Minutes transnational steering group meeting POWERHEAD, 31 March 2021

Participants

Magalie Soenen - Flemish Community, Department Education and Training, coordinator of the Powerhead project and chair of the transnational steering group meeting

Tine Degrande - Flemish Education Council

Carine De Smet - Flemish Education Council

Isabelle De Ridder - Co-chair of the Flemish Working Group, Association of the University Colleges of Antwerp

Cis Van Den Bogaert - Co-chair of the Flemish Working Group, University of Antwerp

Daiga Ivsina - Latvian Ministry of Education and Science

Lāsma Ulmane-Ozoliņa, Dr.paed. – Latvian Working Group, Liepaja University

Nora Jansone-Ratinika, Dr.paed. – Latvian Working Group, Rīga Stradiņš University

Iļja Afanasjevs – Latvian Working Group, Riga Business School within Riga Technical University

Piet Henderikx – Expert, EATDU

Pieter Soete - Expert, NVAO

Linda Daniela – Expert, University of Latvia

Demetrios Sampson - Expert, University of Piraeus, Greece

Janina Van Hees – Expert, Project manager Virtual Campus of EuroTeQ European University.

Patrick Van den Bosch – External evaluator, Vluhr

1 Welcome and tour de table

Magalie Soenen, chair of the meeting, welcomes the participants to this first steering group meeting. All participants introduce themselves briefly and explain their role in the project.

All participants agree with the recording of the meeting.

2 Presentation of the project

Magalie Soenen presents the project. The PowerPoint presentation is annexed to the minutes of this meeting.

The presentation contains:

- Basic information on the partners and experts, the budget and the time schedule.
- General information on the objectives, the target group, planned activities and links to current policy.
- The methodology of the project, with details on the 7 work packages.
- The roadmap of the project. In the application this first transnational steering group meeting was foreseen to take place in Flanders. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, this meeting is organized online. The next transnational steering group meeting (in Work Package 4) is planned in October/November 2021, and will take place in Flanders, if the situation allows it. In January – February 2022, a Peer Learning Activity will be organized in Latvia, if possible.

3 Working methods and implementation tools

3.1 Quality assurance

3.1.1 QA plan

Patrick Van den Bosch, external quality observer, presents the quality assurance plan.

Patrick insists on the need of an open atmosphere during the transnational steering group meetings. The role of the steering group is to take the lead and to check, during every meeting, if the tasks are fulfilled. In the course of the project, problems of any kind (related to staff, to finances, to activities, …) have to be communicated to the coordinator, the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training. Conflicts will be resolved informally, if possible. The external quality observer will advise in case of conflicts, as a critical friend to the project.

The present QA plan is conceived as a document that can be adapted if needed.

Digitalization in higher education is evolving every day. That is why the deliverables of the project have to respond to minimal quality criteria, and have to be as complete, accurate and relevant as possible.

The transnational steering group only meets four times in the course of the project. That is why a smaller project team has and will have (at least) monthly meetings, to check if the project is on track. The results of those project team meetings will be communicated to the steering group and published on the project SharePoint.

After this meeting, as part of the quality assurance activities, a survey will be sent to the participants of the steering group. Patrick kindly asks all participants to respond to this short survey.

3.1.2 Overview of deliverables

Carine De Smet presents the overview of deliverables.

In this document the partners can find, in chronological order of estimated delivery date, a list of all deliverables with, for each deliverable:

- Deliverable number
- Link to work package number
- Title and short description
- Lead beneficiary
- Dissemination level (public or confidential)
- Estimated delivery date

The document can be used at each meeting of the project team and of the steering group meeting to check if the project is on track.

3.2 Internal and external communication

Carine De Smet gives a short overview of communication tools. Magalie Soenen presents the project SharePoint, and kindly invites all partners to make active use of this shared space, where all the information related to the project is collected. All relevant information can be put on the Sharepoint by all partners. Carine De Smet presents the public project website. All partners are invited to refer to this public website when communicating about the project.

3.3 Dissemination

Magalie Soenen invites the participants to fill in the dissemination form, at every moment they present, mention or refer to Powerhead. The form is available at SharePoint and the results can be consulted immediately.

Questions and answers related to working methods and implementation tools

Daiga Ivsina expresses appreciation for the dissemination approach and for the overview of expected project deliverables, which will be helpful to achieve all outcomes in due time. In Latvia, communication about Powerhead is prepared at national level, to be published at the Ministry website. Daiga will inform about this dissemination and add it at SharePoint.

Pieter Soete prepares an announcement about the project for the NVAO newsletter. He informs if the project coordinator wants to be consulted to check the communication before publication. The coordinator will be glad to check communication texts. Partners are invited to refer in their communication to the public project website. The factsheet (in preparation) can also be used.

4 Powerhead background paper

For the minutes of this point of the agenda we refer to the PowerPoint presented during the steering group meeting.

Tine Degrande, Flemish Education Council, presents the process that has led to this Draft background paper. This draft background paper is the first public deliverable of the project. During this meeting, it is presented to the Latvian partners and to the international experts, with the aim

to enrich the document, and to write the final background paper (another public deliverable of the project).

Isabelle De Ridder, co-chair of the Flemish working group, explains the objectives of this first background paper: to outline the current context of digitalization in higher education and give an overview of insights on digitalization in higher education. At the time of the application, digitalization happened in higher education, but not in a structured way. At the time of the application, the project partners wanted to give a boost to digitalization in higher education. But, given the COVID-19 pandemic, digitalization is already happening in higher education, every day. So the context has radically changed, and this has an impact on the project.

Tine Degrande chairs the discussion on the draft background paper.

POINT 1 CONTEXT

No comments.

POINT 2 RECENT POLICY DOCUMENTS ON DIGITALISATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

- Pieter Soete suggests to add the ESG (Standards and Guidelines for Quality Assurance in the European Higher Education Area) as a reference on quality. The ESG are not very recent, but remain the standard. There is a need for tailored criteria for the quality of digital education; but it cannot be disconnected from other types of education.
- Magalie Soenen suggests to add the European Association for Quality Assurance in Higher Education (ENQA). The OpenU project is listed in the section 'European context'. It is good to mention that Ministries from both Latvia and Flanders are participating in this project.
- Demetrios Sampson suggests to broaden to relevant policy documents in other countries, and to add other projects to the list. In the field of digitalization in higher education, high level discussions are taking place; it is important for the project no to be disconnected.
    - Tine Degrande agrees that involving policy documents from other countries would be interesting and relevant. But at this point, the paper focuses on overarching EU-documents and documents from Latvia and Flanders. There are no resources for more desk research on policy documents in other countries. But of course suggestions are welcome. Magalie Soenen confirms that time is short now to make an overview of relevant documents from other countries. She suggests that the Latvian partners and the international experts send the documents they know about to the project team so that they are published in the literature section on SharePoint; the content can be taken along in the course of the project. Daiga Ivsina adds that, in the stage of the background paper, the partners can better comment on the policy documents in their own country.
    - Same comments for the list of projects: the Flemish working group decided to focus on the two projects Flanders is actively involved in, as it is not feasible now to list all relevant running projects. Magalie Soenen suggests to add a sentence, mentioning that the projects mentions are projects in which the Flemish government is involved (or/and the Latvian government) and that our higher education institutions are involved in a number of other projects. This is a way to make clear that the two projects mentioned are not the only projects relevant for our topic. Daiga Ivsina agrees: the two projects mentioned now focus on the institutional level; the involvement of our higher education institutions in European projects (such as European Universities) could be more extensively elaborated in the paper. Lāsma Ulmane-Ozoliņa confirms that Latvian

universities participate in several projects with some attention for digital education; she will send the information.

