, access controls and staff training; local controllers
Resource obsolescence or inaccessible formats	Declining usability or exclusion	Versioning, accessibility review and scheduled updates; editorial custodians
Financial assumptions untested	Unfunded maintenance and reputational risk	Costed scenarios, staged investment and sunset plan; participating partners

14. Options for transition and continued use

0–30 days after sign-off	Confirm final WP5 evidence; freeze output inventory; reconcile licence statements; nominate maintainers	Evidence ledger; rights register; draft charter and host map
Months 2–3	Approve minimal access continuity; pilot the resource catalogue; agree network MoU text and practical contacts	Published cleared catalogue; signed MoUs where agreed; continuity checklist
Months 4–6	Invite a small number of projects to thematic clusters; test two or three local uptake cases	Cluster action notes; examples of adapted resources and documented use
Months 7–9	Review accessibility, adoption, data/technical burden; improve priority resources	Versioned updates; first quality and outcome note
Months 10–12	Assess actual costs, demand and member participation; decide continuation or scale-down	Annual stewardship decision and documented sustainability scenario

The roadmap offers practical options for partners who choose to continue IDEAL-related activities; identifying a potential role is not a commitment to finance, host, manage or deliver it.

15. Conditions for responsible post-project use

- Maintain an up-to-date inventory of the outputs and clearly identify the version being reused.
- Report pilot evidence and LEVEL5-related outcomes according to the underlying records and the actual definition of each indicator.
- Use each educational resource under its verified rights statement; apply the agreed CC BY-NC-SA 4.0 licence and the required attribution.
- Check who currently hosts, controls and is authorised to maintain each digital service before promising continued technical availability.
- Present the voluntary IDEAL network as the agreed consortium follow-up and the MoU and cluster templates as ready to use; record any subsequent signed MoUs or activated clusters separately.
- Apply proportionate institutional legal, data-protection, ethics and AI-governance checks before further collection of learner data or delivery through AI services.
- Include the completed Valorisation Strategy in the output-quality assessment; retain the underlying evidence registers and archive any later partner corrections or new adoption examples as explicitly dated supplements, without postponing circulation of the final Strategy.

Annex A. Memorandum of Understanding — ready-to-use template

READY-TO-USE MoU TEMPLATE — an agreed practical instrument for voluntary IDEAL follow-up; this annex does not itself represent a signed agreement.

A1. Parties and purpose

This Memorandum of Understanding ("MoU") is proposed between [Organisation A], [Organisation B] and any additional signatories listed in Schedule 1 ("Participants"), for voluntary collaboration in maintaining, promoting, responsibly reusing and further developing selected learning outputs of the Erasmus+ IDEAL project. The signatories acknowledge that the project and its funding period do not themselves create a new legal entity.

A2. Areas of cooperation

Subject to resources and institutional approvals, Participants may: share links to lawfully published IDEAL assets; exchange facilitation practices; undertake contextual adaptation and user feedback; organise optional joint learning activities; contribute to thematic clusters; and communicate results with appropriate acknowledgements. Each activity should be described in a short, separately approved action note where staff time, facilities or funds are required.

A3. Governance and decision-making

Each Participant may nominate one contact person. Contacts may coordinate a voluntary Stewardship Group and select a rotating convenor for up to twelve months. Decisions affecting another Participant's finances, intellectual property, brand, data, staff or reputation require that Participant's explicit written authorisation. The Group does not represent a separate incorporated association unless legally established by a subsequent agreement.

A4. Intellectual property and acknowledgement

Existing ownership and third-party rights remain unaffected. Each IDEAL asset may be reused only under its actual published licence, permissions or an additional agreement with its rightsholder. The MoU grants no general sublicence over the complete IDEAL repository and does not override CC or software licence terms. Participants shall preserve proper attribution, funding acknowledgement and change notices.

