HoTEL WP4 –Exploratorium Integrated Report (Annexes)

Author(s)

Daniel Burgos (UNIR)
Aurora Carrasco (UNIR)
Andreas Meiszner (ELIG)
Elmar Husmann (ELIG)
Claudia Didjurgeit (ELIG)
Anthony F. Camilleri (EFQUEL)
Fabio Nascimbeni (MENON)

SEVENTH FRAMEWORK PROGRAMME

HoTEL Holistic Approach to Technology Enhanced Learning

Innovators – Opinions – Perspectives

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. Annex 1 – UNIR. Self-Assessment Reports (Form A)

1.1 Case 1. A4Learning

1st Assessment Questionnaire

to be filled in by investigator				
Ref:	A-ww-x-y-zz[1]	**Lab:**		
Innovation:				
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**		
sheet protocol				
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 3. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.			
Sheet completed by:	Luis de-la-Fuente-Valentín, Universidad Internacional de La Rioja			
Date Completed:	18/02/14	**Contact email:**	luis.delafuente@unir.net	
description of the innovation				
Name:	*A4Learning*			
Purpose:	*Provide feedback to students shaped as a visual representation of a estimation of their grade in a given course. The estimation is achieved by comparing the student with former ones, from previous courses.*			
Stage of Development:	Research Project			
Description				

A4Learning uses information captured from learning scenarios - that is, datasets containing event logs – and calculates the similarity among students. Such calculation takes several forms such as session-based, profile-based, or just raw events processing. Also, A4Learning uses several similarity metrics: eucliedean, pearson, bray-curtis, etc.

Then, information visualization techniques are used to represent the information about similarity and relate similarity with obtained grades. The visualization sends the following message to the learner: "students whose activity were similar to yours, got the following grade at the end of the course". The visualization can be integrated

---

[1] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

in several learning platforms such as Moodle or Sakai, and also can work as a standalone tool.

The learners benefits from the visualization by increasing their awareness in the course. That is, they can decide if their (estimated) grade matches their expectations, so they will be able to modify their attitude towards the course according to their needs.

value proposition

Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* • Universities • Any other educational institutions • Corporate training •

Value Propositions

Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)

Institutions running A4Learning will have a method to motivate learners by providing them with awareness and letting them know if they are working according the course expectations. Self-reflection will empower learning benefits and will also enhance the satisfaction of the learners and the perceived self-efficacy. As a result, students provided with A4Learning will get a more satisfying learning experience and this fact will make a difference on the students' attitude towards the course, because the students will know why they are working for.

Teachers will perceive a clear benefit form A4Learning. Firstly, students will automatically get relevant feedback and this fact will encourage them to be more autonomous learners, less dependent on the teacher. Teachers will be therefore freed from tuition tasks, and they will be able to devote their time to other time consuming teaching tasks. Secondly, teacher will have tools to understand learners' progress and achievements. As a result, teachers will be able to better encourage students and motivate them to achieve learning goals.

Institutions running A4Learning will send a clear message to the learners: "this institution innovates for the benefit of the learner". This recognizes the institution be recognized as a learning innovator, that is, an institution that lead the innovation process, participate on learning research and contribute to the state of the art with the most powerful solutions. The institution trademark will get a clear benefit from that.

Prior Art

What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words)

Prediction of behavioural patterns is a well suited research field in education [1].

On this way, it can be used for the early identification of students at risk and grade prediction, which is rarely targeted at students and instead is teacher-oriented [2], at schools and universities, for example Grade estimation is usually addressed by the 'academic analytics' research field [3] with many examples in the literature. For instance, reference [4] presents an early warning system for educators who make use of data from the LMS; reference [5] discusses the relationship between LMSs' usage patterns and students' motivation; and reference [6] analyses the correlation involvement on a course and obtained grade.

A different approach is the use of awareness systems to provide students with information that enables self-assessment of learning efforts or helps them taking decisions for their learning. For example, the work presented at [7] supports resource-abundance for self-regulated learners. Another example presents visualization methods to analyse trending data in the learning context [8]. As presented at [9], the provision of awareness causes an impact on student's habits.

A4Learning focuses on the awareness provision, trying to detect behavioural patterns in order to inform students and let them self-assess their progress.

[1]   C. Nyce and API CPCU. "Predictive Analytics White Paper." *American Institute for CPCU/Insurance Institute of America.* 2007.

[2]   M. Cocea, and W. Stephan. "Log file analysis for disengagement detection in e-Learning environments." *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 19, no. 4, 2009. pp. 341-385.

[3]   J.P. Campbell, P.B. DeBlois, and D.G. Oblinger. "Academic analytics: A new tool for a new era." *Educause Review* 42, no. 4 2007.

[4]   L.P. Macfadyen, and S. Dawson. "Mining LMS data to develop an "early warning system" for educators: A proof of concept." *Computers & Education* 54, no. 2. 2010. pp. 588-599.

[5]   M. Munoz-Organero, P. J. Munoz-Merino, and C. Delgado Kloos. "Student behavior and interaction patterns with an LMS as motivation predictors in E-learning settings." *IEEE Transactions on Education,* 53, no. 3. 2010. pp. 463-470.

[6]   V.A. Romero-Zaldivar, A. Pardo, D. Burgos, and C. Delgado Kloos. "Monitoring student progress using virtual appliances: A case study." *Computers & Education* 58, no. 4. 2012. pp.1058-1067.

[7]   M. Wang, J. Peng, B. Cheng, H. Zhou, and J. Liu. "Knowledge Visualization for Self-Regulated Learning." *Educational Technology & Society* 14, no. 3. 2011. pp. 28-42.

[8]   S. Govaerts, K. Verbert, E. Duval, and A. Pardo. "The student activity meter for awareness and self-reflection." In *CHI'12 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, ACM, 2012. pp. 869-884.

[9]   J.L. Santos, K. Verbert, S. Govaerts, and E. Duval. "Addressing learner issues with StepUp!: an Evaluation." In *Proceedings of the Third International Conference on Learning Analytics and Knowledge*. ACM, 2013. pp. 14-22

Key Messages

What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each)

- Increase the learners' motivation and awareness. With the information that A4Learning provides to the students, they will know the results of their efforts, and therefore they will be more motivate to do the proposed activities.

- Guide learners towards a more effective learning, increasing satisfaction. Learners will know what activities are more fruitful for their learning and their success in the course. Therefore, they will work more focused on effective tasks.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

- Provide teachers with a powerful tool to monitor students achievements, anticipate risks and verify students' progress

Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words)   *Incorporate visual analytics techniques as a grade estimation method and is shaped as an awareness tool, because it is mainly aimed at students. Grade estimation by explicitly and visually compare students among themselves is a quite understandable method that increases effectiveness of this approach.*

Product Demonstration	*Please provide instructions on how to view a demonstration of the product/service being evaluated.* *The service is in a development stage and no public demonstration has been published yet. The researchers are awaiting for acceptance on scientific journals and such publication will trigger the creation of a public demo.*
Product Literature	Ref #1: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* Ref #2: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* ….

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Validate the tool as a score estimator. That is, obtain an objective proof of functionality.	Average error committed in estimations.
	Get proofs of students satisfaction in pilot programs.	Positive comments on perceived usefulness on pilot programs
	Acceptance by teachers	Positive comments on perceived usefulness on pilot programs

Mid-Term (18 months)	Institutions interested on real tests	Schedule of Pilot programs in real settings
	Test the system in different learning environments	More datasets collected

analysis
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above***   (max. 20 words each)

Strengths	Weaknesses
  • Novelty. The innovation presents a tool with some completely new characteristics that will capture the attention of stakeholders. • Visual approach, for easier understanding • Encourage self-reflection, and therefore will capture the attention of stakeholders • Alive research area, will empower relations of the adopting institution with the research field •	 • Hard to understand. Prior tests have show that users may require a training session • Data collection required. It may result in privacy issues. • Require historic records. That is, one or more tracked courses are required before providing the students with authentic feedback
Opportunities	Threats
  • Capture the attention of the Learning Analytics and visual analytics communities • Increase the value of the adopter trademark, by showing a clear interest on meaningful innovation towards	 • Analytics world is moving fast, other similar solutions may appear • Privacy issues my hinder the adoption

better learning • Improve the state of the art with unique solutions. • Increase students satisfaction	• Provided feedback might not be useful in all scenarios.

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

A4Learning has recently gone through a usability validation process, including reviews by experts in education and development from different perspectives. As a result, a redesign of the visual approach has been planned. Therefore, the first short-term goal of A4Learning is to develop the proposed changes.

The main risk for this short-term redesign is the software library in use. That is, the library might not be able to provide the planned visual representations, so the developers might be forced to move to a different library. This would result in a significative delay in the development.

As a benchmark, the usability validation process will be repeated in order to determine to what extend we were able to solve the A4Learning usability flaws.

Next, A4Learning will require its integration in the educational software used by the piloting institution. Since A4Learning is a web tool that can be offered as a service in the cloud, integration with different LMS is possible. First, it is planned to integrate the A4learning functionality with Sakai, for the development of pilot programs at UNIR. This will require a method to share the information captured by the LMS, and to provide the LMS with the visualizations created by A4Learning, without disturbing the students from their learning tasks.

To risks appear here:

First, the visual representation proposed by A4Learning should find a proper place within the LMS look & feel. This is not an obvious task, because the user dashboard might not fit with the A4Learning design principles. This is a soft risk, that can be solved with a lighter integration between systems.

Second, the used LMS might not be able to offer the required data for the analysis. In such case, alternatives should be found, such as increase the LMS tracking capabilities or develop new monitoring strategies.

The benchmark that will validate the success of this development is the validation by end users. This is planned in the context of the hotel innovation laboratories.

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do

you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

At the current state of the tool, the focus is more on dissemination rather on exploitation. That is, I plan to publish A4Learning on scientific impact-factor journals and to disseminate this tool on conferences, but real exploitation is not planned within the next 6 months.

pricing strategy

Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The same response as avobe.

1.2 Case 2. All-on-top

1st Assessment Questionnaire

You will find below the first assessment questionnaire that all innovators have to fill in and send back to their Lab, before the indicated deadline in the calendar.

This Questionnaire will be analysed by a panel of experts, which will provide back a first set of indications and advice, in order to help you improve your innovation during this first implementation period.

to be filled in by investigator			

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Ref:	A-ww-x-y-zz[2]	Lab:	
Innovation:	All-on-top		
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	
sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 3. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.		
Sheet completed by:	Grisolía, Carina Giorgis, Nidia		
Date Completed:	14/02/2014	**Contact email:**	ngiorgis@gmail.com
description of the innovation			
Name:	All-on-top		
Purpose:	Simple, easy to implement, flexible, technology-enhanced ELearning **instructional design framework** that takes into account people´s natural learning process so learning outcomes are easily and effectively achieved by learners by think critically and creatively, make decisions, manage conflict, and work collaboratively.		
Stage of Development:	Initial – Idea		

---

[2] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Description			
Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words)	All-on-top proposal provides an innovative elearning instructional design framework that takes into account people´s natural learning process so learning outcomes are easily and effectively achieved by learners. This framework is simple to understand, easy to implement and flexible enough to fit most learners' needs through technology-enhanced learning. The definition of learning areas such as: discovery, fun, make sure, growth, link… are an invitation to all kind of learners to take ownership of their learning, think critically and creatively, process information, make decisions, manage conflict, and work collaboratively. It offers an invaluable opportunity to lead elearning professionals through a new/innovative learning framework that allows them to understand current mistakes and (re)think practices which are being used extensively in elearning environments. It also offers an opportunity to analyze how to use emerging technologies for elearning as an added value. The need of more effective, non-traditional elearning practices and the effective use of resources in order to satisfy educational access requirements and better learning processes is urgently claiming for changes. Going through our proposed instructional design learners (individually and as a group) and tutors/experts alike are expected to "walk along hand in hand" in order to (re)create social knowledge and acquire the skills needed to successfully interact in the 21st society.		
value proposition			
Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* ● Elearning Instructional Designers ● Elearning Programme Coordinators ● Professionals involved in elearning.		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

Value Propositions			
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)	Everybody learns things differently, so we created an instructional design for elearning courses to **enable learners to choose their learning path** and to learn in a flexible way, resembling what happens in real life. With learners 3.0 we are in need of a push for creativeness presenting learners with varied opportunities, innovative challenges and new responsibilities in the process of learning at a distance.		
	We would like to prepare learners to work with almost anybody, anytime, everywhere. We are at the right moment since emerging technologies are giving way to innovative work. Moreover, we all know that the knowledge society we are part of is claiming for mobility to (re)configure and (re)contextualize learning environments. The (re)skills learners will (co)construct and/or (co)create while working along the course will give them a competitive advantage at the time of designing their own work in a rather uncertain future.		
Prior Art			
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words)	Based on Newton's quote: "If I have seen further it is by standing on the shoulders of giants." this innovation is intended to improve upon already existing instructional design models such as: Dick and Carey Model which considers instruction as an entire interrelated system (context, content, learning and instruction). The ADDIE model is traditionally used by instructional designers and training developers. It consists of five phases—Analysis, Design, Development, Implementation, and Evaluation, focused mainly on the design process. One of the		

	weakness of this model that All-on-top aims to strength is "detailed processes become so set that creativity becomes a nuisance" (as originally shared by InstructionalDesign.org.) Gagne Model offers a nine-step process that detailed each element required for effective learning. It offers a valuable detailed checklist musts for All-on-top design framework. The ASSURE Model draws on constructivism and emphasizes learners' styles and interaction to build on previous knowledge. ASSURE is based on Gagne Model and inspire the All-on-top design framework. All-on-top will take into account the best of other models and organize people´s natural learning process so learning outcomes are easily and effectively achieved by learners through technology-enhanced learning. The definition of learning areas such as: discovery, fun, make sure, growth, link… are an invitation to all kind of learners to take ownership of their learning, Dick, W., & Carey, L. (1996). *The systematic design of instruction*. 4th ed. New York, NY: Harper Collin		
Key Messages			
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each) ● ● ● ● ●	Efficiency: Learning outcomes are easily and effectively achieved by learners. Teaching strategies (re)definition as an added value. Openness: Sharing and collaboration of resources, ideas and "Know how" for the elearning instructional design framework proposed. Quality: Learners satisfaction and proficiency in their working places and roles in society. Productivity: Learners readiness to apply knowledge and skills in new scenarios and to produce new ideas for a better living. Innovation: Innovative eLearning		

	instructional design framework that resembles the way learners learn in everyday life.		
Innovative Element			
Describe the main innovative element – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words)	Instructional design framework for creating eLearning courses in which learners (un)learn on how to learn. Everybody learns things differently, so we created an instructional design for eLearning courses to enable learners to choose their learning path and to learn in a flexible way, resembling what happens in real life. Our aim is designing and implementing eLearning courses in which learners, through a process of skill (re)building all along the course by taking ownership of their learning, think critically and creatively, process information, make decisions, manage conflict, and work collaboratively.		
Product Demonstration			
Product Literature			
Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service			
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**	
Short-Term (6 months)	Implement the All-on-top design in a UNIR course	positive assessment	
	Improve the All-on-top design based on feedback given during implementation phase	improved design	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efguel   AtoS   ELIG.org

Mid-Term (18 months)	Design All-on-top virtual training course for instructional designers	Designed All-on-top virtual training course	
	Implement All-on-top virtual course	Implemented All-on-top virtual training course	
	Run All-on-top virtual course	Positive feedback	
analysis			
*Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above*** *(max. 20 words each)*			
Strengths	Weaknesses	internal	
● All-on-top responds to the natural way learners learn in everyday life ● It is flexible	● Hidden and passive resistance on part of the community involved in the Lab ●		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

allowing instructional designers to be creative ● It could be used in any LMS and/or instructional environment ● It is low cost (just training cost)	● ● ●		
Opportunities	**Threats**	external	
● All-on-top could be offered as a service/product ● It could be used as a turning point in Instructional Design Methodology (technology-enhanced learning) ●	● All-on-top is not fully understood by target audience (resistance to change and innovation) ● It might be a time consuming activity		

development plans

Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

Goals:
Implement the All-on-top design in a UNIR course
Improve the All-on-top design based on feedback given during implementation phase

Actions:
Select a course and group of participants
Select a teacher
Work in cooperation with the teacher to implement the course using All-on-top Instructional Design
Work in team with the teach in order to run the course designed using All-on-top
Assessment should be at the beginning, during and after the course is served.
Analyze the assessment results and improve All-on-top Design accordingly.

Barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks.

Teacher is not involved.
Teacher does not understand All-on-top
Participants are not involved.
Participants don't understand All-on-top
Time frame might be inadequate for running the course or doesn't fit the UNIR calendar.
Not enough Authorities Support (Faculty)

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

No marketing & promotion activities in the next 6 months.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

pricing strategy
Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.   No pricing strategy in the next 6 months.

1.3 Case 3. TOY

1st A

You will find below the first assessment questionnaire that all innovators have to fill in and send back to their Lab, before the indicated deadline in the calendar.

This Questionnaire will be analysed by a panel of experts, which will provide back a first set of indications and advice, in order to help you improve your innovation during this first implementation period.

ssessment Questionnaire

to be filled in by investigator				
Ref:	A-ww-x-y-zz[3]	**Lab:**	Higher learning innovation lab	
Innovation:	**TOY - Virtual 3D school**			
Date Received:	04/02/14	**Verified by:**	Pasi Mattila, Jana Krajnakova Daniel Burgos, Solene Limpalaer	
sheet protocol				
Notes	4.	All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.		
	5.	The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in		

---

[3] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MEN•N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

| | | the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. |
| | 6. | All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator. |

| **Sheet completed by:** | Pasi Mattila, Finpeda Ltd., Hintantie 18, 90500 Oulu, Finland | | |
| **Date Completed:** | 14/04/14 | **Contact email:** | pasi.mattila@finpeda.fi |

description of the innovation	
Name:	*TOY Virtual school*
Purpose:	*What is the innovation for? (max. 40 words)* Virtual learning environments supports distance learning, global learning communities and interactions among learners
Stage of Development:	Pilot / Prototype

Description
Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words)

Virtual worlds will soon be a reality in learning and living. Students have virtual access to everything else except the most important thing: their school. In the future, we will be able to move between different worlds, virtual spaces, using our electronic identities, avatars. These spaces can be utilized in learning and teaching for example in language learning purposes. The aim is to create 3D virtual learning environments for students and teachers. The environment is an extension of the school and a safe place to learn when the time comes to make the transition from the traditional school into a virtual space. The realXtend virtual environment platform can provide a learning area that is the model of the future learning environments, where students use their own scripts or tools for working in a 3D environment or for building their own virtual worlds. This type of open development closely follows the developments of the 3D Internet, which can lead to a more immersive use of 3D virtual environments and mobile services. The ideology is applicable in new school buildings, schools to be renovated and during the planning process. It is also possible to only change the operational culture. The objective is to offer solutions for the need to develop the role of teachers, leadership, support services, updating training, educational technology, the building of schools and the development of the school network. If we only develop one sector, the entity remains the same. The core ideas relate to the development of learning environments, furnishing solutions and the reform of the operational culture so that it creates a sense of community (social responsibility) and builds a community learning centre (physical institute - virtual global education and learning technologies). Both traditional and virtual learning areas are future learning environments.

value proposition	
Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* • Schools

	• Teachers and Students • Vocational and higher educational institutions • Partner companies e.g. architects or furniture manufactures

Value Propositions
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)
3D virtual school: • supports expand global learning communities and interactions among learners
• promotes relevant, authentic learning through project inquiry-, and game-based educational programs
• provides real and virtual architectural and interior designs

Prior Art
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words) Virtual immersive learning environment apply all educational levels and target groups, but key areas are: 1) Social communication environment e.g. language learning (higher or vocational education) 2) School architecture and infrastructure (new school buildings or renovations and transformation of indoor and outdoor learning environments) This replicate already existing distance learning technologies (e.g. Skype, Adobe connect Pro) used mainly in language learning. Simulations 3D learning and training environment offer the potential for authentic simulations. In architectural design of spaces, we can create a technology when the users can give a feedback through the planning process.

Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each) • Collaboration platform • Multi-users • Participatory planning • Personalized learning solutions • Higher motivation through gamification

Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words) TOY immersive learning environment (3D virtual school) is powered by realXtend. We have designed, developed and researched a range of extensible learning solutions based on the combination of ´smart active classroom´ physical world components, immersive activities and learning solutions. Components are integrated into innovative physical learning spaces and virtual immersive learning environments in order to facilitate structuring and supporting collaborative learning activities. Multiuser platform allows for the interested groups of people to have their meetings and to do their activities like in real life.

Product Demonstration	*Please provide instructions on how to view a demonstration of the product/service being evaluated.* RealXtend open-source technology [www.realxtend.org] Meshmoon Education Program [www.meshmoon.com/meshmoon/mep]
Product Literature	Ref #1: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* Ref #2: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* File 1 "Future learning environment (TOY)" File 2 "3D virtual school – leaflet"

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Launch of project (week 15, 2014)	done
	Press release and information shared through colleagues and global contacts	
	Finalized the layout and add the amphitheatre place and have webinars in the environment	
	Develop new students avatars, especially for children (boy + girl)	
	Development of further usability and Development of new functionalities	
Mid-Term (18	User management system, to have more projects for further technology development	

months)	Development of user document libraries, possibility to utilized PowerPoint slides, Word documents and Excel sheets	
	Possibility to introduce the life video or shared desktop	

Analysis
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above (max. 20 words each)

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Easy to share - Architectural projects – participatory planning - New applications and solutions - Distance education - Green school	- Lack of developer and user communities - Technology barrier / gap between generations - Adult users - Current user interface - Infrastructure
Opportunities	Threats
- Web user interface - Training programs and support services - Multidisciplinary work - Technology boundaries, connection with other technologies - Real-life behaviour	- Technology is still under development - Not enough new projects - Costly based developmental work - Disagreement among developers - How to attract and motivate young users

development plans
Product/service development strategy
Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words. The most important from the point of view of short-term strategy, is to find out a key-person to steer for the further development work as well as to develop the support services. It is also very important to create training and educational programmes which could be offered to potential customers as soon as possible. Other part of R&D strategy should focus on testing the applications with the pilot groups.
marketing & promotion strategy
Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success? Max. 500 words. During the week 15th 2014, the 3D virtual school was launched. This is going to be followed by press release (in journal specialized for education) as well as our biggest partners will be contacted by personal e-mails. The web site of company will be updated. For spreading information about our product, we will use all your current networks. The 3D virtual school is closely connected with MEP release. We are planning to create marketing material where also the information about the pricing will be given. Furthermore, will develop the selling strategy and start with the evaluation of potential market.
pricing strategy
Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words. RealXtend is open source technology and the educational institution after signing; they can have MEP at no cost. If course or teacher would like to have a private space, it could be provided at price 29.90 Euros/per month. Content and tools, remote controller cost 18.90 Euros/ per month, 3D library of objects is considered for 18.90 Euro/per month. However, if everything is taken together, the price is reduced to 50 Euros per month. According to our information for majority of University courses, this does not represent a big amount of money for private learning space. Prices for support services and trainings are still under development. It is possible on request based to develop tailor-made project or special project libraries.

1.4   Case 3. iLIME

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

1

s

t

You will find below the first assessment questionnaire that all innovators have to fill in and send back to their Lab, before the indicated deadline in the calendar.

This Questionnaire will be analysed by a panel of experts, which will provide back a first set of indications and advice, in order to help you improve your innovation during this first implementation period.

A

ssessment Questionnaire

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref: A-ww-x-y-zz[4]	**Lab:**	iLIME	
Innovation:	**iLIME recommender model and software syste,.**		
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	
sheet protocol			
Notes	7. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 8. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 9. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.		
Sheet completed by:	Alberto Corbi Bellot, UNIR		
Date Completed:	18/03/14	**Contact email:**	alberto.corbi@unir.net
description of the innovation			
Name:	*LIME*		
Purpose:	*Development of a recommendation system for learning based on students' interaction outputs, within a learning management system and in social networks*		
Stage of Development:	Pilot		
Description			
The main aim of the iLIME project is to elaborate and implement an itinerary recommendation system for teachers. The LIME eLearning model has been designed for personalized learning, with special focus on the combination of formal and informal settings in a combined paradigm. In doing so, it copes with the artificial difference between Learning Management Systems and specific, restricted social networks which complement the user formal activity with informal interaction. iLIME			

---

[4] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

is the software implementation of the LIME model, which runs as an LTI tool.

value proposition

Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* • Universities • Academic institutions • Mid term schools

Value Propositions

Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)

Ability for a teacher to delegate recommendations and suggestions on a semi-automated system.

Students are able to receive constant recommendations that help them deepen in their academic path.

Guide students thanks to teacher preconfigured templates, even without teacher direct intervention.

Prior Art

There exist a few recommender systems available in prototype or research state based on comparative and content filtering techniques. None of them works side by side with LMS systems as iLIME does.

Key Messages

- Deliver academic recommendations to students in a automated fashion.

- Generate rules and recommendations based pedagogic categories, formal an informal activities.

- Set parameters and their weights in order to reproduce as accurately as possible the learning scenario.

Innovative Element

The main source of innovation is the technical implementation of the LIME model: iLIME. As a piece of software and computer product, iLIME acts as a middleware between any given LMS and the users (students, teachers, etc.) in such a way it is capable of producing recommendations independently of the adopted LMS. In order

to do that, it's necessary to develop and API layer to connect each learning management systems like Sakai to the iLIME middleware. On the other hand, the user interface has been designed to present an intuitive, clean and ready to use configuration screen by the expert/teacher/group manager. A special emphasis has been placed in the use of open and multiplatform technologies, such as HTML5 and LTI.

Product Demonstration	*A demonstration is currently running on tel.unir.net:8080/portal.*
Product Literature	International Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Multimedia, Vol. 2, No 2. L.I.M.E. A recommendation model for informal and formal learning, engaged. Daniel Burgos UNIR Research, International University of La Rioja. Spain

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Install LMS on which to build	LMS deployment
	Configure LTI interface	Small LTI development
	Install backend technology	Backend deployment
Mid-Term (18 months)	Build LIME configuration console	Configuration console deployment
	Collect inputs data on an LMS	Inputs collector script for Sakai
	Deliver LIME recommendations	Recommender screen on student sessions
analysis		

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above***

(max. 20 words each)

Strengths	Weaknesses

• LTI standard • Web technologies • LTI Settings API • Oauth authentication •	• Javascript dependance • CORS (Same origin URL) • • •
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Stablish framework for recommender systems • Deliver recommender system fully independent of LMS • • •	• Get beat by 3rd party more stablished and mature solutions • • • •

development plans
Product/service development strategy
Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words. In the next 6 months we plan to develop script software to monitor user actions and activities in the most common LMS. The main barrier to this goal is the wide range of LMS systems available. It's necessary to study each one carefully in order to devise webservices and interfaces. The most expected risk in this type of processes is losing oneself working in so many technologies. We also plan to deploy a prototype already allowing teachers to parameterize the LIME model and deliver recommendations to students.
marketing & promotion strategy
Schedule group sessions (both internal and external) to show and promote the model and the software being build around it.
pricing strategy
There are no short-terms plans for pricing our project outcomes.

1.5   Case 4. KnowEd

Xxx

1.6   Case 5. VirtualWorlds

1st Assessment Questionnaire

> You will find below the first assessment questionnaire that all innovators have to fill in and send back to their Lab, before the indicated deadline in the calendar.
>
> This Questionnaire will be analysed by a panel of experts, which will provide back a first set of indications and advice, in order to help you improve your innovation during this first implementation period.

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-ww-x-y-zz[5]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:			
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	
sheet protocol			
Notes	10. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 11. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 12. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.		
Sheet completed by:	Sarah Gretton, University of Leicester		
Date Completed:	17/03/2014	**Contact email:**	sng8@le.ac.uk
description of the innovation			
Name:	Virtual Genetic Screening Laboratory		
Purpose:	The virtual genetics laboratory provides experience of the process of performing types three genetic analysis. The use of the virtual world environment allows students apply their theoretical knowledge to make decisions at key stages of the process, and observe animations of the molecular changes involved, in context of the particular genetic test.		
Stage of Development:	Prototype		

---

[5] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MEN◦N   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Description

This activity uses a virtual world environment to provide undergraduate science students with an understanding of the purpose, procedures and possibilities within a genetic testing laboratory.

The activity is based on a problem based learning scenario. For this 3 hour workshop, students are provided with three genetic disease scenarios (family history and symptoms) and details of three analytical techniques. By researching each of disease scenarios students are able to determine the genetic condition described, and using this knowledge, select the appropriate genetic technique to undertake in the virtual genetics laboratory. Students are encouraged to undertake this research in groups.

value proposition	
Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* • Educators of undergraduate science students • Educators of undergraduate Medical students • Educators of college (16-18 year old) Science students

Value Propositions

Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)

This experience of encountering virtual laboratory based genetics techniques will be valuable to students who do not encounter these genetic techniques in laboratory programme teaching, or to reinforce understanding of the techniques for students who have experienced these techniques. The use of the virtual world allows student "to use" expensive specialised equipment without fear of mistakes, which reinforces skills and builds confidence.

It also places the "research question" in context an important element of problem-based learning. The virtual environment provides instant feedback, something that is limited in the "real world" by the number of teachers present. It also has the flexibility to provide tailored support from a tutor also using the virtual world.

Finally it offers the advantage of having no physical space limitations; the laboratory and benches can easily be copied and expanded to accommodate the number students on the programme.

Prior Art

What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words)

The virtual genetics laboratory (with three types of genetic screening techniques) already existed within the Second life® virtual world as part of a larger research project. The project team made some small alterations to the laboratory to introduce an enquiry based element to the activity and allowed it be used with the lab script written for the Natural Sciences programme (see attached document).

Details of the original research project can be found here:

http://www2.le.ac.uk/projects/swift

Key Messages

What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each)

- The lab can be used repeatedly to build skills and confidence with no additional expense.

- The virtual genetics lab offers the advantage of having no physical space limitations.
- Students have the opportunity to test their ideas without the "fear of failure".

- Real world time constraints in the are removed

Innovative Element

Describe the main innovative element – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words)

This initiative allows students who don't have access to these techniques and equipment in a physical genetics laboratory to experience them in

It also places the "research question" in context an important element of problem-based learning. The virtual environment provides instant feedback, something that is limited in the "real world" by the number of teachers present.

Product Demonstration	See details in other attachment - PA2023_LSII_Fac_Sec3_Term2_y1213_v01- p61 -68 please note this is the staff copy which includes model answers should not be publically disseminated

Product Literature	PA2023_LSII_Fac_Sec3_Term2_y1213_ v01 p61 -68

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	We would like assistance in the promotion of the use this resource to other further and higher education institutions	Use of the lab by other institutions
Mid-Term (18 months)	Investigation of the possibility of adapting the resource for use in a more open platform such as Open Sim	Construction of the key aspects of the lab in an open platform virtual world

analysis
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above (max. 20 words each)

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Will allow other users to utilise the lab • Students are able to explore the lab without tutor assistance and re-visit it in	• Until is it moved to another platform it can only be utilised by those with access to Second life®.

their own time • Building the lab in open platform virtual world would help to "future proof" the innovation from changes in format in Second life®	• The lab is currently limited in the tests that can be carried out and the only way to adapt the functionality is by working with the team that initiated the project.
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Allow students who don't have access to Real life laboratories the opportunity to appreciate the testing techniques.	• Changes in the way structure and functionality of Second life®. • Lack of appeal of virtual worlds

development plans
Product/service development strategy
Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.   At the moment our R&D strategdy is limited by the end of the funding of our project
marketing & promotion strategy
Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.   Currently we don't have a marketing/ promotion strategy apart from our presence in Second Life and
pricing strategy
Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.   We don't have a pricing strategy- currently the virtual lab is open to anyone who may wish to use it when our teaching isn't taking place.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

2. Annex 2 – UNIR. Innovation Initial Review Sheet (Form B)

2.1 Case 1. A4Learning

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-01-1-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	A4Learning		
Date Received:	27/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR		
Date Completed:	31 /05/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

A4 learning project combines data mining techniques and information visualization in order to help students to think about their own performance.

A4Learning aims to develop a wide range of tools for capturing, analysing and visualization from learning scenarios,

which are used to represent information about similarity and relate similarity with obtained grades. Grade estimation by explicitly and visually comparison among students is a quite understandable method that increases effectiveness of this approach.

Visualization benefits learners by increasing their awareness in the course, as they will be able to modify their attitude towards the course according to previous expectations and needs.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Prediction of behavioural patterns is a well-suited research field in education, but A4 Learning focuses on the awareness provision, trying to detect behavioural patterns in order to inform students and let them self-assess their progress.

This method can motivate learners by providing them with awareness, because automatically get relevant feedback of their own performance. Self-reflections will empower learning benefits and, in consequence, more satisfying learning experience because the students will know why they are working for.

Teachers will perceive a clear benefit too. This method provides a powerful tool to monitor students´ achievements, and it´s possible to anticipate risks and verify student´s progress. As A4learning makes student less dependent on the teachers, more autonomous learners, teachers can devote their time to other consuming teaching tasks.

Finally, Institution running A4 Learning will be recognized as a learning innovator.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The focus is on divulgation rather on exploitation. The investigator plans to publish A4learning on scientific impact-factor journals and to disseminate this tool on conferences, but real exploitation is not planned within next 6 months.

As A4Learning is a web tool that can be offered as a service in the cloud, integration with different LMS is possible. First it is planned to integrate it with Sakai, for the development of pilot programs at UNIR. The benchmark that will validate the success of this tool is the validation by end users.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The service is in a development stage and no public demonstration has been published yet. A4Learnign has recently gone through a usability validation progress including reviews by experts in education and development. As the result, redesign of the visual approach has been planned. The main risk for this short-term redesign is the software library in use. If the library might not be able to provide the planned visual representation, the developers might be forces to move to a different library. This would result in a significant delay in the development.* *Besides historic records and data collection are required before providing students with authentic feedback. The calculation of similarity among students is achieved by comparing the student with former ones, form previous courses. Such calculation takes several forms such as session-based, profile-based or just raw events processing.* *The visualization can be integrated in platforms such as Moodle or SAKAI, and also can work as a standalone tools. The method is hard to understand. Prior tests have show that users may require a training session.*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score:	*3*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Strategic objectives are given and success indicator are specified.* *Apart from the technical difficulties the project should be over, the main challenges are the validation of the tool as a score estimator at short term and the validation of end users at mid term.* *In the project is not specified in which type of course the tool will be implemented and how will be composed the pilot groups. It´s difficult evaluate the acceptance by teachers and students´ satisfaction in pilot programs.*

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *More information about technical difficulties is needed, in particular, if the redesign software library has been solved, so, as mention the investigator it could result in a significant delay in the development.* *Also another key aspect, data collection and historic records that may result in privacy issues. More information is needed about if Institutions selected for pilot groups are ready for collaboration at this point.*		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**
Efficiency	7	
Clarity-of-concept	5	
Difficulty to Introduce	3	28/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3	
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-01-2-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	A4Learning		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja		
Date Completed:	29/06/14	**Contact email:**	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
The proposal serves to capture information from learning scenarios, this information can be alayzed and displayed using visualization techniques. This feature is not included in most of the LMS platforms, so it can be interesting. This tool can bring benefits to students and teachers. *The author says that can serve to improve the students learning process being usseful for get an automatic feedback, the teachers can do analysis of the student results so fast.*		

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

Most of LMS platforms do not contain a tool like the proposed; if the teacher wants to use a similar tool he will have to use an external system. The use of an external system may increase costs, increases the time spent performing the analysis and send the information to students. I think that the tool can be an advantage over current systems, especially if the tool can be integrated in most popular LMS.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

The key messages clearly present the project highlights. The messages are very suitable and include an acceptable detail level.