- Cis Van Den Bogaert comments that the current list of policy documents at three levels is a purely descriptive list. Adding a reflection to the list would enrich it, as Isabelle De Ridder did for the 'Flemish' documents in her presentation: she referred, for instance, to the Vlor recommendation from 2014, and to the fact that most of the Vlor recommendations have not been taken up and that the challenges still remain. This kind of reflection could also be made for some Latvian documents: what do Flanders and Latvia actually do with EU-documents. Is there any national discussion? Is there a lack of discussion?
  Pieter Soete agrees with the need to add some reflective comments to the descriptive list. He suggests to make some comments on what we observe on a level that goes above the national levels. What do we learn from these documents? Are there any conclusions that we can take to start with? We could make some general observations as a kind of conclusion from the first part, leading to our position to start our project upon. One point we learn is that there is no real consensus on quality in digital education. Plus: there is not enough practical approach. Another point may be that there seems to be a need for specifically tailored criteria to look at the quality of digital education, while these criteria can actually not be completely separated from other types of education.
- Magalie Soenen: In the draft paper, the Vlor recommendation on the European Education Area is listed in the section 'European context'. Would it not be better to list the Vlor recommendation in the section 'Flemish context'? And, if possible, add Latvian documents in the section 'Latvian context'?
- Daiga Ivsina informs that the main Latvian policy document in the field of digitalization in higher education, the 'guidelines', is not approved yet by the Parliament. She will send an update. She will also update on a Latvian document related to EU-recovery.
- The partners agree that some documents can be added to the overview, but that we have at the same time to be careful not to extend too much. The final background paper has to be ready by 30 April. Any extra information will have to be sent to the project team by 14 April.

POINT 3 DIGITAL LEARNING IN HIGHER EDUCATION: DESCRIPTION

- Demetrios Sampson suggests to opt for 'digital teaching and learning', instead of 'digital learning'. This might help later in the needs analysis. Moreover, 'teaching' is referred to several times in the text.
  - Tine Degrande agrees. Teaching and learning are two sides of the same coin; this was also agreed on during discussions in the Flemish working group.
- Demetrios Sampson: 'Normal' learning refers to traditional 'face-to-face' learning. Some reluctance to use the word 'normal'. The statement 'is essentially not something different from 'normal learning' undermines the transformative potential of digital teaching and learning.
- Demetrios Sampson: The definition includes 'different degrees and forms of digitalization': the use of a model for integrating technology into T&L, such as the Substitution, Augmentation, Modification, and Redefinition SAMR Model can be useful for the analysis to follow.
- Demetrios Sampson'(...) minimal, as is the case in face-to-face classroom teaching supported by 'virtual glasses': not really a 'minimal' scenario – i.e. an interactive board might be closer to a minimal scenario.

- Demetrios Sampson: Digital learning is 'accompanied or supported' by technology. A more radical approach would be to talk about 'enhanced and transformed'. The choice of the terms is related to how ambitious the guidelines intend to be. 'Accompanied' and 'supported' are at the very low end.
    - Piet Henderikx agrees with the terminology 'technology enhanced teaching and learning' (used in the UK), where 'enhanced' means 'improved'. 'Transformed' goes further.
    - Transformation is already mentioned in the text (3.2 line 2).
    - Magalie Soenen suggests, as we speak about transformation' to add the European Commission transformation agenda as an overarching document in point 2.1.
    - The aspect of 'transformation' will be made more explicit in the paper.
- Use of technology in education (3.2.1). Linda Daniela proposes to clarify that different focuses are possible here: is technology useful to get the knowledge, or is technology useful to raise entrance to education?
- Is something missing in the overview of emerging educational technologies?
    - Demetrios Sampson suggests to add blockchain (relevant to micro-credentials) and the internet of things (relevant to location based learning and experimentation).

POINT 4 OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES OF DIGITALISATION IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Demetrios Sampson suggests to use the term 'educators' or 'teaching staff' at university level.

Opportunities

- Janina Van Hees suggests to add the internationalization aspect in the list of opportunities for teaching and learning. The digital aspect allows students to meet students in other countries. (international classroom).
- Lāsma Ulmane-Ozoliņa suggests to add, in the list of opportunities for the organization of higher education, the follow up of students through learning analytics for instance. Especially in this crisis, when the teachers don't see the students, learning analytics can help to follow up students activity.
- Daiga Ivsina suggests to add, in the list of opportunities for the organization of higher education, the common/shared use of resources: the same digital platforms, the same educational resources.
- Janina Van Hees suggests to add flexibility in the list of opportunities for the organization of higher education. Offering and validating shorter learning periods, micro-credentials etc to different target groups is easier digitally. This could be integrated under the heading 'reaching more and more diverse students'; but it is maybe better to make a separate heading 'Increasing flexibility of the educational offer'.
    - Daiga Ivsina proposes to consider this flexibility in the framework of lifelong learning. This is already mentioned in 4.1.2 (second bullet), but can be more explicit.
    - Pieter Soete misses the element of the 'professional field'. Virtual reality gives students the opportunity to acquire skills in a safe environment. They can develop 'hands off' skills in a virtual safe environment.