A5. Data protection and confidentiality

No transfer of personal data is authorised by this MoU. Where collaboration requires personal-data processing, the relevant parties shall first establish their responsibilities, lawful basis, notices, security measures and any required controller/processor or data-sharing agreement. Confidential information will not be disclosed or republished without prior written authorisation.

A6. Costs, liability and external communications

Participation is voluntary and each signatory bears its own costs unless separately agreed in writing. No Participant may create financial or legal obligations for another. Joint public statements and use of institutional logos require prior approval. This document is an expression of intended cooperation and is not itself a funding, employment, procurement or commercial-services contract.

A7. Term, review and withdrawal

The initial suggested term is twelve months from last signature, reviewable annually. Any Participant may withdraw on 30 days' notice without prejudicing rights and obligations arising independently under licences, contracts or law. On withdrawal, parties shall agree practical disposal or return of any non-public materials and personal data in accordance with the applicable arrangements.

A8. Signatures and schedules

Organisation: [ ] | Authorised representative: [ ] | Role: [ ] | Date: [ ] | Signature: [ ]
Schedule 1: Participating organisations and nominated contacts. Schedule 2: Optional annual action note. Schedule 3: Links to approved IDEAL asset catalogue and rights register.

Annex B. Inter-project cluster cooperation — ready-to-use template

READY-TO-USE INTER-PROJECT TEMPLATE — available for voluntary network cooperation; a specific cluster agreement takes effect only when the participating parties approve it.

B1. Cluster identification

Cluster title: [ ]. IDEAL contact institution: [ ]. Partner project(s) and coordinators: [ ]. Cooperation period: [ ]. Named leads, institutional mandate and approved communication channels: [ ]. The participating projects retain their own contractual, financial and reporting responsibilities; the cluster is not a merger of grants.

B2. Shared rationale and work programme

The parties identify a common thematic challenge, relevant beneficiary groups and one to three practical outputs, for example a jointly facilitated webinar, comparative case brief, adapted learning activity or local implementation pilot. The work plan should state an owner, date, expected audience, accessibility requirements, indicators and review process for every output.

B3. Contributions and non-duplication of funding

Each party records any promised in-kind or financial contribution in Schedule B. No transfer of funds, procurement, charging arrangement or cost attribution between projects is implied. Activities reported under separate grants must respect their applicable funding and double-financing rules; parties must avoid describing an identical cost as funded twice.

B4. Content rights and publication

Background intellectual property remains with its owners. Any new jointly authored output should have a rights and attribution decision before publication. Project identifiers, funder notices and institutional branding should be used in accordance with applicable rules. The parties shall not automatically apply the IDEAL default licence to another project's deliverable.

B5. Privacy, responsible AI and research ethics

Where cluster activity involves participants, photographs, learning data, survey responses or AI services, the organisers agree the purpose, lawful basis, transparency, data minimisation, retention, security and publication method before collection. For joint research outputs, ethics approvals and authorship rules must be recorded where applicable.

B6. Coordination, delivery and exit

The named leads shall hold a short inception meeting and at least one closing review, documenting planned activities and results. The agreement concludes at the end date unless renewed. Either

party may withdraw on 30 days' notice, subject to separately agreed commitments. Disputes shall initially be addressed by the designated institutional contacts; no party may claim to represent another without permission.

Schedule A — Cluster action record

[Joint activity / lead]	[Date / effort]	[Agenda, accessible files, agreed attribution]
[Local adaptation / lead]	[Setting / time]	[Evaluation record, permissions, no personal data in public output]
[Review meeting / lead]	[Date / contact]	[Decisions, follow-up and lessons learned]

For the signatories: project/institution [ ]; authorised representative [ ]; date [ ]. Legal-status clause to be tailored by authorised institutional services.