The key messages Could be slightly improved including more information about the monitoring capabilities of the tools for example the analysis types or graphics View. It is also important to note which LMS will be able to integrate the tool.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
The proposed tool requires reduced costs and it seems that the author has developed the core of the tool, so it probably will be reduced investment. *However missing other parts of the tool to develop but there is no reason to think that causes incidentals.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
The raises objectives are assessable but some objectives are difficult to measure because they are expressed in a relative abstract way, for example: "Acceptance by teachers", "Institutions interested on real tests", "Test the system in different learning environments. *Applying the appropriate scope for each objective probably will be met on time; in general terms seem quite realistic.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
The activities presented in the plan are faithfully adapted to the outlined objectives; within expectations the author provides an adequate level of detail on activities to develop. The author includes a report of potential risks, which is a positive because all projects involve risk and there are more success possibilities if the risks are clearly identified. *The author includes a marketing strategy or plan of development.*		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	
Clarity-of-concept	5	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	31/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-01-3-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**A4LEARNING**		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	CARINA GONZÁLEZ, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA
Date Completed:	06/06/2014	**Contact email:**	CJGONZA@ULL.EDU.ES

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Learning analytics, recommender systems for personalization in learning are a current big problem, which needs more research and applications. Awareness in LMS is still undeveloped or in very early stage, moreover, educational datamining and visualization techniques need more experimentation and development.*		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It is not clear (or explicit), which are the advantages of the current approach, in terms of resource efficiency.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Marketing materials are only associated to academic public (scientific impact-factor journals and conferences).*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It seems very easy to adopt if it is integrated with the educational software (LMS) of institutions.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The objectives are specific, measurable, assessable and realistic, but not clearly time-bound.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Adoption plan is realistic in terms of activities, but time and resources are not clearly presented.*		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**
Efficiency	3	
Clarity-of-concept	3	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	30/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-01-4-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	A4Learning		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven		
Date Completed:	22/05/204	**Contact email:**	Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

There is an innovative part, comparing grades with activity patterns. I miss a definition about what are the key actions considered in this approach.

Not clear if there are user models behind this approach…

It is mention that visualizations are currently problem, however there is a high risk that once that the visualization problem Is addressed, will the currently tracked data of high value for the end user?

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It is an alternative to predictive modelling that relies on the user the cognitive effort to makesense of the data.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *High focus on research. Not sure whether policy makers still attend to conferences and read scientific journals.*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *As it is planned to make the approach compatible with the most popular LMS, I do not see a huge problem on this section.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	3	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *There is a very optimistic view about the approach. How can we know that this tool will be used? One of the main reported problems in the literature is that users actually use tools.*		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel Atos ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The plan looks feasible, however there is no risk management considered*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	3		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	26/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

heere

2.2 Case 2. All-on-top

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-1-1-11	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**All-on-Top**		
Date Received:	28/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR		
Date Completed:	27/05/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

All-on- top is essentially inspired on Assure model, from constructivist paradigm. This model is ideal for those teachers interested in knowing their students´ characteristics before designing the course, because the model allows them to make an objective planning based on students´ background, select strategies, means and resources, design materials, activities and evaluation.

The main innovation of this project, All on top, will be the creation of an instructional design for an eLearning course to enable students to choose their own learning path, to fain a competitive advantage in planning their own work , to learn in a flexible way.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *This tool is focused in a wide range of users: e Learning instructional designers, programme coordinators and professionals involves in elearning.* *All-on-top can be very useful to inexperience teachers can develop a course , activities and materials.* *It is a low cost (just training cost)* *In the future, All-on-top could be offered as a service or product in any LMS and/or instructional environment.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	0	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No marketing & promotion activities in the next 6 months*		

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?

Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
The goal is implement All-on-top design in a UNIR course.
Work in cooperation with the teacher to implement the course using All-on-top instructional design. Analyze the assessment results and improve design accordingly.
R & D strategy is not mentioned.
The stage of development is an initial idea. So more details are necessary to evaluate if this new model could be compatible with the actual system in UNIR, to specify which type of course, if new teachers´ skills are needed and time.

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?

Score:	*1*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
Implementation All-on-top design in a UNIR course is a difficult point to evaluate, because of the investigator doesn´t mention which kind of course and her previous knowledge about UNIR, working system and its educational programme.
In this application form, costs are not mentioned and stages timing of the project are not specified.

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*0*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No equipment and human resources are mentioned.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	0		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	18/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	1		
Quality of Adoption Plan	0		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-2-1-11	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**All-on-top**		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja
Date Completed:	29/06/14

		Contact email:	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

The authors propose a novel system that allow students to reconfigure and recontextualize the learning environments. The authors are supported in that not all students have not the same abilities and preferences and custom learning environments could increase student productivity in many cases.

Some learning environments offer customization posibilities, although these posibilities may be quite limited.

The potential of the proposed project depends on the configuration features that are implemented, these features are not detailed specifically within the proposal, What issues the student will be able to configure in the learning environment?

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
The proposal may improve the use of existing educational environments for some students. The authors assumed that the custom personalization of the learning environment can create more productive students, but really this that increased productivity is not yet validated or is quantified.		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Really the key message highlighted several of the more important features of the proposal. But the messages area relatively abstract, do not provide much detail on the operation of the project, *Manly highlight what can be achieved using the project; I think that customers want to have some idea about how the project plans to achieve the objectives.*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Certainly it is difficult to know the scope of the project, the document does not do much emphasis on detailing the configuration possibilities that students may select, may have configuration possibilities that are really complex to develop, however others may be very simple. If the development is done in a proper way probably the development cost can be very reasonable.		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	6	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Although the scope of the configuration settings is not clearly presented in the proposal, the objectives seem quite adequate and reasonable. The objectives can be verified and most of them also quantified. *The objectives are not only focused on the tool development, also include tests in real environments for get real feedback.* *The time allowed for the completion of the first objective "Implement the All-on-top design in a JOIN course" seems a bit short, or probably All-on-Top have too little scope and therefore it can be implemented quick.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
The plan contains an appropriate set of activities related with the project goals. I think the authors have access to all the resources they need to develop activities satisfactorily. The division of activities seems quite realistic and consistent, although the activity main idea is understandable activity the descriptions are to short description are too short. *The proposal does not include any marketing or promotion plan.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	3		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	27/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-3-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	All on top		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1.	All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.	
	2.	The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.	
	3.	All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.	
	4.	Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.	
	5.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.	
Sheet completed by:	CARINA GONZÁLEZ, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA		
Date Completed:	06/06/2014	**Contact email:**	CJGONZA@ULL.EDU.ES

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The innovation improves the instructional design for e-learning courses, enabling learners to choose their learning path.*		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It isn't described the difference of this approach among the current ones in terms of efficiency.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	1	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Marketing materials are not presented.*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The innovation requires investing time in training of teachers and students.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	*1*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The objectives are unspecific, and not well described in terms of measure, assessment, realism and time-bound.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	*1*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *I think the plan is partially described (¿only a course?).*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	1		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	14/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	1		
Quality of Adoption Plan	1		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-4-1-11	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education lab
Innovation:	**All-on-Top**		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven		
Date Completed:	22/05/204	**Contact email:**	Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

MEN_oN   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Score:	*1*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *I didn't understand if framework meant here a pedagogical or software framework till almost the end of the proposal. They only consider one paper from 1996 in the related work and there are many other frameworks that address partially the same challenges.*		

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	*1*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Same than previous section*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	*1*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No description*		

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?

Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
I don't think that this framework is validated yet. So there is a huge risk that end-users do not want to change their work flows

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?

Score:	3	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
E.g. Improved design: this metric is very ambiguous.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	7	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *If the plan is already arranged, I don't identify any risk.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	1	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	1		
Clarity-of-concept	1		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	18/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3		
Quality of Adoption Plan	7		

2.3 Case 3. TOY

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-1-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**TOY - FINPEDA**		
Date Received:	29/05/14		

sheet protocol		
Notes	1.	All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	2.	The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	3.	All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.
	4.	Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	5.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR	
Date Completed:	28/05/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	*7*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The aim is to create 3D virtual school, for students and teachers. It´s important to develop learning environments for 21st century learners. The objective is to offer solutions for the need to develop the role of teachers leadership, support services, updating training, educational technology, the building of schools and the development of the school network.* *There is a need to develop physical learning environments towards more innovative, immersive and use-friendly spaces in order to meet future challenges in terms of collaborative, mobile and immersive learning.* *The use of new information and communication technologies, including 3D virtual learning environment,   have provided additional value to previous e-learning environments and learning processes. 3D virtual environments have great potential in bringing a new immersive learning to schools and also can enhance online communication to a completely new scale.* *The interaction with the 3D environments improve learning experience, can strongly influence students´ experience, because creative and participative activities, including games, can be more motivating.*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

TOY is a virtual learning environment developed for comprehensive schools by realXtend platform. The environment has been studied with pupils and students from primary and secondary schools, and also in vocational education school.

If a course or a teacher would like to have a private space, the group will work to personalize learning solutions. It is possible on request based to develop tailor-made project, such as special project libraries.

3D environments or simulations promote relevant learning. Educators can put 3D models to create their own 3D scenes with interactions, which can help to facilitate learning in all levels of education.

3D virtual school supports expand global learning communities and interactions among learners.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

During the week 15th 2014, the 3D virtual school was launched.

This launch was mentioned by press (in journal specialized for education), current networks, and the web site of companies as biggest partners (e.g. architects or furniture manufactures) as provides virtual architectural and interior designs.

Besides, the investigator was planning to create marketing material with additional information about the pricing, and to develop selling strategy and evaluation of potential market.

Prices for support services and trainings are still under development.

Part of R&D strategy should focus on testing the applications with the pilot groups.

The main weakness is the lack of user communities and so, enough new projects. So the marketing working should be

MEN**ON** Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

focussed in how to attract and motivate new users.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Technology is still under development.* *The group have experience in 3D virtual school as they have designed, developed and researched a range of extensible learning solutions at TOY and realXtend. However, at short term, a key-person is needed to steer for the further development work as to develop the support services.* *It is also very important to create training and educational programmes which could be offered to potential customers as soon as possible.* *Part of R&D strategy should focus on testing the applications with pilot groups.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	3	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Strategic objectives are given and related with the promotion of the product but success indicators are not specified.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *At this point, it would be interesting to know if marketing actions have become successful, new users are motivated with the project, and finally if technology barriers between generations are being over.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5	30/42	
Difficulty to Introduce	5		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-2-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	TOY - Virtual 3D school		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja		
Date Completed:	29/06/14	**Contact email:**	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

MEN∂N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Score:	3	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
The project proposes a new paradigm of school in a virtual world. The project is based on the realXTend platform that which is commonly used to create virtual worlds, some of them also for educational purposes. Although is a very innovative project and currently there not many virtual schools in use, there are other projects with similar goals.		

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	*1*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

Probably the use of a school in a virtual world can have great advantages for some students and teachers, Unfortunately, the proposal does not reason too are the advantages of this tool.

Would not be bad that the authors include clearly what are the advantages that their system provides, compared to traditional systems, but also in comparison with other TIC tools that can be used in the field of education.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	*1*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

The marketing material includes five key messages but I do not think that those messages are very focused on the proposal.

These messages could be used to promote any social learning network.

Should be less generic messages highlighting the features of the system.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
The project may require an average development effort, I think it can be assumed by the authors. *The main part of the development will be built the virtual world, the authors are going to use realXtend which is relatively solid platform, which should minimize the project risks.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	6	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
The objectives focus primarily on the development of the virtual world, do not include any aspect of the exploitation phase of the tool by real users. *While it would be good to raise objectives in other ways all proposed objectives can be validated and seem quite realistic.*		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	*1*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
The development plan does not explain the activities that can lead to achieving the project objectives, seems that the plan is not very detailed. The marketing and promotion strategy once the product is developed has been developed in a more detailed way.		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**
Efficiency	1	
Clarity-of-concept	1	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	17/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6	
Quality of Adoption Plan	1	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-3-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**TOY - FINPEDA**		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Carina González		
Date Completed:	09/06/2014	**Contact email:**	cjgonza@ull.edu.es

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.

				5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description				
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The described innovation is not really new (3D virtual worlds / RealXtend) and it seems not going to improve over current approaches.*				

Efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The efficiency seems similar to current approaches.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	*5*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The marketing and pricing strategies are adequate and well explained.*		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel AtoS ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score:	*5*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Current 3D technologies allow adopt the innovation easily.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score:	*6*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The indicators are not really specific.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*5*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The activities are adequate and the plan partially clear.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	5		**27/42**
Difficulty to Introduce	5		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

HoTEL

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-4-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**TOY - FINPEDA**		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven
Date Completed:	22/05/204 **Contact email:** Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

			current approaches?		
Score:		3	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.		
Description					
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *What is the innovation with other existing VLEs? It is not really explained… I think that VLEs have widely researched…*					

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Same applies here.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *If there is a press release, it may have an impact. Mailing is not a strategy that use to work, people usually filter and send it to the SPAM folder.*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Works independently of other apps, however getting familiar with this technology and changing workflows can take time.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	1	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No success indicators in the document*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Mid-term activities have many technical implications that are not reflected in the document*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	24/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	1		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

2.4 Case 3. iLIME

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-1-1-11	**Lab:**	iLIME
Innovation:	**iLIME recommender model and software system**		
Date Received:	03/06/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR		
Date Completed:	29/05/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?		
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.		
Description				

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The main aim of the project is to elaborate and implement an itinerary recommendation system for teachers, based on student´s interactions output, with a learning management system and in social networks.

i-LIME is envisaged as a new cognitive learning concept to create, share and reuse scalable didactic contents, to adapt the content to learners´ individual needs, and to share with other (personal learning network) according to the LIME model (based on Learning, Interaction, Mentoring and Evaluation). This model provides a more interactive, personalized learning process, as can generate rules and recommendations based on pedagogic categories, formal and informal activities.

i-LIME has been designed as a technology-enhanced learning platform that combines the use of didactic contents, knowledge and learning resources for online teaching. It can be played stand alone or integrated with another existing learning environments (e.g. Moodle, SAKAI) via web services.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) There are a few recommender systems available in prototype or research state but none of them works with LMS model as i-Lime does. This itinerary recommendation system can be useful for teachers in planning, monitoring and correction stages either formal activities or informal interactions. Teachers can delegate recommendations and suggestions on a semi-automated system while students can receive constant recommendations and guide in their academic path. Learning itinerary provided by LIME model is efficient and effective, and therefore, increases the user performance.		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	7	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Schedule group sessions (both internal and external) are planned to show how i-LIME works, software performance and promote the product to end-users. At short term, the investigator plan to deploy a prototype, which allows teachers to parameterize the LIME model and deliver recommendations to students. There are no short-term plans for pricing the project outcomes.		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The principal source of innovation is the technical implementation of LIME Model in i-LIME.

Although i-LIME system has already been applied at the learning environment of UNIR with success in preliminary tests, there are some technical objectives to overcome in this project.

It´s necessary to develop and API (Application Programming Interface) layer to connect each learning management systems, like AKAI, to i-Lime middleware, and install LMs and build configuration screen and console by expert/teacher /group manager in the pilot groups.

In addition, there are two weaknesses in the project to overcome, the Javascript dependence and same origin between CORS (cross-origin resource sharing) and URL on web page.

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Strategic objectives are given and success indicators are specified.

The investigator plan to develop script software to monitor users actions and activities in the most common LMS in next 6 months. But because the wide range of LMS systems available, it´s necessary to study each one carefully in order to devise webservices and interfaces.

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *i-LIME system has already been applied at the learning environment of UNIR with success in preliminary tests .By other hand there are some strengths in the technological area and web technologies such as experience with LTI standard , LTI settings API and Oauth authentication. Both factors aim prototype can be achieved in planning time, so teachers can parameterize the LIME model and deliver recommendations to students.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	7		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	36/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-2-1-11	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	iLIME recommender model and software system.		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja
Date Completed:	29/06/14

		Contact email:	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
		There are some recommendation popular recommendation systems, but I think but probably there are very few recommendation systems that can be integrated into an elearning-CMS to provide assistance to teachers and students in an easy and fast way.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
The project can bring benefits for current elearning environment getting the possibility to complete the environment functionality. The project can save time for teachers and students those frequently using recommendation systems. Also the integration in an eLearning environment can promote the recommendation systems in people who previously did not pay attention to these systems.		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
The marketing material includes three key messages, but these messages are focused on the students. I think that the authors neglect the role of the teacher, and they should make emphasis on the system possibilities for teachers (advantages, configurations, etc.) , teachers really have a very important role and are also those who say to their students when is suitable to use such systems		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		

The project requires developing a recommendation system and also a plugin for the LMS. It does not seem that the development costs and time can be high.

But of course depends on the recommendation system complexity and the plugin complexity, the proposal does not include a broad description of these two modules, so it is difficult to make an accurate prediction.

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	6	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		

Several of the initial objectives are measurable, but not the final objectives. These objectives are relatively abstract: "Collect inputs data on an LMS", "Deliver LIME Recommendations" Is not specified is the LMS is in a real course and not include estimates about the data and students volume. These two objectives pose a relative uncertainty but the set of objectives are realistic and can be validated

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*3*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
The development plans is too summarized, I do not think that the plan explain in detail all the activities that are necessary to achieve all proposed objectives.		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	
Clarity-of-concept	5	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	29/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6	
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-3-1-11	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	iLIME		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes		1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.	
Sheet completed by:		Carina González, Universidad de La Laguna	
Date Completed:	09/06/2014	**Contact email:**	cjgonza@ull.edu.es

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	*5*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

			5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description			
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *There is a big improvement of the potential for learning because this innovation could help to mitigate and make more interesting the time needed for the teacher and the student to go through the learning process.*			

Efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	*7*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The use of semi-automated systems could improve the time teachers spent doing evaluations and give them more time to improve other aspects of the learning process.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	*5*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The marketing materials are clear and concise.*		

MEN⌒N Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score:	*5*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The use of web technologies is well suited for the tasks.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score:	*7*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The objectives are specific, measurable, assessable, realistic and time-bound with clear indicators.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*7*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The plan seems good enough to fulfil the objectives.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	**36/42**	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	7		
Quality of Adoption Plan	7		

HoTEL

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-4-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	iLIME		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven
Date Completed:	22/05/204 **Contact email:** Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to

		current approaches?	
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.	
Description			
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *What is the algorithm running behind the recommender? This can be big part of the innovation.* *What is the technology running behind? Mahout?* *What kind of user data is using as input?*			

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *LTI compliance is an improvement*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	1	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Not filled*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The configuration interface is not implemented and may have an impact on the adoption time. However, LTI compliance is clearly an asset.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Not sure if they are really success indicators. They are technical related rather than success indicators of the general approach.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*3*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Planning is a bit vague and I think that requires a bit of research on how others have faced this approach since there are work done in this area.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	1	**24/42**	
Difficulty to Introduce	5		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

2.5 Case 4. KnowEd

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-1-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	KnowED - HALPD LTD		
Date Received:	03/06/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR		
Date Completed:	02 /06/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *KnowED will be a platform with an interactive interface that unveil the existing networks among historical characters, events and works of art, allowing users to understand how social interactions have always represented the foundation of human history.* *The main innovation is KnowED will provide a new and unusual perspective to the study of history, connecting existing knowledge form different subjects, discovering logical relations throughout History and putting information into context.* *By selecting a single character, KnowED allows users to discover a network of relations and learn about the people connected to him/her by different kinds of relationship (family, friendship, rivalry or influence). Users will be given the possibility of learning about the most significant events in which the character participates (as well as the main historical events going on worldwide during his/her lifetime) and seeing the works he/she realized or have been mentioned in.*		

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

KnowED is an interactive website where users can choose what to learn and visualize all the human and social side of historical characters in one place. It´s the first instrument to connect existing knowledge and put information into context.

KnowED will build an organized net of knowledge with a good user experience (UX) tailored on the target user group.

Besides users are able to share their knowledge by adding content using a wiki platform.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

In next 2 months the investigator plan to develop a MVP (minimum viable product) to test the idea on line with two main objectives: engage conversations around idea and discover and analyse primary targeted audience.

A website on the style of a blog is being developed, where every week an article and a multimedia content will be posted. Putting content on line will be useful to understand if visitors will engage with the project. Instruments such as Google Analytics and Facebook Analytics will help in defining a demographic and social target or the website.

Besides, in a second phase, a crowd-funding campaign will be developed in order to further spread the project and raise funds to finance expenses.

The basic content of the website will be for free; at long term a pricing strategy will be needed when payable content will be offered.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *At mid-term, the planning considers first the development of algorithms to automatically fill database with basic information about historical characters, historical events and works of art (mainly taken from Wikipedia database) and also the prototype of the website and testing within a group of target users. But the investigator mentions in weakness section, possible difficulties in finding web-designer specialised in user experience and interactive interfaces. By other hand Wikipedia or Google could quickly develop a similar solution starting from their database and user-base.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score:	*3*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Strategic objectives are given and success indicators are specified.* *The first objective, creation of a website in form of a blog, is not available yet, so more information is needed about the validity of the plan or new compromise. The delay could affect the promotion of the website on social networks and so further testing within a group of target users.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan			
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed	
Description			

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

www.knowed.co *is not available yet, although the investigator took on a commitment on April 2014.*

More information is needed about delay, if technical problems or finding a web designer are the cause, and if it´s necessary adjust the actual planning.

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5	28/42	
Difficulty to Introduce	3		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-2-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	KnowEd – HALPH LTD		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1.	All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.	
	2.	The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.	
	3.	All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.	
	4.	Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.	
	5.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.	
Sheet completed by:		Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja	
Date Completed:	29/06/14	**Contact email:**	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

The Project proposes a new and unusual perspective to the study of history. There are many websites in which the students can review the history, but the proposed project establish relationships between concepts and historical events. This feature can be very interesting for students, and make the project very attractive because there are not many web repositories (focused on history or other themes) that have a good relation system between their contents.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		

The project can be very useful to optimize the time that the students spend t in searching information in internet or books. Many people have trouble to making online searches, they are inefficient and are not able to validate the quality of the consulted material, it's great that a reliable website collect a lot of information about history.

The project also be a very interesting tool for teachers, that allows them to centralize their teaching material, reducing the cost and the time involved in the developing of teaching material. The teaching material revised by many experts probably has much better quality that the material revised by a single teacher.

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		

The marketing material includes four key messages quite attractive for people, these messages correctly highlight the most interesting points of the project: the material is inter-related and organized by concepts, the tool offer an interactive way to discover the history, and the community can collaborate in the content creation.

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
The required resources not seem too expensive. The project is based mainly on a web platform, and free domain history content. But the cost may depend depends by the website that will be developed, it is not the same use an existing CMS than develop a complex web application. Largely the proper development of the project also depends by the cooperation of collaborating users.		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
The objectives raised are measurable and therefore verifiable. The 6 month objectives are perfectly achievable. I think that the goal of get 2000 visitors per month is quite poor, many educational videos on youtube or presentations in slideshare have the same number of visit each day. The 18 months are also verifiable and realistic, they focus primarily on the development of the website features.		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		

The activity's to complete the development of the tool seem very specific and are clearly related to project objectives.

I think that the proposal has great potential to be developed successfully, however, seems that the authors have not put enough effort into designing activities to capture users and promote the tool. A tool of this type without a big user community is not really useful.

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	30/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-3-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	KnowEd –HALPHLTD		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	CARINA GONZÁLEZ, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA
Date Completed:	06/06/2014	**Contact email:**	CJGONZA@ULL.EDU.ES

learning advantage

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The visual active exploring based on social interactions are the key innovative difference of this approach.* *Moreover, the learning innovation is based on the stimulation of curiosity and visual memory.*		

MEN∂N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Other current approaches (Wikipedia, Google Knowledge Graph, Kindred Britain…), although don't uses social connections, has powerful engines and a large quantity of data for learning history / art or events.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	*3*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Marketing materials includes social networks (Facebook and Twitter), Adwords campaigns in Google and crowd-funding strategies. The crowd-funding campaign is difficult to carry out with the main user target (students of 12-19 years old).*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The innovation is very easy to adopt.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The objectives are specific, measurable, assessable but partially realistic in terms of time/cost/activities.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan			
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	*1*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources	
		3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions	
		5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed	
		7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed	
Description			
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)			
I think the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and available resources. For example, the web (http://www.knowed.co/) planned to mid---late April 2014 with topics as Einstein, Freud, Madame de Pompadour & Louis XV & much more, only shows information of the project.			

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**
Efficiency	3	
Clarity-of-concept	3	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	**21/42**
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	1	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-4-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**KnowEd – HALPH LTD**		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1.	All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.	
	2.	The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.	
	3.	All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.	
	4.	Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.	
	5.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.	
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven		
Date Completed:	22/05/204	**Contact email:**	Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

		current approaches?			
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.			
Description					
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The innovation is not clearly explained. When they talk about other approaches (i.e. Stanford approach) They assume a user experience problem without prior evaluation. How are they going to address Stanford's issues?*					

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Same than previous section*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The crowdfunding strategy is a good idea, however if they do not get funding how they are going to address the lack of interest?*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Maybe there are some usability issues like in the Stanford approach...*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *They should be more specific and how are they going to track all this metrics*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No risk management considered in the plan*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	26/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

2.6 Case 5. VirtualWorlds

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-06-1-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**Virtual Worlds**		
Date Received:	23/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Ana Isabel Manzanal Martínez, UNIR		
Date Completed:	20/05/14	**Contact email:**	ana.manzanal@unir.net

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

In the web, there are several virtual genetics laboratories, created by universities or commercial laboratories. Most of them are Mendelian genetics cross simulators, and perform experiments with a variety of organisms. In this project, there are two main differences: firstly, the learning scenario, where students are provided with three genetic disease scenarios (family, history and symptoms), and second, students can use expensive specialised equipment which reinforce skills and builds confidence with lab genetic techniques.

By other hand, some universities and educational institutions have introduced in Second Life, but as far as I could find, this is no a virtual lab for human genetic diseases have been created.

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *This tool is focused in a wide range of students: from high school to university* *Provides tailored support from a tutor, instant feedback , and flexibility* *Virtual lab allows students to get used with expensive specialised equipment, to test without the fear of failure.* *No limitations of time or teachers*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score:	0	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *There is no marketing / promotion strategy* *The group is interested in assistance aid to promote the virtual lab to other educational institutions*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The virtual lab is already created at Second Life and used for teaching by this group, but changes in the structure and functionality are needed to solve the actual limitation in the tests.* *Besides, at mid term, the group would be involved in adapting the resource to Open Sin (a opener platform.)* *R & D strategy is limited by the available previous funds and the team that initiated the project.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	2	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The promotion of the virtual lab to other educational institutions are realistic and time-bound whenever the group get assistance with the marketing / promotion strategy.* *At mid term, the adaptation of the virtual lab to a new platform, such as Open Sim, would be guided by the same team that initiated the previous project as experts, but in this application form, costs and stages of the project are not specified.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	*3*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It would be advisable that this group could complete the sections marketing and promotion for the first objective, and development strategy of the new product in Open Sim for the second objective.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	0		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	20/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	2		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-06-2-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**Virtual Worlds**		
Date Received:	30/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	Jordán Pascual Espada, Universidad Internacional de la Rioja		
Date Completed:	29/06/14	**Contact email:**	Jordan.pascual@unir.net

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

The Project proposes the use of a virtual world environment to show a genetic testing laboratory to undergraduate students. The use of Virtual World in educational environments is not very common, but really exists many similar proposes in other areas (mathematics, computer science, etc.).

If the real world is well implemented can be a big improvement for teaching genetics. The real world can provide more motivation to students and can give to the students a first idea of genetic laboratories.

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Really the proposal archive to significantly reduce the cost of a real genetic laboratory, but this comparison is not totally fair. I think that others alternatives based on TIC (Web platforms, educational games, etc.) could achieve the same results with a relatively similar cost. Other positive points raised in the proposal such as automatic feedback could also be achieved by any other TIC solutions. I don't think this proposal present any unique advantage that belonging specifically to Virtual worlds.		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	*3*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
The proposal includes four key messages, but really they all seem to be based on the same ideal "is not a real laboratory", I think there are better ways to promote the project, focusing on the main benefits: an accurate simulation of all lab elements, learn with guided experiments, etc.		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
The implantation of the proposal requires a little cost and small effort. The proposal is based on a third virtual world and the development process in this virtual world is relatively fast and cheap, especially compared to other technology solutions.		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	2	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Really, no measurable objective, the objectives are quite abstract. It is clear that the proposal authors plan to reach schools and institutes but the does not specify how many schools expect to use their proposal, and not explain the plans that they are going to use to achieve that the schools use the product.		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel Atos ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*1*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
The objectives outlined in the plan are not based only on the authors work. The objectives require the success of the promotions that the authors will perform, thus meeting the objectives is not assured. *Instead the objectives that depend only of the authors are very realistic; the scope of the project and the derivate development processes seems really bearable.*		

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	3	
Clarity-of-concept	3	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	21/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	2	
Quality of Adoption Plan	1	

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-06-3-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**Virtual Worlds**		
Date Received:	09/06/14		

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	CARINA GONZÁLEZ, UNIVERSIDAD DE LA LAGUNA
Date Completed:	06/06/2014	**Contact email:**	CJGONZA@ULL.EDU.ES

learning advantage

Guiding Question:		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score:	*3*	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Although the virtual world environment provides understanding of the purpose, procedures and possibilities within a genetic testing laboratory, the idea of virtual labs/ Second Life is not very innovative.*		

Efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *It isn't described the difference of this approach among the current ones in terms of efficiency.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	1	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Marketing materials are not presented.*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The innovation is easy to adopt.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	*1*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The objectives are unspecific, and not well described in terms of measure, assessment, realism and time-bound.*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	*1*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No plan is described.*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	1		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	**14/42**	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	1		
Quality of Adoption Plan	1		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-06-4-1-01	**Lab:**	UNIR Higher Education Lab
Innovation:	**Virtual Worlds**		
Date Received:	22/05/14		

sheet protocol			
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.		
Sheet completed by:	José Luis Santos, KULeuven		
Date Completed:	22/05/204	**Contact email:**	Joseluis.santos@cs.kuleuven.be

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *All VLEs have some kind of innovation involved. However, what it's clearly missing is a comparison with other similar decision-making similar approaches. Sometimes VLEs look like cracking nuts with sledgehammers.*		

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Lack of comparison with other approaches explaining the benefits of the use of VLEs.*		

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	1	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *No description*		

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *I wouldn't expect too much problems involved in this adoption phase, however users are not used to interact with VLEs.*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	2	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *More work on the objective section is clearly needed*		

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:		Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score:	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3 = the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *More work on the objective section is clearly needed*		

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	1		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	19/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	2		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

3. Annex 3 – UNIR. Initial Collective Review Sheet (Form C)

3.1 Case 1. A4Learning

General information			
Ref:	C-01-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education
Innovation:	A4Learning		
Date Received:	25/04/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	Innovative service
Nature	Disruptive
Current process stage	Prototype evaluation
Implementation phase	Pilot

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Territorial level covered	European Union
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	It should have an impact on the learning process
Involved stakeholders	Educational sector, teachers, trainers, students

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores

All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section:
    1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches.
    3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
    5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches
    7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	**Learning advantage**	7	5	7	5	24	85%
2	**Efficiency**	7	5	3	5	20	71%
3	**Clarity-of-concept**	5	5	3	3	16	57%
4	**Difficulty to Introduce**	3	7	7	5	22	78%
5	**Quality of Objectives/Indicators**	3	4	5	3	15	53%
6	**Quality of Adoption Plan**	3	5	5	5	18	64%
	TOTAL	28	31	30	26	115	68%

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions

Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*Learning analytics and recommendation systems for personalisation in learning are currently an issue for which more research and application are needed. Awareness in LMS is still undeveloped or in very early stage. Moreover, educational data mining and visualisation techniques need for more experimentation and development. A4Learning project combines data mining techniques and information visualisation in order to help students think about their own performance. A4Learning aims at developing a wide range*

	of tools, by capturing and analysing information from learning scenarios so that it can be visualised: The information represents and relate similarities with obtained grades. Grade estimation through an explicit and visual comparison process among students is a quite understandable method that increases effectiveness of this approach. Visualisation benefits learners by increasing their awareness in the course, as they will be able to modify their attitude towards the course according to previous expectations and needs. ***A4Learning feature is not included in most LMS platforms, so it can be interesting.*** *This tool could bring benefits to both students and teachers. It could indeed serve for students to improve their learning process, by obtaining automatic feedback.* ***There is an innovative part, comparing grades with activity patterns.***
2	*Prediction of behavioural patterns is a well-suited research field in education, but A4Learning focuses on the awareness provision, trying to detect behavioural patterns in order to inform students and let them <u>self-assess their progress</u>.* *This method can <u>motivate learners</u> by providing them with awareness feedback as they could <u>automatically get relevant feedback of their own performance</u>. Self-reflections will <u>empower learning benefits</u> and, as a consequence, more satisfying learning experience as <u>the students will understand their learning process</u>.* *Teachers will perceive a clear benefit too. This method provides a powerful tool to <u>monitor student achievements</u> and it is possible to <u>anticipate risks and verify student progress</u>. As A4Learning makes student <u>less dependent on the teachers</u>, more <u>autonomous</u> learners, teachers can devote their time to other consuming teaching tasks.* ***Most of LMS platforms do not contain a tool like A4Learning.*** *If the teacher wants to use a similar tool, he will have to use an external system. The use of an external system may increase costs as well as the time spent performing the analysis and send information to students.* ***The tool can be an advantage over current systems, most especially if the tool can be integrated in most popular LMS.***
3	*The key messages clearly present the project highlights. The messages are very suitable and include an acceptable detail level.* ***The focus is on divulgation rather than on exploitation.*** *High focus on research: The researcher plans to publish A4Learning on scientific impact-factor journals and to disseminate this tool on conferences, but real exploitation is not planned within the next 6 months.* ***Marketing material are only associated to academic public*** *(scientific impact-factor journals and conferences).* *As A4Learning is a web tool that can be offered as a service in the cloud,* ***integration with different LMS is possible.*** *First, it is planned to integrate it with Sakai, for the development*

	of pilot programmes at UNIR. ***<u>The benchmark that will validate the success of this tool is the validation by end-users</u>***.
4	*The proposed tool requires reduced costs and it seems that the author has developed the core of the tool, so it probably will be a reduced investment. However, the fact that <u>the development of other parts of the tool are missing has to be taken into account</u>, although there is no reason to think that it will cause incidents.* *The service is at development stage and <u>no public demonstration has been published yet</u>. A4Learning has recently gone through a usability validation progress including reviews by experts in education and development. As a result, the redesign of the visual approach has been planned.* ***The main risk for this short-term redesign is the software library in use.*** *If the library might not be able to provide the planned visual representation, the developers might be forced to move to a different library. This would result in* ***a significant delay in the development.*** *Besides,* ***historic records and data collection are required*** *before providing students with authentic feedback. The calculation of similarity among students is achieved by comparing the student with former ones, from previous courses.* ***Such calculation takes several forms such as session-based, profile-based or just raw event processing.*** ***It seems very easy to adopt if it is integrated with the educational software (LMS) of institutions.*** *And as it is planned to make the approach compatible with the most popular LMS, such as* ***Moodle or Sakai,*** *no huge problem is forecast. Moreover, it can also work* ***as standalone tools.*** *<u>The method is hard to understand</u>. Prior tests have shown that* ***<u>users may require a training session</u>***.
5	*<u>Strategic objectives</u> are given and <u>success indicators</u> are specified.* ***The objectives are specific, measurable, assessable and realistic,*** *but not clearly time-bound.* *Apart from the technical difficulties, the project should be over, the main challenges are:* *-the difficulty to* ***<u>evaluate the acceptance and satisfaction</u>*** *by teachers and students in pilot programmes* *-the validation of the tool as a* ***<u>score estimator</u>*** *at short term* *-the validation of* ***<u>end users</u>*** *at mid-term.*
6	*Adoption plan is* ***realistic in terms of activities*** *but* ***<u>time and resources are not clearly presented</u>***. *The activities presented in the plan are faithfully adapted to the outlines objectives. The*

	author provides an adequate level of detail on activities to develop and __includes a report of potential risks__, which has to be positively highlighted: all project involve risks. Thus, there are __more success possibilities__ if the risks are identified. The author also includes a marketing strategy or plan of development. __The risk management should be however developed.__ *More information about __technical difficulties__ is needed, and particularly if the __software library design__ issue has been solved. It could indeed, as the researcher mentions, result in a significant __delay in the development__. Another key aspect is the __data collection and historic records__ that may result in __privacy issues__.*

recommendations to improve adoption	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Reviewers recommendations and questions**
1	*-Clearly describe __where the real innovation is__* *-Clearly __define the key actions__ considered in this approach* *-Are their __user models__ behind this approach?* *-Once the visualisation problem is addressed, will the actual tracked data be of __high value for the end user__? __Why__?* *-What are the concrete __statistical metrics__? Details would be helpful in this regards since they constitute the core of the innovative aspect of your project.* *-Since analytics usually relies on user modelling, are you going to use __user models__?* *-One of the hottest topics in the learning analytics and educational data mining fields is __what the relevant learner traces are__: What are the concrete __learner traces__ that you are going to capture?*
2	*Nothing to add in this regards*
3	*-Include __more information about the monitoring capabilities__ of the tool:* *for instance the analysis types or graphics view* *-__Which LMS__ will be able to integrate this tool?* *-Considering the fact that policy makers may not be reached by this means of dissemination (conferences attendance and scientific papers consultation), __do you consider any other way to promote A4Learning__ and reach a larger audience? __How? Why?__*
4	*-Find ways to __ease the understanding of the tool__ and/or __prepare a training session__*

5	*-In **which course type** will this tool be implemented?* *- As reflected in the literature, **one of the main reported problems is that users actually use tools**: How can we know that this tool will be used?* *-How will the **pilot group** be composed?* *-**Explain in detail** the objectives*
6	*More information is needed about the status of the **selected institutions**: Are they **ready for collaboration** in terms of launching pilot groups?*

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ Innovative product ➢ Innovative service ➢ Innovative process
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ Disruptive ➢ Radical ➢ Incremental
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ Recognition ➢ Invention ➢ Concept development ➢ Concept evaluation ➢ Prototype development ➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ Development

	➢ Pilot ➢ Scale ➢ Mainstream
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?**
	➢ Local ➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?**
	➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?**
	➢ It should contribute to organisational change ➢ It should have an impact on the learning process ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?**
	➢ Policy makers ➢ Decision makers at local level ➢ Sector ➢ Researchers ➢ Teachers ➢ Trainers ➢ Students

3.2 Case 2. All-on-top

General information			
Ref:	C-03-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education
Innovation:	**All-on-Top**		
Date Received:	21/02/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR

Innovation classification

Innovation features*	
Type	**Innovative process**
Nature	**Incremental**
Current process stage	**Recognition**
Implementation phase	**Development**
Territorial level covered	**Regional**
User target addressed	**Multiple actors**
Potential impact	**It might improve the range of technological services available in the field**
Involved stakeholders	**Researchers, teachers, trainers**

*see related selection options on page 4 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores						
All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section: 1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.						