Challenges

- ‘Importance of ‘teaching methods’. Dimitrios Sampson suggests to consider ‘educational design’ instead.
- No ‘one-size-fits-all’ approach. Daiga Ivsina agrees, but stresses the importance of balance between digital learning and face-to-face learning. Isabelle De Ridder adds that it is crucial to look at the situation and to decide whether a digital or/and a face-to-face approach are most appropriate. And, when decided to opt for a digital approach, it is crucial to take into account the context, again. This is elaborated at page 11 ‘Particular challenges for certain learning objectives, students and contexts’.
- ‘Positive attitude of teachers and students’. Janina Van Hees suggests to raise the challenge of how to keep the learning communities of students together, how to give students the feeling that they are part of a community. This aspect could be seen as a challenge, but at the same time as an opportunity.
- Pieter Soete adds that a major challenge of digital education is the acquisition and assessment of hands on skills that are often required by the professional field.
- Cis Van Den Bogaert states that the impact on the assessment is now in the section of challenges for learning and teaching. It could also be listed in the section of challenges for the organization of higher education. It is a challenge to look for good quality assessment supported by digital technology (simulation, video performance, …) and the role of it in the design of the educational environment. He suggests to put one item related to assessment in each section.
- Linda Daniela suggests to add the challenge ‘Information architecture and design of materials’. Sometimes the materials are not well prepared, sometimes not easily accessible.
- Attention for privacy, security and reuse of material. Demetrios Sampson suggests to be more specific: ‘Privacy & Security of Educational Data produced. IPR & Copyright issues’. Janina Van Hees states that reuse of materials can be a challenge, but at the same time an opportunity. It will be added in the section of opportunities related to OER.
- ‘Continuing education and open education’. Janina Van Hees wondered what the rationale was for the Flemish working group to name this challenge. Tine Degrande explains that this challenge has been added following a discussion in the Flemish working group: when talking about higher education, all aspects of higher education have to be taken into account; not only mainstream higher education, but also lifelong learning provision and open education provision.
- Daiga Ivsina suggests to link to the broader context of the digital transformation in the challenges section. At EU-level, green and digital transitions are often linked. There are a lot of unknown issues, and this is a challenge that goes beyond education. Tine Degrande suggests to stress this point under the heading ‘relation to major issues, such as climate’ on page 13.

Pieter Soete has doubts about the structure of the sections ‘opportunities’ and ‘challenges’, making the distinction between the level ‘teaching and learning’ and ‘organization of higher education’. Tine Degrande informs that this also has been discussed in the Flemish working group: the feeling was that these are two different levels, but it is a fact that it is not possible to disconnect or separate completely. Demetrios Sampson agrees: when we look in detail at the issues raised in ‘organization of higher education’, they have to do with administrative issues, with workload, with privacy, with the profession..; All these aspects are related to the support of teaching and learning, within an institutional context. Maybe ‘institutional context (or dimension)’ is thus a better heading

than ‘organization’. Magalie Soenen informs that the same discussion also took place in the advisory group on teaching and learning. There it is called ‘to strengthen higher education institutions’ and systems’ capacity to enhance learning and teaching’. This was one of the reasons to make the distinction in the Flemish working group. In the final background paper, a short text will be added to clarify why and how the working group decided to make the distinction.

Essential preconditions

The first bullet ‘Achieving added value via embedding in the teaching and learning environment’. Pieter Soete states that this position is too much one way. Education can bring added value to technology as well.

Demetrios Sampson: The second bullet ‘connection to learning objectives, students and context’ gives a very focused perspective on teachers. But in fact, when talking about digitalization in higher education, the capabilities of the individual teacher are filtered by the abilities of the educational organization. This paragraph with focus on teachers is thus misleading. On the other hand, the connection to learning objectives in this same paragraph is obvious. This is not a real precondition.

5 Proposal Powerhead needs analysis

The objective of this point at the agenda is to explain how the Flemish partner will conduct the needs analysis, and to inspire the Latvian partner. For the minutes of this point of the agenda we refer to the PowerPoint presented during the steering group meeting.

Tine Degrande explains the process that has led to this proposal for a needs analysis.

Cis Van Den Bogaert, co-chair of the Flemish working group, presents he context of the Flemish needs analysis. The aim is to make an inventory of the needs of HEI to implement a thought-out policy on digital learning. The proposal is based on the guiding model of Laurillard, identifying various ‘drivers’ and ‘enablers’. Cis Van Den Bogaert informs that, according to the working group, student wellbeing and student readiness was somehow underrepresented in this model. It has been added by the working group as an important enabler.

This is the overview of clustered themes:

- Funding and infrastructure;
- Course and curriculum design (including curriculum design, assessment, support of teachers and professionalisation);
- Vision and policy (including policy assurance);
- Stakeholders;
- Students.

Cis Van Den Bogaert insists on the importance to agree on the themes by both partners. In order to strive for comparable data, it is important that the same themes are questioned in Flanders and in Latvia.

Tine Degrande chairs the discussion on the needs analysis proposal.

Dimitrios Sampson welcomes the proposal as a good starting point for the needs analysis. He suggests additional literature: Singh, G. and Hardaker, G. (2014), "Barriers and enablers to adoption and diffusion of eLearning : A systematic review of the literature – a need for an integrative approach", *Education + Training*, Vol. 56 No. 2/3, pp. 105-121. https://doi.org/10.1108/ET-11-2012-0123.

Piet Henderikx agrees with the stressed importance of students readiness in the needs analysis proposal. He refers to a recent document published in the UK, where 4 in 5 of all recommendations are linked to students. They are indeed the first stakeholders. They will have to 'consume' digital education, so it is crucial to question how they perceive it.

All themes can be discussed in five homogeneous groups, followed by one heterogeneous focus group. Tine Degrande informs that it remains to be seen to what extent the Flemish working group will use a top-down approach (i.e. steering the discussion by linking the discussion questions to certain themes), or rather a bottom-up approach (i.e. linking what is discussed in the groups to the themes only afterwards).

Janina Van Hees agrees with the suggestion to decide about the composition of the heterogeneous focus group in the course of the process, depending on the outcomes of the five homogeneous groups.

Daiga Ivsina welcomes the proposal, which she finds an excellent start. She informs that, on the Latvian side, the working group has not come to a conclusion or a proposal on the way to conduct the needs analysis. The idea is to start from the results of recent Latvian research at national level in the field of digital education, and then to decide about a methodology to build further upon those data. Tine Degrande comments that it is not necessary to use the same approach for the needs analysis in both partner countries, but that we have to agree on the themes in order to be able to compare afterwards.

Piet Henderikx states that it would be good to semi-structure the focus groups, by formulating questions deduced from research. The Latvian research can be a source of inspiration here.

Piet Henderikx states that the questions in the focus groups should not only collect input on a description of what is existing, but rather on how things need to be changed. The essential question is 'How can we make progress starting from the needs we have?'

6 Further steps and timing

Magalie Soenen presents the next steps.

She insists on the short term timing: the input for the final paper has to be collected before 15 April 2021; the final paper has to be published before 30 April 2021.

The Flemish working group will work on the questions for the focus groups in the second half of April. Focus groups will take place in May/June.

Magalie Soenen thanks the participants for the cooperation today, and stresses the fact that close cooperation and interaction between the partners will remain needed in order to deliver relevant guidelines and recommendations.

She invites all participants to fill in the evaluation form that will be sent after this meeting.

