IDEAL

Integrating Data Analysis and AI in Learning Experiences

D5.4

IDEAL Final Conference and Award – Report

From AI/Data Analysis Competence to Higher Education Practice

Event report | 8 September 2026 · 09:00–14:30 EEST · KEDEA, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece

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 overview 3
Programme and participating contributions 3
From empirical research to educational competence 4
Designing a usable learning offer and Learning Suite 4
Pilots, their evidence and practical lessons 4
Digital poster showcase and discussion synthesis 5
Event assessment 5
IDEAL Award: scope, criteria and winner 6
Participation, dissemination and continuing use 6
Annex A. Five-question event evaluation anonymous instrument 7

63 TOTAL	43 ON SITE	20 VIA ZOOM	HYBRID EVENT

Executive overview

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 poster showcase also served as the basis for the IDEAL Award.

Programme and participating contributions

The short-format programme reflected the project's progression from the mapping of educational needs to implementation. The conference programme ran from 09:00 to 14:30 EEST and linked the project's research foundations, blended learning offer, Learning Suite, pilot experiences and final poster showcase.

TIME (EEST)	PROGRAMME
09:00–09:30	Registration, welcome coffee and hybrid set-up
09:30–09:45	Welcome and framing — George K. Zarifis; Davide Taibi included in remote programme
09:45–10:15	IDEAL perspective — George K. Zarifis
10:15–11:00	Mapping the field and competence architecture (WP2) — AUTH representative
11:00–11:20	Coffee and exchange
11:20–12:00	Blended learning pathway (WP3) — HRW representative
12:00–12:35	IDEAL Learning Suite (WP4) — Q21 representative
12:35–13:15	Pilot experience, assessment and implementation (WP5) — UPF representative
13:15–14:00	Lunch break
14:00–14:15	Poster showcase / IDEAL Award candidate contributions
14:15–14:30	Synthesis, future use and closing — George K. Zarifis

From empirical research to educational competence

The opening and WP2 contributions framed AI and data-analysis competence as a pedagogical and institutional responsibility, rather than a measure of familiarity with fashionable tools. The inventory mapped 88 methodologies and 82 cases; a targeted survey documented 102 higher-education staff responses, complemented by qualitative focus groups. Across these sources, opportunities in writing, translation, accessibility, information retrieval and feedback were considered alongside unreliable outputs, unequal access, privacy risks, bias, academic integrity and professional accountability.

The IDEAL Competence Framework translates that mixed evidence into four interdependent domains, 20 competences and 40 subcompetences. It treats knowledge, practical action and ethical dispositions as connected dimensions of capability. The assessment repository provides more than 80 methods—from design tasks and reflective portfolios to bias investigations and peer feedback—intended to support developmental and contextualised evaluation. Discussion of the WP2 findings emphasised that competence assessment must preserve the difference between self-reported confidence, an artefact demonstrating learning and formal validation.

Designing a usable learning offer and Learning Suite

The WP3 contribution established how the competence architecture can be operationalised through modular blended pathways, practical tasks and facilitator guidance. Its significance lies in flexibility: institutions can use the full qualification pathway, focus on the validation of competence developed through authentic practice, or select modules for a specific teaching problem. Coherent learning objectives, opportunities for reflection and contextual adaptation are essential if resources are to function outside the original consortium.

The WP4 Learning Suite, maintained by Q21 at https://ideal.q21.de, provides a digital route to courses, learning resources and reflective or validation processes. Its contribution was considered in pedagogical as well as technical terms: discoverability, accessible materials, understandable permissions, portable course content and ongoing institutional stewardship determine whether an open learning environment can be used sustainably. The Learning Suite supports flexible, competence-oriented engagement with IDEAL learning resources and can be adopted through pathways appropriate to participants' professional and institutional contexts.

Pilots, their evidence and practical lessons

The consortium reported ten pilot activities in Italy, Germany, Spain and Greece. CNR tested AI-disclosure requirements in postgraduate data visualisation, with 159 submitted projects and an observed disclosure rate of 107/159 (67.3%). At UNIMIB, four workshops involved 59 Master's students in responsible prompting and AI-supported reflection. HRW organised a two-round pilot with computer-science students with pre/post competence reflection. The SMART Revolution pilot brought tailored AI and data-literacy training to 58 technical and administrative staff at the University of Turin, linked to a Datathon. Q21 tested a CPD project-management setting involving

graduates and trainers, while UPF introduced the Lantern Socratic AI tutor to 54 first-year physics students and two instructors. At Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, the six-ECTS P1808 course embedded IDEAL materials in a pilot involving 54 undergraduate students and six teaching staff. Ten student teams developed scenario-based thematic-unit designs addressing responsible AI use, ethical risk mapping, learning outcomes and assessment alignment. Learning was assessed through existing course procedures and portfolios.