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	**Learning advantage**	7	5	5	1	**18**	**64%**
2	**Efficiency**	7	5	3	1	**16**	**57%**
3	**Clarity-of-concept**	0	3	1	1	**5**	**17%**
4	**Difficulty to Introduce**	3	3	3	5	**14**	**50%**
5	**Quality of Objectives/Indicators**	1	6	1	3	**11**	**39%**
6	**Quality of Adoption Plan**	0	5	1	7	**13**	**46%**
	TOTAL	18	27	14	18	**77**	**45%**

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	

Ref.	Feedback
1	*The authors propose a novel system that allow students to reconfigure and recontextualize the learning environments. All-on-top is essentially inspired on the Assure model, from constructivist paradigm. This model is ideal for those teachers interested in knowing their students´ characteristics before designing the course, because the model allows them to develop an objective planning based on the background of the students, select strategies, means and resources, design materials, activities and evaluation.* *The main innovation of this project, All on top, will be* ***the creation of an instructional design for an eLearning course to*** ***<u>enable students to choose their own learning path</u>****, a competitive advantage in planning their own work, to learn in a flexible way.* *The authors take as a starting point the idea that not all students have not the same abilities and preferences and custom learning environments could increase student productivity in many cases. Some learning environments offer customization possibilities, although these possibilities may be quite limited.* ***The potential of the proposed project depends on the configuration features that are implemented****, these features are not detailed specifically within the proposal*
2	*This tool is focused on a wide range of users:* *-e Learning instructional designers* *-programme coordinators* *-professionals involves in elearning.* *All-on-top can be very useful to inexperienced teachers so to develop courses, activities and materials and at a low cost (just training cost).* *In the future, All-on-top could be offered as a service or product in any LMS and/or instructional environment.*
3	*All-on-Top is a pedagogical framework. The reviewers state the fact that they only have realised if the project was dealing with a pedagogical framework after reading the last pages, before it is difficult to not know if it is a software or a pedagogical framework.* *Besides, from all the reported problems that the innovators claim to solve with All-on-Top, the reviewers agree that other pedagogical frameworks partially address the same problem*
4	*The goal is implement All-on-top design in a UNIR course and work in cooperation with the*

	teachers to implement the course using All-on-top instructional design. Analyse the assessment results and improve design accordingly. *The stage of development is an initial idea. So more details are necessary to evaluate if this new model could be compatible with the actual system in UNIR, to specify which type of course, if new teachers´ skills are needed and time.* *If the development is done in a proper way probably the development cost can be very reasonable.* *However, the innovation requires investing time in training of teachers and students.*
5	*Implementation All-on-top design in a UNIR course is a difficult point to evaluate, because the researcher does not mention the kind of course it would fit in and previous knowledge about UNIR, working system and educational programme.* *The objectives are not only focused on the tool development, also include tests in real environments so to get real feedback. The time allowed for the completion of the first objective "Implement the All-on-top design in a JOIN course" seems a bit short, or probably All-on-Top have too little scope and therefore it can be implemented quick.*
6	*No equipment and human resources are mentioned. However, the plan does contain an appropriate set of activities related with the project goals. The division of activities seems quite realistic and consistent, although the activity main idea is understandable activity the descriptions are too short. The proposal does not include any marketing or promotion plan.*

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*-Provide details on the configuration features: What issues the student will be able to configure in the learning environment?* *-Clearly explain if the framework meant here a pedagogical or software framework since the beginning of the project description* *-Need for relating the project to more works (only one paper from 1996 considered)* *-Find differentiation strategies so to add a stronger added value in comparison with other frameworks that partially address the same challenges*

2	*-It is assumed that the custom personalization of the learning environment can create more productive students, however there is a need for indicators to quantify and validate this increased productivity* *- Described the difference of this approach among the current ones in terms of efficiency*
3	*-Mention clearly from the beginning that All-on-Top is a pedagogical framework* *-Why do you decide to set up All-on-Top? In which way does it solve current issues dealing with pedagogical frameworks? In which way is it different to all existing pedagogical frameworks?* *-Is there a real need?* *-What is the specific problem that you are trying to address?* *-How are you going to evaluate the impact?* *-Describe real metrics* *-Provide more detail on the operation of the project* *-Highlight what can be achieved using the project: customers want to have some idea about how the project plans to achieve the objectives.*
4	*-Specify R&D strategy* *-Emphasise details on the configuration possibilities that students may select so to evaluate the complexity to operate further developments* *-Find potential solutions to the risk that end-users do not want to change their work flow*
5	*-Need for costs and time planning of the project* *-Specify the objectives, which are not well described in terms of measure, assessment, realism and time-bound. (E.g. Improved design: this metric is very ambiguous.)*
6	*-Provide much more details on the overall plan*

* Innovation classification criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?**
	➢ **Innovative product** ➢ **Innovative service** ➢ **Innovative process**

MEN∩N Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efguel Atos ELIG.org

Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?**
	➢ **Disruptive** ➢ **Radical** ➢ **Incremental**
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?**
	➢ **Recognition** ➢ **Invention** ➢ **Concept development** ➢ **Concept evaluation** ➢ **Prototype development** ➢ **Prototype evaluation** ➢ **Product testing** ➢ **Other**
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?**
	➢ **Development** ➢ **Pilot** ➢ **Scale** ➢ **Mainstream**
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?**
	➢ **Local** ➢ **Regional / National** ➢ **European Union**
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?**
	➢ **Individual actors** ➢ **Multiple actors** ➢ **Wide range of actors**
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?**
	➢ **It should contribute to organisational change** ➢ **It should have an impact on the learning process** ➢ **It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field**

Involved stakeholders	Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?
	➢ **Policy makers** ➢ **Decision makers at local level** ➢ **Sector** ➢ **Researchers** ➢ **Teachers** ➢ **Trainers** ➢ **Students**

3.3 Case 3. TOY

General information			
Ref: C-04-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education	
Innovation: TOY			
Date Received: 14/04/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR	

Innovation classification

Innovation features*	
Type	**Innovative product**
Nature	**Incremental**
Current process stage	**Prototype evaluation**
Implementation phase	**Scale**
Territorial level covered	**European Union**
User target addressed	**Individual actors**
Potential impact	**It may improve the range of technological products available in the field**
Involved stakeholders	**Researchers, teachers, trainers, students, educational sector**

* see related selection options on page 4 of this form

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores						

All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section:

    1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches.
    3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
    5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches
    7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	**Learning advantage**	7	3	3	3	**16**	**57%**
2	**Efficiency**	7	1	3	3	**14**	**50%**
3	**Clarity-of-concept**	5	1	5	5	**16**	**57%**
4	**Difficulty to Introduce**	5	5	5	5	**20**	**71%**
5	**Quality of Objectives/Indicators**	3	6	6	1	**16**	**57%**
6	**Quality of Adoption Plan**	3	1	5	5	**14**	**50%**
	TOTAL	30	17	27	22	**96**	**57%**

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions

Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*There is a need to develop physical learning environments towards more innovative, immersive and use-friendly spaces in order to meet future challenges in terms of collaborative, mobile and immersive learning. The use of new information and communication technologies, including 3D virtual learning environment, have provided additional value to previous e-learning environments and learning processes. 3D virtual environments have great potential in bringing a new immersive learning to schools and also can enhance online communication to a completely new scale. The interaction with the 3D environments improve learning experience, can strongly influence students´ experience, because creative and participative activities, including games, can be more motivating.* *The project proposes a new paradigm of school in a virtual world. The project is based on the realXTend platform that which is commonly used to create virtual worlds, some of them also for educational purposes. There are currently few virtual schools in use, but there are other projects with similar goals. The described innovation is indeed not really new (3D virtual worlds / RealXtend) and it seems not going to improve over current approaches.*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

2	*TOY is a virtual learning environment developed for comprehensive schools by realXtend platform. The environment has been studied with pupils and students from primary and secondary schools, and also in vocational education school. If a course or a teacher would like to have a private space, the group will work to personalize learning solutions. It is possible on request based to develop tailor-made project, such as special project libraries. 3D environments or simulations promote relevant learning. Educators use 3D models to create their own 3D scenes with interactions, which can help to facilitate learning in all levels of education. 3D virtual school supports expand global learning communities and interactions among learners.* *Nevertheless, the efficiency seems similar to current approaches.*
3	*The 3D virtual school was launched on week 15 of 2014. This milestone was mentioned by press release (in journal specialized for education), current networks, and the web site of companies as biggest partners (e.g. architects or furniture manufactures) as provides virtual architectural and interior designs.* *Besides, the researcher has planned to create marketing material with additional information about the pricing, and to develop selling strategy and evaluation of potential market. Prices for support services and trainings are still under development. Part of R&D strategy should focus on testing the applications with the pilot groups.* *The main weaknesses are:* *-the lack of user communities, and thus, the lack of enough new projects* *-the marketing messages could be used to promote any social learning network* *-mailing is not an efficient strategy, as promotions usually are redirected to spams*
4	*The technology is still under development.* *The main part of the development will be built the virtual world, the authors are going to use realXtend which is relatively **solid platform**, which **should minimize the project risks**.* *The innovation works independently of other apps, however getting familiar with this technology and changing workflows can take time.*
5	***Strategic objectives** focus primarily on the development of the virtual world, do not include any aspect of the exploitation phase of the tool by real users, while it would be good to raise objectives. In other words, all proposed objectives can be validated and seem quite realistic.*
6	*At this point, it would be interesting to know if marketing actions have become successful, new users are motivated with the project, and finally if technology barriers between*

	generations are being over. The marketing and promotion strategy once the product has been developed in a more detailed way.

recommendations to improve adoption	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Reviewers recommendations and questions**
1	*-Explain the relation between TOY and other existing VLEs, which have been widely researched* *-Explain the added value of the innovation compared to other VLE: It is quite difficult to understand the innovative component of the project when the prior art section is not clearly described: How different is your proposal from existing solutions?*
2	*-Describe in detail the advantages of this tool in comparison with similar innovations, the advantages that their system provides, compared to traditional systems, but also in comparison with other TIC tools that can be used in the field of education.*
3	*-Extract key ideas from the websites you are mentioning so to concentrate all key information on the same form* *-Focus the marketing strategy on how to attract and motivate new users.* *-Personalise the marketing messages on the innovation, so that they become less generic, highlighting the features of the system.*
4	*-****Dedicate more human resources*** *to the innovation so to steer for the further development work, and thus, develop the support services* *-****Generate training and educational programmes*** *so that the technology could be offered to potential customers as soon as possible* *-Focus part of the R&D strategy on testing the applications with* ***pilot groups***
5	*-Develop* ***success indicators***
6	*-Explain the activities that can lead to achieving the project objectives* *-Provide a more detailed development plan* *-Explain the technical implications of the mid-term activities*

* Innovation classification criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ **Innovative product** ➢ **Innovative service** ➢ **Innovative process**
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ **Disruptive** ➢ **Radical** ➢ **Incremental**
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Recognition** ➢ **Invention** ➢ **Concept development** ➢ **Concept evaluation** ➢ **Prototype development** ➢ **Prototype evaluation** ➢ **Product testing** ➢ **Other**
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Development** ➢ **Pilot** ➢ **Scale** ➢ **Mainstream**
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ **Local** ➢ **Regional / National** ➢ **European Union**
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢ **Individual actors**

	➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?**
	➢ It should contribute to organisational change ➢ It should have an impact on the learning process ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?**
	➢ Policy makers ➢ Decision makers at local level ➢ Sector ➢ Researchers ➢ Teachers ➢ Trainers ➢ Students

3.4 Case 3. iLIME

General information			
Ref:	C-02-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education
Innovation:	iLIME		
Date Received:	20/03/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR

Innovation classification

Innovation features*	
Type	**Innovative product**
Nature	**Incremental**
Current process stage	**Prototype evaluation**
Implementation phase	**Pilot**
Territorial level covered	**European Union**

User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	It should have an impact on the learning processes
Involved stakeholders	Educational sector, teachers, trainers, students

* see related selection options on page 4 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores								

All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section:
> 1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches.
> 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
> 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches
> 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	Learning advantage	7	5	5	5	22	78%
2	Efficiency	7	5	7	5	24	85%
3	Clarity-of-concept	7	5	5	1	18	64%
4	Difficulty to Introduce	5	5	5	5	20	71%
5	Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5	6	7	5	23	82%
6	Quality of Adoption Plan	5	3	7	3	18	64%
	TOTAL	36	29	36	24	125	74%

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions

Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*i-LIME is envisaged as a new cognitive learning concept to create, share and reuse scalable didactic contents, to adapt the content to learners' individual needs, and to share with other (personal learning network) according to the LIME model (based on Learning, Interaction, Mentoring and Evaluation). This model provides **a more interactive, personalized learning process**, as can generate rules and recommendations based on pedagogic categories, formal and informal activities. There is a <u>big improvement of the potential for learning</u> because this innovation could help to **mitigate and make more interesting the time needed** for the teacher and the student to go through the learning*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	process. *i-LIME has been designed as a technology-enhanced learning platform that combines the use of didactic contents, knowledge and learning resources for online teaching. It can be played stand alone or integrated with another existing learning environments (e.g. Moodle, SAKAI) via web services. This is a real asset:* **there are very few recommendation systems that can be integrated into an elearning-CMS** *to provide assistance to teachers and students in an <u>easy and fast way</u>.*
2	*There are a few recommender systems available in prototype or research state but none of them <u>**works with LMS model**</u> as i-Lime does.* **LTI compliance** *is an improvement* *This itinerary recommendation system can be useful for teachers in planning, monitoring and correction stages either formal activities or informal interactions. Teachers can delegate recommendations and suggestions on a semi-automated system while students can receive constant recommendations and guide in their academic path. The project can* **<u>help teachers and students save time</u>,** *and particularly the time teachers spend carrying out evaluations, which let them more time to improve other aspects of the learning process. Also the integration in an eLearning environment can* **<u>promote the recommendation systems</u>** *in people who previously did not pay attention to these systems.* **Learning itinerary** *provided by LIME model is* **efficient and effective,** *and therefore,* **<u>increases the user performance</u>.**
3	*Schedule* **group sessions** *(both internal and external) are planned to show how i-LIME works, software performance and promote the product to end-users.* *At short term, the researcher plans to* **deploy a prototype,** *which allows teachers to parameterize the LIME model and deliver recommendations to students.* *The* **marketing material** *are clear and concise, including three key messages, but these messages are focused on the students.* *There are* **no short-term plans for pricing** *the project outcomes.*
4	*The principal source of innovation is* **<u>the technical implementation of LIME Model in i-LIME</u>.** *Although i-LIME system has already been applied at the learning environment of UNIR with success in preliminary tests, <u>there are some technical objectives</u> to overcome in this project. The configuration interface is not implemented and may have an impact on the adoption time.* **LTI compliance is clearly an asset**. *It is necessary to develop an API (Application Programming Interface) layer to connect each learning management systems, like Sakai, to*

	i-Lime middleware, and install LMs and build configuration screen and console by expert/teacher /group manager in the pilot groups. *The project requires developing a recommendation system and also a plugin for the LMS. It does not seem that the development costs and time can be high. It naturally depends on the recommendation system complexity and the plugin complexity.*
5	*The set of **strategic objectives** is **realistic** and can be validated. The objectives are **time-bound** with clear **technical indicators** are specified.* *Several of the **initial objectives are measurable**, but **not the final objectives**.*
6	*i-LIME system has already been **applied within UNIR learning environment** with success in preliminary tests.* *Strengths in the technological area and web technologies such as experience with LTI standard, LTI settings, API and Oauth authentication.* *Both factors aim prototype can be achieved in planning time, so teachers can parameterize the LIME model and deliver recommendations to students.*

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*-Describe clearly where the real innovation is* *-What is the algorithm running behind the recommender or the approach in the back end? This can be big part of the innovation.* *-What is the technology running behind? Mahout?* *-What kind of user data is used as input? One of the hottest topics in the related field is indeed linked to learner traces*
2	*Nothing to add in this section*
3	*Emphasis should be put on the system possibilities for teachers (advantages, configurations, etc.) as teachers really play a very important role and are also those who say to their students when it is suitable to use such systems.*

4	*-Include a broader **description** of the **recommendation system and plugin*** *-Develop **alternative solutions** to cope with **the Javascript dependence*** *-**Solve the similar origin issue** (between CORS and URL on web page).*
5	*-Given the wide range if LMS systems available, **develop a study to devise web-services and interfaces*** *-Foreseen means of **measurement of final objectives*** *-Specify if the LMS is **implemented within a real course*** *-Provide **estimated figures and data,** for instance regarding students volume* *-Develop **success indicators** related to the overall approach* *-Provide a **broader description** of the following objectives:* • *"Collect inputs data on an LMS"* • *"Deliver LIME Recommendations"*
6	*-Further develop the plan, so to explain in detail all the activities that are necessary to achieve all proposed objectives. The planning is indeed a bit vague and may require a bit of research on how others researchers have faced this approach since there is work done in this area.*

* Innovation classification criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ **Innovative product** ➢ **Innovative service** ➢ **Innovative process**
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ **Disruptive** ➢ **Radical** ➢ **Incremental**
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Recognition** ➢ **Invention** ➢ **Concept development** ➢ **Concept evaluation** ➢ **Prototype development**

	➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ Development ➢ Pilot ➢ Scale ➢ Mainstream
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ Local ➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢ It should contribute to organisational change ➢ It should have an impact on the learning process ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ Policy makers ➢ Decision makers at local level ➢ Sector ➢ Researchers ➢ Teachers ➢ Trainers ➢ Students

3.5 Case 4. KnowEd

General information			
Ref: C-05-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education	
Innovation: KnowEd			
Date Received: 24/02/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR	

Innovation classification

Innovation features*	
Type	**Innovative service**
Nature	**Incremental**
Current process stage	**Concept development**
Implementation phase	**Development**
Territorial level covered	**European Union**
User target addressed	**Wide range of actors**
Potential impact	**It could have an impact on the learning processes**
Involved stakeholders	**Educational sector, researchers, teachers, trainers, students**

* see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores						

All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section:
     1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches.
     3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
     5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches
     7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.						

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	**Learning advantage**	7	7	3	3	**20**	**71%**
2	**Efficiency**	7	5	3	3	**18**	**64%**
3	**Clarity-of-concept**	5	5	3	5	**18**	**64%**
4	**Difficulty to Introduce**	3	5	7	5	**20**	**71%**
5	**Quality of Objectives/Indicators**	3	5	4	5	**17**	**60%**
6	**Quality of Adoption Plan**	3	3	1	5	**12**	**42%**

	TOTAL		28	30	21	26	**105**	**62%**

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions

Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*KnowED will be a platform with an interactive interface that unveil the existing networks among historical characters, events and works of art, allowing users to understand how social interactions have always represented the foundation of human history.* *The <u>main innovation</u> is the fact that* **KnowED will provide a new and unusual perspective to the study of history,** *connecting existing knowledge form different subjects, discovering logical relations throughout history and putting information into context.* *By selecting a single character, KnowED allows users to discover a network of relations and learn about the people connected to him/her by different kinds of relationship (family, friendship, rivalry or influence). Users will be given the possibility of learning about the most significant events in which the character participates (as well as the main historical events going on worldwide during his/her lifetime) and seeing the works he/she realized or have been mentioned in.* *There are many websites in which the students can review the history, but* **the proposed project establish relationships between concepts and historical events.** *This feature can be very interesting for students, and make the project very attractive because* **there are not many web repositories** *(focused on history or other themes)* **that have a good relation system between their contents.** *In other words, <u>the visual active exploring based on social interactions</u> are the key innovative difference of this approach. Moreover, the learning innovation is based on the stimulation of curiosity and visual memory.*
2	*KnowED is an interactive website where users can choose what to learn and visualize all the human and social side of historical characters in one place. It´s the first instrument to connect existing knowledge and put information into context. KnowED will build an organized net of knowledge with a good user experience (UX) tailored on the target user group. Besides users are able to share their knowledge by adding content using a wiki platform.* *The project* **can be very useful to optimize the time that the <u>students</u> spend in searching information in internet or books.** *Many people have trouble to making online searches, they are inefficient and are not able to validate the quality of the consulted material,*

	*KnowEd would constitute **a reliable website**, collecting a lot of information about history. The project can also be a very interesting tool for <u>teachers</u> that **allows them to centralize their teaching material, reducing the cost and the time involved in the developing of teaching material**. The teaching material revised by many experts probably has much better quality that the material revised by a single teacher.*	
	*Other current approaches (Wikipedia, Google Knowledge Graph, Kindred Britain...) have powerful engines and a large quantity of data for learning history / art or events. However, they do not call on **social connections.***	
3	*In next 2 months, the innovator plans to develop an MVP (minimum viable product) to test the idea on line with two main objectives:* *-engage conversations around idea* *-discover and analyse primary targeted audience*	
	*A website on the style of a blog is being developed, where every week an article and a multimedia content will be posted. **Developing content on line will be useful to understand if visitors will engage with the project.** Instruments such as Google Analytics and Facebook Analytics will help in defining a demographic and social target or the website. Besides, in a second phase, **a crowd-funding campaign** will be developed in order to further spread the project and raise funds to finance expenses. The basic content of the website will be for free; at long term a pricing strategy will be needed when payable content will be offered.*	
	*The marketing material includes four key messages quite attractive for people, **<u>these messages correctly highlight the most interesting points of the project</u>**: the material is inter-related and organized by concepts, the tool offer an interactive way to discover the history, and the community can collaborate in the content creation.*	
	Marketing materials includes social networks (Facebook and Twitter), Adwords campaigns in Google and crowd-funding strategies. The crowdfunding strategy is a good idea. However, this kind of campaign is difficult to carry out with the main user target (students of 12-19 years old).	
4	*At mid-term, the planning considers first the development of algorithms to automatically fill database with basic information about historical characters, historical events and works of art (mainly taken from Wikipedia database) and also the prototype of the website and testing within a group of target users. As mentioned in by the innovator, there are **<u>possible difficulties in finding web-designer specialised in user experience and interactive interfaces</u>**. Wikipedia or Google could quickly develop a similar solution starting from their database and user-base.*	
	*The required resources do not seem too expensive. The project is based mainly on a web platform, and free domain history content. But **<u>the cost may depend depends on the</u>***	

	*website that will be developed, it is not the same use an existing CMS than develop a complex web application. Moreover the proper development of the project **also depends on the cooperation of collaborating users**. Besides some **usability issues** can appear, like in the Stanford approach.*
5	*The objectives are specific, measurable, assessable but partially realistic in terms of time/cost/activities. The first objective, creation of a website in form of a blog, is not available yet, so **more information is needed about the validity of the plan or new compromise**. The delay **could affect the steps coming afterwards**, such as:* *-The promotion of the website on social networks* *-Further testing within a group of target users.* *The objectives raised are measurable and therefore verifiable. The six-month objectives are perfectly achievable. **The goal of getting 2000 visitors per month is quite poor,** many educational videos on YouTube or presentations in Slideshare have the same number of visit each day. The 18 months are also verifiable and realistic, they focus primarily on the development of the website features.*
6	*More information is needed about delay, if technical problems or finding a web designer are the cause, and if it´s necessary adjust the actual planning.* *The activity's to complete the development of the tool seem very specific and are clearly related to project objectives. The proposal has great potential to be developed successfully.* *The plan may be too ambitious given planned activities and available resources. For example, the web (http://www.knowed.co/) planned to mid---late April 2014 with topics as Einstein, Freud, Madame de Pompadour & Louis XV & much more, only shows information of the project.*

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*-Provide a **broader explanation** of the innovation* *-When mentioning other approaches (i.e. Stanford approach), user experience problem is assumed without prior evaluation. **How will the Stanford issue be addressed?** As the KnowEd project description mentions in the prior art that their approach is similar to something that Stanford did, and that user experience was a bit complicated: On what evaluation results do you rely on? The innovation seems indeed to be focussed on this issue*

MEN∩N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	so it would be very useful to report how you are going to address this user experience issue through your innovation: The answer to this question will constitute the real innovation
2	
3	*-If enough funding for the innovation is not collected through crowdfunding, how will the lack of interest be addressed?*
4	
5	*-Provide more details on the way all this metrics will be tracked*
6	*-Analyse the source of the delay in the website delivery (technical problem? Web designer?)* *-Adjust actual planning according to these conclusions* *-Develop a risk management plan* *-Strengthen the development of design activities to capture users and promote the tool: A tool of this type without a big user community is not really useful.*

* Innovation classification criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ **Innovative product** ➢ **Innovative service** ➢ **Innovative process**
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ **Disruptive** ➢ **Radical** ➢ **Incremental**
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Recognition** ➢ **Invention** ➢ **Concept development** ➢ **Concept evaluation**

	➢ **Prototype development** ➢ **Prototype evaluation** ➢ **Product testing** ➢ **Other**
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Development** ➢ **Pilot** ➢ **Scale** ➢ **Mainstream**
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ **Local** ➢ **Regional / National** ➢ **European Union**
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢ **Individual actors** ➢ **Multiple actors** ➢ **Wide range of actors**
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢ **It should contribute to organisational change** ➢ **It should have an impact on the learning process** ➢ **It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field**
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ **Policy makers** ➢ **Decision makers at local level** ➢ **Sector** ➢ **Researchers** ➢ **Teachers** ➢ **Trainers** ➢ **Students**

3.6 Case 5. VirtualWorlds

General information			
Ref:	C-06-05-1-1	**Lab:**	UNIR Lab on eLearning in Higher Education
Innovation:	Virtual Worlds		
Date Received:	24/03/14	**Verified by:**	UNIR

Innovation classification

Innovation features*	
Type	**Innovative product**
Nature	**Incremental**
Current process stage	**Prototype development**
Implementation phase	**Development**
Territorial level covered	**European Union**
User target addressed	**Wide range of actors**
Potential impact	**It may improve the range of technological products available in the field**
Involved stakeholders	**Researchers, teachers, trainers, students, educational sector**

* see related selection options on page 3 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

Overview of Scores						
All sections have been scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section:						

1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches.
3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches
7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.

Ref.	Concept	R1	R2	R3	R4	Total	%
1	**Learning advantage**	5	5	3	5	**18**	**64%**
2	**Efficiency**	5	3	3	3	**14**	**50%**
3	**Clarity-of-concept**	0	3	1	1	**5**	**17%**
4	**Difficulty to Introduce**	5	7	5	5	**22**	**78%**

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

5	**Quality of Objectives/Indicators**		2	2	1	2	**7**	**25%**
6	**Quality of Adoption Plan**		3	1	1	3	**8**	**28%**
	TOTAL		20	21	14	19	**74**	**44%**

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*In the web, there are several virtual genetics laboratories, created by universities or commercial laboratories. Most of them are Mendelian genetics cross simulators, and perform experiments with a variety of organisms. In this project, there are <u>two main differences</u>:* *-The learning scenario, where students are provided with three genetic disease scenarios (family, history and symptoms)* *-The students can use expensive specialised equipment which reinforce skills and builds confidence with lab genetic techniques.* *The Project proposes the use of a virtual world environment to show a genetic testing laboratory to undergraduate students. **The use of Virtual World in educational environments is not very common, but really exists many similar proposes in other areas** (mathematics, computer science, etc.). If the real world is well implemented, it could constitute an **<u>important improvement for the teaching of genetics</u>**. The real world can provide more motivation to students and can provide the students with a first idea of genetic laboratories.*
2	*The proposal achieves to significantly reduce the cost of a real genetic laboratory, but this comparison is not totally fair. Other alternatives based on TIC (web platforms, educational games, etc.) could achieve the same results with a relatively similar cost. Besides, automatic feedback could also be achieved by any other TIC solutions.*
3	
4	*The implantation of the proposal requires little cost and small effort. The proposal is based on a third virtual world and the development process in this virtual world is relatively fast and cheap, especially compared to other technology solutions. R & D strategy is limited by the available previous funds and the team that initiated the project.*

5	*The objectives are unspecific, and not well described in terms of measure, assessment, realism and time-bound.*
6	*The objectives outlined in the plan are not only based on the authors work. They require the success of the promotion that the authors will perform, thus meeting the objectives is not assured. However, the objectives that depend only of the authors are very realistic; the scope of the project and the derivate development processes seems really bearable.*

recommendations to improve adoption	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Reviewers recommendations and questions**
1	*-Analyse and compare the innovation with other virtual learning environments, with other similar decision-making approaches. Explain the added value of the innovation compared to other VLE: It is quite difficult to understand the innovative component of the project when the prior art section is not clearly described: How different is your proposal from existing solutions?*
2	*-Develop comparisons with other approaches explaining the benefits of the use of VLEs, for instance in terms of efficiency*
3	*-Develop the promotion of the project focusing on the main benefits, such as an accurate simulation of all lab elements, learn with guided experiments, etc.*
4	
5	*-Provide a broader description of the objectives* *-Provide figures related to the objectives* *-Develop some measurement indicators concerning the objectives* *-Explain their strategy so to achieve that the schools use the product.* *-Specify the costs and stages of the project* *-Get assistance with the marketing / promotion strategy.*
6	*-More work on the objective section is clearly needed: Complete the sections "marketing*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	and promotion" for the first objective, and "development strategy" of the new product in Open Sim for the second objective.

* Innovation classification criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ **Innovative product** ➢ **Innovative service** ➢ **Innovative process**
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ **Disruptive** ➢ **Radical** ➢ **Incremental**
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Recognition** ➢ **Invention** ➢ **Concept development** ➢ **Concept evaluation** ➢ **Prototype development** ➢ **Prototype evaluation** ➢ **Product testing** ➢ **Other**
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ **Development** ➢ **Pilot** ➢ **Scale** ➢ **Mainstream**
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ **Local** ➢ **Regional / National** ➢ **European Union**
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?**

	➢ **Individual actors** ➢ **Multiple actors** ➢ **Wide range of actors**
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢ **It should contribute to organisational change** ➢ **It should have an impact on the learning process** ➢ **It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field**
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ **Policy makers** ➢ **Decision makers at local level** ➢ **Sector** ➢ **Researchers** ➢ **Teachers** ➢ **Trainers** ➢ **Students**

4. Annex 4 – UNIR. Innovator Progress Report Sheet + Implementation report (Form D)

4.1 Case 1. A4Learning

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	D-ww-x-y-zz[6]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:			
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. 2. Information in this sheet should: a. Update information filled in in sheet A

---

[6] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

	b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C 3. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.	
Sheet completed by:	Luis de-la-Fuente-Valentín, Univesidad Internacional de La Rioja	
Date Completed:	07/10/2014	**Contact email:**	luis.delafuente@unir.net

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**
Value propositions	A4Learning was initially clearly focused on supporting students. After the evaluations, we decided to push the teachers support because we realized that teachers are demanding it.
Key messages	According to the change in value propositions, we have put more emphasis on the "message to teachers". That is, to better explain how the tool can support teaching and tutoring.
Product development strategy	The feedback given by HoTEL experts allowed us to identify clarity-of-concept as a weakness of A4Learning. Therefore, we have put more emphasis on usability issues, in order to better explain the concept to the end user.
Marketing & promotion strategy	No changes are done here, we follow our plans: publish A4Learning on scientific impact-factor journals, and disseminate in conferences.
Pricing strategy	At the current state of the tool, the focus is more on dissemination rather on exploitation, so there is no pricing strategy.