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

POWERHEAD

Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning

Pow Er
h Ead mpowering Higher Education in
Adopting Digital Learning

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

Draft agenda

- Welcome and tour de table *10.00 – 10.15 h*
- Presentation of the project *10.15 – 10.45 h*
- Working methods and implementation tools *10.45 – 11.30 h*
    - Quality assurance
    - Internal and external communication
    - Dissemination
- Powerhead background paper - first round *11.45 – 12.45 h*

Lunch break

- Powerhead background paper - second round *13.30 – 14.30 h*
- Proposal Powerhead needs analysis *14.30 – 15.30 h*
- Further steps and timing *15.30 – 16.00 h*

1. Basic Information

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

- Title: Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning
- Time schedule:
  - Call 2019, approval summer 2020
  - Implementation: December 2020 – November 2022
- Budget:
  - Total budget: 180.638,47 Euro
  - Max. EU grant: 162.574,62 Euro
  - 10% co-financing

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

1. Basic Information

- Partners:
  - Department of Education and Training, Belgium/Flemish Community
    - Linked third party Flemish Education Council (VLOR)
  - Department of Higher Education, Innovation and Science, Latvia
- Experts:
  - Linda Daniela, Piet Henderikx, Demetrios Sampson, Pieter Soete, Cis Van Den Bogaert, Janina van Hees

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

2. In general

- Objective of the project: design guidelines for a policy on digital learning in HE at two levels:
  - national policy
  - higher education institutions
- Target group:
  - national authorities of the EHEA-countries
  - stakeholders of higher education: HEI, students, academic staff, employers
- Planned activities:
  - Analysis of needs of actors in HE
  - Comparison/confrontation with other countries
  - Publication of guidelines

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

2. In general

- Links to current policy:
  - Recovery plan European Commission
  - Digital Education Action Plan European Commission
  - European Education Area
  - Rome Communiqué: 'innovative and interconnected' + Annex Learning and Teaching: 'foster continuous enhancement of teaching, especially digital'
  - …

3. Methodology (1)

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

2 croscutting work packages:

- WP1: General management and coordination of the project
- WP2: Monitoring and evaluation

WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7
Setting the stage	Needs analysis	Broadening the expertise	Guidelines on digital learning in HE	Dissemination of results

3. Methodology (2)

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

WP3: Setting the stage/3a Preparation of background paper

Timing	December 2020 – March 2021
Objective	Setting the stage, inventory of discussion questions.
Rationale	Agree on the definition of digital learning in HE, make inventory of insights
Activity	Preparing of a background paper on digital learning in higher education
Methodology	National Flemish working group with inclusion of stakeholders higher education. This builds upon previous work of the Flemish Education Council and international publications and insights.
Deliverable	Draft background paper

3. Methodology (3)

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

WP3: Setting the stage/3b Kick-off transnational steering group

Timing	March 2021 – April 2021
Objective	Plan the outline of the project, agree on discussion questions
Rationale	This is the real starting point of the project where all partners agree on the outline of the project.
Activity	1 day-meeting of the transnational steering group
Methodology	In-depth discussion of the background paper
Deliverable	Final background paper with agreement on discussion questions and outline of the activities to be set up

3. Methodology (4)

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

WP4: Needs analysis/4a The national perspective

Timing	April-September 2021
Objective	Inventory of the needs of higher education institutions in order to develop a thought-out policy on digital learning.
Rationale	Since higher education institutions are the primary partners for implementing digital learning, it is important to have an overview of their needs.
Activity	One national seminar (2 days) in every country of the consortium where the higher education institutions of this country are represented.
Methodology	In-depth discussion with the use of deep democracy techniques
Deliverable	Report with an the overview of the needs of higher education institutions in the participating countries

3. Methodology (5)

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

WP4: Needs analysis/4b Transnational comparison

Timing	October-December 2021
Objective	Identify the needs that are common in the participating countries.
Rationale	Since this project draws on the different expertise of the participating countries in this matter, it is important to compare the needs of higher education institutions in the participating countries and to see if a common perspective can be found.
Activity	2-day meeting of the transnational steering group
Methodology	In-depth discussion of the national reports.
Deliverable	Overview of the common needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning in the participating partner countries.

3. Methodology (6)

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

WP5: Broadening the expertise

Timing	January-February 2022
Objective	Sharing of the different needs analysis and confrontation with experts of different EHEA-countries.
Rationale	It is interesting to see if the results of the project so far, are recognisable for other Bologna countries (who may be at different stages of the implementation of digital learning in higher education).
Activity	A two-day PLA-seminar
Methodology	Peer Learning Activity involving representatives from national working groups of the participating countries and international peers from three other EHEA-countries, experts and representatives of the ministries.
Deliverable	Report of the PLA

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

3. Methodology (7)

WP6: The guidelines on digital learning in HE

	6.1 Preparation: National work	**6.2 Transnational steering group**	**6.3 Publication online and on paper**
Timing	February – June 2022	June-July 2022	July-October 2022
Objective	Process the information	Agree on the guidelines	Put together the findings
Rationale	If all the gathered information is put together, what guidelines or recommendations can be assembled?		
Activity	National working groups in the participating countries	2-day seminar	Desk work of the project managers
Methodology	/	In-depth discussion of the conclusions	Publication
Deliverable	Summary of conclusions of the participating countries	Guidelines for national policy and HEI on digital learning	

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

3. Methodology (8)

WP7: Dissimination of the results

	7.1 Preparation of the conference	**7.2 Disseminiation conference**	**7.3 Disseminiation on other fora**
Timing	August-September 2022	September-October 2022	October-November 2022
Objective	Agree on content	disseminate the results of to other EHEA-countries	
Rationale	The guidelines can be used by other countries		
Activity	International conference		Participation of the project team in international fora
Methodology	Transnational steering group prepares the program	Organisation of and presentation on the dissemination conference	Pesentation on other fora
Deliverable	A dissemination conference		PowerPoint and poster