Annex C. Asset register and adoption record templates

C1. Asset catalogue fields

Unique asset ID and title	[WP – Result – Asset number; definitive title]
Version and date	[Version; last reviewed; planned next review]
Owner / custodian / maintainer	[Legal rightsholder; operational contact; technical contact]
Location / access	[Canonical URL; public, enrolment-only, internal; offline format]
Licence and exceptions	[SPDX/CC version or permission; third-party exclusion; attribution]
Audience and prerequisites	[HE educator, student, provider etc.; language, support, prior knowledge]
Accessibility status	[Formats; captions/transcripts; issues and remediation]
Evidence and limitations	[Source report, pilot/test, non-verified claims, intended evaluation]
Reuse pathway	[CPD, module, research case, cluster exchange]
Update/withdrawal rule	[Scheduled check; obsolete, broken or rights-restricted asset]

C2. One-page local adoption record

Adopting organisation and responsible contact: [ ]. Learner population/context: [ ]. Educational challenge: [ ]. Selected IDEAL assets and versions: [ ]. Route A/B/C: [ ]. Local adaptation and rationale: [ ]. Rights/accessibility/data checks: [ ]. Delivery and participation definition: [ ]. Learning evidence (not just satisfaction): [ ]. Unintended effects and implementation constraints: [ ]. What changed, what should change next, and consent for publication: [ ].

C3. Minimum quality-review questions

- Is the output educationally relevant to an identifiable target group and a meaningful problem?
- Is its purpose, structure and use explained in language accessible to the target audience?
- Can it be implemented with realistic support, technology and time?
- Can local teachers adapt it without losing the competence and ethical rationale?
- Are accessibility, equality, bias, privacy and academic integrity adequately considered?
- Is the licence, ownership, version and attribution clear?
- Which concrete improvement and future-use case should be prioritised?

Annex D. Conference and awards reporting — evidence note

The IDEAL final conference took place on 8 September 2026 in hybrid format at Aristotle University of Thessaloniki. Documentary attendance evidence records 43 in-person and 20 online participants, totaling 63. The event presented the project's competence and pedagogical resources, Learning Suite, pilot experiences and perspectives for future use.

Onsite evaluation: 41/43 anonymous paper questionnaires (95.35% response rate) were transcribed by the organiser. Relevance and presentation quality each averaged 4.85/5 (35 ratings of 5, six of 4); poster showcase and overall satisfaction each averaged 5.00/5 (41 ratings of 5). Nineteen respondents supplied comments. The original handwritten questionnaires are the primary records and should be retained securely; the 20 Zoom participants were excluded from this survey.

Annex D record: the source archive contains 22 poster-related files (16 numbered student posters and six additional overview or partner-pilot files, including a general project overview). The six review dimensions are relevance to IDEAL, pedagogical quality, critical and ethical AI use, inclusion and accessibility, originality and transferability. WINNER (external recipient): University of Turin technical and administrative staff pilot cohort (SMART-facilitated pilot). The award is linked to the poster showcase of the Final Conference (8 September 2026, Thessaloniki).

Award documentation: six criteria and their operational meanings are set out in §11.3. The external award recipient is the University of Turin technical and administrative staff pilot cohort (SMART-facilitated activity) , as confirmed by the consortium. An A4 award certificate has been prepared.

Annex E. Five-question event evaluation anonymous instrument

This anonymous-format template requests no names or directly identifying information.
IDEAL Final Conference | 8 September 2026 | KEDEA, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki

For items 1–4: 1 = Strongly disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither agree nor disagree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly agree.

1. Relevance — The conference addressed topics relevant to my academic, professional or educational interests.
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

2. Quality of presentations — The presentations provided clear, informative insights into IDEAL's results, resources and pilot experiences.
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

3. Poster showcase — The poster showcase offered useful examples of responsible, ethical and inclusive AI applications in education.
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

4. Overall satisfaction — Overall, I was satisfied with the organisation, content and delivery of the conference.
☐ 1 ☐ 2 ☐ 3 ☐ 4 ☐ 5

5. Open feedback — What did you find most valuable, and what would you suggest for future events or educational activities?
.....
.....



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.