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Improve usability and clarity-of-concept.	SUS score to measure usability
	Disseminate A4Learning	Number of publications
	Integration in real scenario	The objective is accomplished if the integration is completed
Mid-Term (18 months)	Improve estimation capabilities of A4Learning	Improve RMSE results for error committed in estimations
	Integrate, as pilot program, A4Learning in the daily activities of teachers, tutors	The objective is accomplished if the integration is completed

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

	action on recommendations to improve adoption	
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1	**One recommendation was to "find ways to ease the understanding of the tool". We worked on such direction to improve de usability of the prototype.**	**SUS score in pilot programs**
2	**One recommendation was to "prepare a training session". We are going to prepare a 1-hour training session for the stakeholders that will participate in the pilot program**	**Successful if the stakeholders understand and use the tool**
3		

Innovator	Luis de-la-Fuente-Valentín
Innovation	A4Learning
Day and time of the session	2014/05/14 17:00 (CET)
Link to the session recording	http://unir.adobeconnect.com/p1mvyripbor/
Number of participants	60
Report	First implementation report

[1] Participants profile

- Participants profile:
  o Students from two different groups both at the same Masters Degree: "eLearning and Social Networks", taught at the Universidad Internacional de La Rioja
  o Some of the participants are students in this course, at the time they taught other courses (they are taking this course to improve technical skills and apply it to their work as teacher).

- Type of session (online / face to face):
  o Online

- Number of participants to the session:
  o 60 participants joined the online session

- Number of questionnaires fully completed:
  o 39 completed the task succesfully

- Incentives used to encourage participation to the session, if any:
  o The participants received extra score in their course for their participation: they were required to join the live session, and answer two questionnaires.

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- <u>Before the session:</u> A document with the instructions for the session (in Spanish) was available at the LMS prior to the session

- <u>During the session:</u> The researcher gave an online introduction of the system (5 slides, 20 mins) through the Adobeconnect system (videoconference). The students were asked to complete an initial questionnaire within the next 1 hour (first impression questionnaire)

- <u>After the session:</u> The A4Learning web system was enabled to the students, so they were able to access and try the proposed visualizations. The students were asked to complete a post questionnaire within the next 4 days (after reflection questionnaire)

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed)

a) Quantitatively evaluate: usability, perceived usefulness, intention of use

b) Qualitatively evaluate: ability to be understood

c) Collect proposals for improvement and understand how students perceive the visualization

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes)

a) SUS score is above average. Perceived usefulness show positive results. 59 out of 60 respondents would like to use the system.

b) Although some of the students missed some important points, most of the students felt that they understood the system.

c) Examples of the collected propolsals are:

   o More information on how similarity is measured

   o More interactive interface (e.g. recalculate with filters)

   o Add recommendations to improve

   o A ranking of the best scoring students, or the most similar students.

   Most of the received recommendations were already in the TO DO list of the researchers' team, but the students view help to rank and prioritize the most demanded (or useful) features.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session)

A new prototype will be developed, including the suggestions made by the students and also including a tool aimed at supporting the teacher on tutoring tasks.

Innovator	Luis de-la-Fuente-Valentín
Innovation	A4Learning
Day and time of the session	Sep,29th, 2014
Link to the session recording	http://unir.adobeconnect.com/p6lw9bpx8x4/
Number of participants	10
Report	Second implementation report

[1] Stakeholders

- Participants profile: stakeholders at different levels from higher education institution

- Type of session (online / face to face): Online.

- Number of questionnaires fully completed: 6

- Incentives used to encourage participation to the session, if any: none

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- Before the session:
    - Preparation of the software for the demo
    - Preparation of some slides and a speech
    - Preparation of a questionnaire
- During the session:
    - Brief speech explaining A4Learning characteristics
    - Guided demo shown to participants via screen sharing
    - Discussion (questions from participants)
    - The presenter asks the participants to fill the questionnaire
- After the session:
    - Analysis of the discussion
    - Analysis of the questionnaire results

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

MEN⊙N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Previous feedback received in the context of HoTEL and other validation procedures identified clarity-of-concept as one weakness of the A4Learning project. Latest developments were therefore oriented towards making A4Learning to be self-explanatory. This session was devoted to understand if stakeholders are able to understand the tool and what is their perception on the utility and the usability of A4Learning.

Additionally, the received feedback made the tool evolve by offering a teacher interface, aimed at supporting the teaching staff on the decision making process. The session was also oriented towards exploring the clarity-of-concept, usability and perceived utility of the teacher interface.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

The session has two main goals.

First, to check if the evolution of the interface has improved clarity-of-concept and usability. The SUS score is 66. Taking into account that -when measured for 500 products- the mean SUS score[7] is around 68, we consider that A4Learning has achieved a reasonable level of usability. This value is lower than in the previous session, but the result cannot be compared because the user profiles and methods were different in both sessions. Also, some comments from the participants acknowledged the improvement of the interface. "It is much clearer with the current interface" or "I'm glad you removed the scatter plot, it was confusing" are examples of this.

Second, to explore clarity-of-concept, usability and utility of the teacher interface. Five participants stated that teachers will use A4Learning more the students. However, they also stated that the student will get more benefit, because teachers will use the tool to help the students. Most of the participants said that A4learning would help them to reach their goals; and all participants stated that, if they were teaching a course, they would like to use A4Learning.

Most of the functionality request were oriented towards increasing the information offered by the tool. For example, some participants requested to improve and explain the *confidence on estimation* value, while other asked for textual information explaining the reasons of the estimation.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

According to the session results, future work will be oriented towards the provision of information (visualized information, when possible) that will explain the reasons of the estimation. That is, the user will be able to explore the user history and see how it is related to previous students. In other words, while A4Learning currently shows the results of the previous students similar to you, future work will show why these students are similar to you.

Additionally, help icon will be included in several locations of the user interface, allowing the user to request information on demand.

---

[7] http://www.measuringu.com/blog/10-things-SUS.php

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

The primary goal of the A4Learning validation in the context of HoTEL was to measure usability and perceived utility of the innovation in scenarios involving real students and teachers. As the tool is in a prototypical state, it was not possible to deploy it in an actual learning scenario. However, a demo (minimum viable product) was presented to real students, allowing them to interact with the user interface. This demo deployment pushed the development of the prototype and offered useful feedback for further developments.

So, the implementation was successful in the sense that the innovators were able to measure usability and perceived utility.

The feedback collected from the HoTEL advisory board was also useful, but much more oriented to exploitation and marketing, which is, at this stage of development, out of the scope of the A4Learning project.

[7] Assess the implementation session

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	④	
I would repeat the experience	④	
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	③	
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	④	

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I am satisfied with the balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	②	

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
All defined outcomes are covered at the implementation phase	③	
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	②	
The outcomes are relevance to your local context related needs	③	

[9] Comment from the Lab leader about the implementation and overall assessment

From the HoTEL project, I expected two things:

- Learning new methods to design/evaluate/deploy innovation in the educational field. I expected this to be taught with a coaching process.
- The chance to deploy my prototype in a real scenario.

The second expectation was fulfilled and I deployed my prototype, getting feedback from users.

Despite I got some advice about my innovation, it came mainly from self-reflection while filling the HoTEL forms, but I was expecting a more close coaching strategy.

4.2 Case 3. TOY

Innovator	Finpeda / Pasi Mattila
Innovation	TOY VLE

Day and time of the session	27/0/2014
Link to the session recording	
Number of participants	12

[1] Participants profile

- Participants profile: distance learning educators and developers

- Type of session (online / face to face): online, virtual world

- Number of participants to the session:

- Number of questionnaires fully completed:

- Incentives used to encourage participation to the session, if any:

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- Before the session:
    - setup the private environment
    - create instruction documents
    - test the spaces and actions

- During the session:
    - explain the space properties and functionalities
    - present main functions and benefits

- After the session
    - help online use
    - provide the needed user support
    - think the evaluation criteria

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed)

Objective for the first implementation session was to introduce the environment, show the main functions and prepare participants to use their own environment for distance learning and teaching. The idea was also to introduce the technology, make it ready for all participants to take it in use with their own personal computers and use it in real learning situation. The goal was to make test-users to use readymade environments with their students and give the feedback from pilots and implementations.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes)

The session was realized through online and distance learning technology (ACP) and it gave a good opportunity to introduce the environments (VLE's) and technology (realXtend) through shared desktop and short presentation. It was a nice way to introduce the idea and show examples. However, it did not give feedback from test-users about their personal pilots, demos, learning or teaching situations or real distance learning use cases.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session)

It would be important, as the feedback report also showed, to find real test-user groups and test the private environments with them. After pilot use collect the feedback and analyse the current development stage and necessary further steps (development, business etc.), including what kind of learning and teaching tools they expect to have or need to support multi-user social communication and learning / distance learning. Also to share the results and information of existing solution, technology and development throughout the Europe to find more users, community and pilots.

4.3 Case 3. iLIME

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref: D-ww-x-y-zz[8]	**Lab:**	UNIR Research	
Innovation:	iLIME recommender model and software system		
Date Received:	23/09/14	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	

Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process.
	2. Information in this sheet should:
	  a. Update information filled in in sheet A
	  b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C
	3. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.

Sheet completed by:	Alberto Corbi, UNIR Research
Date Completed:	23/09/2014 **Contact email:** alberto.corbi@unir.net

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**

---

[8] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

Value propositions	**Increase of student inputs being monitored** **Re-definition of the *mentoring* category**
Key messages	**Current inputs do not fit into student models** **Need for an increase of inputs** **Inputs are the entry point into for model understanding**
Product development strategy	**Analyse current input set status and possible increase** **New focus groups with learning professionals about monitoring capabilities and convenience**
Marketing & promotion strategy	**Internal promotion: promote more focus groups on the model and software in order to publicize research group inside our university** **External promotion: any radical change, keep on with articles, publications and networking rate**
Pricing strategy	**No change**

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	2 New focus groups on monitoring	Focus groups took place
	Analyse possible technical implementation on Sakai 2.10	Verbal or formal report from Sakai experts/programmers
	Implement at least 4 new custom monitoring inputs suggested on focus group(s)	Web services working on Sakai
Mid-Term (18 months)	1 more focus groups on monitoring	Focus group took place
	Implement as many inputs on Sakai as possible	Web services delivered
	Suggestions Inbox to let teachers ask for new monitoring options	Inbox Web site up and running

action on recommendations to improve adoption		
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1	**Implementation of new monitoring inputs**	**# monitored inputs implemented**

2		
3		

Innovator	Unir Research GdI TELSOCK
Innovation	LIME Recommender System
Day and time of the session	09/09/2014
Link to the session recording	
Number of participants	8
Report	Implementation report

[1] Stakeholders

- Participants' profile: primary education degree teachers, communication and marketing experts and other teachers and professionals members of UNIR Staff.

- Type of session (online / face to face): online

- Number of questionnaires fully completed: 2

- Incentives used to encourage participation to the session, if any: 3 different sessions with different schedules. Complete availability from the Lab Innovator to be contacted both by email or video conference to solve doubts and ask further questions with no time limitation.

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- Before the session: Contact participants, kindly offer a wide array of schedule possibilities, development of a specific tool to submit feedback.

- During the session: 1st phase, model and innovation theoretical explanation: 2nd phase, ad-hoc tool introduction.

- After the session: several extra sessions with 2 teachers in order to solve doubts and troubleshoot.

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

- *Transfer the innovation to an array of Institution teachers and staff members in order to obtain feedback on the innovation itself.*
- *Present a custom previously programmed GUI tool in order to test and describe new innovation features.*

- *Solve doubts regarding the theory plane behind of the innovation.*
- *Open a 10 minutes discussion and question section.*
- *Collaterally, present the research group to other UNIR members non initially involved with the research area.*
- *Shake assistants consciousness towards the analysis of their own way of conducting their pedagogical tasks.*
- *Alternatively expressed, we wanted assistant to perform a serious, personal, intimate and deep analysis on how they model their own class in the pursue of their goals as teachers.*
- *I personally had the goal of conglomerating and putting together several areas of the Institution supporting the innovation by the fact of connecting motivated people from each of these departments.*

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

As explained before, the session began with an introductory and theoretical phase where the innovation was kindly introduced. Though concepts and theory had been already been smoothed, some teachers presented soon than expected doubts and found it difficult to understand some slides. Some also had difficulties in understanding the tool that was subsequently presented. One teacher demanded an extra session to gather further explanation and two more sent an email with doubts and suggestions.

In spite of the facts just described, the session went fine. Teachers seemed at the end to have internalize the concepts and ideas just presented.

Teachers also contributed in the same online session with nice ideas, and even with their doubts and criticism. Worth mentioning, they expressed their frustration over the small amount of inputs our innovation is able to work with. Inputs are a key concept of our recommender model as they represent student activities. Assistants to the session couldn't see the inputs they'll like to be able to operate with or they demanded a more fine-grained set of inputs that might reflect better some happenings that take place during the execution of their professional activity.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

After the session it became clearer than ever to me that input (user activity) monitoring is the most important phase of the model. It is the intellectual "door" to the model given its immediate intuitiveness. As already explained before, inputs are just student actions taken place in the system/platform or even on real life or scenarios. They represent something anybody (teachers mainly) can understand. Categorization (Learning, Interaction and Mentoring) and formal-informal setting classification is something that always comes afterwards and simplifies rule application and recommendation generation and final delivery. However this is not necessarily intuitive and might require further and constant assessment and counselling from the Innovation leading team (towards Innovation users, i.e. teachers/tutors). Expressed in other words: we have to give the teachers a very complete pool of inputs so that they feel they can apply the model with freedom. In a simplified manner: more inputs, more freedom, more intuitive application, more comfortableness and finally, more model usage rate from both teachers and students.

In summary: from our Innovator side we should develop input monitoring sockets for a specific LMS.

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

I would describe this Innovation as a mixed success. The model itself is theoretically robust and not excessively difficult to implement, compared with other very complex approaches. LIME is based on the teacher's own specifications and wishes and therefore its results are impregnated with the vision of the educationist. However, the software realization of the model relies in something that can mean at the same time its revitalizing soul and its prison sentence. And that thing is the amount, level, and resolution of inputs (student actions) being taken into account. This number has turn out more important than a priori expected given the fact that it represents how teaching staff approaches our recommender layer. Few inputs will turn out into a poor model implementation. Lots of inputs (with fine grained detail) might increase the possibility of rendering it a successful tool.

[7] Assess the implementation session

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	④	Sessions with kind experts are always welcome and somehow useful, even when the outcome is totally different from results expected.
I would repeat the experience	⑤	Yes, I think we are just glancing at top of the iceberg regarding teacher possible feedback.
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	⑤	Yes, session was flawlessly organised by Ocapi and GdI TELSOCK.
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	③	I'm not fully satisfied given that few session members have sent enough feedback back.

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I am satisfied with the balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	③	Not fully... a dedicated software tool was carefully written and not much used.

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
All defined outcomes are covered at the implementation phase	③	
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	②	On one hand no, given the humble participation rate planned to take place afterwards. But on the other hand, I think we touch a core problem regarding inputs amount.
The outcomes are relevance to your local context related needs	⑤	Yes, if we read between the lines: teachers demand more inputs.

4.4 Case 5. VirtualWorlds

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	D-ww-x-y-zz[9]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:			
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	

	sheet protocol

Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process.
	2. Information in this sheet should:
	   a. Update information filled in in sheet A
	   b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C

---

[9] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

	3.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Sarah Gretton, University of Leicester	
Date Completed:	06/11/2014	**Contact email:**	Sng8@le.ac.uk

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**
Value propositions	I agree with much of the assessment that innovation would be better compared with other learning platforms rather than just a real life laboratory. The rationale for using this platform was that a similar resource already existed within Second Life, however, we are now considering whether this is a sustainable and as recommended are researching other virtual environments which allow similar decision making processes
Key messages	This resource has the potential to be quite pedagogically innovative but we need to work further as a team involved to find a more suitable platform for the resource.
Product development strategy	The next step will be through research of other VLEs, open SIM environments etc., and to compare our innovation other examples of virtual laboratories (genetic and other sciences) to decide which platform allows us to still achieve the original pedagogic aims of the lab whilst reducing the current cost and technical problems associated with using Second Life.
Marketing & promotion strategy	The resource has been disseminated at Higher Education Teaching meetings within the UK; if we are re-develop the resource as described above we would continue to do this but place increased emphasis on the main benefits of the innovation. It has been noted that we need to additional support to market and promote the innovation
Pricing strategy	Due to high costs involved in hosting the current innovation in Second Life we are currently exploring options to host the lab elsewhere. Until we have done this we will cannot comment further on a pricing strategy

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Try and find a "better" platform to host this virtual lab. As suggested we should audit similar resources and more sustainable platforms to host the lab.	Successful re-location of the concept to a new platform that allows the original learning objectives to still be achieved.
	Secure funding to move the key learning objectives from the Second Life lab onto another platform.	Funding received to move at least one genetic test to the new

		platform
Mid-Term (18 months)	Once new platform has been tried and tested, we would aim to continue to use it within the core curriculum of our programme, but also work with to encourage the use of the resource in our partner programmes (iSci at McMaster University, Canada and Centre de Recherches Interdisciplinares, Universite Paris Descartes)	Uptake of the resource by other Higher Education Interdisciplinary Science programmes

	action on recommendations to improve adoption	
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1	Research similar resources and platforms	*Not sure how to complete this section – I'm afraid!*
2	Clarify Objectives of the project	
3	Seek assistance in marketing and promotion	

5. Annex 5 – UNIR. Innovation Support Model Evaluation Sheet (Form G)

5.1 Case 1. A4Learning

	to be filled in by investigator	
Ref:	F-ww-x-y-	**Lab:**

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

	zz[10]			
Innovation:				
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**		

sheet protocol	
Notes	13. All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HOTEL project with respect to the innovation.. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 14. Where the HOTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team. 15. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Luis de-la-Fuente-Valentín, Universidad Internacional de La Rioja
Date Completed: 02/10/14 **Contact email:**	luis.delafuente@unir.net

overall process evaluation	
What did you expect when you decided to work with HOTEL and engage in the process of getting support for your innovation? Have your expectations been met?	I expected two things: - Learning new methods to design/evaluate/deploy innovation in the educational field. I expected this to be taught with a coaching process. - The chance to deploy my prototype in a real scenario. The second expectation was fulfilled and I deployed my prototype, getting feedback from users. Despite I got some advice about my innovation, it came mainly from self-reflection while filling the HoTEL forms, but I was expecting a more close coaching strategy.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innvoators, with stakeholders, with reviewers)	Setting up an innovation takes some time, so I liked the duration of the support. Less time wouldn't be enough I had almost no interaction with other innovators. It's true that the project deployed a collaboration platform, but I didn't see any reward for my participation, so I was not motivated to do so.
Did the HOTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?	Yes, because the imposed deadlines for the sessions with real users pushed me to develop harder, and as I result I was able to improve the

---

[10] G = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

	system in time. Therefore, now I have a system that I can deploy with real users. Also, the interaction with real users allowed me to detect the flaws in the product, and to offer a solution.
If, YES, how would you characterise the support given by the HOTEL process? If NO, why not?	
(max. 200 words) *As said before, it was extrinsic motivation: I had a deadline so I did not want to show anything below the project expectations, so I worked harder on the prototype. Also, the information collected from the sessions with users was a good help to improve the product in the next iteration.*	
Would you recommend the HOTEL process to other innovators? Why?	If you already have a product, or you are already working in a product that you are going to evaluate one way or another, HoTEL can provide you with participants for your experiments and can give you some visibility.

evaluation of criteria	
The HOTEL model used a set of criteria to analyse your innovation. Did you find these criteria useful in understanding your adoption strategy?	
(max. 200 words) *Yes, they were useful, mainly because these criteria pushed me to self-reflect on some aspects. For example, there were some criteria related to the commercial exploitation. I don't feel this aspect to be important in my case, but I least I reflected on that.*	
Were any criteria superfluous? Why?	*(max. 75 words)* I did not put much attention in the commercial part
Were any criteria missing? Why?	*(max. 75 words)* I don't feel so

Analysis of HOTEL Process	
What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HOTEL Process?	**What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HOTEL Process?**

• **The ability to offer scenarios for validation with real users.** • **The chance to disseminate your innovation in different forums**	• **Lack of communication with innovators** • **Lack of sense of community among innovators** • **Weak coaching process**

Would you make any recommendations for improvement?	• **The innovators are expecting some kind of reward for their participation in the process. I did not feel that my reward (the validation sessions and data from real users) was that motivating. Possible offers:**
	   o **Contact with other researchers with similar ideas**
	   o **A special issue in a journal with the presented innovations and their evaluation method**
	   o **A workshop in a conference allowing the innovators to present their work (funded by HoTEL)**

other comments

5.2 Case 3. iLIME

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	F-ww-x-y-zz[11]	**Lab:**	UNIR Research GdI6
Innovation:	iLIME recommender model and software system		
Date Received:	23/09/14	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	
Notes	16. All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HOTEL project with respect to the innovation.. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 17. Where the HOTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team. 18. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed	Alberto Corbi, UNIR Research

---

[11] G = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MEN♀N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

by:			
Date Completed:	dd/mm/yy	**Contact email:**	alberto.corbi@unir.net

overall process evaluation	
What did you expect when you decided to work with HOTEL and engage in the process of getting support for your innovation? Have your expectations been met?	I expected a clear roadmap on the inception and development of an e-learning research project. Yes, my expectations have been roughly met, as I did not counted with previous experience on this area of research an innovation.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers)	I would have appreciated interaction with other innovators, labs and research groups. Relation with stakeholders and reviewers has been fluid.
Did the HOTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?	Partly, HoTEL has helped me in the adaptation of my project to a broader audience of users.
If, YES, how would you characterise the support given by the HOTEL process? If NO, why not?	
Being able to cooperate with learning experts and e-learning researchers has been of great meaning to the project and me. HoTEL methodology has played the role of breeding ground from which to establish the roots of my research.	
Would you recommend the HOTEL process to other innovators? Why?	I would recommend the HoTEL process to researchers who initiate in research in education.

evaluation of criteria	
The HOTEL model used a set of criteria to analyse your innovation. Did you find these criteria useful in understanding your adoption strategy?	
The TEL "originality" criteria has been particularly important to me as I did not want to iterate over pre-existent ideas and concepts. *It has also been important the "target criteria" as it has pointed my research in the right direction: the teachers and students experience.*	
Were any criteria superfluous? Why?	*(max. 75 words)*

Were any criteria missing? Why?	*(max. 75 words)*

Analysis of HOTEL Process	
What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HOTEL Process?	**What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HOTEL Process?**
• **Professional assesment and guidance from TEL experts** • **Being able to develop research in a TEL proffesionals framework**	• **Not enough connection between HoTEL implementators and labs, worldwide** • **Comprehensive open and easy access compilation of previous research covered by HoTEL**
Would you make any recommendations for improvement?	• **Kick off event at a given location and date so that researchers have the opportunity to know each other and share knowledge in a *one to one* manner.** • •

other comments

5.3 Case 5. VirtualWorlds

to be filled in by investigator		

Ref:	F-ww-x-y-zz	**Lab:**	
Innovation:			
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	

Sheet protocol

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Notes	1.	All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HOTEL project with respect to the innovation.. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	2.	Where the HOTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team.
	3.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator

Sheet completed by:	Sarah Gretton, University of Leceister		
Date Completed:	06/11/2014	**Contact email:**	Sng8@le.ac.uk

The HOTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation

Did the HOTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HOTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HOTEL ? (please refer to what you declared in the self assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations)	1. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met. 2. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them. (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective) 3. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved. 4. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below 2. Some parts were not so effective for this particular innovation due our funding for the project ending shortly after the review process began- this has prevented us from following up on some very useful aspects of feedback provided. So not a problem with the process itself just transient nature of funding for innovations such as this one.
The HOTEL Innovation Support process	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

Did HOTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (for instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses)	1. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation. 2. Thanks to HOTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects 3. Thanks to HOTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation 4. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HOTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
	Put your mark and comments below 3. Yes it allowed the team to provide a more thorough and objective analysis of our innovations.
Did HOTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (for instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HOTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning)	1. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 2. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically. 3. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically 4. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting..)

	Put your mark and comments below 1. But only due to the funding issues described above, if we manage to secure more funding then our response to this question would change to 2.

The HOTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did HOTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (you learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation)	1. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 2. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted. 3. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed. 4. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.
	Put your mark and comments below 1. No suggestions of

	funding were provided

The HOTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HOTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	☐**Yes** ☐No ☐Other (please specify)
Did the HOTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	☐**Yes – use in schools** ☐No ☐Other (please specify)
The HOTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HOTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	☐**Yes** ☐No ☐Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	☐Yes ☐**No** ☐Other (please specify)
Did the HOTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	☐Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)- not directly but it was suggested that similar innovations exist should we wish to look for them

MEN⌀N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Do you think the HOTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (from idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype.)…	☐Yes ☐No – ☐**Other (please specify)- difficult to say**

Your assessment of the HOTEL Innovation Support Process	
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HOTEL, do you consider the HOTEL support process good value? Why?	
I think the process would have been very helpful if we had had the time and funding available to act on the recommendations.	
Did the HOTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?	
No	
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?	
I thought the process was quite long and would have liked more formal interaction with other innovators.	
What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HOTEL Process?	**What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HOTEL Process?**
• **Clear goals** • **Helpful team – and friendly reminders** •	• **Length of project** • **Lack of funding for innovators/ innovations** •

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	• • •

Would you recommend the HOTEL process to other innovators? Why?

Yes I found it a useful reflective process and it can up with some useful critiques of our resource

Other comments
Thank you for your patience as I appreciate I was often late in returning paperwork. The problem with working on a project which doesn't have funding anymore is that paid work has to take precedence unfortunately – so I really appreciate your patience with this.

6. Annex 1 – ELIG – Initial Review Sheet (Form C)

6.1 Case 1. Comenius

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e.: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (Please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (Policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	19.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case
	20.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise

Description of the Innovation			
Ref	Case study #1	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning		
Purpose	The course "e-learning conception" is a postgraduate course, structured in eight different modules during one semester.		

Stage of Development	Prototype

Description
In order to follow new learning trends, Comenius conceptualized a postgraduate course in e-learning conception. Planned to start in April, its first edition was postponed due to the lack of participants (minimum of ten is required). The ambition and objective was to allow participants to design and implement e-learning actions. While raising awareness about distance learning platforms, its usability and the role of the e-tutor, participants are asked to present a final project with learning content created and developed.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	- Training managers - Teachers and trainers - Recent graduates or young graduates, unemployed (representing about 75% of Comenius customers) - Other graduates (older) unemployed, seeking a professional alternative or enrichment (representing about 15% of customers)
Territorial Level	Regional

Value Propositions
While analysing the current educational situation, Comenius trainers realized an apparent gap in the market regarding educational offers in e-learning content conception. Comenius trainers assumed that nowadays, e-learning courses are increasing in the education ecosystem, and they are usually conceptualized and held by teachers without proper instruction. It was believed that despite the fact that those capacities can be self-taught, future employers will likely take the course attendance or similar as an eligible criteria, and it's exactly here where Comenius aims to make a difference. One of the course's advantage was seen to be in its "hands-on" paradigm, i.e., the practical component that comes alongside with this course.

Intended Outcomes
Through participant's capacity building of general and specific skills, while giving support in the creation and development of their own open online course, one learning outcome will be the implementation of new MOOCs in the educational market. This is linked directly with the know-how vision of the course, as referred above.

Prior Art
This course was designed and envisioned by experienced teachers and trainers that used lessons learnt from courses that they've been developing (Planning of Training

Management, for instance). They developed a one semester postgraduate course, covering all relevant e-learning areas, with a main focus in its conception.

Key Messages

- Future of learning
- New tools
- Practical
- Integration of diverse perspectives

Innovative Element

This course intends to fill a perceived gap regarding e-learning conception. It aims to provide a solution for current e-learning autonomy. It will also bring a better understanding of useful e-learning tools and platforms so that they can be used adequately.

Impact

In order to improve the training quality and have an impact on the education community, Comenius understands that e-learning is a strategy for the future, highlighting the quality of teaching, taking advantages of teacher's competencies and established synergies with educational partners.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

Measures of achievement consist of the learners' ability to plan their training investment and acquire competencies in an efficient and pleasant way, in order to acquire the most desirable skills for the job market.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

Measures can be defined through two perspectives: the learner and the course. From a learner perspective, the rate of employability is measured by a follow-up process, six months after the course completion. The learner perspective also attempts to measure the knowledge applicability acquired through the course, using quantitative methods. From a course perspective, and by replicating practices of other courses, all participants have the opportunity to assess the course and trainers in the end. Thus, participants' expectations and thoughts about the course are measured, and further analysed.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To spread into new educational markets.	Number of editions.
	To increase the number of postgraduate courses within the current educational offers.	Number of educational offers.
	To offer a satisfactory and useful course.	Satisfaction rate in the final self-assessment

		test.
Mid-Term	To establish a partnership in the Digital Marketing area.	Number of partnerships established.
	To be an e-learning recognised educational institution.	Brand awareness.
Product Demonstration	In order to check the course impact, there's a questionnaire in the end, where participants can assess some dimensions as, for instance, the course, trainers and facilities quality.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://www.e-comenius.com/ Ref #2: Meetings with coordinators Ref #3: PAF 2014 (Annual Formation Plan)	

SWOT ANALYSIS
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above.***

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Innovative: unique features of the course in Portugal - The practical component of the course provides a hands-on paradigm for course's participants - Course quality assured by trainers' competencies and background - Previous synergies with e-learning based companies reinforces the course's content - Good statistical indicators given by participants in other courses	- Course doesn't award ECTS, resulting in no academic acknowledgement - Poor research carried out to understand the market demand - Presented eligible criteria with low relevance - Lack of experience and recognition in e-learning courses - Promotion of an e-learning conception course, when no other educational offer uses e-learning approaches
Opportunities	Threats
- Provides the opportunity for students to create own MOOCs in the future - To understand how to enter into a new niche market	- Course structure doesn't allow to choose which modules to attend - There are already several educational platforms where users can acquire similar competencies with lower costs

MEN_oN   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

• e-learning as a new learning trend • Course's structure can be built upon 8 separate and optional modules • High market demand for e-learning courses • To establish partnerships with HE and VET institutions • External intervention to improve the offer	• The presented content of course organisation is not very relevant • Competitiveness: other entities with more recognition that may arise • Course market seems to be orientated to funded training

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
One of the intended strategic actions is to establish and develop technical-scientific partnerships with Higher Education Institutions, so to give this training offer some credibility, recognition, and mainly to raise the participation rate. Another strategic action will be to organize a workshop with educators, trainers and young graduates to present the current need, and thus promote the course and raise awareness.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
The course promotion follows the usual marketing strategy. This strategy encloses the promotion through mailing (using "Egoi"), and other communication channels. This promotion model is thus similar to other offers/courses held by the company, with exception to "Google Adwords". Regarding the Comenius website, it's planned to make a deep change in some levels as the structure and content, and also to highlight some positive references given by the self-assessment of previous users.
Pricing Strategy
The established price of €1.189 was defined taking into consideration other postgraduate courses' costs currently offered by Comenius. Students, unemployed, alumni of other courses, and clients, collaborators or associates of a partner company have a 10% discount.

6.2 Case 2. Simpiens

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol			
Notes		21. Attach or make reference to a demo of the case 22. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise	
Description of the Innovation			
Ref	Case study #2	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Simpiens		
Purpose	Simpiens Online is an online courses educational platform that acts as a marketplace for professionals so to optimize current competencies and acquire new skills demanded by the market.		
Stage of Development		Pilot	
Description			
Simpiens is a platform that offers and markets courses, it allows learners to find teachers,			

and it provide tools for educators to design and further sell their own courses. Simpiens Online is thus a market space that allows educators to develop and deliver their courses online.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	- Learners (or people that want to develop new skills) - Trainers (or people that want to teach and share their knowledge about one specific topic)
Territorial Level	National

Value Propositions

Simpiens attempt to be a Portuguese alternative to the US based offer from Udemy (www.udemy.com) allowing for more targeted and locally relevant and reachable education offers.

Intended Outcomes

The Simpiens platform intends to provide educators with a space to develop and market their courses, and to provide students with a place to learn.

Prior Art

The Simpiens platform builds on the lessons learnt from similar international MOOCs' institutions and attempts to adapt them into the Portuguese learning context.

Key Messages

- To learn and teach has never been so easy
- Portuguese MOOCs
- Supports educators to plan, create, publish and promote their offers

Innovative Element

The lack of students in some physical trainings due to geographic, scheduling, pricing and time incompatibilities was an identified need by Simpiens. In order to create a solution, Simpiens Online was developed and is currently the only Portuguese platform for MOOCs.

Impact

In order to establish itself as the best solution to acquire new and desirable skills for the job market, Simpiens is linked with trainers and recruiters from different areas of expertise. This new form of professional development brings to professionals autonomy and responsibility. Simpiens doesn't intend to be a substitute to the current main education system, but to be an additional value within non-formal education, vocational training and training throughout life contexts.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

By allowing professionals not just to attend but also to sell their own courses, success is measured by the number, and quality, of existing courses in the online platform. This option enable professionals from various areas of expertise to plan their investment in training.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

Courses available via the Simpiens platform are evaluated through three stages:
- Firstly, the quality requirements of each course are assured by Simpiens reviewers, in order to be published. These requirements cover dimensions such as the educational quality and technical quality. Simpiens reviewers thus support trainers to create quality courses, assuming a coaching role;
- Secondly, the quality control is exercised by community trainers, i.e., some trainers are invited to evaluate peers' courses, rate them and provide further feedback;
- Thirdly, a final review is done by users, who are encouraged to rank the courses according to some parameters, and leave their testimony in the end.
Thus, in addition to the existing information about the course (objectives, content, structure, and trainers' biography), all courses have quality validated.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To democratize access to education and knowledge allowing people to learn in a simple, cheap and flexible way.	Idea spread through the target group.
	To provide an opportunity to learners to plan their training investment and acquire skills in an efficient and pleasant way.	Desirable skills for the job market are acquired.
	To build up a user community of students, teachers and online courses.	Number of users.
Mid-Term	Internationalization.	Platform present on the five Portuguese speaking countries.
	To be recognized by national and international organisms (such as IEFP and CEDEFOP).	Valid recognition.
Product Demonstration	The product's evaluation will be made by prioritising objectives described above.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://simpiens.com/ Ref #2: http://prezi.com/ocsydzf1qatu/simpiens/	
SWOT ANALYSIS		

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above.

Strengths	Weaknesses
- New offer: online courses in Portuguese - Affordable pricing - Content and trainers quality - Flexible schedules: participants can learn in their own pace and time - User friendly: simple and fast - Innovative: courses' marketplace	- Current low offer: number of courses available - Portuguese market focus: courses are only in Portuguese - Does not support offline courses
Opportunities	**Threats**
- Possibility to buy and sell courses - Users can earn a commission by promoting courses - Possibility to enter in a new niche market - Scalable courses to low course's fees	- Low promotion of the pedagogical offer - Unknown brand - Resistance to online courses

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
Simpiens is in a start-up phase, negotiating an investment through business angels, working on the courses acquisition, and at the same time developing and testing new platform features. The articulation with the labour market proposed is in development and will be implemented shortly. The Simpiens business model eventually will evolve into a platform similar to the "Udemy" online courses' platform, but with some distinctive differences such as the degree of interaction with the Portuguese labour market, local recruitment and services' provision.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Overview of marketing & promotion strategy (in the next 6 months). How will the product/service be concretely promoted and implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent success? To follow-up.
Pricing Strategy
All the courses have different prices, and the pricing of each course is the choice of the teacher, with Simpiens charging a 30% commission.