4. Roadmap

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

Work Plan – Road Map Project	M 1	M 2	M 3	M 4	M 5	M 6	M 7	M 8	M 9	M 10	M 11	M 12	M 13	M 14	M 15	M 16	M 17	M 18	M 19	M 20	M 21	M 22	M 23	M 24
	Dec 20	Jan 21	Feb 21	Ma 21	Apr 21	May 21	Jun 21	Jul 21	Aug 21	Sept 21	Oct 21	Nov 21	Dec 21	Jan 22	Feb 22	Ma 22	Apr 22	May 22	Jun 22	Jul 22	Aug 22	Sept 22	OKt 22	Nov 22
Work package 1: General management and coordination of the project (= crosscutting work package)																								
1.1 Preparatory activities																								
1.2 Management activities																								
Work package 2: Monitoring and evaluation (= crosscutting work package)																								
2.1 Evaluation																								
2.2 Reporting																								
2.2 Maintaining website																								
Work package 3: Setting the stage																								
3.1 Preparation of a background paper in working group meetings (Flanders)																								
3.2 Background paper																								
3.3 Kickoff of the transnational steering group in Flanders																								
3.4 Report of the transnational steering group																								
3.5 Final background paper																								
Work package 4: Needs analysis																								
4.1 National working group in Flanders																								
4.2 National working group in Latvia																								
4.3 National inventories of needs and reports																								
4.4 Transnational steering group: comparison needs analysis in Flanders																								
4.5 Overview of the common needs (transnational)																								
Work package 5: Broadening the expertise																								
5.1 Peer learning activity in Latvia																								
5.2 Report of the peer learning activity																								
Work package 6: Guidelines on digital learning in higher education																								
6.1 National working group in Flanders																								

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

Next steps

POWERHEAD project

Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning

PowErhEad
mpowering Higher Education in
Adopting Digital Learning

Roadmap

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

Work Plan – Road Map Project	M 1	M 2	M 3	M 4	M 5	M 6	M 7	M 8	M 9	M 10	M 11	M 12	M 13	M 14	M 15	M 16	M 17	M 18	M 19	M 20	M 21	M 22	M 23	M 24
	Dec 20	Jan 21	Feb 21	Ma 21	Apr 21	May 21	Jun 21	Jul 21	Aug 21	Sept 21	Oct 21	Nov 21	Dec 21	Jan 22	Feb 22	Ma 22	Apr 22	May 22	Jun 22	Jul 22	Aug 22	Sept 22	OKt 22	Nov 22
Work package 1: General management and coordination of the project (= crosscutting work package)																								
1.1 Preparatory activities	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
1.2 Management activities	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Work package 2: Monitoring and evaluation (= crosscutting work package)																								
2.1 Evaluation	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
2.2 Reporting	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
2.2 Maintaining website	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■	■
Work package 3: Setting the stage																								
3.1 Preparation of a background paper in working group meetings (Flanders)	■	■	■																					
3.2 Background paper			■	■																				
3.3 Kickoff of the transnational steering group in Flanders				■																				
3.4 Report of the transnational steering group					■																			
3.5 Final background paper					■																			
Work package 4: Needs analysis																								
4.1 National working group in Flanders					■	■	■	■																
4.2 National working group in Latvia					■	■	■	■																
4.3 National inventories of needs and reports									■	■														
4.4 Transnational steering group: comparison needs analysis in Flanders											■	■												
4.5 Overview of the common needs (transnational)													■											
Work package 5: Broadening the expertise																								
5.1 Peer learning activity in Latvia														■	■									
5.2 Report of the peer learning activity														■	■									
Work package 6: Guidelines on digital learning in higher education																								
6.1 National working group in Flanders															■	■	■	■	■					

PowErhEad

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

WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7
Setting the stage	Needs analysis	Broadening the expertise	Guidelines on digital learning in HE	Dissemination of results

WP3: Setting the stage

- WP3a: Preparation of background paper
  - Timing: December 2020 – March 2021
  - Deliverable: Draft background paper

- WP3b: Kick-off transnational steering group
  - Timing: 31 March 2021 –> Input final paper 15/4/2021, publication final paper 30/04/2021
  - Deliverable: Final background paper

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

WP3	WP4	WP5	WP6	WP7
Setting the stage	**Needs analysis**	Broadening the expertise	Guidelines on digital learning in HE	Dissemination of results

WP4: Needs analysis

- WP4a: The national perspective
  - Timing: April-September 2021, inform from Latvian side by 15 April?
  - Deliverable: Report with an overview of the needs of HEI in the participating countries

- WP4b: Transnational comparison
  - Timing: October-December 2021
  - Deliverable: 2-day transnational steering group meeting

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

Thank you for your cooperation

POWERHEAD project

Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning

PowerHEad
Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning

Quality assurance plan

Project	POWERHEAD Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning 893839
WP reference	WP 2
Responsible	MINEDU-FC

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

1 Introduction

This document forms a point of reference on the quality that will be governed during the POWERHEAD project. The aim of the Quality Assurance Plan is to define the quality assurance activities that will be carried out throughout the project in order to ensure smooth implementation, continuous monitoring and high-quality level of the project results and the project outcomes.

This Quality Assurance Plan will be distributed to all Project Partners and Experts:

- Ministry of Education and Training - Belgium/ Flemish Community (MINEDU-FC)
- Flemish Education Council (Vlor) (Linked Third Party)
- Ministry of Education and Science Latvia (LV MoES)
- Quality Assurance Unit of the Flemish Higher Education Council (VLUHR QA)
- Linda Daniela
- Piet Henderikx
- Demetrios Sampson
- Pieter Soete
- Linda Van Hees

The Quality Assurance Plan will enable an efficient collaboration among the project partners and delivery of project results and outcomes.

The draft version of the Quality Assurance Plan is prepared by the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training and the Flemish Education Council. The external evaluator advised on the preparation of the QA plan. The Quality Assurance Plan will be presented and discussed during the transnational steering group meeting on 31 March 2021. During the implementation of the project, project partners may change or adapt the QAP to respond to current and expectant conditions.

Rev N	Description	Author(s)	Review	Date
0	Draft	Magalie Soenen – Tine Degrande – Carine De Smet – Patrick Van den Bosch		31 March 2021
1	First revision			
2				

2 Project description

Higher education institutions are embracing digital learning today but mostly, this seems to happen ad-hoc, in a haphazard way. Therefore, a more structural approach is needed, as suggested by the Paris Communiqué (2018). The Bologna implementation report (2018) states that different Bologna countries are at different levels of implementation of national policies in this area. The project thus aims at exchange of knowledge and good practices between countries that are geographically well spread in Europe and implemented digital learning in a different way.

Objectives

How can national authorities support higher education institutions on this topic, given their autonomy? How can digital learning in higher education be stimulated? This project builds upon an analysis of the needs of higher education institutions to enhance digital learning in higher education. This project aims at developing guidelines for partner (and other) countries for a national policy on digital learning in higher education at two levels: guidelines for a national policy strategy on digital learning in HE & guidelines including recommendations for higher education institutions.

The **target groups** of this project are: national authorities of the EHEA-countries (reachable through the BFUG) and the stakeholders of higher education (higher education institutions, students, academic staff, employers).

Planned activities

The project plans an analysis of the needs of higher education institutions in the participating countries, the comparison of this analysis with the results of the same analysis in the other participating countries, the confrontation of these results with other peers, and the publication of guidelines.