Digital poster showcase and discussion synthesis

The programme included a poster showcase, making student learning designs and consortium pilot experience accessible to the onsite and online audiences. The organiser's consolidated archive contains 22 files: 16 numbered student posters and six further project, overview or pilot-related files, one of which is a general IDEAL project poster. The material offered an accessible common reference point for remote and on-site participants and linked the project framework to the work of learners, facilitators and pilot partners.
The prepared exchanges and closing synthesis centred on six interrelated challenges: distinguishing competence from simple tool operation; keeping human oversight substantive; selecting authentic and reflective evidence of learning; building capacity across teams rather than requiring every academic to master every tool; designing for inclusion, accessibility and data protection; and ensuring that educational reuse is supported by clear licences, guidance, maintenance and local evaluation.

Event assessment

Of the 43 participants attending the IDEAL Final Conference in person, 41 completed the in-situ anonymous, five-point evaluation questionnaire (in Annex A). The ratings are summarised below.

43 On-site participants	**41** Respondents	**95.35%** Response rate

Evaluation criterion	Responses	Average rating	Share of maximum
Conference relevance	41	4.85 / 5	97%
Quality of presentations	41	4.85 / 5	97%
Poster showcase	41	5 / 5	100%
Overall satisfaction	41	5 / 5	100%

Of 43 onsite participants, 41 completed anonymous paper questionnaires (95.35% response rate), subsequently transcribed by the organiser. For relevance and presentation quality, 35 respondents

gave 5/5 and six gave 4/5, producing an average of 4.85/5 (97.07% of the maximum score) for each item. All 41 gave 5/5 for the poster showcase and overall satisfaction. Nineteen participants provided optional written feedback, emphasising relevance, informative presentations, practical ethical/inclusive AI examples and organisation.

IDEAL Award: scope, criteria and winner

The IDEAL Award recognises a poster contribution that translates the project's competence and ethical principles into an educational or professional-learning practice. The 8 September poster showcase provides the source material for IDEAL Award recognition. Six assessment criteria were set out for the subsequent review: relevance to IDEAL, pedagogical quality, critical and ethical AI use, inclusion and accessibility, originality, and transferability. The resulting recommendation, documented in the selection note, was confirmed by the consortium.

CRITERION	APPLICATION
Relevance to IDEAL	Whether the contribution addresses identifiable AI/data-analysis competences and meaningful higher-education or professional-learning needs.
Pedagogical quality	Whether aims, learning activities, facilitation and assessment or reflective evidence form a coherent, usable learning design.
Critical and ethical AI use	Whether privacy, reliability, bias, transparency and accountable human oversight are treated as operational safeguards.
Inclusion and accessibility	Whether the design responds to diverse participants, accessibility barriers and equitable opportunities to engage.
Originality	Whether the educational approach offers a distinctive, contextually justified idea or thoughtful adaptation rather than tool novelty alone.
Transferability	Whether another educational provider could realistically adapt the approach, with sufficiently clear tools, conditions and lessons.

The award recipient (winner) 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 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.

Participation, dissemination and continuing use

The conference reached 63 documented participants: 43 face-to-face and 20 via Zoom. Attendance figures, programme materials and original poster artworks provide traceable evidence of delivery.

For sustainability, the conference reinforced the value of a connected set of reusable assets: the WP2 competence and assessment resources, WP3 modular learning patterns, the Q21-hosted Learning Suite and the WP5 pilot experience, Implementation Strategy and Valorisation Strategy. The project website is maintained by CNR at https://www.project-ideal.eu. The voluntary network and MoU/cluster templates offer a framework for continuation without implying that every template is already signed or that a separate legal association has been incorporated.

Annex A. Five-question event evaluation anonymous instrument

This instrument was used for the onsite paper evaluation. Forty-one paper responses were transcribed into the accompanying anonymised Excel data file.

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.