6.3 Case 3. Lab4Ed

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
-   Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
-   Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
-   Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
-   Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
-   Concept development
-   Concept evaluation
-   Prototype development
-   Prototype evaluation
-   Product testing
-   Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	23. Attach or make reference to a demo of the case	
	24. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise	
Description of the Innovation		
Ref	Case study #3	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Learnovation Lab		
Purpose	Empowering students to better structure and develop their innovative ideas into projects through tools that support innovation.		
Stage of Development	Commercialised		
Description			
Learnovation Lab is an idea contest where students can apply with their ideas or academic projects that are related to Information and Communication Technologies and learning practices. Learnovation Lab thus supports the development of those ideas into concepts, through the introduction and use of an innovation support tool - the Pearson Efficacy Framework, and its potential assessment, for instance.			
Value Proposition			
Target Groups	• Higher Education students		
Territorial Level	Regional		
Value Propositions			
This competition was organised in order to support students structuring their ideas and develop their projects, by providing them with analytical tools and training on how to use			

them; followed by online and physical support, and the option to receive individualized assessment and further recommendations.

The Learnovation Lab thus support students in organizing and structuring their ideas and academic works, and the opportunity to improve their skills and capacities.

Intended Outcomes

The main intended outcome of the project is to evaluate how to support students to turn their ideas into products and services, to understand which are the existing type of tools and services to use, and how those tools and services might be orchestrated.

Prior Art

Learnovation Lab draws on the Pearson Efficacy Framework as a tool to support innovation, to then subsequently evaluate its applicability by looking at the applicability within the wider innovation support methods that have been put forward within the HoTEL project.

Key Messages

- Supporting innovation in education
- From idea to concept
- "Self-assess yourself"
- Structure thoughts and organize ideas

Innovative Element

The innovative element of the Learnovation Lab is the attempted combination of established innovation support methods, and as put forward within the HoTEL project, and the combination and interplay with the Pearson Efficacy Framework. The focus of the competition is not only on the ideas and further projects, but also on the participants and their capacity building.

Impact

The impact is – at least – twofold. Firstly, the Learnovation Lab idea contest will build up capacity in students on how to use analytical tools so to turn their ideas into products and services. Secondly, the results of the Learnovation Lab idea contest will allow to evaluate how the different types of tools and services did support the students, and how those tools and services might be orchestrated.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

In order to measure the success of its first edition, Learnovation Lab will analyse feedback provided from students and educators, the quality of the final projects presented, and a hands-on workshop directed at practitioners and educators.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

The intended measures will be obtained through participants' feedback and the evaluation of contributions through the idea contest and the hands-on workshop. Evaluation will also

make use of the Pearson Efficacy Framework as a tool for assessment.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To support ideas' development.	Several works supported.
	To introduce the Pearson Efficacy Framework as an analytical tool.	Use of this tool in other projects.
	To provide information, awareness and training sessions regarding technology-enhanced learning and its variables.	Participant's presence rate.
	To share theoretical and practical knowledge and experiences.	Understanding of constructs.
Mid-Term	To evaluate findings within the wider HoTEL context.	Comparability of results obtained
Product Demonstration	The product's evaluation will be made by prioritising objectives described above.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: HoTEL methodologies Ref #2: Pearson Efficacy Framework methodology Ref #3: Lab4Ed annual activities' plan	

SWOT ANALYSIS	
*Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above.***	
Strengths	Weaknesses
- Context of the contest: link with students' needs - Prizes: summer internships and publications - Support hold by staff and experts - Pricing: no costs for participants - Wide opportunities: students can apply with already developed academic works	- Pilot phase (1st edition): customer awareness regarding the organising company - Timing of the competition: students have less time and other priorities during second semester

Opportunities	Threats
• New concept of an idea contest: to enhance knowledge and promote capacity building • Promotion of technologies to enhance learning • To test tools already used in different action fields	• Other educational contests • Ideas' protection: participants resistance in share their ideas • Applicability of an analytical tool for an educational context

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
The development strategy has been derived from the objectives of the HoTEL project and the way that the Pearson Efficacy Framework usually would be applied, or theoretically could be applied as an analytical tool. The development of the strategy has been supported by colleagues from Pearson UK, and with involvement of local partners from the private and higher & adult education sectors.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
In order to promote the competition, and raise participation rate, contacts with adult and higher education institutions are made, as well as the use of social networks, forums, newsletters, and other digital communication channels.
Pricing Strategy
The Learnovation Lab idea contest has no pricing strategy, since it was carried out as a part of the HoTEL ELIG experimental application.

6.4 Case 4. Pearson

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?

- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol			
Notes	25.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case	
	26.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise	
Description of the Innovation			
Ref	Case study #4	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Pearson Efficacy Framework		
Purpose	It's an interactive tool that allows users to self-assess their products or services in a structured way, obtaining recommendations on what to change so to achieve the product's or service's efficacy.		
Stage of Development	Commercialised		
Description			
The Efficacy Framework is a tool that uses a tried and tested method to support users to understand how their product, service, or business capability can achieve the intended outcomes and results. It can help to identify gaps and risks on the path to efficacy, allowing users to decide how to progress.			

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	- Higher Education students - Teachers - Educational actors
Territorial Level	International

Value Propositions

The aim of this tool is to be a primary and essential intervention process where users can solve the randomness of initial thoughts, and be able to structure their ideas in the most effective way.

Intended Outcomes

By providing an interactive tool, while working with others to focus on driving learner outcomes, Pearson Group hopes that this tool will become a widely spread and useful method of products' assessment.

Prior Art

The term "efficacy" comes from the pharmaceutical industry, where focusing on outcomes as well as inputs is essential. Other industries and businesses have ways to measure the impact of their products and services on their customers through efficacy, so this is not a new concept. The Pearson Group, while developing this analytical tool, aims to apply the same principle and level of rigour to the educational sector.

Key Messages

- Structures ones thoughts and allows to organize ideas
- Supports a path to efficacy
- Allows for self-assessment of educational products

Innovative Element

The Pearson Efficacy Framework aims to provide a rigorous and scalable quality assurance system that checks what necessary conditions are in place for an education programme to deliver the intended learning outcomes. In addition to this the interactivity that the framework process provides might also be considered as an innovation.

Impact

The Pearson's efficacy program and tool understand learning as a life-changing opportunity – and that a great education should have a measurable, proven impact on learners' lives. Thus, the current approach aims to be a real contribution to improve socio-economic growth and development around the world, and to drive innovation through the support of products' development.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

<mark>To follow-up.</mark>	
How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning? <mark>To follow-up.</mark>	

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To help people making progress in their lives through learning, and ensure that the pursuit of efficacy and learning outcomes are at the centre of a new global education strategy.	Positive reviews / feedback.
	To raise awareness about the Efficacy Framework and its usefulness.	Use of this tool by educational actors.
Mid-Term	To help people making progress in their lives through learning, and ensure that the pursuit of efficacy and learning outcomes are at the centre of a new global education strategy.	Positive reviews / feedback.
Product Demonstration	Pearson carefully evaluates this product when they offer global products and services, when those are customised for local needs, and when is required a true local approach. Pearson focus the investment on markets with the biggest growth opportunities.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://efficacy.pearson.com/efficacy-tool/ Ref #2: http://efficacy.pearson.com/the-urgent-challenge/faq/ Ref #3: http://ar2012.pearson.com/assets/downloads/15939_PearsonAR12_Chief_Exec.pdf	

SWOT ANALYSIS	
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above.	

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Innovation: interactivity component of the analytical tool • Pricing: free of charge	• Recognition of this tool within an educational sector • Partiality: self-assessment can be biased

- Way to validate and structure thoughts - Time efficacy and workload - Appealing: visual results through colour rating scheme	Questions' specificity: questions are independent of the product or service that is being evaluated
Opportunities	Threats
- Efficacy: initial idea or product development from another point of view - To enhance knowledge and promote capacity building - Idea of knowledge exchange - Promoting technology to enhance learning - Implementation of a new analytical tool within the education system	- Resistance to the use of a new tool against other existing platforms of analysis (as SWOT, PEST/PESTLE/ STEEPLED, Core Assessment, Porter's Five Forces and Risk Analysis, for example) - Framework with different results in the educational approach when comparing to the industrial ones - Complexity of concepts and terms' definitions for an educational context

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
As part of a new global education strategy which sets out to help more people make progress in their lives through learning, Pearson published its Efficacy Framework – Pearson's approach for ensuring its products and services enable students to learn what they need to make progress – for feedback and improvement. Pearson also promised to develop a global research network to gather the evidence needed on the "path to efficacy", and openly to share and broker debate around its findings. Additionally, Pearson committed to report audited learning outcomes measures and targets alongside its financial accounts, covering its whole business by 2018, and to share plans to "institutionalise" efficacy across Pearson's organisation, creating dedicated focus and incentives towards learning outcomes targets for all business areas.   The company's ambition is to ensure that its work is driven by an ever-clearer understanding of how it can maximise and measure its impact on learning outcomes, drawing on the lessons of the healthcare industry to invest in research and development and build new partnerships that will address the most pressing unmet needs in education.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
The marketing of this framework will essentially be focused at Pearson's digital communication platforms and in physical workshops in order to present the tool directly to educational actors. As it is unknown in the educational world, there might be a resistance in adopt and implement this tool.

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Pricing Strategy
The use of this product is free of charge and can be done at Pearson's website.

6.5 Case 5. Laureate Online Education

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
-   Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
-   Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
-   Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
-   Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
-   Concept development
-   Concept evaluation
-   Prototype development
-   Prototype evaluation
-   Product testing
-   Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
-   Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
-   Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
-   Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
-   Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
-   Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
-   It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
-   It will have an impact on the learning processes

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	27. Attach or make reference to a demo of the case 28. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise	
Description of the Innovation		
Ref	Case study #5	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work

Ref	Case study #5 **Lab** ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Programme
Purpose	The University of Liverpool's online DBA programme is designed to prepare students to carry out research-based professional practice.
Stage of Development	Commercialised

Description

The online Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) from the University of Liverpool is a professional doctorate for senior working professionals currently looking to advance their careers by bringing real workplace challenges to the classroom and creating actionable knowledge. The programme's innovative Critical Action Learning and Action Research approach encourages the development of doctoral-level thinking and research skills across key contemporary management areas.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	• Senior business professionals • Graduate students
Territorial Level	International

Value Propositions

The value proposition lays within the pedagogy, namely Critical Action Learning and Action Research where individuals work cooperatively to improve their practice by tackling real issues and reflecting on their actions. This method is also applied by high-achieving organisations, and a core value of it is that it allows for relevant learning and by the same time to find solutions to existing difficult problems. This online DBA program is targeted at executive level learner and another value that the online dimension provides is the opportunity to learn with peers from across the globe.

Intended Outcomes

To ensure that students are fully equipped for the career challenges, supporting them to find the right solutions for contemporary business situations.

Prior Art

This educational offer builds on the experiences of Laureate Online Education and the University of Liverpool with regards to course design and delivery.

Key Messages
• Innovative Critical Action Learning and Action Research approach to foster the development of doctoral-level thinking and research skills across key contemporary management areas • Innovative public-private partnership model in between Laureate Online Education (NL) and the University of Liverpool

Innovative Element
Laureate Online Education uses Critical Action Learning and Action Research learning methods to bring real-world challenges to the classroom, making it highly relevant to student's career. Despite of being a 100% online course, students who complete the DBA are awarded with a degree that is equivalent to the study-on-campus one, thus being subject to the same academic scrutiny and quality control.

Impact
The DBA aims to be a real contribution and improvement of socio-economic growth and development around the world. Senior managers have the opportunity to learn with and from each other, while being supported and challenged by the faculty in a rigorous and scholarly environment. By improving critical reflection and thinking, students will have the opportunity to acquire skills that are sought-after across a wide range of organisations and settings.

Measures of Achievements and Success
What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service? The evaluation criteria during the course covers some important dimensions as, among others, the intellectual and methodological soundness, the success of and learning from project, the quality of the final project assessment and the adherence to intellectual and ethical norms.
How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning? To follow-up.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To undertake significant research in the business field.	Relevance of findings and publications.
Mid-Term	To follow-up.	To follow-up.
Product Demonstration	Users registered on this Laureate course can learn, and further apply that knowledge. During online classes, students can assess the course, so the educational institution can adapt and correct any existing

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

	issues.
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://www.liv.ac.uk/study/online/programmes/management/doctor-of-business-administration/overview/ Ref #2: https://my.laureate.net/Faculty/programs/Pages/DBAbyActionLearning.aspx

SWOT ANALYSIS
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above.

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Innovative learning and research methods that encourage students to engage deeply with their organisation • Collaborative learning with other high level, international executives • An international, up-to-date curriculum, covering contemporary management topics • There are no fixed lecture times, the classroom is always open and there is no need to synchronise study with anyone else • 100% online assessment, with optional face-to-face residencies, which provide the opportunity to deepen the learning experience and to meet other DBA students and experienced researchers • Support given by Liverpool University • It awards the same degree as the equivalent study on-campus, subject to the same academic scrutiny and quality control	• Pricing: resistance to attend an expensive course
Opportunities	Threats
• Opportunity to develop leadership and	• Competitiveness: other existing

MENON Brunel uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

critical thinking skills through disciplined self-reflection • Networking: communication with fellow executives from across the world • Market needs: number of universities with this educational offer	courses, with lower prices (Athabasca's online course, for example)

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
Overview of R&D strategy (in the next 6 months). The overview can include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. To follow-up.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
The promotion is done through digital communication channels, such as the University of Liverpool and the Laureate's website, as well as by the "Google Adwords" platform.
Pricing Strategy
DBA's tuition fee is establish on €9.300 per year (EEA), with a total fee for EU (excluding the United Kingdom) students of €42,081.67. The fee depends on the region where the student lives. As pricing strategy, it is possible to pay this fee as a single instalment to give the best possible saving; as a monthly payment plan to fit the budget and spread the tuition fees over 36 or 45 month; as a pay-as-you-go payment plan so student pays as progress through the degree; or as a three instalment plan which reduces the total cost of tuition.

6.6 Case 6. Auth

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?

- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol			
Notes	29.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case	
	30.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise	
Description of the Innovation			
Ref	Case study #6	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	openSE – open educational framework for computer science Software Engineering		
Purpose	openSE is a space to study, practice, play and to get recognition and learn through experiences in the openSE community. Teachers may also use openSE as a space to better support students, providing them with a large number of learning resources, to allow them to engage at real live projects, to practice their skills, or to connect with learners around the globe.		
Stage of Development		Commercialised	
Description			
The openSE platform aims to deliver an open approach to computer science Software Engineering as well as the continuous provision of up-to-date and relevant learning			

materials, and opportunities that match students' interests and employers' demand. This platform aims to provide companies with better-educated employees and to allow learners to acquire an enhanced set of skills in comparison to traditional education. openSE further aims to provide relevant content, facilitating student's awareness regarding open source projects, to preserve students' experience as 'learning projects', and to allow for communication among learners and teaching assistants.

The platform brings together the fields of education, voluntary learning, and enterprises through innovative use of ICT, supporting free and open educational provision, connecting content and reasoning, and providing the fundament for a dynamic and evolutionary growing participatory learning ecosystem.

The openSE platform addresses a number of issues, such as imparting students' practical as well as key and soft skills, keeping curricula updated and close to market needs, providing up to date and rich learning resources and opportunities, driven by open access and inclusive learning scenarios, laying the base for new educational revenue models and public/private partnerships.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	- Higher education students - Teachers and teaching assistants - Software developers
Territorial Level	European

Value Propositions
openSE attempts to provide an Open Educational Framework for Software Engineering bringing together academia, formally enrolled students and fellow students, free learners outside the formal education, and open source practitioners and enterprises. Students have the chance to work with software developers and user communities, apply theoretical knowledge in real world projects, and acquire a professional experience that later will be relevant for their CV.

Intended Outcomes
To stimulate participatory learning experiences and foster practical sessions where learning activities and outputs become learning resources themselves, and to enable current and future learners to fully and continuously benefit from others' achievements, regardless of where those achievements have been made.

Prior Art
The openSE platform attempts to provide an open educational infrastructure bringing together education and business, hence increasing the speed of innovation. By ensuring continuous provision of up to date and relevant learning materials and opportunities that match students' interests and employers' demand, learners' life and working' opportunities are enhanced regardless of age, gender, etc. or formal educational degrees. openSE draws upon the lessons learnt from Open Source communities, as an open participatory learning ecosystem, and initial experimental small scale pilots, or similar initiatives in formal education.

Key Messages

- Improve education
- Sharing of knowledge
- Increase the speed of innovation

Innovative Element
The openSE framework tangles two characteristics that are predominant in formal education and preventing it – almost 'per-se' - to take full advantage through web provided opportunities: "closeness" and "semester based structures". Closeness, on one hand, prevents that the learning resources of one institution might be improved by the outside world, or enhanced through external sources that are brought in by individuals or through technology. Semester based structures, on the other hand, provide a challenge to establish a learning ecosystem that would allow for continuous and evolutionary growth, as well as in a community level, including the full spectrum of participants ranging from newbies over advanced learners to "old foxes". Such a learning ecosystem would be desirable as it connects learning resources to learning processes (and related discourse), or provides the possibility to establish peer support, correction, development, or even assessment systems.

Impact
openSE platform aims to allow future learners to benefit from earlier achievements and build upon them, instead of starting from scratch, and to enable free learners outside the formal education to upgrade their skills, and to make those skills visible for potential employers.

Measures of Achievements and Success
What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?
Success is measured in the assessment of the students' project report that is made available via the openSE platform. Student reports can also be peer-reviewed and peer-rated within openSE. At current openSE features more than 500 Learning / Internship Projects & Reports.
How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?   To follow-up.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To gather users on the platform.	Quantity of users on the platform.
	To bring together the various stakeholders to facilitate mutual support and exchange of educational and training materials on Free Software and Open Standards.	Quantity of stakeholders and interaction between them.
	To centralise, transmit and enlarge the available	Increase of knowledge

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	knowledge on Free Software and Open Standards through creating a platform for the development, distribution and use of related information, educational and training programmes.	on Free Software and Open Standards' awareness.
Mid-Term	To raise awareness and contribute to the building of critical mass for the use of Free Software and Open Standards.	Quantity of users of Free Software and Open Standards system wide.

Product Demonstration	Users relying on the system to develop pedagogical ideas.
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://visir-network.eu/innovations/auth/ Ref #2: http://www.opense.net/#sthash.YgL7vUmm.dpuf

SWOT ANALYSIS

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above.***

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Innovative idea and context: space to study, practice, play, get recognition and learn through experiences in the openSE community - Pricing: free of charge for users - Supporting platform: support of users provided, reaching students and teachers	- Lack of quality control: lack of implemented measures to control - Platform and concept awareness: openSE is still unknown to the majority of the target groups
Opportunities	Threats
- Capitalizing ideals: idea of knowledge exchange - Learning assistance: support given by openSE members	Confidentiality: resistance to share works with other users in the platform

Development Plans

Product/Service Development Strategy
Overview of R&D strategy (in the next 6 months). The overview can include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks.   To follow-up.

Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Overview of marketing & promotion strategy (in the next 6 months). How will the product/service be concretely promoted and implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent success?   To follow-up.

Pricing Strategy
This platform is funded by European programmes and it's free of charge for all participants.

6.7 Case 7. Apollo

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	31.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case
	32.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise
Description of the Innovation		
Ref	Case study #7 **Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	Balloon	
Purpose	Balloon is described as a radical new career and learning tool that helps users to manage their career success in today's dizzying knowledge economy.	
Stage of Development	Commercialised	
Description		
Balloon is a new kind of digital platform that brings the world of skills, jobs, and learning together - all personalized around users and their future. It's a system that maps out users skills constantly and supports users to see where they are in the career landscape. Balloon allows exploring career paths and jobs, presents the skills needed to get those jobs, and provides access to learning and related courses.		
Value Proposition		
Target Groups	• Technology companies searching for job candidates • Candidates searching for a job related to technology • Users interested in online courses about technology	
Territorial Level	International	
Value Propositions		
Balloon helps to find a new job, or to move on from a current one. In addition, it gives support to knowledge improvement. Balloon brings job seekers, course providers, and employers together, by creating a more efficient way to give all users the information they need to make smart and confident career decisions. Balloon aims to make tech companies'		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

recruitment more efficient. Job applicants can browse job openings on the site and learn which skills are required to apply. They can then search in the course database by either the skill they need to learn or the job title. Job seekers also learn about the potential salary for the different jobs.

Intended Outcomes

Balloon's portal is about supporting users to see further and get where they want to go, easier and faster.

Prior Art

Balloon provides courses and jobs' information, as any other common job search portal, but is more focused on technology in an online environment.

Key Messages

- "BALLOON. Up is this way"
- "Helping you rise above in your technology career"

Innovative Element

Balloon had pulled in tens of thousands live job openings, skills profiles, and online courses to be available to users.

Impact

The envisioned impact is to be a relevant platform that allows users to assess their skills, discover career paths, and acquire new skills.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

The platform will provide an understanding on what type of jobs people are more interested in and what are the most desired skills to employers.
Based on this, Apollo Education can (and will) shape their own educational offers accordingly.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

This educational service can be measured through an analysis that uses as an indicator if users get a job in their action field.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To support in maximizing career options.	Raise of employment rate.
	To match the skills needed by employers with the courses that teach those skills.	Matching offer and demand.

Mid-Term	To improve matching technology constantly.	Success obtained if they are consider innovative.
	To offer new tools in order to maximize Balloon efficacy.	Success obtained if they are considered an effective way to achieve efficacy.
Product Demonstration	- Assessing Skills: Balloon profiles with users' current professional skills and qualifications, gives a broader, deeper, and smarter view of their unique value and career potential. - Discover Career Paths: Balloon's skills-matching technology links users' profile to job openings they're qualified for today. It also identifies positions that may be suited with additional training, as well as career paths yet to be considered. - Acquire New Skills: Balloon's course catalogue is open and includes courses from an unprecedented array of leading online education and training providers. Thus, courses are recommended to meet training needs.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: https://www.balloon.com	

SWOT ANALYSIS

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above.***

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Cluster the current dispersed offer: it joins all the separate but related offer in one place - skills, jobs, and learning • Pricing options: Free and paid courses • High quality courses: provided by established partnerships • No minimum qualification required	• Target-group: lack of public awareness regarding need and platform as solution
Opportunities	Threats

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

• Lack of proper competition • Trend: e-learning with a big increase in development	• Competitiveness: cheaper courses provided by similar existing platforms

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
Overview of R&D strategy (in the next 6 months). The overview can include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. To follow-up.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Overview of marketing & promotion strategy (in the next 6 months). How will the product/service be concretely promoted and implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent success? To follow-up.
Pricing Strategy
Balloon is a free service, though courses that are available via Balloon might be available only against a fee.

6.8 Case 8. Floqq

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	33. Attach or make reference to a demo of the case 34. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise
Description of the Innovation	

Ref	Case study #8	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	FLOQQ		
Purpose	FLOQQ was created with the vision to improve the way people learn and acquire new skills. FLOQQ is an online courses' marketplace with a focus in practical orientation at which specialists from different areas can share their knowledge and experiences.		
Stage of Development	Commercialised		

Description
The FLOQQ platform was developed to support employability and personal knowledge by providing life-long learning opportunities. FLOQQ is a platform where anyone can teach and learn whatever matters to them; using what FLOQQ calls "pills of knowledge". At FLOQQ, users can find very specific and practical courses, like about skills that are demanded by companies. The difference to traditional education offers is that users can rate, amongst others, the teachers' performance, or the content of the course, and by using their own social network, and similar to the approaches that are used by "Amazon" or "Ebay", for instance. FLOQQ associates believe that learning is a social activity, thus it´s very important to know who is going to teach, and who has been in that class before, in order to know if it´s worth it.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	• A professional who has been working in a specific field and see FLOQQ as an opportunity to earn extra money with it • Anyone who needs to know a specific skill to work • Passionate people who love to learn new skills

Territorial Level	International

Value Propositions

While the job market is constantly changing, education does not have the flexibility to change at the same rhythm. As an example, the top 10 in-demand jobs in 2012 did not exist 5 years ago. Thus, FLOQQ covers the increasing gap between what is learnt from traditional education and the real labour market needs.

Intended Outcomes

FLOQQ puts the users at the centre by giving them the power to decide the skills they need to learn in order to build their own learning menu, and structure their career path.

Prior Art

FLOQQ turned the development of practical skills of day-to-day activities into an educational purpose.

Key Messages

- "Take charge of your future and live up to your potential!"
- The biggest marketplace for online video courses
- "Join and improve your skills"

Innovative Element

FLOQQ aims at continuously democratizing education by empowering people to learn and teach what matters to them. FLOQQ allows for flexible skills development so to respond to market demands, personal brands, and individual interests.

Impact

FLOQQ aims to make an impact by providing a bridge between education and job reality, and to generate employment by providing useful life-long learning.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

To follow-up.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

To follow-up.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator

Type	Objective	Success Indicator
Short-Term	To generate employment by providing useful life-long learning.	People finding jobs and be efficient in doing it through the FLOQQ platform

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

		knowledge driven.
Mid-Term	To become the most useful tool to learn useful skills, in any device, format and country.	People using FLOQQ as a tool to improve themselves.
Product Demonstration	During online classes, students can assess the course, in order to correct any existing issues. Users can rate the teacher performance, the content of the course, etc., using their own social network.	
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: http://www.floqq.com/ Ref #2: http://visir-network.eu/innovations/floqq/ Ref #3: http://vimeo.com/floqq#sthash.eet4UGji.dpuf Ref #4: http://www.finsmes.com/2013/01/floqq-interview-ceo-alvaro-sanmartin.html Ref #5: http://www.easypromosapp.com/blog/en/2014/02/case-study-floqq-and-the-giveaway-with-recruiting-110000-users-in-a-month/	

SWOT ANALYSIS

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above.***

Strengths	Weaknesses
- FLOQQ app: it allows access with mobile devices - Multilingual: available in three different languages (English, Spanish and Portuguese) - Commission to users that promote a course - Multi-currency: eight types of currency are applicable	Doesn't provide support during offline courses
Opportunities	Threats
- Accreditation/certified courses - Networking: business experts to join with their own videos and share their	- Competitiveness: replication of this type of platform - Pricing: over price of some courses that can bring resistance to users

knowledge and experience	• Support: lack of trainers' reviews

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
At FLOQQ users can find compact courses with practical orientation, taught by business experts who are passionate to share their knowledge and experience. FLOQQ ambition to further improve the current platform and plans to expand services first to Latin American countries and subsequently other international markets, while trying to find marketing alliances.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Overview of marketing & promotion strategy (in the next 6 months). How will the product/service be concretely promoted and implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent success? To follow-up.
Pricing Strategy
In terms of pricing strategy, FLOQQ takes 15% of each transaction that takes place in their continuous learning marketplace. FLOQQ's mobile phone app doesn't have any costs for users. Furthermore, for each user that attends a course through a promotion, the promoter wins a 50% commission.

6.9 Case 9. EdX

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?

- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	35.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case
	36.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise
Description of the Innovation		
Ref	Case study #9 **Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Name	edX online courses	
Purpose	edX is a not-for-profit platform that attempts offering the highest quality education, both online and in the classroom. edX is building an open-source online learning platform and hosting a web portal for online education, with interactive online classes and MOOCs from world leading universities.	
Stage of Development	Commercialised	
Description		
edX was created for students and institutions that seek to transform themselves through cutting-edge technologies, innovative pedagogy, and rigorous courses. Through their institutional partners, the Xconsortium, along with other leading global members, edX presents online higher education courses, offering an opportunity to anyone who wants to accomplish personal goals, thrive, and grow. This platform uses the Learning Management System (LMS) for students and teachers, enabling real-time collaboration while reducing learning costs.		
Value Proposition		
Target Groups	• Everyone with access to a computer with a current browser, an internet connection, and a desire to learn.	
Territorial Level	International	
Value Propositions		

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

The edX schools and member organizations aim to extend their collective reach to build a student's online global community. Along with online courses offering, partner institutions plan to use their educational programs to enhance education on their own campuses, and to undertake research on how students learn and how technology can transform learning.

Intended Outcomes

To provide great self-service tools that ensure students' success.

Prior Art

This pedagogical platform improves traditional learning methods by teaching online, free of schedules, unbundling the usual educational system. It replicates other similar platforms, as 'Coursera' and 'OpenUniversity', for example.

Key Messages

- Take great online courses from the world's best universities
- Verified Certificates
- Open Source & the edX Technology Platform

Innovative Element

From edX innovative elements it's possible to highlight:

- In addition to educational offers, the platform is used for learning and distance education research by collecting learners' clicks and analysing the data, as well as collecting demographics from each registrant;

- edX offers certificates of successful completion, but it does not offer course credit. Whether or not a college or university offers credit for an online course is within the sole discretion of the school.

Impact

Initial results showed a decrease in failure rates from previous semesters. The students percentage required to retake the course dropped from 41% under the traditional format to 9% for those taking the edX blended course.

Measures of Achievements and Success

What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service?

To follow-up.

How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?

To follow-up.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To bring together learners from different parts of the world.	Number of students/learners.

	To collect data for education research.	Quantity of useful data for education research.
	To raise the number of the online courses' offer.	Build a global online students community.
	Research focuses on improving retention, course completion and learning outcomes in traditional campus courses and online.	Decrease of drop-out rate.
Mid-Term	To extend their collective reach and expand access to education for everyone.	Education capable of reaching everyone.
	To advance teaching and learning through research.	Google and edX will collaborate to build out and operate MOOC.org, a site for non-edX universities, institutions, businesses, governments and teachers to build and host their courses for a global audience.
	To enhance teaching and learning on campus and online.	Increase of students' results.

Product Demonstration	To follow-up.
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: https://www.edx.org/

SWOT ANALYSIS

Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above.

Strengths	Weaknesses
- Offers honour code certificates of achievement - Pricing: open source platform where all courses are free of charge - Flexible schedules: students can learn at their own pace and time	Limited: Don´t allows access with mobile devices

• Supporting offline courses • Xconsortium: based in Cambridge and Massachusetts, and hosted by MIT and Harvard, clusters a wide number of educational institutions	
Opportunities	**Threats**
• To give the possibility to students to unbundle their educational programs and structure their own learning schedule • Pedagogical approach: e-learning courses as a new learning trend	• Academic recognition: participation at courses validated by other universities • Competitiveness: similar existing platforms

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
Overview of R&D strategy (in the next 6 months). The overview can include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Although a non-profit platform, edX has the ambition to become self-sustainable, as it calls itself as the more contemplative, academically oriented player in the field, when compared with other major providers of MOOCs like "Coursera" and "Udacity". The development strategy plans to establish partnerships with international universities, by proposing one of two partnership models: a) the "university self-service model", which allows a participating university to use edX's platform as a free learning-management system for a course on the condition that part of any revenue generated by the course flow to edX. This means that the courses developed under this model will be created by individual faculty members without course-production assistance from edX, and will be branded separately in the edX catalog as "edge" courses until they pass a quality-review process (once a self-service course goes live on the edX website, edX will collect the first $50,000 generated by the course, or $10,000 for each recurring course. The organization and the university partner will each get 50 percent of all revenue beyond that threshold); or b) the "edX-supported model", which casts the organization in the role of consultant and design partner, offering "production assistance" to universities for their MOOCs. The organization charges a base rate of $250,000 for each new course, plus $50,000 for each time a course is offered for an additional term, according to the standard agreement. Although the edX-supported model requires cash upfront, the potential returns for the university are high if a course ends up making money. The university partners can choose which model they want to use on a course-by-course basis, and every 12 months they have the opportunity to switch from one to the other.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Overview of marketing & promotion strategy (in the next 6 months). How will the product/service be concretely

promoted and implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent success?

<mark>To follow-up.</mark>

Pricing Strategy
edX courses are free for everyone. Some courses have a fee (fees vary by course) for verified certificates but are free to audit. Others offer a free honour code certificate to everyone who meets the completion requirements.

6.10 Case 10. Iversity

Assessment Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form C questionnaire)

Glossary & explanations about possible answers

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product | Innovative service | Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive | Radical | Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development | Pilot | Scale | Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local | Regional/national | EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
- Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
- Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
- Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?)

Sheet Protocol		
Notes	37.	Attach or make reference to a demo of the case
	38.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise
Description of the Innovation		
Ref	Case study #10	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work

Name	Iversity
Purpose	Iversity is a platform for Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs).

Stage of Development	Commercialised

Description

The Iversity works in close cooperation with instructors, universities and knowledge-based companies to build high-quality courses that are engaging, interactive and fun. The Iversity platform, in cooperation with its partner universities, is the first MOOCs platform worldwide to offer ECTS credit points for university-level online courses. Iversity uses the Learning Management System (LMS) for students and teachers, enabling real-time collaboration, among other advantages.

Value Proposition	
Target Groups	• Free learners and people that want to develop new skills
Territorial Level	International

Value Propositions
Iversity believes that education must be available to all. Therefore, a MOOCs platform was developed, opening the chance to offer unprecedented opportunities for students and teachers alike.

Intended Outcomes
Iversity wants to support the universities on their way into the digital age, and allows access to education that can both vastly improve people's lives and create real change to communities as a whole.

Prior Art
Improves traditional learning methods by teaching online, drawing upon a classical university program but unbounding it into separate courses, allowing users to choose and define their own learning path.

Key Messages
"MOOCs for everyone!"   - Wide range of free online courses   "Let's take the campus experience online!"

Innovative Element
It's possible to highlight the following innovative elements: - Massive Open Online Courses (MOOCs), which make use of online video in new ways, combining it with interactive elements, as well as a social layer that encourages peer-to-peer learning; - Teachers can reach broader audiences, universities can share introductory courses, and companies can teach workers as well as future employees and customers.

Impact
Iversity aims to be a "university of the future", where students don't necessarily need to be enrolled in the university course offer, enabling them to study wherever in the world they may live. As opposed to MOOCs' platforms in the US, Iversity does not focus on elite universities, but rather in the study field, subject and pedagogical qualifications of each team and teacher.

Measures of Achievements and Success
What are the intended (or already implemented) measures of achievements and success through the life cycle of the education product or service? To follow-up. *How do you intend to measure if your education product and service does facilitate and support learning?* To follow-up.

Strategic Objectives and Success Indicator		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term	To bring together learners from different parts of the world.	Number of students/learners.
	Offering online courses and empower academics.	Build a global online students community.
Mid-Term	To have 1 million users.	Number of users.
	To have over 100 courses.	Number of courses.
	To support the universities on their way into the digital age.	Number of universities supported.

Product Demonstration	Some of the courses were winners of the MOOC Production Fellowship held in early 2013.
Product / Service Background Information	Ref #1: https://iversity.org/

SWOT ANALYSIS
Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your ***strategy to achieve the objectives above.***

Strengths	Weaknesses
- ECTS are awarded in some courses - Certificate after successfully completing a course - Multilingual - Iversity app: mobile version of this platform	Credit offer: the small number of courses awarding ECTS are just in German
Opportunities	**Threats**
To expand ECTS courses offer	- Credibility of free online courses - Academic recognition: validation of the participation in the course by other educational institutions

Development Plans
Product/Service Development Strategy
Iversity is committed to research how students learn, how technology can transform learning, and how teachers teach on campus and beyond. Iversity also wants to continue providing the current European Credit Transfer System.
Marketing & Promotion Strategy
Iversity tries to let the world know who they are. For this, they're constantly looking for new possibilities to spread the word about the company, trying to find new channels to reach the public. They want to keep everybody up-to-date about what's going on with the platform, so they make sure a fresh newsletter ends up in the users' mailbox every week.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

They also try to make the platform continually more fun to use. By conducting data analysis, they keep optimising the users' experience, making online learning as pleasant as possible for everyone.