Expected impact

Enhancing and stimulating digital learning relates to the priority of Learning and Teaching of the Bologna process, but also plays a part in the realisation of mobility, the social dimension and lifelong learning. The impact expected is multidimensional.

3 Quality Assurance Responsibilities

Quality assurance is an integral part of the project and aims to ensure that objectives are met in the most effective way. This section outlines the responsibilities of the partners.

3.1 Flemish Ministry of Education and Training (MINEDU-FC)

The Flemish Ministry of Education and Training is assigned in Powerhead as responsible for the quality assurance plan and has through the project the responsibility to:

- Monitor and control the quality during the project execution
- Identify problems during the project process and initiate actions for conflicts or quality problems solving
- Verify the implementation of quality solutions
- Review and update the quality assurance plan

The Flemish Education Council (Vlor), being the Linked Third Party, supports MINEDU-FC.

3.2 Latvian Ministry of Education and Science (LV MoES)

The Latvian Ministry of Education and Science is assigned in Powerhead as responsible for the quality of the deliverables assigned to this organisation.

3.3 Transnational steering group

The transnational steering group is responsible for:

- Ensuring the scientific and technical quality of the deliverables
- Monitoring the quality control of all deliverables submitted
- Reviewing the reports produced
- Ensuring that all the project outputs are consistent

3.4 Project team

At regular basis (monthly, can be adapted according to needs) the project team will have an online meeting in order to discuss the project progress and to tackle possible challenges.

The project team is composed by members of all partners (MINEDU-FC, Vlor and MoES-LV)

3.5 VLUHR QA

An external evaluator of VLUHR QA assists the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training by conducting as independent evaluator quality assurance activities to ensure that processes and procedures in the project are sufficient for their purpose and are applied and followed.

The external evaluator is responsible for:

- Monitoring performance by gathering relevant data
- Making suggestions for changes and improvements and how to implement them
- Making an evaluation report

4 Cost and effort management

The coordinator will provide clear information about the financial status of the project. Each partner is responsible to oversee and record their own budgets. The coordinator is responsible to keep track of the overall financial status of the project. The Grant Agreement between EACEA and the Flemish Community will be consultable for further information about the specific reporting and payment arrangements.

Regularly agreed financial monitoring and reporting dates will enable the project coordinator and partners to prepare adequately for spending and financial reporting. None, or irregular reporting will be rectified through attempts at resolution followed by ultimately withholding payment to a partner until acceptable evidence is produced. The budget and costs allocation was put together by all partners so it is well understood by the partnership. Equally, all partners are familiar with the financial rules and eligible cost documents provided by the European Commission. The submitted budget contains an overview of spending limits and staff time requirements, so each partner is well aware of and responsible for keeping spending within these limits. Knowing that each budget amount is already allocated to a predetermined heading will prevent budget scope creep.

Each partner will allocate a staff member to be responsible for financial reporting; and they will report to a designated staff member or coordinator. Regular evaluation and monitoring of the project will be the important factor of successful project management.

5 Quality assurance deliverables

An important focus is the quality assurance of the project outcomes in order to verify if they are complete, correct, and of acceptable quality.

5.1 Project deliverables

A matrix of project deliverables is maintained by the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training. This matrix describes for each deliverable ID, name, work package, description, responsible, planned delivery date, approval date and comments.

To promote the timely and qualitative production of each deliverable, the matrix will be at the agenda of each transnational steering group meeting and at each project team meeting.

5.2 Deliverable review

The most formal process for quality assurance, which will be applied to every deliverable in the project is an internal review of the deliverables, performed by the partners and experts from within the project consortium.

Minimal criteria to be considered within each deliverable are the following:

- Completeness: Information provided by deliverables must be complete, reliable and corresponding with reality. This means that all background information used in the report should be appropriately supported by references and the work been done consistently and clearly explained, in order to avoid misinterpretation of the foreground.

- Accuracy: Information used in the deliverable should be focused on key issues and be written in a way that takes into consideration the scope of the specific research work and its targeted audience.
- Relevance: All information used should be provided to the depth needed for the purpose of the reports and the project.
- Uniformity: Appearance and structure. Although different partners within the framework of Powerhead project will author deliverable reports, it is important that reports are prepared with uniform appearance and structure. This will lead to provide a common appearance, as they are originated under a common initiative.
- Punctuality: This quality indicator is dealing with orthography and the correct grammar usage.

The project members working on a deliverable/outcome are expected to integrate the relevant feedback of the reviewers in the further production of the deliverables.

5.3 Quality assurance project

Apart from the particular procedure to assess the quality of the deliverables, this section outlines activities to ensure to monitor project processes and deals with the issues related to the general performance and execution of Powerhead and the quality of their work outcome.

To support a smooth collaboration and communication between the partners, several communication tools, strategies and agreements are installed:

- **Shared Webspace**
  A SharePoint site is installed to allow the partners to share and to exchange project-documents. The access is restricted only to consortium members and experts to avoid broadcasting of the project data and results. The structure of the project space follows the structure of the Work Packages.
- **Email for daily communication**
  A mailing list is installed at the beginning of the project and will be updated immediately in case of any changes.
- **Files and archives**
  The Flemish Ministry of Education and Training provided formats with a standard visual image, to assist clear communication and comprehension. In this way, visual quality is also to be considered in all the documentation generated by POWERHEAD project. The formats for use in partner communication, documentation, reporting, and deliverable production can be found on the SharePoint site.
- **Meetings**
  - During the project 3 transnational steering group meetings and one peer learning activity are planned. All the partners need to be represented during the meetings. The agenda will be published soon enough to facilitate partners finding the right transport and accommodation, in case of physical meetings. The minutes will be prepared after the meeting according to the standards.
  - Videoconferences between the project partners are scheduled on a regular base (monthly) to keep up with the progress of the project between the transnational meetings. These meetings can take place more frequently based on individual needs.
- **Change request**

If any partner determines that a change to the time schedule, budget, efforts, quality etc. is necessary, he has to send its request to the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training. The Flemish Ministry will analyse the request and determine which tasks will be impacted and in what way, what will be the result of a change and how it would affect the scope, schedule, risks, quality and resources. The Flemish Ministry will communicate the change request and its analysis to the project partners to agree on. Once the change request has been reviewed and approved, the Flemish Ministry is responsible that the changes are captured in the project documentation where necessary. These document updates will be communicated to the consortium partners as well. Major changes will be discussed and communicated by the Flemish Ministry to EACEA.

- Conflict resolution
  Since the partners have worked together on similar projects we are confident that conflict is unlikely. The project team (project managers of each partner) is responsible for the supervision of the process of problem solving and conflict resolution. Firstly, disagreements should be initially resolved informally by the interested parties. The project management committee will meet using electronic communications and make a decision within two weeks of a formal request in writing. Conflict resolution will be handled and solved mainly through pragmatic negotiation. If any party is dissatisfied with the outcome, the steering committee will invite the external evaluator as an independent person to review the evidence and provide judgement. The parties will be informed in writing of the decision. The EACEA will be kept informed in case of any serious conflicts.

6 External quality assurance

An external and independent evaluator of VLUHR QA assists the Flemish Ministry of Education and Training by conducting quality assurance activities to ensure that processes and procedures in the project are sufficient for their purpose and are applied and followed.

The external and independent evaluator is responsible for:

- Monitoring performance by gathering relevant data and produce a quality-evaluation report.
- Making suggestions for changes and improvements and how to implement them.
- Producing an evaluation report

The external evaluator will attend some transnational steering group meetings as an observer and will report his findings to the Flemish Ministry and give recommendations for improvement. He will further be in close contact with the Flemish Ministry throughout the project to monitor and exchange on the processes. At mid-term and at the end of the project, the evaluator will produce an evaluation report which will comprise a methodological report that will evaluate the quality indicators resulting from the application and the specific Quality assurance plan. The quality assurance activities will be based on qualitative data (i.e. observations meetings, meeting the specified deadlines, achievement of targets and indicators) and on quantitative data (i.e. answers to questionnaires and reports). The Flemish Ministry will therefore gather data from all project partners and key stakeholders.

Checklists achievement project outcomes

For each deliverable, the following characteristics are defined (see the overview of deliverables, from the project application):

- Deliverable number
- Link to work package number
- Title and short description
- Lead beneficiary
- Dissemination level (public or confidential)
- Estimated delivery date

The deliverables are listed below in chronological order of estimated delivery date.

Minimal quality criteria to be considered within each deliverable are the following:

- Completeness:
  Information provided by deliverables must be complete, reliable and corresponding with reality. This means that all background information used in the report should be appropriately supported by references and the work been done consistently and clearly explained, in order to avoid misinterpretation of the foreground.
- Accuracy:
  Information used in the deliverable should be focused on key issues and be written in a way that takes into consideration the scope of the specific research work and its targeted audience.
- Relevance:
  All information used should be provided to the depth needed for the purpose of the reports and the project.
- Uniformity:
  Appearance and structure. Although different partners within the framework of Powerhead project will author deliverable reports, it is important that reports are prepared with uniform appearance and structure. This will lead to provide a common appearance, as they are originated under a common initiative.
- Punctuality:
  This quality indicator is dealing with orthography and the correct grammar usage.

The project members working on a deliverable/outcome are expected to deliver the project outcomes complying with these standards of quality.

1 Draft background paper

Deliverable number	D8
Short description	First background paper on digital learning in higher education
Linked to work package	WP3 ‘Setting the stage’

Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End February 2021
Dissemination level	Public

2 Report of the kick-off meeting of the transnational steering group

Deliverable number	D9
Short description	Report of the kick-off meeting of the transnational steering group, planning the further outline of the project end agreeing on discussion questions
Linked to work package	WP3 'Setting the stage'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End April 2021

Dissemination level	Public

3 Final background paper

Deliverable number	D10
Short description	Background paper on digital learning in higher education, based on the draft background paper and including feedback from the transnational steering group
Linked to work package	WP3 'Setting the stage'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End April 2021
Dissemination level	Public

4 National overview of the needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning - Flanders

Deliverable number	D11
Short description	Inventory of the needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning in Flanders

Linked to work package	WP4 'Needs analysis'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End September 2021
Dissemination level	Public

5 National overview of the needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning - Latvia

Deliverable number	D12
Short description	Inventory of the needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning in Latvia
Linked to work package	WP4 'Needs analysis'
Responsible partner	MoES
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End September 2021

Dissemination level	Public

6 Interim report by the external observer

Deliverable number	D6
Short description	Interim report, making a state of affairs of the progress of the implementation of the project at mid-term
Linked to work package	WP2 'Monitoring and evaluation' (cross-cutting work package)
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End November 2021
Dissemination level	Public

7 Overview of the common needs of higher education institutions regarding digital learning - Flanders and Latvia

Deliverable number	D13
Short description	Transnational comparison of the needs in higher education institutions regarding digital learning

Linked to work package	WP4 ‘Needs analysis’
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End December 2021
Dissemination level	Public

8 Report of the PLA

Deliverable number	D14
Short description	Report of PLA involving representatives from the national working groups as well as international peers from three other EHEA-countries, experts and representatives of ministries
Linked to work package	WP5 ‘Broadening the expertise’
Responsible partner	MoES
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End January 2022

Dissemination level	Public

9 Report of the external observer after the PLA

Deliverable number	D2
Short description	Report of the PLA including evaluative comments and recommendations
Linked to work package	WP2 'Monitoring and evaluation' (cross-cutting work package)
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End February 2022
Dissemination level	Public

10 Filled questionnaires after the PLA

Deliverable number	D4
Short description	Questionnaires evaluating the PLA filled in by participants at the PLA
Linked to work package	WP2

Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End February 2022
Dissemination level	Confidential

11 Report of the national working group on guidelines - Latvia

Deliverable number	D15
Short description	Report of the working group discussing the findings of the previous milestones in the project, working towards guidelines
Linked to work package	WP6 'Guidelines on digital learning in higher education'
Responsible partner	MoES
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End July 2022
Dissemination level	Public

12 Report of the national working group on guidelines - Flanders

Deliverable number	D16
Short description	Report of the working group discussing the findings of the previous milestones in the project, working towards guidelines
Linked to work package	WP6 'Guidelines on digital learning in higher education'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End July 2022
Dissemination level	Public

13 Report of the transnational steering group on guidelines

Deliverable number	D17
Short description	Putting together all gathered information and working towards guidelines
Linked to work package	WP6 'Guidelines on digital learning in higher education'

Responsible partner	MoES
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End July 2022
Dissemination level	Public

14 Guidelines

Deliverable number	D18
Linked to work package	WP6 ‘Guidelines on digital learning in higher education’
Short description	Guidelines for higher education institutions and for the policy level
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End October 2022
Dissemination level	Public

15 Report of the online transnational steering group preparing the dissemination conference

Deliverable number	D19
Short description	Report of the meeting of the transnational steering group preparing the dissemination conference
Linked to work package	WP7 'Dissemination'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End October 2022
Dissemination level	Public

16 PowerPoint presentation presenting the guidelines

Deliverable number	D21
Short description	A PowerPoint presentation, aimed to support dissemination at the conference and at international fora
Linked to work package	WP7 'Dissemination'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness

	Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End October 2022
Dissemination level	Public

17 Poster presenting the guidelines

Deliverable number	D22
Short description	A poster presenting the guidelines, aimed to support dissemination of project results at the conference and at international fora
Linked to work package	WP7 'Dissemination'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End October 2022
Dissemination level	Public