Furthermore, the Marketing Department works closely with other departments. Together with the Communications Department, for example, they craft the messages and send them out to the world. The Course Production Department works to promote courses through all different kinds of channels and, together with the Product Development team, they look forward to improve the platform.

Pricing Strategy
Iversity courses are free for everyone. Some courses have a fee for verified certificates.

7. Annex 2. Reviewers Questionnaire (Form E)

7.1 Case 1. Comenius

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #1	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	08/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score **5**	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) While comparing it with similar postgraduate courses, this specific course enhances teaching skills. By focusing not only on e-tutors' training but also on the conception of content, users will be supported to further create and develop their own open online courses. Thus, through participant's capacity building of general and specific skills, one of the intended outcomes will be the implementation of new MOOCs in the educational market.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score **3**	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Comenius is currently the only Portuguese institution providing this postgraduate course. Although this uniqueness brings several benefits for users, there's a lack of clearly understanding about the existent need. The established price is similar to other postgraduate courses, but it can be considered high while comparing it with competitive existent courses. Even though resources and time (8 modules during one semester) are appropriated to deliver intended outcomes, there's an inherent lack of credibility regarding an institution offering an e-learning conception course without using any e-learning approach.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score 3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The current marketing materials, mostly present through Comenius digital platforms (website and social networks) and promoted through mailing (using 'Egoi') are neither convincing nor present the current need and its solution. The information isn't presented by content relevance, thus it must be changed or adapted so the promotion can really work in the most efficient way. This can help overlap some issues, such as the improvement of the participation rate in this course.
The course promotion followed the usual marketing strategy used with other courses held by the company, with exception to 'Google Adwords'.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

One of the intended strategic actions is to establish and develop technical and/or

scientific partnerships with Higher Education Institutions, so to provide this training offer with some more credibility as well as recognition, and thus to raise the participation rate. However it won't be easy for Comenius to empower its offers and have recognition amongst e-learning training institutions, due to the fact that existing platforms are currently offering similar skills by a lower price. In order to successfully achieve the intended outcomes, within a long-term perspective, some efforts covering several dimensions must be made.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Comenius doesn't have a specific plan for this course but to training offers in general. This plan is created in the beginning of each year and identifies short and long-term priorities, as well as it characterizes Comenius over some dimensions as its mission, strategy, training team, as well as other relevant aspects. Major risks are identified but an action plan to solve those risks is not included. Additionally, timelines aren't specifically defined to each course. To assess the course, users can give their feedback during the course, or officially in the end of it, through a self-assessment.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) As previously referred, existing plan is general and thus a specific plan for each course should be developed because each has their own characteristics and issues. To successfully achieve the aimed objectives, an individual plan to each course must be developed, priorities and barriers to success must be identified, and some partnerships must be established in order not to just to promote the course but also to raise awareness within the target-group.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	3		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	**21/42**	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #1	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation			Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	Verified by	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	08/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	3	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Comenius offer is structured according to the other courses already taught by them, showing no significant difference to current approaches. The only detail that distinguish this as innovative is that students will be capable to implement and create quality e-learning content.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.

		5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements because all the teachers are capable to use the most recent and updated tools providing an efficient way to access material resources. They will be also able to produce learning content for e-learning creating your own material.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	1	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material is almost inexistent. They only have a non-highlighted information on their web site. A confusing brochure that scares future students with irrelevant technical information. And the only "big scaled" promotion was made by mailing, however those e-mails were only sent using the Comenius database composed mainly by former students.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score	1	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in

			the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description			
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) When Comenius created this course they didn´t studied the market. So there's a big "blindness" to the market reality. The course was created without consulting good and bad practises, they don´t know if it is a good market to invest. The course structure also needs to be upgraded and to reflect the practices that they teach in their course.			
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*		

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 　　5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) All the Comenius activities are planned annually in a document called PAF (Plano Anual de Formação). So this plan is created having in mind specific (what they pretend to accomplish), measurable (they analyse data from previous activities and establish goals), assessable (they have to be achieved) and realistic/time bounded criteria (they set when they are gone accomplish the goals).	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 　　3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by

		significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The plan may succeed if the course is updated to reflect the market reality and the practises that they teach. In addition with some marketing investment, the plan may succeed because it covers a gap in the Portuguese learning reality making people to reflect on new learning trends.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	1		
Difficulty to Introduce	1	18/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.2 Case 2. Simpiens

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #2	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work

Innovation	Simpiens Online		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol		
Notes		1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel	
Date Completed	09/05/2014	**Contact email**

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question		Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This online platform has a completely unique approach, as it allows not only to buy courses but also opens the room for people who wants to create and sell their courses. Thus, the platform has a lot of room for improvement due to the potential of trainers and courses that can be held. Simpiens tries to use good practices of similar international platforms, and adapt them to the Portuguese context.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches.

		3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Still in a conceptual phase, learning resources/existing courses are scarce. The courses' costs are affordable and defined by each trainer, and quality is assured through a 3-step process involving Simpiens associates, trainers and users. Material resources depend of the number of trainers who might want to sell their own courses. Support is given by Simpiens to facilitate this process and an online course is freely available to everyone at the platform.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) It's possible to observe a lack of marketing material, however the marketing strategy is directly dependent on the funding, so it'll further evolve. Promotion is softly done through Simpiens' social networks, with regular posts and interaction with users. Still, more benefits could be presented to the target-group, and key-advantages could be more highlighted, as well as the gap that Simpiens aims to fill in.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant

		resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Due to this kind of learning and knowledge exchange as a new learning trend, the innovation will be easy to adopt, but some barriers to success can emerge, mostly because of the credibility of these courses. Simpiens does not have an educational and training background, which can cause some resistance over the Portuguese mindset. One positive point that can easier the implementation is the widely target-group. An ambition to learn and teach is the only requirement to take part of this project.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The objectives on Simpiens´ plan were developed specifically to this online educational platform. The market research previously done and awareness about some dimensions such as the inserted context, the actual economic situation, the current educational paradigm and the forecast of digital learning methodologies as a new trend, supported the development of a realistic plan. Regarding the indicators, those can only be measurable in a qualitative way (quantitative assessment is only statistical, through the number of users attending the courses).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Although Simpiens have a well-structured and reflected plan, it will always depend on some variables. Once again, funding is the most relevant one, and it can shape all process. The number of training offers available within this learning platform will directly depend on the number of trainers who want to sell their courses. If these two main variables are overtaken, Simpiens' plan is likely to succeed in the Portuguese digital education setting, and further internationally.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	3	27/42	
Difficulty to Introduce	5		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #2	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Simpiens ONline		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	12/05/2014 **Contact email**

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	1	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Simpiens offer shows less potential for learning innovation that current approaches because they have a static offer / web site, in addition there aren't currently having any new courses added to their already small offer (and very		

focused in the beauty treatments' area) for some time.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score	**1** — 1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches because it only replicate in a simple way what already exist in the market, without adding any value or inventing new types of materials and interactions. The innovation is also highly confined in the target group because it only exists in the Portuguese market.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	**3** — 1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material does not take advantage of the service, the only think related with the spreading of the platform knowledge to the target group is a video presentation on the website. There is also some difficulty to gather trainers since over 50% of the courses presented in the platform are from the same trainer.	

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation is difficult to introduce, but with some changing aspects, such as a good marketing campaign, the introduction of partnerships, or an active search for trainers to associate with Simpiens, it will be possible to recover the investment made by Simpiens, as now it seems stagnant.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 3	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) In Simpiens they are not promising things that they can't fulfil. They have created a forum were users can vote for assessable, realistic and time-bounded features. In addition this forum is open to new ideas and this ideas are also subject of a voting action.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Simpiens' plan only contemplate plausible and achievable goals, so with some luck and good bets in the platform development the plan may succeed. The platform is building up slowly due to this factor. Simpiens' plan is to reach one goal at a time, according to their possibilities.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	1	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	1		
Clarity-of-concept	3		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	16/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	3		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

7.3 Case 3. Lab4Ed

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #3	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Learnovation Lab		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

| | 4. | Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. |
| | 5. | All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise. |

| **Sheet Completed by** | ELIG expert review panel | |
| **Date Completed** | 02/05/2014 | **Contact email** | |

Learning Advantage	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score 5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This ideas' contest was structured in a different way over current existing contests. Its structured was designed bearing in mind an equal process to all participants, i.e., there's no knock-out phase during the competition and all participants are provided with an individual virtual and/or physical support. Learnovation Lab aims with this initiative to promote and provide a capacity building within some relevant thematics such as entrepreneurship, management, planning and creativity. This contest has the ambition to support the development of projects from the idea to the final concept.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score 7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) It's recognised by LabEd's team that timing wasn't the best to start the contest	

(because of students' workload in this academic stage). Still, the fact that there's an adjustment to each participant's objective overtakes this first barrier to success. In terms of costs, this competition is inserted in a European Union funded project, and it's totally free of costs for the participants.

The support to participants is given by national (Portuguese) and international experts in innovation and project development.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Lab4Ed's marketing strategy was targeted essentially to students and former students who could see in the idea contest a good opportunity to develop a new or already existing project, and to take the chance to make a summer internship and to have a publication within ELIG's digital platforms. The benefits, costs, requirements and objectives were well defined in the marketing material. The promotion was done through several communication channels (website, social networks, and universities' platforms). In addition, presentations were held in relevant higher education classes in order to raise the awareness regarding the theme, and to increase the participation rate.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems

		disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) If the contest approaches a 'hot topic', searches for ideas, provides support, and offers relevant prizes, at the same time that challenges the students, the innovation have the full recipe to be successfully adopted. Since target-group is mainly composed by higher education students, currently finishing their courses, time-consumption it's an important factor for their participation (or drop-out). Thus, process must be adapted to students' objectives and availability.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The objectives outlined were part of a plan specifically designed for this first editions of the idea contest. Indicators are measurable through communication between participants and their projects' assessment. Thus, those indicators are assessable, as the communication can be virtual or physically made. The contest defined some milestones for its pathway but didn't define exact days, so time-bound is subjective. There's a notion of a time space but it isn't mandatory.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?

Score		
	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Learnovation Lab is in its first edition. Thus, some lessons can be further learnt to improve a second edition. Some assumptions must be corrected in order to design a contest which covers all essential and secondary aspects. To succeed, the plan must pay attention to several variables that can directly or indirectly have an influence in the path to achieve success.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	29/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #3	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Learnovation Lab		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewhere.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	06/05/2014
Contact email	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Learnovation Lab contest shows significant potential over current approaches because it takes advantage of the already implemented students' work and helps them to improve further. With that, students can improve their academic work already done in their courses, while preparing this work for a chance to take it into practice in the future.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.

Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Learnovation Lab innovation is highly efficient because it adapts itself to the students' schedule and objectives and supports then in both physically and virtually ways. Also all the support given by Lab4Ed is free and in a physical or virtual way depending of the students will.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely

Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material is excellent, it's concise and clear so that's easy to be read by the target group. The target group had direct contact with the marketing material through their university (with explanatory workshops and through flyers and mupis) and social media (with Facebook adds).	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost,

Score		
		disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation requires little effort to adopt because it takes advantage of the already implemented scholar works and it helps to improve them. Also the Learnovation lab contest doesn't require any specific material to be bought or used by students.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score	7	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Learnovation Lab has set its plan as specific (test the Pearson Efficacy Framework), measurable (see how many students it can whelp and how the PEF facilitates their work), assessable (it adapts itself to the students schedule and helps then physically and virtually), realistic and time-bounded (it doesn't asks for impossible or off topic subjects).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Score		1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
	3	
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Due to the final year workload that is pending on the student's calendar, it's difficult for them to spend some time with the Learnovation Lab contest. Nevertheless the plan is already having some success and acceptance.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5	**34/42**	
Difficulty to Introduce	7		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	7		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.4 Case 4. Pearson

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #4	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Pearson Efficacy Framework		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	12/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	3	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This analytical tool has proven results within other working environment. Considered as an innovation to the educational sector, the framework can also have some potential in other sectors if some changes are made to adapt it to the new target-group. Particularly for learning, the Pearson Efficacy Framework doesn't show as much potential as it was firstly intended to, also while comparing it to other methodologies as the SWOT analysis and the PDCA approach.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) If we compare this innovation with similar analytical tools, it's possible to observe some advantages. The fact that this is an interactive tool, possible to freely use through Pearson's website, supports the achievement of significant efficient improvements. Even more, it covers some relevant and specific topics, and it facilitates its use through given examples of possible answers and hypothetical situations.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Pearson Group has a main focus on the educational setting, and has the ambition to provide education for all, no matter the place where students are located. Hence, marketing materials are education-focus. It also takes some lessons learnt from previous interventions within other areas of expertise to raise material's quality. However it's possible to clearly understand the tool's objective and concept, more advantages should be highlighted in this marketing		

process.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Although this is an experienced and tested tool in other professional settings, knowledge about the educational one can conclude that the implementation will not be easy in this special context. The fairly aim to be a future and relevant tool to analyse and support new pedagogical approaches can stuck against teachers and, most of all, school managers/directors who can show some resistance about a tool with no visible results yet. Specifically within the Portuguese context, Pearson's framework would be used by teachers as an additional platform to support their classes' design, and it would be difficult to have it as an official implemented tool.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Taken lessons learnt from the industrial and economical scene, the analytical tool was designed specifically to educational purposes. As it can be done both at the website and as a printed version, it's possible to measure the number of times someone used it, at least through the first alternative. However objectives are realistic, in some countries will be tough to implement this tool. Following this line, time-bound is not defined, as it's independent by country.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The implementation of Pearson's framework is completely dependent and influenced by countries current educational context. The plan may succeed, but some assumptions must be corrected in order to adapt some specifications to this setting, especially when it comes to constructs, terms and concepts used, that were previously outlined to physical products or industrial services.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	
Clarity-of-concept	5	
Difficulty to Introduce	3	23/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #4	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Pearson Efficacy Framework		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	15/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

		7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation shows a high potential for improvement over current approaches because it's a new tool that focus in an early stage of a work (the idea structuring) in a very easy and intuitive way, allowing for an excellent self-evaluation (the user can adapt the questions and attribute colours as a result, so recommendations on how to improve the idea can be given by the Framework).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This innovation shows itself highly efficient, is not time consuming (in about 10 to 15 minutes is done), it's for free and only requires the user and its self-analytic perspective. In addition the innovation gives recommendations on how to improve the projects, by being analysed through the framework.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches,

		and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing materials are of great quality however they have difficulty to reach the target groups. The marketing materials exists but they are not spread in an efficient way, also most of the materials are physical and that makes the innovation with problems in introduce itself on a wider global targeted group market.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score	3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Pearson Efficacy Framework is proving difficult to be introduced. It will require an investment aiming for long term results in marketing and creating awareness of the tool's benefits. Also the innovation needs to prove itself as a useful and a good alternative to existing analyse frameworks.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score	7	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
The Pearson Group as set a specific (help to identify the gaps or risks on the path to efficacy, allowing users to decide how to progress), measurable (positive reviews / feedback; participation on workshops about this tool), assessable (everyone can use it), realistic and time-bounded (Pearson will channel its investment into four proven business models: direct-to-consumer; 'Pearson Inside'; assessment and certification; and learning systems plan).

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
The term 'efficacy' comes from the pharmaceutical industry, where focusing on outcomes as well as inputs is essential. Other industries and businesses have ways of measuring the impact of their products and services on their customers, though efficacy is not a new concept. The Pearson Group, while developing this analytical tool, aims to apply the same principle and level of rigour to the education sector. So by replicating the good results in other areas the innovation is likely to succeed.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	3	**32/42**	
Difficulty to Introduce	3		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Objectives/Indicators	7	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.5 Case 5. Laureate Online Education

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator				
Ref	Case study #5	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work	
Innovation	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Programme			
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner	

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewhere.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	14/05/2014 **Contact email**

Learning Advantage

Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Laureate International university provides a 100% structured online course, and thus gives opportunity to students from all over the world to attend one or more courses within a wide educational offer. In case of the DBA, this institution proves that there are no bundles to any educational level – whether a bachelor, a master or a doctorate can be done through this methodology. Hence, this new approach shows significant improvements over current approaches, dependent of a physical attendance to be successful in the course.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The main difference between Laureate's DBA and another higher education institutions who offered similar courses is that, in the first one, support is provided to students both virtually and physically. Even more, students can choose the support approach that fits them better. In terms of costs and times, there are no significant differences regarding similar courses. The same applies to the resources, which are available in the same way.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR efquel Atos ELIG.org

		service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely

Description

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Within the marketing material, it's possible to observe some ambiguity. Even though it has clear details as the entry requirements and contacts – which are easily findable, in what relates to target-group specificities the material should be more tailored. Additionally, it'd be expected to have some benefits presented, or some more clear advantages in order to raise the attractiveness to possible new students.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score	5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Although the fact that current price is not affordable for all, this course aims to attract a specific target-group. Hence, the effort required to adopt this innovation is low. Future changes we'll always be target-group driven, so the mainly thing that can vary in the end is the number of courses' editions per year.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) As reported above, this course is targeted to a specific audience. Therefore, objectives are specific. The learning method allows to an instantly record of data, since subjects' evaluation to students' feedback regarding the methods used. However realistic, this data collected and rating can be biased.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Laureate's plan for 100% online courses were piloted before its implementation. Thus, current plan is well planned and very likely to succeed. In addition, the fact that this DBA is addressed to a specific target-group helps this university to achieve success in its implementation.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MEN⊙N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	3	
Clarity-of-concept	3	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	26/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #5	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Programme		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	6. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	7. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	8. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.
	9. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	10. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel	
Date Completed	19/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	3	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) programme shows no significant difference to Laureate current courses' approach, only replicating the teaching methods used on the other University of Liverpool - Laureate Online Education courses.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	3	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This innovation show advantage in terms of time consumption because students can organise their schedules according to their preferences. It also has innovative learning and research online methods. The costs are considerably high, therefore it's not easy for everyone to engage in such DBA.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept

Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) All marketing material are of good quality, clearly explaining the advantages and concisely proving a clear understanding of their target group. They had also taken advantage of the product demonstration with the University of Liverpool experience and testimonies from former students.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This innovation is already matured and extendedly spread and tested. It exists for some time and it has all the infrastructures and teachers' council fully matured, providing excellent results. It was created an international, up-to-date curriculum covering contemporary management topics.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) When the DBA was planned it had a set of specific goals and target groups. The information created by this course was also relatively easy to analyse because everything is made online creating a great amount of data. This course is also realistic because it aims to achieve plausible goals, and the student´s review enforce that.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3 = the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This course is very well resourced with the Liverpool University's support and credibility meeting the criteria to increase the chances to succeed. This course also has realistic goals, and its recognised teacher's council facilitates the successfully achievement of the intended outcomes.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	3	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	7	28/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	5		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.6 Case 6. Auth

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #6	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	openSE		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	5.	All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.	
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel		
Date Completed	16/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score 5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This online platform aims to stimulate learning experiences and foster practical sessions where learning activities and outputs become learning resources themselves, and to enable current and future learners to fully and continuously benefit from others' achievements, regardless of where those achievements have been made. openSE platform draws upon the lessons learnt from Open Source communities, as an open participatory learning ecosystem, and initial experimental small scale pilots, or similar initiatives in formal education.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score 5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The openSE framework tangles two characteristics that are predominant in formal education, preventing it – almost 'per-se' - to take full advantage through web provided opportunities: "closeness" and "semester based structures". Closeness, on one hand, prevents that the learning resources of one institution might be improved by the outside world, or enhanced through external sources	

that are brought in by individuals or through technology. Semester based structures, on the other hand, provide a challenge to establish a learning ecosystem that would allow for continuous and evolutionary growth.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score 3	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The open educational framework is targeted to a wide audience, ranging from learners to teachers, mentors and learning assistants. It's possible to verify which are provided specifically for each dimension of the target-group, but a clear understanding about the advantages and benefits of the platform for users it's barely seen. The promotion was done mainly through digital platforms and directly to AUTH educational actors.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The openSE project aimed to build an open educational framework for computer science Software Engineering by bringing together higher education institutions, free software projects and companies. The project was initially supported by the European Commission's Lifelong Learning Programme, but it is conceived to be self-sustainable after this initial period. As it is targeted to AUTH community, the innovation will be adopted easier if awareness will be previously raised by specific defined actions.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks

Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The initial innovator's plan, designed to the broad target-group, have included specific objectives to each dimension of the group (student, teachers, mentors and assistants). As it is an open educational platform, data can be collected and indicators can be measurable. In what relates to time-bound, the project defined some milestones and deadlines in its conception lifetime, but those are not outlined to the post-implementation phase.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan

Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score 5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed

		7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The established activities are supported by a set of several higher education institutions, thus resources are provided in a way project can likely succeed. Even though, if existing advantages were highlighted over the marketing material, this likelihood would be increased. The time available to develop this innovative idea into a practical concept is enough to achieve a successful implementation and fulfil the intended outcomes and expectations.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	
Clarity-of-concept	3	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	**27/42**
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

#6			Learning@Work	
Innovation	openSE			
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)		**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	21/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The openSE platform is unique in their outcomes because they foster a participatory learning experience involving practical "hands-on" sessions where these activities and developed content will further become learning resources themselves. Future learners would be able to benefit from earlier achievements and build upon them, instead of starting from scratch. Furthermore, it also allows free learners outside the formal education to upgrade their skills, and to make their skills visible for potential employers.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency

MEN**ON**   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	**7**	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This innovation show advantages over current approaches (it brings together the various stakeholders to facilitate mutual support and exchange of educational and training materials), costs (using free software and open standards) and material resources (by centralising, transmit and enlarge the available knowledge on free software and open standards through the creation of a platform for the development, distribution and use of related information, and educational and training programmes).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	**5**	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material is of good quality, as it covers the advantages concisely, clearly, and shows an understanding of the targets group's needs. The openSE platform makes also very good intent descriptions for the 4 targets groups, explaining the roles of each one.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation requires little effort to adopt because of the idea and context: space to study, practice, play, get recognition and learn through experiences in the openSE community. The only thing needed to use this innovation is a computer.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 5	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) There was a set of specific target group orientated action, measurable with positive reviews / feedback, assessable by students, teachers, mentors and assistants direct-to-consumer plan.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available

		time and resources?
Score	3	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The plan may succeed if there is a correct marketing strategy and the target group adheres to the idea. It will also requires students, teachers, mentors and assistants to receive a platform introduction so they can get use to it.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	7	34/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5		
Quality of Adoption Plan	3		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.7 Case 7. Apollo

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel Atos ELIG.org

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #7	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Balloon		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewhere.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	19/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

There are currently a several number of platforms which provide the development of general and specific skills, or shows a variety of job opportunities within a general or specific area of expertise. The Apollo Group brought them together and developed a unique platform which gathers job seekers, course providers and employers together in the same virtual space. Thus, in this platform it's possible to view the most in-demand skills for a career, to find a course, to help learners and to open the opportunity to apply for jobs

that need those learners with those proper skills.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Balloon is described as a radical new career and learning tool that helps users to manage their career success in today's knowledge economy. The registration within this innovative platform is free of costs for the user – independently if is a learner, job seeker or employer. The major difference between this and others similar platforms is that Balloon creates a more efficient way to give users all the information they need to make smart and confident career decisions, with no need to switch or search things in different pages.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Score	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Apollo Group developed a modern digital platform, with appealing content, presented in a clear and understandable way. The platform is also user-friendly,		

with constant support provided by simple information given within all different webpage sectors. Targeted specifically to the technology industry, this platform highlights Apollo's aim in their marketing material. Hence, the idea is to make recruiting more efficient for companies, while giving learners a better idea of what other skills employers in the tech industry are looking for, apart from the general ones indicated by a traditional degree.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

There are over 4.3 million unfilled tech jobs globally – not from the lack of qualified talent, but because employers have no easy way of communicating the skills they need. Balloon was created because his founders saw this breakdown in communication, and believe in the value of skills to career advancement. If Apollo Group can raise this awareness among tech enterprises, providing a platform that promises to make those companies' recruitment more efficient, the effort required to adopt the innovation will be low and will allow the group to achieve the intended outcomes successfully.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 6	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria

		6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more
		7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) One of the things within this platform is the fact that numbers and jobs are directly linked, so it's always possible to have a comparison between a diverse set of relevant characteristics, independent of the job or skill we're currently seeking for. As it was developed to the technology industry, objectives are specific to this area of expertise. Data is measurable in a statistic point of view and indicators are realistic for the current employment situation.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	7	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3 = the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Balloon helps to find a new job, or to move on from a current one. In addition, it gives support to knowledge improvement. The fact that it facilitates both employers and job seekers raises the likelihood to succeed. The Apollo Group established important partnerships with technologic enterprises and also with educational institutions. Thus, Balloon will be pitched to adult learners who want to pick up skills that have been flagged by technology companies as requirements for certain job openings.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5	35/42	
Clarity-of-concept	5		

Difficulty to Introduce	5	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6	
Quality of Adoption Plan	7	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator				
Ref	Case study #7	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work	
Innovation	Balloon			
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner	

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	23/05/2014 **Contact email**

Learning Advantage	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score 5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Balloon is a new kind of digital platform that brings the world of skills, jobs, and learning together - all personalized around users and their needs. It's a system that constantly maps out users' skills and supports users to see where they are in the career landscape. It also allows to explore career paths and jobs, presents the skills needed to get those jobs, and provides access to learning and related courses.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score 7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Balloon platform allows users to engage courses accordingly to their schedules and allows to choose between free and paid courses. This innovation has the advantage to connect students and employees, allowing each one to see what the market needs (for students) and availability (for employees) are.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages

Score		1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
	5	

Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material is of good quality and they clearly understand the target group needs. They had also taken advantage of the mix of students and employees in the same platform, and the digital nature of the offer, showing statistics to better communicate their message to the target-group.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	
	7

Score		1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation doesn´t require efforts to adopt as it is already matured, extendedly spread and tested. Besides that, the innovation needs to prove itself as a useful and a good alternative / complement to existing teaching methods and to find a job or employees.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound

Score		(SMART)?
Score	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The Balloon platform was planned to meet a specific goal: to help employers to meet the skills they need, and at the same time to allow learners to invest in skills demanded by the market. The information created by this course is also relatively easy to analyse because everything is made online, creating a great amount of data. The course is also realistic because it aims to achieve plausible goals that were previously identify.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation is well resourced, planned and will likely succeed because it's unique and fills a market gap (the combination between the job and education realities). In addition, this innovation draws upon a research and market demand identified by the Balloon team.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**

MEN◌N   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Efficiency	7	
Clarity-of-concept	5	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	**33/42**
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service

7.8 Case 8. Floqq

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator					
Ref	Case study #8	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work		
Innovation	FLOQQ platform				
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner		

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel	
Date Completed	21/05/2014	**Contact email**

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) By empowering people to learn and teach what matters to them, FLOQQ aims at continuously democratizing education. This digital platform allows for flexible skills developments so to respond to market demands, personal brands, and individual interests. This development can be done through educational courses currently offered in three different languages (English, Spanish and Portuguese).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	5*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) In terms of pricing strategy, FLOQQ takes 15% of each transaction that takes place in their continuous learning marketplace. FLOQQ's mobile phone app doesn't have any costs for users. Furthermore, for each user that attends a course through a promotion, the promoter wins a 50% commission. The user has a multi-currency option to pay the courses he wish to attend to, with eight types of currency applicable. In what regards the criteria to analyse efficiency, no further information could be obtained.		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score 3*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The only information regarding the material and promotion strategy adopted by FLOQQ members was obtained while observing this platform's digital communication channels and social networks. Although it has quality, some aspects must be changed to have a content equity. For instance, while the courses are possible to buy/attend in three different languages, the promotion is currently only presented in Spanish.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 5	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Although FLOQQ considered itself as "the biggest marketplace for online video	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

courses", the digital learning market watches similar digital learning platforms being implemented every day. This new methodology is currently a learning trend, which can facilitate its adoption within a competitive market. Furthermore, FLOQQ aims to further improve the current platform and plans to expand services first to Latin American countries, and subsequently other international markets, while will be trying to find marketing alliances.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score _*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No further information could be obtained regarding indicators and objectives.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score _*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No information could be obtained regarding FLOQQ's defined plan.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel Atos ELIG.org

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5*	
Clarity-of-concept	3*	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	18*/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	— *	
Quality of Adoption Plan	— *	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service
* Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed.

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #8	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	FLOQQ platform		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.
	4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	26/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation shows significant improvement compared to current approaches because it was developed in order to create an online courses' marketplace with a focus in practical orientation, offered by specialists from different areas that want to share their knowledge and experiences.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Score	5*	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) FLOQQ allows students to take their course anywhere and anytime; they only need a computer with internet access. Users can also choose between free and paid courses. They also have one of the biggest online MOOCS's library covering almost every topic, and as a plus there's a great variety of languages to choose. In what regards the criteria to analyse efficiency, no further information could be obtained.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	**5*** 1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Based on what was possible to observe at FLOQQ's platform, the marketing material seems of good quality and they intend to expand their services first into Latin American countries, and after to other international markets, while trying to find marketing alliances. They use a modern design while trying to show their key advantages.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	**7** 1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation requires little effort because it's already well-established and tested, making it a matured and extendedly spread innovation. The FLOQQ platform is also very user friendly, is has a great variety of languages and accepts different types of currencies.	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score	_*_ 1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No further information could be obtained regarding indicators and objectives.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Score	_*_ 1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No information could be obtained regarding FLOQQ's defined plan.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	

MEN◊N Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Efficiency	5*	
Clarity-of-concept	5*	
Difficulty to Introduce	7	**22/42**
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	_*	
Quality of Adoption Plan	_*	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service
* Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed.

7.9 Case 9. EdX

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator								
Ref	Case study #9	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work					
Innovation	edX online courses							
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner					

	Sheet Protocol
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section.
	4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.		
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel	
Date Completed	22/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Score 7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Defined already as a new trend, this new educational approach is ready to unbundle higher institutions paradigms and academic paths, while giving the option to the study to create and develop his learning plan, gathering individual interesting subjects and though having more motivation.
In addition to actual educational offers, the platform is used for learning and distance education research by collecting learners' clicks and analysing the data, as well as collecting demographics from each registrant.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score 7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

The large number of users registered in this educational platforms shows that efficiency is a must in this organisation. It's possible to outline some strengths that raises edX's value over similar competitive companies. For instance, they offer honour code certificates of achievement, all courses within this open source platform are free of charge for the users (learners), and they can learn at their own pace and time, allowing them to create a personal schedule. The

existing partnerships with recognised American higher education institutions allow edX to have always up to date pedagogical material resources.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	5* — 1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Although more information is needed regarding edX marketing and promotion strategies, the information digitally collected is addressed directly to the focus group, showing an understanding about groups' existing needs, with a highlight on the stakeholders (recognised higher education institutions).	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	5 — 1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The development strategy plans to establish partnerships with international	

universities, by proposing one of two partnership models: a) the "university self-service model"[1] or b) the "edX-supported model"[2]. Although the edX-supported model requires cash upfront, the potential returns for the university are high if a course ends up making money. The university partners can choose which model they want to use on a course-by-course basis, and every 12 months they have the opportunity to switch from one to the other.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score	4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) edX has the ambition to become self-sustainable, as it calls itself as the more contemplative, academically oriented player in the field, when compared with other major providers of MOOCs like "Coursera" and "Udacity", thus competitiveness is a relevant issue. edX's objectives are assessable and realistic. Measuring can be possibility through specific data collecting tools, but targeting will be difficult due to the nature of this innovation.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	*—*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)		

Regarding edX plan for adoption, no information could be obtained.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage	7	**Total Score**
Efficiency	7	
Clarity-of-concept	5*	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	28*/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	
Quality of Adoption Plan	_*	

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service * Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed. [1] The "university self-service model" allows a participating university to use edX's platform as a free learning-management system for a course on the condition that part of any revenue generated by the course flow to edX. This means that the courses developed under this model will be created by individual faculty members without course-production assistance from edX, and will be branded separately in the edX catalog as "edge" courses until they pass a quality-review process (once a self-service course goes live on the edX website, edX will collect the first $50,000 generated by the course, or $10,000 for each recurring course. The organization and the university partner will each get 50 percent of all revenue beyond that threshold). [2] The "edX-supported model", which casts the organization in the role of consultant and design partner, offering "production assistance" to universities for their MOOCs. The organization charges a base rate of $250,000 for each new course, plus $50,000 for each time a course is offered for an additional term, according to the standard agreement.

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #9	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	edX online courses		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel

Date Completed	28/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The edX platform improves the potential for learning by providing a great self-service tool that ensure students' success. This courses are open to everyone with a desire to learn. In addition it also provides the required material to take the course.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost

MEN◌N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

Score		1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches.
	7	3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches.
		5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements
		7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
This pedagogical platform improves traditional learning methods by teaching online and free of schedule courses, thus unbounding the usual educational system. It replicates other similar platforms, as 'Coursera' and 'OpenUniversity', for example. edX courses are free for everyone. Some of them have a fee for verified certificates but are free to audit.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score 5*	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)
Despite the fact that there's a lack of information regarding edX's marketing strategy, from what was possible to check at the digital communication channels, the material can be considered as of good quality. It covers the advantages concisely and shows a clearly understanding of the target-group's needs. The edX platform also makes very good intent descriptions in FAQ's to dismiss any wrong or misleading idea that the users may have.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant

		resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score	7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation requires little effort to be adopted and they already have good indicators such as the initial results which have shown a decrease in failure rates from previous semesters. The students' percentage required to retake the course dropped from 41% under the traditional format to 9% for those taking the edX blended course.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 4	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria

Description
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) edX's objectives are specifically targeted to learners (it was created for students and institutions that seek to transform themselves through cutting-edge technologies, innovative pedagogy, and rigorous courses), measurable and assessable (edX is committed to research and understand how students learn, how technology can transform learning, and the way teachers teach on campus and beyond).

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and

		resources?
Score	* _	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Regarding edX's development and implementation plan, no information could be obtained.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5*		
Difficulty to Introduce	7	28*/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4		
Quality of Adoption Plan	_ *		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service * Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed.