18 Report of the dissemination conference

Deliverable number	D20
Short description	Report of the international conference presenting the results of the project to the target group
Linked to work package	WP7 'Dissemination'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End November 2022
Dissemination level	Public

19 Report of the external observer after the dissemination conference

Deliverable number	D3
Short description	Report of the dissemination conference including evaluative comments and recommendations
Linked to work package	WP2 'Monitoring and evaluation' (cross-cutting work package)
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness

	Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End November 2022
Dissemination level	Public

20 Filled questionnaires after the dissemination conference

Deliverable number	D5
Short description	Evaluative questionnaires filled in by the participants at the dissemination conference
Linked to work package	WP2 'Monitoring and evaluation' (cross-cutting work package'
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End November 2022
Dissemination level	Confidential

21 Project website

Deliverable number	D7
Short description	The web page is constructed from the beginning of the project and will contain all public deliverables at the end of the project.
Linked to work package	WP2 ‘Monitoring and evaluation’ (cross-cutting work package)
Responsible partner	MINEDU-FC
Quality criteria	Completeness Accuracy Relevance Uniformity Punctuality
Delivery date	End November 2022
Dissemination level	Public

Internal and external communication tools

1 Project website

General information on the project can be found at the project webpage.

This webpage will be further developed including an appropriate image for the project.

Each public deliverable will be published at this webpage.

2 Sharepoint

For internal communication, the MINEDU-FC has prepared a sharepoint site. The SharePoint site is installed to allow the partners to share and to exchange project documents. The access is restricted only to consortium members and experts to avoid broadcasting of the project data and results. The structure of the project space follows the structure of the Work Packages.

It will contain:

- Background documents, such as the project application, the workplan;
- Documents related to quality assurance;
- The logo and format for Word documents and PPT presentations;
- Literature related to the project;
- Meeting agenda's, documents and minutes;
- Public and confidential deliverables.

3 Logo

A project logo is used supporting all communication related to the project. The logo is available in short and long version at the sharepoint site.

We recall that all communication related to the project needs to include the logo of the European Commission:

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

4 Factsheet

A one-page fact sheet is at the disposal at the sharepoint site. It can be used in all communication and dissemination of project results.

5 Template

A template for Word-documents and Powerpoint presentations is available at the sharepoint site. It has to be used for all deliverables and intermediate documents related to the project, in partner communication, documentation, reporting, and deliverable production. It includes a standard visual image, to assist clear communication and comprehension. In this way, visual quality is also to be considered in all the documentation generated by POWERHEAD project.

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

First background paper

POWERHEAD

Prepared by the Flemish Working Group

PowErhEad
Empowering Higher Education in Adopting Digital Learning

0. Process

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

- Prepared by the Flemish Working Group
- 16 members, different stakeholders:
  - 2 co-chairs: Cis Van Den Bogaert & Isabelle De Ridder
  - 3 representatives of higher education institutions
  - 3 representatives of the staff unions
  - 2 student representatives
  - 2 experts of the Department of Education and Training: i.a. Magalie Soenen
  - 2 experts of the POWERHEAD-project proposal: Piet Henderikx & Patrick Van den Bosch
  - 2 members of the Flemish Education Council: Carine De Smet & Tine Degrande
- 3 working group meetings (2 hours): 12 February, 26 February, and 12 March 2021

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

1. Context

- Original objective of the project: design guidelines for a policy on digital learning in HE at two levels:
  - national policy
  - higher education institutions
- Impact of the current context
- Objectives of the background paper:
  - Outline the current context of digitalisation in HE
  - Give an overview of insights on digitalisation in HE

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

2. Recent policy documents on digitalisation in HE

- In the European context
  - European Digital Strategy & Skills Agenda
  - Communication on European Education Area & Digital Action Plan
  - Bologna Process & European Higher Education Area
  - EUA/Erasmus+ project: Digitally enhanced learning and teaching in European higher education institutions
  - Digital Competence Frameworks
  - European Projects in which Flanders is actively involved: MICROBOL & OpenU

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

2. Recent policy documents on digitalisation in HE

- In the Flemish context
  - "Digisprong" (digi-leap) for compulsory education
  - Relaunch plans for higher education
  - Previous initiatives of the Flemish Education Council (incl. recommendation on digital learning)
- In the Latvian context
  - National Development Plan of Latvia for 2021-2024
  - OESO Skills Strategy Implementation Guidance in Latvia & Going Digital Latvia
  - European recovery plans

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

3. Digital learning in higher education

- Definition digital learning
  - *Digital learning is 'any form of learning that is accompanied or supported by technology'. In this sense, digital learning is 'essentially not something different from 'normal' learning, it is part of it'.*
  - Blended, distance, and hybrid learning
  - Continuum of digitalisation possibilities
- Recent technological developments
  - Technology vs. educational technology
  - Typologies of educational technology

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

4. Opportunities of digitalisation in HE

- For learning and teaching
  - Designing quality education
  - Promoting student learning
  - Motivate and connect with the world of students
  - Contribute to inclusion
  - Collaboration and exchange between teachers

- For the organisation of HE
  - Preparing students for digital society
  - Reaching more and more diverse students
  - Contributing to innovation in HE
  - Strengthening participation of teachers and students
  - Administrative support via digital platforms

4. Challenges of digitalisation in HE (1)

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

- For learning and teaching
  - Education-driven instead of technology-driven
  - Importance of teaching method next to educational technology
  - No 'one-size-fits-all' approach
  - Particular challenges for certain learning objectives/students/contexts
  - Attention for digital inclusion
  - Digital competences of teachers and students
  - Positive attitude of teachers and students to digitalisation
  - Impact on assessment

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

4. Challenges of digitalisation in HE (2)

- For the organisation of HE
  - Increasing workload for teachers
  - Need for professionalisation of teachers
  - Attention needed for privacy, security and reuse of material
  - Impact on the broader organisation of HE
  - Relation to other major issues, such as climate
  - Continuing education and open education

4. Essential preconditions for digitalisation in HE

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

- For learning and teaching
  - Added value via embedding in the learning environment
  - Connection to learning objectives, students and context

- For the organisation of HE
  - Modernising the infrastructure
  - Adequate funding
  - Professionalisation of teachers/staff
  - Developing students' digital competences
  - Importance of support functions in and outside institutions
  - Developing and conveying a vision in HEI
  - Embedding in quality assurance
  - Health aspects

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

5. Next step

- Conduct a needs analysis
- From the perspective of ‘change management’
- Based on the model of Laurillard (2015) for a systemic analysis of innovation in higher education
  - Drivers
  - Enablers
- Further concretised into themes and linked to questions for various actors in the field of HE