7.10 Case 10. Iversity

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #10	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Iversity		
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewhere.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	23/05/2014	**Contact email**	

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Iversity is a MOOCs' platform which makes use of online video in new ways, combining it with interactive elements, as well as a social layer that encourages peer-to-peer learning. This learning platform have currently a wide diversity of courses and thematics approached (from mechanics to political philosophy) and in three different languages: English, German and Russian.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score 5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) In terms of costs, this online platform is free for everyone. After the successful completion of a course, a certificate is awarded. This innovation achieves a significant improvement by awarding ECTS in some of the courses (however just in the German based ones). Iversity also developed the "Iversity app", a mobile version of this learning platform which allows free learners to continue their courses even when there's no computer or similar around.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score 5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Iversity are constantly looking for new possibilities to spread the word about the company, by trying to find new channels to reach the public. To keep everybody up-to-date about what's going on with the platform, a newsletter is sent to users on a weekly-basis. Iversity also tries to make the platform continually more fun to use. By conducting data analysis, they keep optimising the users' experience, making online learning as pleasant as possible for everyone. Regarding the promotion material itself, information was only collected at Iversity's	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

website and social networks where this company is present, but it has some good and professional quality.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) Due to the competitiveness present currently in the free and open online courses' market, innovation has to prove to the target-group that is better than similar existing platforms. Courses are free to everyone, so learning timings will always be dependent of the user and his ambition or objectives.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 4*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) While bringing together learners from different parts of the world, Iversity associates have established some quantitative objectives, such as the attempt to have 1 million users and, at the same time, the possibility to have 100 courses in their educational and capacity building programme. Other objectives, like the support provided to universities on their way into the digital age, are difficult to measure.	

In what specifically regards to indicators, no further information could be obtained.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	_*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No information could be obtained regarding Iversity's development plan.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	3	22*/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4*		
Quality of Adoption Plan	_*		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service * Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed.

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Reviewer Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form E questionnaire)

This document constitutes the questionnaire that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator				
Ref	Case study #10	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work	
Innovation	Iversity			
Date Received	June 16th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner	

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential if not agreed elsewise.
Sheet Completed by	ELIG expert review panel
Date Completed	29/05/2014 **Contact email**

Learning Advantage		
Guiding Question	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Iversity believes that education must be available to all. Therefore, a MOOCs platform was developed, opening the chance to offer unprecedented opportunities for students and professors alike. They work in close cooperation with instructors,

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

universities and knowledge-based companies to build high-quality courses that are engaging, interactive and fun.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Efficiency	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score	7 1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) This innovation show advantages over current approaches in time (it facilitates mutual support and exchange of educational and training materials) and material resources (users only need a computer with internet connection). Iversity also take advantage of the European Credit Transfer System. Their partner institutions have the opportunity to offer exams that award ECTS credits.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question	Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score	5 1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The marketing material are excellent while trying to let the community know who they are. For this, they're constantly looking for new possibilities to spread the	

word about the company, by trying to find new channels to reach the public. Iversity also tries to make the platform continually more fun to use. By conducting data analyses, they keep optimising the users' experience, making online learning as pleasant as possible for everyone.

Furthermore, the Marketing Department works closely with other departments, particularly the Course Production Department, who's main role is to promote courses through all different kinds of channels.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Score 7	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovation requires little to no effort to be adopted. It is already matured and extendedly spread and tested. Furthermore, Iversity is aiming to have 1 million users and over 100 courses in the near future.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
Score 6*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description	
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) The innovator objective plan is specific (open courses that enable professors to	

extend their reach by teaching tens of thousands of students worldwide allowing at the same time access to education vastly improving people's lives and bringing real change to communities as a whole.

No further information could be obtained about the remaining criteria to present the actual indicators.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score	_*	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) No information could be obtained regarding Iversity's development plan.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage	5	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	7		
Clarity-of-concept	5		
Difficulty to Introduce	7	30*/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	6*		
Quality of Adoption Plan	_*		

Notes / Comments
Notes or comments regarding company or product/service * Partly completed via inquiry with case owner and/or data collection via lab. No

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

further information could be obtained. Case couldn't be ultimately completed.

8. Annex 3. Initial Collective Reviewer Sheets (Form F)

8.1 Case 1. Comenius

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator				
Ref	Case study #1	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work	
Innovation	Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning			
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team	

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations. 3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team. 4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor
Date Completed	02/06/2014	**Contact email**	andreas.meiszner@elig.org

Overview of Scores				
	R1	**R2**	**Total**	
Learning Advantage	5	3	8	**Total Score**
Efficiency	3	5	8	
Clarity-of-concept	3	1	4	
Difficulty to Introduce	3	1	4	39/84
Quality of	4	5	9	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

Objectives/Indicators				
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	3	6	
TOTAL	21	18	39	

Main Barriers to Adoption	
Area	**Barrier**
Planning	Although Comenius has an annual plan, this is not specific to the postgraduate course. Hence, even though there are common variables to similar educational offers, it'll be difficult to foresee and overcome barriers without a specific analysis.
Marketing	Promotion can be adapted to the current context, presenting the existing need while clarifying the concept, as well as its benefits and learning advantages. Relevance of presented information can also be tailored to the target-group.
Competitiveness	Nowadays there is a number of institutions providing similar capacities with a lower cost, by an e-learning or b-learning training format. Although Comenius postgraduate course is unique, its structure and price doesn't attract many participants, who perhaps try to obtain the same skills through cheaper and less time-consuming options.

Recommendations to Improve Adoption		
Ref	**Recommendation**	**Indicator of Success**
1	Partnerships with current and new stakeholders in order to promote the course, (re)use and exchange knowledge and good practices, and further raise the participation rate.	Number/strength of established partnerships.
2	To make a deep market research to analyse competitiveness with similar training institutions and adapt the course to the current reality in terms of methodological approaches (b-learning and even e-learning, for instance).	Number of participants attending the course.
3	To focus on the marketing strategy and the content presented at Comenius digital platforms. Information should be in a relevance logic order towards participant awareness of existing need and solution provided by Comenius.	Number of participants attending the course.
4	To define the structure and offer different options for participants to attend the course. For example: instead of an 8 module mandatory course, participant can choose which module wants to attend and which specific skills need to develop.	Alternatives created to attend the course and number of

	Thus, some pricing strategy can be developed, with price options for a single module, a pack of modules or the entire course.	participants attending it.

Other Comments
Specific recommendations can be found in the Pearson Efficacy Review document attached.

8.2 Case 2. Simpiens

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #2	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Simpiens Online		
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations. 3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team. 4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor
Date Completed	05/06/2014	**Contact email**	andreas.meiszner@elig.org

Overview of Scores				
	R1	**R2**	**Total**	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Learning Advantage	5	1	6	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	5	1	6		
Clarity-of-concept	3	3	6		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	3	8		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	3	7	**43/84**	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	5	10		
TOTAL	27	16	43		

Main Barriers to Adoption	
Area	**Barrier**
Competitiveness	MOOCs are becoming a real learning solution and Simpiens want to be the first Portuguese platform to provide it. Still, a small research showed that there are other more developed European platforms already providing courses in Portuguese.
Marketing	Promotion is planned but still not in practice. They are present in most-known social networks, with regular posts, however the message should be adapt in order to attract users, both 'students' and trainers.
Partnerships	Although its quality is assured by the courses implementation process, the lack of credibility from a platform with no background in the educational and training setting still remains.
Funding	Simpiens' founders are currently negotiating with a business angel, after an attempt to fund the project through crowdfunding. This funding opportunities are setting the pace for improvement.

Recommendations to Improve Adoption		
Ref	**Recommendation**	**Indicator of Success**
1	Anyone can sell his own course. This unique approach is well highlighted, however more support should be provided and more information should be given.	Number of users (trainers).
2	To establish partnerships with some training institutions who can work together to raise the educational offers and empower the learning environment. Research the needs of key stakeholders and hold regular formal meetings to build long-term trusting relationships.	Number of partnerships / relevance of stakeholders.

3	While quantitative evidence is not collectable yet, qualitative evidence is, only through an open space where users, trainers and associates can post their opinions and discuss about general and/or specific topics. It's positive for the interaction and display of awareness regarding users, but it can work backwards within a competitiveness perspective.	Quality of collected evidence.
4	The platform's presentation should be restructured to improve the credibility of the provided courses. Smart filters (as browser cookies) should be applied to improve user experience, presenting relevant results based upon user's preferences.	Number of users ('students') attending the courses.
5	Create or include tools that can monitor the performance of the platform in real-time and develop a plan for how the team will analyse and use that data.	Performance of the platform.

Other Comments
Specific recommendations can be found in the Pearson Efficacy Review document attached.

8.3 Case 3. Lab4Ed

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #3	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Lab4Ed		
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.

MEN N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

	2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations.
	3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team.
	4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.

Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor		
Date Completed	30/05/2014	Contact email	andreas.meiszner@elig.org

Overview of Scores				
	R1	R2	Total	
Learning Advantage	5	5	10	Total Score
Efficiency	7	7	14	
Clarity-of-concept	5	5	10	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	7	12	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	7	11	63/84
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	3	6	
TOTAL	29	34	63	

Main Barriers to Adoption	
Area	Barrier
Planning	The plan was well defined but some variables were not taking into account. One was the established time to start the contest, which was on the beginning of the higher education institutions' second semester. The students' workload and priorities are essential to their participation.
Assessment	It's possible to verify and assess project's development but Lab4Ed didn't officially define neither quantitative nor qualitative methods to do it. Thus, final evaluation will be made from experts who will have to analyse all the process, instead of just review partial or regular assessments.
Marketing	As a start-up company Lab4Ed is still an unknown brand within the educational context. Therefore, the contest's first edition had some difficulties to attract a great number of participants. Additionally, similar existing idea contests have a prize-money attached, which turns them more appealing than the Learnovation Lab contest.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Structure	Lab4Ed tried a new approach by not setting deadlines. Even though, milestones were established in the outlined plan. On one hand this innovative approach can provide more freedom to the project development, but on the other hand it can bring (an idea of) a lack of commitment by both the organisation and the participants.	
Recommendations to Improve Adoption		
Ref	**Recommendation**	**Indicator of Success**
1	Re-evaluate current objectives to ensure they are both ambitious and achievable. Turning an idea into a concept is challenging, but participants may need something more to attract them. This has to be discussed among the team, in order to analyse the variables that must be changed or included.	Number of participants in the contest.
2	Establish partnerships with a higher education institution in order to increase the participation rate, raise credibility of the contest (and Lab4Ed, as well) and strength its value.	Number of stakeholders.
3	Collect evidence through participants' feedback to understand their perspective about positive and negative points so far. As the contest has space to adapt and improve, it'll be important to use lessons from that data to continuously improve the structure of the contest.	Increase of positive feedback.
4	Quantitative research methods should be further implemented so to have a stronger understanding about participants thoughts over specific contest topics, having though the possibility to assess several dimensions such as the structure of the contest or the support given. This information could be extremely important to raise awareness about existing issues not visible in a first instance.	Evaluation through assessment tools and methods.

Other Comments
Specific recommendations can be found in the Pearson Efficacy Review document attached.

8.4 Case 4. Pearson

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #4	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Pearson Efficacy Framework		
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations. 3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team. 4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor
Date Completed	09/06/2014 **Contact email** andreas.meiszner@elig.org

Overview of Scores				
	R1	**R2**	**Total**	
Learning Advantage	3	7	10	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	7	12	
Clarity-of-concept	5	3	8	
Difficulty to Introduce	3	3	6	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	7	11	55/84
Quality of Adoption Plan	3	5	8	
TOTAL	23	32	55	

Main Barriers to Adoption	
Area	**Barrier**
Clarity-of-concept	Although it was designed specifically to an educational setting, this tool drew upon lessons learned within other contexts as the industrial or economical ones. Thus, some terms and concepts

	are difficult to introduce in the educational paradigm, and can be a resistance to new users.
Marketing	The innovation's objectives are understandable but the advantages of this tool over similar analytical ones are not clearly expressed. Additionally, Pearson aims to act worldwide and specificities of each countries' context are not covered.
Promotion	One of Pearson's approaches to present and further implement this innovation is to introduce it to local educational experts and professional through physical presentations. This audience tend to care only what the impact of this is at the local level; whether that means stronger marketing of the session to present it as merely an introduction to the Efficacy Framework or more examples to serve the local context.
Implementation	Once again, Pearson designed a tool taking in account a general international context. Even though this fairly approach can produce outcomes, some professional from non-native English speaking countries can choose to use similar analytical tools which are built in their mother language, thus facilitating the process.
Design	The framework does not take into account the "process" within the criteria. For example, while analysing e-learning as a pedagogical method, it should be considered as a process, and the framework is more applicable to products.

Recommendations to Improve Adoption		
Ref	**Recommendation**	**Indicator of Success**
1	Define terms and concepts specifically to education. Hence, some assumptions must be corrected in order to adapt some specifications to this setting that were previously outlined to physical products or industrial services. For instance, to consider a "good" outcome will vary by the application's variables as the context and target-group.	User's comprehensiveness.
2	Consider the translation of the Efficacy Framework to make it accessible to non-English speakers into more languages. As this tool works in a colour rating base, it should be considered to create a solution or alternative for those that are colour-blind.	Number of users in non-English speaking countries.
3	Bear in mind the consistent comparison across a diverse possible range of innovations. In order to facilitate the implementation, it should be contextualised and applied in scenarios where people who apply it are involved with interventions.	Diversity of users' areas of expertise.

4	Provide real previously application examples in similar educational institutions during the promotion and presentation of this tool to an audience consisted by educational experts and professionals, in order to support its understanding and clearly show its benefits.	Number of professional using regularly using the tool.
5	Pilot the implementation within a small number of educational institutions to further analyse positive and negative points. Then, take lessons learnt to engage in a more general approach.	Quantity and quality of implementations.

Other Comments

8.5 Case 5. Laureate Online Education

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #5	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Programme		
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations. 3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team. 4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor
Date Completed	11/06/2014	**Contact email**	andreas.meiszner@elig.org

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Overview of Scores					
	R1	R2	Total		
Learning Advantage	5	3	8	**Total Score**	
Efficiency	3	3	6		
Clarity-of-concept	3	5	8		
Difficulty to Introduce	5	7	12		
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	5	5	10	54/84	
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	5	10		
TOTAL	26	28	54		

Main Barriers to Adoption	
Area	**Barrier**
Competitiveness	Although it's a doctorate level course, some resistance must exist to attend an expensive on-line based course. For instance, Athabasca's online course can be more attractive by the established lower price.
Requirements	A minimum of five year's management experience at a senior level with practical knowledge of business or public organisation is one of the compulsory requirements to attend this course. Former master students who want to go forward in their career can't attend this course without previous experience.
Methodologies	The programme's innovative Critical Action Learning and Action Research approach can be a positive point to choose the DBA rather than a similar course. However, some further explanation or brief review about those methodologies should be present at the website.
Recommendations to Improve Adoption	

Ref	Recommendation	Indicator of Success
1	In order to raise the number of editions per year, some pricing options can be provided, as well as some promotions to raise the participation rate.	Number of editions per year.
2	The website page with DBA's structure could have a brief explanation about the Critical Action Learning and Action Research, so to interested students be aware of how these methodologies work, and what	People interested in the innovative approach.

	benefits do they bring to this course.	
3	Even though this course is developed specifically to a target-group, DBA's main advantages could be highlighted, and benefits for future students could be presented. Even more, it could facilitate the choice over similar courses.	People interested in attending the course.

Other Comments

8.6 Case 6. Auth

Collective Review Questionnaire

(Adapted for ELIG Lab from HoTEL Form F questionnaire)

This document constitutes a basic tool that will be used by the reviewers to assess the innovators, to be adapted by every Lab, if needed.

To be filled in by Investigator			
Ref	Case study #6	**Lab**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation	openSE		
Date Received	July 28th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by**	ELIG Lab Team

Sheet Protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the chair of the review-team. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The review-team should discuss their individual findings on the case in an online meeting, and use this sheet to record their collective observations. 3. All statements in this sheet should be supported by a consensus from the part of the review team. 4. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by	Andreas Meiszner, ELIG Senior Advisor
Date Completed	13/06/2014 **Contact email** andreas.meiszner@elig.org

MEN∘N   Brunel   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Overview of Scores				
	R1	**R2**	**Total**	
Learning Advantage	5	7	12	**Total Score**
Efficiency	5	7	12	
Clarity-of-concept	3	5	8	
Difficulty to Introduce	5	7	12	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators	4	5	9	61/84
Quality of Adoption Plan	5	3	8	
TOTAL	27	34	61	

Main Barriers to Adoption		
Area	**Barrier**	
Development	The openSE project was designed to provide students and teachers with an open educational platform where participants are able to study, practice, and mainly learn through experiences in the openSE community. Although those objectives were fulfilled, it seems that the platform stuck in time and an updated resources are likely needed.	
Marketing	This platform is targeted to different people among the educational community. As this community enclose a range of actors from learners to teachers, marketing material would ideally be specific to each target-group, with a clear understanding of the existent advantages.	
Content presentation	As an open framework, openSE wants to provide the target-group with different settings. If there's an opportunity to learn and to study, there's also a space to play and get recognition. Even though this ambivalence can be positive, option's hierarchy presentation can open a lack of credibility in the platform (for instance, "to play" and "to get recognition" are at the same level).	
Recommendations to Improve Adoption		
Ref	**Recommendation**	**Indicator of Success**
1	In order to constantly increase the number of users and beneficiaries of the several educational activities provided by the platform, content should be regularly updated and links for documents should be verify in order to check if they're still correctly running.	Number of users.

2	The content presented in the project's homepage presents all in the same level. Hence, to raise the framework's credibility, relevant activities such as "to study, to learn, and to get recognition" should be highlighted, and engaging activities as "to play" shouldn't be aside but in a different space.	Feedback given by users.
3	The initial openSE project was designed by a set of organisations, each one with a different and important role in the development and conception of the framework. The main aim was to implement the platform, and this was possible over the actual partners. To improve the product's adoption it's recommended to spread the word amongst other organisations and educational institutions as universities and training centres, and raise the number of users. As some activities draw upon a knowledge exchange methodology among the community, the quantity of users could also increase the quality of the ideas and discussions at the platform's forums.	Number of users outside member partners.

Other Comments

9. Annex 4 – ELIG – Support Model Evaluation (Form G)

9.1 Case 1. Comenius

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	Case study #1	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation:		Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning	
Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by:**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet protocol	
Notes	4. All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation. 5. Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team. 6. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel AtoS ELIG.org

Sheet completed by:	Paulo Guedes, co-founder		
Date Completed:	July 2014	Contact email:	paulo@e-comenius.com

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self- assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	5. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met. 6. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective). 7. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved. 8. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below When Comenius embraced the HoTEL project was looking for guidance from external experts to support the development of our brand new course. Furthermore, we wanted someone who could warn us for situations that were not so clearly observed at the conceptualization and planning phases. These expectations were met, and several partnerships were established with some stakeholders in order to develop potential synergies in the future.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	5. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation. 6. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects. 7. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation. 8. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
	Put your mark and comments below One of the most relevant lessons learnt was the focus on the marketing and promotion strategy. As our innovation was a postgraduate course, the HoTEL project was

MENON · Brunel UNIVERSITY · uniR · EFQUEL · Atos · ELIG.org

	important to understand that the marketing material should highlight the impact of the course for the learner and, most of all, his benefits. The intended objective to increase the participation rate will be facilitated if the promotional content is presented in a different order than the current one. Comenius also understood the advantages of the analytical tools to improve the development of the course. Hence, it's planned to (re)conduct not only the SWOT but also the Pearson Efficacy Framework analyses, as the previously obtained results from these tools were useful for the process.
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)	5. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 6. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically. 7. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically. 8. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).
	Put your mark and comments below The theoretical assumptions taken while analyzing the strengths of the course and its likely obstacles for adoption have turned into practice. The recommendations made both by ELIG team and external experts covered different areas, ranging from the marketing to the pricing strategy, from the structure to the advantages of the establishment of partnerships. For instance, after the first recommendations given by ELIG team, Comenius' associates have decided to modify the pedagogical methodology used in this particular course, changing some classes to e-learning modules, and thus the initial physical approach to a b-learning one.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	

| Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.) | 5. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation.
6. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted.
7. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed.
8. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed. |
| | **Put your mark and comments below**

HoTEL approach was essential to review our position in the market, and most of all our competitively value among other similar training centers. The recommendations regarding the strategy were welcomed and will be adopted soon. For instance, by straightening relations with a higher education institution, some outcomes can potentially be obtained: it can raise the awareness among the students' community, wider the promotion, facilitate the increase of the participation rate, and strength the course structure with staff and knowledge exchange. |

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)

Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, …)	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?
By looking to the final results of the process it's possible to conclude that the enrollment with the HoTEL project, and particularly with ELIG team, was a very good investment. In this sense, the negotiation of involvement in the beginning of the project was important to conduct the path to success. By sharing our issues with national stakeholders and international experts, some aspects not previously foreseen were discussed and solutions to overcome existing barriers to success were presented. In general, by engaging with the HoTEL project, Comenius have improved not only the postgraduate course (considered as the innovative case) but also another educational offers, while replicating and adapting some recommendations to those

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

particular cases.

Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?
The provided support for the development of the postgraduate course had considerably increased its market value. The suggested recommendations were based on different areas such as planning, marketing, competitiveness, structure, and methodologies used among others. Furthermore, the strategies were adapted to the current context with a foreseen view of the future. Thus, the adoption plan was positively influenced mainly by ELIG team but also by the stakeholders' opinion about some of the discussed topics.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?
The duration of the support process was adequate to accomplish the intended objectives. The given possibility to adapt the support length with the existing needs was essential to achieve the estimated outcomes. It's also important to highlight ELIG team's availability shown through all process. Comenius realized that more support would be given in case it was needed. Regarding the level of interaction, communication with the reviewers occurred without any major issue, and the project team was always positively critical and proactive, while showing interest in both innovation and company. The relationship with the stakeholders was generally good, particularly with those whom a partnership for developed projects in the future was established with.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL process?	What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL process?
 • Shown availability through all the process; • Knowledge from ELIG experts team; • Direct inclusion of stakeholders in the process.	• Complexity of some terms and concepts for non-native English speakers; • In some moments the focus were more on which forms to fill in and when rather on the support of the innovation itself;
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	• To reduce the number of forms; • To increase the number of physical meetings; • To consider a standard language to all process.
Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?	

MEN_{ON}   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Comenius' members have a consensual opinion regarding the HoTEL process and its objectives, and what the real benefits for both the innovation and the company were. Hence, we would highly recommend it to other institutions who might need support in the conceptualization and/or implementation of their innovative product or service. The exemplar use of different analytical tools towards the empowerment of solutions and enhancement of the potential for a successful implementation within the specific market is a very good practice which can have results in other action fields.

Other comments
Note: this report includes notes and information that had been partially recorded in Portuguese. The report has been translated to English using meaning translation under the responsibility of SCIO Lda.

9.2 Case 2. Simpiens

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	Case study #2	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation:	Simpiens Online		
Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by:**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet protocol	
Notes	7. All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation. 8. Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team. 9. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Pedro Bandeira, co-founder
Date Completed:	July 2014 **Contact email:** pedro@simpiens.com

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you	9. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met. 10. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were

agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self-assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	not effective). 11. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved. 12. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below Simpiens´ objectives were outlined when the negotiation of the involvement with ELIG took place. Now, looking backwards to all the process, it's possible to say that the initial expectations were met. HoTEL support was important to analyse aspects not seen on a first instance, to plan solutions in order to overtake risks not previously foreseen, and to make the platform more competitive towards an emergent market.

The HoTEL Innovation Support process

Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	9. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation. 10. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects. 11. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation. 12. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
	Put your mark and comments below ELIG team's collaboration started when our platform was still in a beta phase. Although the basic structure was defined, the HoTEL support process had an impact on several details that have improved the website and its structure. One of the tools which contribute to this improvement was the Pearson Efficacy Framework (PEF). After understanding its application, a deeper dive into specific topics opened an internal discussion about the current situation and what could be changed or adapted in order to be successfully efficient and, most of all, to differentiate ourselves from competitors. To facilitate the brainstorming behind the discussions held, a SWOT analyses was conducted. This analytical tool was relevant to raise our members' awareness regarding the current platform weaknesses and barriers to success. In contrast, strengths were debated, and opportunities

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

	to further improve the innovation were also analysed. Then, the comparison between the SWOT and PEF analysis was used to provide a list of recommendations to enhance our MOOCs' platform.
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)	9. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 10. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically. 11. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically. 12. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HOTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).
	Put your mark and comments below The possibility for a user not only to buy, but also to sell his own course, defines our platform's uniqueness. This added value is obviously highlighted over the promotional material and it's a key-factor for the marketing strategy in order to present the benefits and outcomes for both learners and trainers. In terms of pedagogical assumptions, even though the platform is dependent on what users want to teach and which courses they aim to sell, recommendations were provided so to improve the platform. For instance, by establishing a partnership with an educational institution, the platform will raise its credibility, the number of offers and the communication will reach more people. Regarding the technological context, there were also recommendations provided by ELIG and external experts, who were also given support through all process. For instance, they suggested us to apply smart filters (as browser cookies) at the platform to better respond to user's preferences. One positive and always highlighted aspect of the HoTEL support was the fact that those provided recommendations were merely suggestions. The discussions about the further adoption or not of those recommendations were then internally debated with the members of our team.

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.)	9. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 10. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted. 11. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed. 12. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.
	Put your mark and comments below One of Simpiens recognised issues among the multidisciplinary team was the lack of knowledge specifically regarding the digital learning market. However team's background could help in the definition of some assumptions, some important aspects were not initially foreseen. Hence, HoTEL support was helpful to understand how, when and where to act in a way the platform will be competitive and, most of all, user-friendly. For instance, while conceptualizing the platform, the strategies were defined with the main objective to attract new users (learners, trainers or both). The different visions of our stakeholders in this process helped us to focus not only on this target, but also to pay attention to those users who are already registered in the platform, to motivate their engagement with the platform and, even more important, to avoid drop-outs. Experts' wisdom about this area of expertise was also relevant to Simpiens' current and future financial stage. However we did know about national funding opportunities, our knowledge about international possibilities to reach some important funding to the

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR efquel AtoS ELIG.org

	development and successful implementation of our platform was relatively low. The discussion over this international funding allowed us to understand the existing type of open calls, the usual accepted types of proposals, and tips for essential aspects to include on those proposals among others. From this discussion, some suggestions to future project's proposals came out.

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, …)	X Yes ☐ No

	☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?
The availability shown by ELIG team while supporting the improvement of our courses' platform was essential to achieve the intended outcomes on time. Although deadlines were not strictly defined, milestones were outlined. Thus, it was possible for Simpiens to manage the development of this particular innovation and the involvement of the HoTEL project in this process. The follow-ups by virtual means facilitated this management, and also overcome the existent logistic barriers.
Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?
The HoTEL support process was truly important not only to our platform's current situation but also to its near future. By reviewing our innovation as a case study, ELIG team and external experts dove deep into our platform and came out with useful suggestions and applicable recommendations. Furthermore, the support process acted as an idea catalyst, by raising the awareness about topics that are directly or indirectly linked to educational products like Simpiens Online which influence its developmental efficiency.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?
The level of interaction between Simpiens' members and others have differed according to its purpose. For instance, despite the interaction with other innovators had almost been inexistent, with the stakeholders it often occurred. The communication with the project team was always clear and the interaction happened on a regular-basis. In terms of duration, it was extremely positive to, on one hand, know that the support would be provided when needed, and on the other hand, to have space to discuss internally all the points brought to the table and thus developed the platform on our own pace.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL process?	**What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL process?**
• Involvement and commitment from project actors regarding our case; • Availability to provide support when needed, independently of date and time; • Learning of useful analytical tools to conceptualize, develop or implement other products or services;	• Number and type of forms asked to complete;

• Interesting interaction with the stakeholders through all process; • Competitiveness mindset and shown need of collection of evidence to support the product development.	
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	• Examples provided can be more similar to the support given (i.e., there were many examples about physical educational products but less about educational services or learning platforms); • To simplify and standard the terms used. Since some are difficult to translate to Portuguese, sometimes they turn out to be confusing or doubtful.
Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?	
By drawing to a close of this partnership it's possible to honestly admit that our platform would likely be less prepared to entry the market without the HoTEL project's support. This process overcome some aspects not initially envisioned while conceptualizing Simpiens Online platform. Furthermore, the application of different analytical tools have provided relevant suggestions, and have opened the discussion about specific topics not covered in the initial plan. Due to all this outcomes and many more, Simpiens' team strongly recommend the HoTEL to other institutions who wish to be the most successful as possible in the implementation of their educational product or service.	

Other comments
Note: this report includes notes and information that had been partially recorded in Portuguese. The report has been translated to English using meaning translation under the responsibility of SCIO Lda.

9.3 Case 3. Lab4Ed

to be filled in by investigator				
Ref:	Case study #3	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work	
Innovation:	Learnovation Lab			
Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by:**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner	

Sheet protocol		
Notes	10.	All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation.
	11.	Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team.
	12.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.

Sheet completed by:	João Sousa		
Date Completed:	July 2014	**Contact email:**	geral@lab4ed.pt

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self-assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	13. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met.
	14. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective).
	15. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved.
	16. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below
	When the discussion about the involvement of HoTEL on the support of Lab4Ed's idea contest took place, the initial objectives were twofold: to make a deeper analysis of the contest's first edition and to start defining points for a second edition.
	The support provided by HoTEL was positive and, most of all, complete, with a multidisciplinary approach by both ELIG team and stakeholders' external experts.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	13. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation.
	14. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects.
	15. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation.

16. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>

Put your mark and comments below

The presence of professionals and experts with knowledge in this action field was very helpful to understand how similar innovative competitions are successfully developed. Lab4Ed's team recognised that this use of good practices should have been done while conceptualizing the first edition, because it would certainly avoid some issues later found.

To reflect about these and other issues, but also to understand the strengths and opportunities, the SWOT analyses was first introduced and then used to understand how the innovation was and what had to be changed in order to go from theory to practice. It was the first time that this analytical tool was used and Lab4Ed members were positively surprised with its easiness to outline aspects not previously foreseen.

Additionally, in order to go deep in the analyses of some topics and to obtain some recommendations too, the Pearson Efficacy Framework was ran. This practice have opened the possibility for Lab4Ed's team to understand how this tool works, its possible benefits for future projects and, also important, its impact on the learner (or on the participant, in this particular case).

</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>

Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)

</td>
<td>

13. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation.

14. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically.

15. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically.

16. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).

</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Put your mark and comments below The majority of recommendations provided by the HoTEL team were adopted by Lab4Ed. Even being more used to the development of innovations as educational products or services, to support one innovative contest was a good to challenge to all the actors of this process. The discussions were extremely positive and helped to contextualize some issues that are influencing the implementation's efficacy and to foresee some barriers to the success. Hence, the suggestions contribute to the design and conceptualization of the contest's second edition in several areas. For instance, it was suggested to update the registration process in the competition through a specific digital platform, to define timings and deadlines, to provide a clear understanding of the intended final product and, most of all, of the Learnovation Lab's impact for the participant.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.)	13. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 14. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted. 15. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed. 16. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.
	Put your mark and comments below In order to improve strategically the idea contest, one of the consensual aspects among both ELIG team and

	stakeholders was the need to establish partnerships with pertinent institutions. By ranging from education to technology organisations, the quantity and quality of partners has a potential to facilitate and empower the innovative process. As Lab4Ed is currently an unknown brand among the educational community, these partnerships would potentially be a great support for several phases of the process, from design to implementation. For instance, it could contribute to better define the marketing strategy, to wider the promotion of the contest through sponsorships, to improve the quality and quantity of prizes for participants, to give more credit and recognition to the contest within a scientific setting, and to raise the awareness regarding the contest thematic, resulting also on the increase of the participation rate.

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)

Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, ...)	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?
As a start-up company, Lab4Ed depends on external funds to develop the approved projects. Learnovation Lab is one of those, following the same financing line. Hence, it was important to have a collaborative support with HoTEL in a no-costs basis. In terms of time, the investment in the project was fairly good, even though Lab4Ed team would benefit from a continuous follow-us till the beginning of Learnovation's second edition.
Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?
Regarding the impact in the innovation, this will be mostly visible at the structuring phase for a second edition. As the first edition (considered by Lab4Ed team as a pilot edition) was already running, it was difficult to follow some recommendations and to perform deep changes in the contest. Even though, some small changes took place and, in general, the feedback from participants regarding those improvements was positive.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?
The duration of the project was well adjusted to the intended objectives. As referred above, the ideal for Lab4Ed would be to have this support till the second edition's starting point, thus ensuring the right way for a successful implementation. Nevertheless, networking with HoTEL reviewers was good, and availability for punctual advertising or support was shown. This was possible due to the good interaction between project's actors. A good communication was always a key-factor for both ELIG and Lab4Ed teams towards the achievement of envisioned outcomes, and it has facilitated the whole process: the given support, the adoption of suggestions, the exposition of doubts or the understanding of current needs among others are an example.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL Process?	What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL Process?

• Optimistic view from ELIG team about the success of the implementation; • Total availability from both team and reviewers to support the idea contest; • Recognised knowledge from the support actors; • Different analytical tools used for analysis; • Practical and realistic recommendations provided.	• The support is mainly designed towards a product or service rather than a contest.
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	• Integration of possible future stakeholders in the project as external assessment partners.
Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?	
Lab4Ed strongly recommends the HoTEL process to other institutions who plan to implement an innovation but lack knowledge in that matter, or need some kind of support. This recommendation is made bearing in mind the given support to the improvement of Learnovation Lab. The HoTEL project and its professionals performed a holistic assessment of the innovation, by analysing aspects not previously thought of when the design of the contest was made.	

Other comments
Note: this report includes notes and information that had been partially recorded in Portuguese. The report has been translated to English using meaning translation under the responsibility of SCIO Lda.

9.4 Case 4. Pearson

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	Case study #4	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation:	Pearson Efficacy Framework		

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	Verified by:	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet protocol		
Notes	13.	All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation.
	14.	Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team.
	15.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.

Sheet completed by:	Kelwyn Looi, associate	
Date Completed:	July 2014	**Contact email:** kelwyn.looi@pearson.com

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self- assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	17. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met.
	18. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective).
	19. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved.
	20. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below
	The Pearson Efficacy Framework is an analytical tool that was founded on work that Sir Michael Barber (Pearson's Chief Education Advisor) did in the UK government to ensure that policy programmes delivered in the future. Pearson is actively applying this tool within their business, and has shared it publicly - the HoTEL project volunteered itself to investigate its use more deeply.
	The innovation's support process drawn upon theoretical assumptions and was based on reflections regarding the feasibility of the framework's application to technology-enhanced innovations.
	It was interesting to understand the tool's applicability in the different educational contexts and, most of all, to draw some conclusions while hearing the feedback of several educational actors (from administrators to trainers, from teachers to students).

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

The HoTEL Innovation Support process	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	17. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation. 18. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects. 19. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation. 20. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
	Put your mark and comments below As referred above, the Pearson's framework is currently applied in a business environment. The HoTEL project was appropriate to support the replication of good practices to implement this analytical tool on challenging and different scenarios. Some educational experts had doubts in the applicability of this tool to their schools, while others drew some comparisons to other constructs, such as the action research cycle. The HoTEL support process also allowed to analyse its potential integration specifically in the Portuguese educational scene. Furthermore, it was possible to understand some changes needed in order to successfully achieve the intended outcomes. For instance, the framework's introduction sessions have showed that individuals tend to care only with what the impact will be at the local level. Thus, a practical recommendation was to provide some real application examples previously implemented, to serve the local context during the promotion and presentation of this tool in order to support its understanding and clearly show its benefits.
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)	17. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 18. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically. 19. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically. 20. The recommendations from the external experts and

the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).

Put your mark and comments below

The support team and reviewers provided some suggestions to enhance the potential of the Efficacy Framework. Although it was agreed that the implemented tool is well structured and has a great likelihood to succeed, some assumptions were taken and some details for improvement were highlighted. For example, as this tool applied colour-ratings, it should be considered to create a solution or alternative for those that are colour-blind. Another example would be to consider the translation of the Pearson Efficacy Framework to make it accessible to non-English speakers into more languages. This could facilitate its use and final assessment, while simplifying terms and concepts present on the tool's description.

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation

Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.)

17. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation.
18. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted.
19. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed.
20. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.

MENON   Brunel   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org
UNIVERSITY

	Put your mark and comments below
	The involvement in this European project opened up a possibility to have an analytical tool analysed by a support team. As the innovative process is a cycle, and existing variables ask for a constant improvement of a product, it was important to understand what external experts had to say. Some recommendations were possible to be outlined in order to adopt some adjustments, and to enhance the framework's performance. For instance, it was suggested that the framework does not take into account the "process" itself within the criteria (for example e-learning is very much a process), being currently more applicable to products. Regarding the tool's applicability to review learning processes, the issue of measuring the non-tangible outcomes was also raised, particularly outcomes of confidence, motivation and role-modelling, given some innovations are often focussed on purely course or product-level outcomes.

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐ No

	☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, …)	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?
In a time where Pearson has introduced a new tool into the educational community, replicating good practices of previous implementations in other working environments, as the business one for example, it was important to have the support of a team with the necessary knowledge to help overcome some found issues during the process.
Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?
The suggestions and recommendations provided by both the reviewers and the support team where useful to contextualize the Pearson's analytical tool within the current pedagogical trends particularly in the Portuguese learning environment. It was also possible to compare the framework with other similar tools which are currently used to design the teaching methods, for instance.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?
As the HoTEL process worked for Pearson as an additional set of supporting actions over the original development of the framework, the duration was suitable to the expected objectives. The interaction mainly occurred with the project team, and the communication revealed to be clear and transparent.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL Process?	What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL Process?

• Applicability and reasoning of provided recommendations; • Knowledge about the current educational moment and the foreseen of future learning trends.	• Number of forms to complete in order to obtain the support.
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	

Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?
The holistic assessment provided by the HoTEL support process is useful to analyse potential improvements of an innovation, always bearing in mind the surrounding variables which directly or indirectly influence its implementation in the market. In this particular case, the Pearson Efficacy Framework was already implemented. Nevertheless, HoTEL actions were positive and productive to enhance the tool and prepare it to future barriers to success.

Other comments

9.5 Case 5. Laureate Online Education

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	Case study #5	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation:	Doctor of Business Administration (DBA) Programme		
Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by:**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet protocol

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Notes	16.	All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation.
	17.	Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team.
	18.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.

Sheet completed by:	Pascale Hardy, Director of the DBA program	
Date Completed:	July 2014	**Contact email:** Pascale.Hardy@ohecampus.com

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self- assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	21. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met.
	22. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective).
	23. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved.
	24. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below
	The main purpose for HoTEL actions regarding our DBA programme was to make a holistic review over the general characteristics of the course. Furthermore, an incision over specific aspects of the programme was negotiated, in case of need to better analyse some constructs. In this order, the initial expectations were met. The suggestions provided by HoTEL reviewers and experts team towards Laureate's aimed to raise the participation rate of the course, and to consequently increase the number of editions per year. As expected, this was useful for a potential improvement.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	21. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation.
	22. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects.
	23. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
continuous improvement process of the innovation.

24. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
Put your mark and comments below

Although this doctorate course is designed for a particular target-group, with specific requirements to attend it, the fact that the DBA is a 100% online programme may seem less credible among potential students. Hence, the HoTEL support process was essential to understand some strategies that could be adapted. Almost all strategies' suggestions were in the marketing and promotion field, and have raised the awareness among Laureate's team, by opening a discussion about those and the benefits of their possible adoption so to develop the DBA and achieve the initial intended objectives.
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)
</td>
<td>
21. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation.
22. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically.
23. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically.
24. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).
</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>
Put your mark and comments below

As referred in the previous question, the recommendations from HoTEL support actors were essentially in the marketing strategy. Even being a recognised higher education institution, the University of Liverpool as to highlight the benefits and outcomes for the learner on taking a 100% online course. Whilst the presented contents are well structured, with the focus on the Critical Action Learning and Action Research methodologies, HoTEL process was important to reflect about the transmitted advantages for the target-group.
</td>
</tr>
</table>

	Furthermore, the fact that the same information is within two different websites and presented in different order might confuse the potential learners who want to choose a DBA programme.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.)	21. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 22. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted. 23. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed. 24. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.
	Put your mark and comments below HoTEL support process was relevant to reflect about some details not previously foreseen when conceptualizing the DBA programme. These details mainly concerning the marketing strategy, with the found need of a highlight of the benefits for the learner in the courses' presentation. This aspect can contribute for the decision of a potential attendant while choosing his doctorate and, most of all, the institution where to have it.

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience

Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐ No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, …)	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?

The HoTEL support process was recognised as important to place the DBA programme in the digital learning market. The uniqueness of a 100% online doctorate course brings several challenges, namely for the marketing department, which have to adequate the course's promotion to a different approach in order to achieve the main objectives. The HoTEL project highlighted this aspect and have supported in the definition of the better strategy.

Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?

The HoTEL's intervention acted with the objective to provide recommendations to improve the DBA programme, as this was already implemented. It's possible to say that these recommendations had a positive influence on the strategies' design for the course's next editions, by raising the awareness about the learner's understanding of the benefits in attending this particular programme.

How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?

The HoTEL support was considered to have an appropriate duration for this type of process. In terms of interaction, the project team totally understood our objectives since the negotiation of involvement, and it had facilitated the whole process.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL Process?	What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL Process?
• Commitment on the support to improve an innovation; • Methodologies used to analyse the innovation; • Professionalism of the project team.	• Number of forms needed for this type of intervention.
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	

Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?

This type of support process is highly recommended to other innovators because it makes a deep analysis to the established objectives accordingly. Although the DBA programme was already implemented, we observed how the process works and, most of all, what are the potential results obtained with the process.

Other comments

9.6 Case 6. Auth

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	Case study #6	**Lab:**	ELIG Learning Exploratorium Lab on Learning@Work
Innovation:	Open SE		
Date Received:	August 20th 2014 (in final version)	**Verified by:**	On behalf of ELIG Lab by Andreas Meiszner

Sheet protocol	
Notes	19. All information below should be filled in by the innovator (or staff members of the innovator) who liaised with the HoTEL project with respect to the innovation. 20. Where the HoTEL project recommendations have been implemented by a team, the comments should represent the consensus view of the team. 21. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Prof. Ioannis Stamelos
Date Completed:	July 2014	**Contact email:**	stamelos@csd.auth.gr

The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation	
Did the HoTEL support process (self-description of your innovation, feedback by experts, meetings with the HoTEL team, support in the implementation of the suggested improvements, new feedback by external experts) help you in achieving the aims you had established when you agreed to join HoTEL ? (Please refer to what you declared in the self- assessment questionnaire in terms of aims and expectations.)	25. The process has been totally ineffective and the aims and expectations established at the beginning were not met. 26. Some parts of the process were effective, others were not and we did not follow them (in case you tick this option, please specify below which parts were not effective). 27. The process was very effective, expectations were met and aims achieved. 28. We went even beyond original expectations and aims.
	Put your mark and comments below

	The openSE is a platform that aims to bring together the fields of education, voluntary learning, and enterprises through an innovative use of ICT. It was developed with the purpose to deliver an open approach to computer science, as well as the continuous provision of up-to-date and relevant learning materials, and opportunities that match student's interests and employers' demands. While engaging in the support process, the HoTEL's mission was to support the improvement of this platform, by analysing the different innovation's phases towards the successful implementation. In this intent, the interaction between AUTH and HoTEL teams was productive and in the end expectations were met.
The HoTEL Innovation Support process	
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation conceptually? (For instance, you learnt that in order to convince the wide variety of actors potentially interested in your innovation you need to highlight both theoretical and technological features of the innovation and to reflect on its strengths and weaknesses.)	25. Until this very moment, I was not aware that this was needed to improve my innovation. 26. Thanks to HoTEL, I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects. 27. Thanks to HoTEL I am now able to present my innovation in a more convincing way highlighting its key strategic aspects and I have understood the need to persistently conduct SWOT analyses for the continuous improvement process of the innovation. 28. In fact, thanks to the inspiration of HoTEL we came to a conceptual improvement of our innovation.
	Put your mark and comments below The openSE project was initially designed to provide students and teachers with an open educational platform where participants would be able to study, practice, and mainly learn through experiences in the virtual community. Hence, to fulfil these objectives and also to constantly increase the number of users of the several educational activities provided by the platform, the HoTEL experts suggested to regularly update the presented content, thus renewing the resources and consequently avoiding the image of an obsolete platform.
Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation concretely? (For instance, the recommendations of the external experts and of the HoTEL team have led to concrete improvements to the innovation that is now a different thing from the beginning.)	25. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation. 26. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically or technologically. 27. The recommendations from the external experts and

<table>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation both pedagogically and technologically.

28. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped to improve the innovation pedagogically and technologically and have allowed to move from an innovation phase to the next (from concept to prototype, from prototype to piloting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Put your mark and comments below

The openSE was designed by a set of organisations who have supported the development of the platform, each one strengthening it with a particular expertise. Whilst the platform was developed, this partnership worked together in order to succeed in the path to efficacy, while overcoming barriers and materialising ideas into concepts.
Even though this process occurred before the given support by HoTEL members, the pertinence of the HoTEL project was the same: to improve the platform by helping its development among other action fields not initially foreseen. In this sense, the support process was important to understand the platform's potential within other educational institutions and training centres, for instance. If in the conceptualization stage the platform was developed only around Software Engineering, the successful implementation and the reviews through HoTEL project have opened another possibilities to evolve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td colspan="2" align="center">The HoTEL Innovation Support process and your innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did HoTEL help you in improving your innovation strategically? (You learnt which actors to address to get the needed support – financial or other; you learnt how to get access to the right sources of information to get funding; you received suggestions to partner/ally with other innovations or with actors that could facilitate the adoption of your innovation.)</td>
<td>25. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have produced no variations to the status of the innovation.
26. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted.
27. The recommendations from the external experts and the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn which actors (among end users, policy makers, industry leaders, practitioners, researchers) to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted and which sources of information to consult to get funding if needed.
28. The recommendations from the external experts and</td>
</tr>
</table>

	the work with the HoTEL team have helped me to learn: i) which actors to address to get the needed support for my innovation to be adopted; ii) which sources of information to consult to get funding. In addition, I learnt that partnering with complementary innovations could be a solution for my innovation to be adopted or mainstreamed.
	Put your mark and comments below One of the relevant interventions of HoTEL support team in the process was the suggestions made regarding the marketing strategy. If the platform's conceptualization was targeted to different people among the educational community (students, teachers, assistants), then it's important to have a specific marketing material to each target-group, by providing a clear understanding about the existing advantages.

The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify new adoption/mainstreaming opportunities in the original target sector?	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the HoTEL support process allow you to identify market opportunities in other sectors, not originally foreseen?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
The HoTEL Innovation Support Process and your experience	
Did the HoTEL support process help you to identify weaknesses that needed to be addressed?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)
Did the process help you to identify some points of strength that were originally underestimated?	X Yes ☐No ☐ Other (please specify)

Did the HoTEL support process allow you to find complementary innovations that can strengthen your market/mainstreaming potential?	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)
Do you think the HoTEL support process helped you in speeding up your innovation path? (From idea to pilot, from pilot to market, from concept to prototype, …)	☐ Yes X No ☐ Other (please specify)

Your assessment of the HoTEL Innovation Support Process
Considering the time and resources you invested in working with HoTEL, do you consider the HoTEL support process good value? Why?
The time invested in this collaboration with HoTEL project was positive. Even though the implementation process was already completed, the motivation and commitment from both reviewers and external experts was exemplary, and the main aim to support the innovation's improvement was achieved.
Did the HoTEL support process significantly impact the adoption plan of your innovation, and if so, to what extent?
Although it's not possible to talk about an influence in the development and implementation of the openSE platform, it's true that HoTEL was relevant to the next step, which is crucial, even more in terms of competitiveness in an emergent digital learning market.
How would you assess the innovation support process in terms of both duration (too long/too short) and level of interaction (with other innovators, with stakeholders, with reviewers, with the project team)?
The communication between the innovator and the project team was always clear, and occurred without any problem registered. The same applies to the interaction with the review team. Regarding the duration of the support process, the defined time to make a deep analysis over the innovation was accomplished.

What do you consider to be the main strengths of the HoTEL Process?	What do you consider to be the main weaknesses of the HoTEL Process?

• Knowledge in the innovation's area of expertise by the HoTEL support members; • Contacts with stakeholders who can take the innovation to another level.	• The support provided to different innovations can reduce the level of commitment and distract the focus on this particular platform.
Would you make any recommendation for improvement?	
Would you recommend the HoTEL process to other innovators? Why?	
The provided support to improve the openSE platform was a good example to understand where HoTEL can positively act. By replicating good practices from another projects where support was requested, HoTEL team of experts can guide an innovation, analysing it and its development amongst a great set of variables, not all being initially predictable.	

Other comments

10. Annex 5 – ELIG – Implementation reports

10.1 Case 1. Comenius

Innovator	Comenius
Innovation	Pós-graduação em conceção de e-learning
Day and time of the session	2014/07/23
Link to the session recording	n/a
Number of participants	10

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

[1] Stakeholders

- The session was organised at Comenius, on a three-hour physical workshop.

- The participants in this session were:
  - Paulo Guedes, co-founder, Comenius
  - Mónica Ovaia, training coordinator, Comenius
  - Rita Fontes, digital marketer, Comenius
  - Sofia Caetano, project manager, Comenius
  - Andreas Meiszner, senior advisor, ELIG (acting as intermediating reviewer on behalf of international ELIG review team)
  - Kelwyn Looi, associate, Pearson Group (acting as intermediating co-reviewer on behalf of international ELIG review team)
  - Ana Faria, SCIO (acting as session organizer and translator).
  - André Malho, Ricardo Loureiro, João Sousa, all Lab4ED (in their role as local stakeholders and peers to support discussion and reflection)

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- This implementation session was the fourth physical meeting at the premises of Comenius' that aimed to provide dedicated support to the virtual and other local meetings of the HoTEL project. This fourth meeting build on the previous meetings that roughly focused on:

  - First meeting: introduction, description of the Exploratorium Lab, and negotiation of involvement +"Declaration of Intentions for Innovators".

  - Second meeting: Self-assessment through the "First Assessment Questionnaire".

  - Third meeting: Follow-up to clarify concepts and collect relevant missing information + recommendations given, based on the SWOT analysis and the additional use of the Pearson Efficacy Framework in order to strength specific points

- For this fourth session, Mr. Kelwyn Looi was invited to contribute with is expertise on the field and to assess the innovation status within the implementation process, and to provide some further recommendations based upon the collected information.

- In terms of used tools, the team at Comenius felt that the Pearson Efficacy Framework had been a useful analytical tool to them, especially in what regards the recommendation's phase.

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

- This session was organized with the aim to verify if the innovative process was currently under good development. Although this was a general objective, specific

ones were also outlined as intended for the purpose of this implementation meeting, respecting from a different range of areas.

- Hence, one of these aims was to understand how did the recommendations previously provided by the HoTEL reviewers' team work both for the innovation and the innovator. As the suggestions for improvement were based on different areas, such as planning, marketing, competitiveness, structure, and methodologies used, it was important to run all of those individually so to clearly understand whereas HoTEL intervention was positive, negative or without any influence in the process.

- The Pearson Efficacy Framework was used to make a more incisive analysis of relevant points on the discussion, and to provide support to the new recommendations to empower the implementation. The addressed focus of the review was on the 'outcomes' side in general, and on the 'intended outcomes', 'overall design' and 'value for money' sections in particular. The use of the Pearson's analytical tool also allowed to understand the thoughts of each member of the organisation, and to redefine the role of each one in the innovative cycle, as well as to highlight their relevance in the process and, most of all, in the achievement of the intended objectives.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

- In general, this implementation session approached all the expected and previously defined topics. Even more, it positively opened room for a discussion about other relevant subjects. From variables as the country's economic and social situation to the current learning trends, it was consensual among the group that each variable can influence the success of an innovation's implementation, whether if it's this specific course or another.

- One of the session's strengths was clearly the presence of international experts, with recognised experience and knowledge in this field, who could present their visions and thoughts about not only this course but also over the institution, its objectives, its targets, and its future inside the training and educational market. In the same way, the interaction between actors and the awareness regarding the current situation and existing problems was positive and helped the creation of a better working environment during the sessions.

- The sessions were mainly held in English. Although in a first instance it seemed to be an obstacle, the support given by the stakeholders present in the session helped to understand all the discussed concepts. Another positive thing about the language was the possibility to the team to be introduced with some technical terms and start to incorporate these terms in their day-to-day vocabulary. For instance, this technical vocabulary will also be helpful to facilitate the communication with international stakeholders, if needed.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

- A several number of suggestions came out from this session. Although all of those actions have the intent to improve the innovation and facilitate its implementation, not all the suggested will be possible to adopt in a short-time length. Even though, milestones and time-bounds were also defined.

- One of the recommendations previously provided was reinforced, and it was related to the importance of the partnerships for the whole process. These partnerships can cover a set of areas where actions need to be taken. For instance, by straightening relations with a higher education institution, benefits can possibly be obtained among different areas: it has the potential to raise the awareness among the students' community, wider the promotion, facilitate the increase of the participation rate, and strength the course structure for example. Particularly in this last point, the possibility to make something as a staff-exchange between Comenius and the stakeholders could empower the content taught in courses. This exchange has also the potential to enhance the course's recognition among the educational market and thus help Comenius to get out as a winner among this market.

- Another suggested implementation action was to develop some components of the course based on the gamification theory, i.e., to introduce this concept by bringing a healthy competitiveness between students. One example for a type of competition could be the development of e-learning content in a MOOC format. This practical component of the course could empower not only the students' capacities but also their motivation, even more if their works would be shared and published within relevant communication channels.

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

- Independently of the course addressed by Comenius among their educational offers, to define whether one course was successfully implemented or not is something that have to be analysed bearing in mind a different set of variables that can – direct or indirectly – influence the path to the intended outcomes.

- Hence, one of the tacit indicators of success will be the number of editions of the postgraduate course. However it depends on the number of students attending the course (which is also an indicator), Comenius main aim is to repeat this course at least twice a year in the same place. Furthermore, the training institution also aims to replicate good practices and start an edition of this particular course which can cover other geographical areas (as Lisbon and Coimbra, for instance).

- Another indicator of success is the number and strength of the partnerships already established. The clear communication with the stakeholders, creating win-win situations while enhancing both the course and the institution's recognition among the specific training market, is a key-factor.

- Finally, an indicator of a successful implementation is the quantity (and also the quality) of e-learning content created and delivered by the students and alumni of this particular course. The same applies to the quality and amount of e-learning courses developed by these students.

[7] Assess the implementation session

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	The initial expectations over this session were met.
I would repeat the experience	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	
I am satisfied with the balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
All defined outcomes are covered at the implementation phase	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	Even though they have different weight in the success of the innovation's implementation, all outcomes are covered in this phase.
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

The outcomes are relevant to your local context related needs	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	

[9] Suggestions and improvements for next session (150 to 300 words)

- One of the suggestions pointed out from the Comenius team was the language used at the meetings. Even though it can be helpful to learn about terms and concepts, and also to understand their applicability in the professionalized context. The fact that the discussion is not in the mother-language can affect the session's efficiency. It also can lead to some misunderstandings or ambiguous comprehensiveness by the participants, which can negatively lead to different conclusions.

- Another potential benefit for a next joint session would be the organisation of a day-workshop instead of a single meeting. For example, this event could be structured in a way it could deeper approach all the topics of the discussion. It would allow participants to go deeper in the analysis of each topic, in contrast with what happened in this session, where the outcomes part had a great highlight while comparing to other discussed aspects of the innovation. Time-consuming on each topic can vary, depending on the relevance of the discussed points and also on the demands by the participants, particularly to the implementation phase, thus it's important to have more time and therefore less pressure while discussing it.

- Finally, it would be interesting to, on one hand, have participants from another areas of expertise in order to compare cases and use good practices that perhaps can be adapted to this particular case. On the other hand, and as a training institution, it would be positive if some students or interns could attend the session and learn and observe the innovative process.

[10]   Any other general or specific comment about the implementation

- No further comments.

[11]   Comment from the Lab leader about the implementation and overall assessment

- Since the beginning HoTEL reviewers that described this course as an innovation likely to succeed, whether in a short-term, mid-term or long-term timespan. The existent doubt was to define success, particularly in this case. As it's a course and not a product, this definition had ambiguous opinions.

- Another discussed point by the reviewers was the fact that, even though the implementation has a potential to be successful, some variables are difficult to control. Thus, it's always important to define the terms in which the project can support the implementation and the ones in which a theoretically developed plan would be the only taken action.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

- It was positive to observe the differences between this fourth meeting and previous ones. Furthermore, it was grateful to see the recommendations provided used and implemented by the innovator's team. It's extremely motivating for the Lab team to see the given support results, by allowing an innovation to successfully integrate its specific educational market.

- A common opinion of both Lab team and innovator about the advantages of the physical meetings over on-line counselling. Even though, it'll always be important to have both during the innovative process, and it'll be essential if they complement each other. For instance, in this case, physical meetings were necessary for a clear understanding of objectives and targets among all participants, but on-line support was also good for the follow-up actions and quick need of answers regarding specific points of the process, especially in the development and implementation phases.

It's important to refer that the number of forms used were not facilitating the process. In contrast, sometimes the innovator and also the reviewer showed themselves confused while filling in some of the fields within the forms because questions didn't have relevant differences between them, thus making this process more time-consuming. Finally, it would facilitate the process if the forms where written in the mother-language. This would make all actions faster and more understandable for the innovator.

10.2 Case 2. Simpiens

Innovator	Simpiens
Innovation	Simpiens Online
Day and time of the session	2014/07/14 and 2014/07/23
Link to the session recording	-
Number of participants	8

[1] Stakeholders

- This was the second physical session between Simpiens' associates, HoTEL reviewers and local stakeholders, and after the first initial contact were the project and its objectives were presented and the negotiation of involvement was settled. For logistic reasons this meeting had been broken down into two sub-meetings, so to benefit from the physical presence of Kelwyn Looi on 2014/07/23.

- The participants in this session were:

  - Pedro Bandeira, co-founder, Simpiens (only 2014/07/14)

  - Michel Santos, co-founder, Simpiens (only 2014/07/14)

  - Andreas Meiszner, senior advisor, ELIG (acting as intermediating reviewer on behalf of international ELIG review team)

- Kelwyn Looi, associate, Pearson Group (acting as intermediating co-reviewer on behalf of international ELIG review team) (only 2014/07/23)

- Ana Faria, SCIO (acting as session organizer and translator)

- André Malho, Ricardo Loureiro, João Sousa, all Lab4ED (in their role as local stakeholders and peers to support discussion and reflection)

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- Since the first meeting held in the beginning of the project until this implementation session, a number of online follow-ups took place. Although it could have compromised the efficacy of the given support, due to logistic reasons this option seemed to be the best one for both teams.

- The session started with an overview of this follow-ups in order to understand Simpiens' thoughts about how the support worked and in what terms the initial expectations were met and the intended outcomes were achieved. Then, a contextualization of the current situation of the courses' platform was done in order to provide ELIG's members with up to date information. This information was useful to define the path of the session and to decide its focus.

- To support the analyses and discussion over the innovation, some tools were used. Firstly, the SWOT analysis was used to determine the major differences in the time space between this session and a previous follow-up were this analytical tool was used. Secondly, the Pearson Efficacy Framework was used for the first time, giving then the chance to Simpiens' team to familiarize with this tool. The obtained results also helped to understand some verified issues and, most of all, to outline recommendations to overcome them.

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

- The Simpiens Online courses' platform is currently at a beta phase, but already have some available courses that are possible to attend to. One of the main objectives of this session was to provide ELIG's team an explanation of how the platform is currently working and how is the development going. It was aim to discuss the obstacles found in the path to the fully implementation, the intended short and long-term outcomes, and the established deadlines to achieve those outcomes.

- It was also an objective of this session to explain how evidence is qualitative and quantitatively collected, and how that evidence influences the development of the platform. This innovation has two target-groups – learners and trainers, and a user can take both roles. Hence, it was important to understand the differences of the information collected, as well as to be aware of the evidence that can be biased.

- Another objective of the session was to review Simpiens' strategy to be successful in an emergent learning market. Within a competitiveness point of view, a discussion was open regarding the existing platforms and learning alternatives in Portugal. Although Simpiens is the only Portuguese company selling (and buying) courses in

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

the digital world, other international companies with similar platforms are already developing courses in Portuguese too.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

- The implementation session was positive, mainly because it helped to clarify some aspects that weren't so clear through the virtual support previously provided. The expectations were met and interesting discussions about some relevant thematics such as the increase of MOOCs and OERs as new learning trends took place in several moments of the meeting. Those discussions were productive to observe the points of view from international experts of this specific educational area.

- The session also allowed to understand that some of the initially idealized outcomes were still not completely achieved. Most of all can be explained due to independent factors which have an influence in the process but are difficult to control by the innovator. For instance, the recognition and credibility of this new learning methods and alternatives is still doubtful among the Portuguese community. Thus, awareness of this existing learning and teaching possibilities must be raised in order to change mindsets and to achieve some of the intended objectives.

- One of the strengths of the session was the use of the Pearson Efficacy Tool as a framework to structure the innovation and the team's approach towards a most efficient development. This tool helped to identify some missing or hiding points not foreseen during the conceptualization of the platform. The same applies to some points while gathering the company's team.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

- From ELIG's recommendations to improve the innovation and facilitate the path to a successful implementation, a number of actions was outlined, some more urgent than others. Simpiens' team was grateful for receiving such advises and declared to subsequently discuss them internally with the other members and then decide how to make use of those.

- One of the recommendations was the use of good practices from similar learning platforms. A deeper market research was suggested to be made in order to understand how, when and where to act in a way the platform will be competitive and, most of all, user-friendly. Strategies must be define not only to attract new users (learners and teachers) but also to keep and motivate those who are already registered in the platform.

- This important point just referred above is also directly linked with the marketing strategy. When Simpiens will start with a stronger promotion, it'll be essential to highlight the benefits for users on buying and selling courses by raising the awareness over existing easy learning alternatives.

- Although Simpiens planned to enter alone in the digital learning market, it was suggested to establish partnerships with institutions accordingly to the specific objectives outlined. For instance, a partnership with a training centre that only provides physical classes was considered being a potential win-win situation during the discussions, not only to increase the number of users but also the number of courses available.

- Some details in the platforms' display were also identified that potentially could allow for improving user experience, as well as smart filters (as browser cookies) to better respond to user's preferences. Additionally, the number of users registered in a course was identified as being a criteria to be looked at further: while a course with a large number of learners can attract new users to attend it, a course without registered users can create some resistance for a new user to attend it.

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

- Simpiens Online is an innovative platform where users can buy and attend chosen courses but also trainers can create and sell their courses. It's also possible to do both things, so a user can be a learner, a teacher, or assume the two roles. In this order, one success criteria is the number of users registered in the platform.

- In the first months after the first promotion, the number of page visitors was high and the number of learners was considered good, even for a small presented educational offer. As the time goes by, the number of courses is increasing and so it's the number of learners. Based on this defined criteria, Simpiens foreseen a successful implementation.

- In contrast, the number of trainers is still low, and it also makes the diversity of thematics approached smaller than it might be. Therefore and to realize the full potential offered by the platform the number of trainers offering courses through the platform might ideally be still further increased.

[7] Assess the implementation session

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	
I would repeat the experience	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☒☐☐	
I am satisfied withthe balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
All defined outcomes are covered at the implementation phase	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	
The outcomes are relevant to your local context related needs	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	

[9] Suggestions and improvements for next session (150 to 300 words)

- One of the consensual suggestions a next session was to continue the approach through physical meetings, if possible. While in a physical meeting everything is discussed live and on time, in the online support there's a waiting process as common to asynchronous communication.

- The invitation of possible future stakeholders in the next session was discussed in order to improve and wider the platform. This would also work within an exchange of knowledge and good practices between institutions.

- Another suggested improvement was to open the session to all members of Simpiens' team. This could be useful for everyone to understand the defined and intended outcomes and targets, and also the better metrics to use in order to assess those outcomes.

- The use of the Pearson Efficacy Framework was also suggested. Even if it was already use in a general setting, it would be good to dig in some specific aspects of the innovation.

[10]   Any other general or specific comment about the implementation

- No more comments needed.

[11]   Comment from the Lab leader about the implementation and overall assessment

- Simpiens Online platform is currently in a good shape and has a great likelihood to succeed. Its uniqueness of either buy and/or sell courses raise the value within an almost non-existing digital learning market in Portugal (only exceptions are the e-learning offers in some universities).

- Some recommendations might be addressed earlier as other and the Simpiens' team might decide upon a prioritization in accordance to their strategy.

10.3 Case 3. Lab4Ed

Innovator	Lab4Ed
Innovation	Learnovation Lab
Day and time of the session	2014/07/03 15:00 (UTC)
Link to the session recording	-
Number of participants	9

[1] Stakeholders

- The session took place at ANJE – Associação Nacional de Jovens Empresários, a business incubator at Porto, Portugal.

- The participants in this session were:

  - André Malho, research assistant, Lab4Ed

  - Ricardo Loureiro, project manager, Lab4Ed

  - João Sousa, web designer, Lab4Ed

- Francisca Ribeiro, student, Learnovation Lab

- Maria Inês Ribeiro, student, Learnovation Lab

- Vítor Passos, student, Learnovation Lab

- Andreas Meiszner, senior advisor, ELIG

- Kelwyn Looi, associate, Pearson Group

- Ana Faria, SCIO (acting as session organizer and translator).

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- The implementation session came after previous counselling sessions. The constant follow-up from ELIG's team started from the first meeting on, when the negotiation of involvement of both parts was discussed. The main focus of the session was the innovation's current status, with adoption's obstacles and future opportunities been outlined, but the discussion also addressed other topics as the current Portuguese educational situation, the existing needs and issues foreseen among others.

- To support the holistic assessment, Mr. Kelwyn Looi made a case review through the Pearson Efficacy Framework analytical tool. Amongst all covered topics by the framework, the planning, overall design and intended outcomes were deeper analysed.

- The contest's finalists also attended the session. The purpose of inviting the finalists was to give them an opportunity to experience a professional working environment within this area of expertise.

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

- The objectives of this session were twofold: on one hand, to make a deeper analysis of the contest's first edition; on the other hand, to start structuring and organising its second edition.

- By considering the contest's first edition as the innovation's pilot phase, the session allowed a general reflection over the process, highlighting its strengths, weaknesses, barriers found and procedures taken to overcome those barriers to success.

- In order to conceptualize Learnovation's second edition, assumptions drew upon the previous referred analysis. Lessons learnt were important to structure the contest and adapt it to the target-group in order to avoid some issues such as the lack of participations and their full commitment to the contest, for instance.

- This session was also relevant to review the innovation in the light of the Pearson Efficacy Framework tool, which provided specific recommendations to some new topics approached. Additionally, the introduction of this analytical tool was useful to Lab4Ed team understand its benefits for future projects' conception.

- Another objective was to get direct feedback from users. To fulfil this objective, contest's participants were asked to share their thoughts about the innovation and to provide suggestions to its improvement.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

- This implementation session was in general very productive. All previously established objectives were achieved, and all of initial expectations were met. The availability of some members of the ELIG team to continue the support after the end of the HoTEL process, throughout on-line follow-ups for instance, was discussed.

- One of the highlights of this session was the diversity of positions among participants – ranging from students to international education experts. This fact allowed to have positive discussions about not only the innovation itself but also regarding current Portuguese educational issues. A comparison between the situation in Portugal against other European countries, with special focus on England and Germany, also took place.

- The language of the meeting was considered as an obstacle but also as an opportunity. Although one session held in Portuguese could likely facilitate the comprehensiveness and interaction between actors, it was important to discuss some terms in English so to understand their applicability within this context.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

- In order to empower the innovative process some suggested actions have resulted from this session, and their adoption will be further discussed internally.

- Bearing in mind some relevant points directly linked to the target-group, such as the starting time of the contest (for example, to avoid a low participation rate due to participant's availability), a restructuration was suggested.

- Another suggestion was the presentation of the contest focused on the impact for the participant, i.e., the benefits for participants should be highlighted and taken as essential particularly while defining the marketing strategy.

- A set of benefits would potentially be present in the suggested establishment of partnerships with institutions from different action fields as higher education, industry, technology, and so on, depending on the envisioned final results. For instance, as the contest is currently unknown within the educational environment thus lacking recognition, these partners would likely be a good support through all the innovative process: they could act as sponsors and help in the promotion or in the definition of prizes, for example.

- Reviewers' team also suggested to simplify the registration process in the contest. Looking to the pilot edition, was verified that this process has potential to be easier and faster to the future participant.

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

- The number of participants, and also the number of projects developed and consequently supported were considered as a success criteria. For the first and pilot edition expectations were low regarding the number of participants. Nevertheless, the final number of projects and its relevance and potential for future implementation was extremely positive.

- Although one of the requirements was the presentation of an idea specifically for the education, participants' focus was different, i.e., some products that have the potential to enhance learning were idealized, but also some innovative services were presented.

- One of Lab4Ed's intentions through Learnovation Lab was to act an employment catalyst, by opening possibilities for the creation of participant's own job through the support of the materialisation of their idea. Hence, in this point of view, self-employed and the number of new companies founded can be considered as a success criteria.

[7] Assess the implementation session

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	
I would repeat the experience	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I am satisfied with the balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
All defined outcomes are covered at the implementation phase	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☐☒	
The outcomes are relevant to your local context related needs	①②③④⑤ ☐☐☐☒☐	

[9] Suggestions and improvements for next session (150 to 300 words)

- The format approach of this session was similar to previous meetings which were then considered as productive. Thus, it was consensual that both work methodologies and tools used to analyse the contest and its variables are highly recommended. Furthermore, Lab4Ed as an ambition to use these methods to improve other developed products.

- Although the language used in the sessions had ambiguous opinions among the Lab4Ed team, as referred above on the obstacles and strengths section, it was suggested to continue these sessions in English. One of the solutions presented to overcome this possible issue was to have a short preparation before, in order to clearly understand some terms and concepts, and facilitate the communication consequently.

- In order to obtain more feedback over the discussed topics, the presence of more stakeholders has the potential to enhance the session. Although this clearly depends

on the current existing partnerships, this sessions have the potential to reap synergies between organisations.

[10]   Any other general or specific comment about the implementation (150 to 300 words)

- HoTEL support sessions were extremely positive to improve the innovation and also to empower the team members. Having said that, Lab4Ed is thankful for taking part in such an interesting and, most of all, productively project widening opportunities to make a difference within the specific market and to grow as an educational solution.

[11]   Comment from the Lab leader about the implementation and overall assessment

- Lab4Ed is a brand and prosper company with ambitious entrepreneurs who want to mark the educational area, by providing the support of innovations. Thus, the commonality of objectives with the HoTEL project raised interesting discussions and results both to the reviewers and the innovators. Hence, some recommendations towards the case's improvement can be seen as lessons learnt to the HoTEL project itself.

- The intervention of the HoTEL was in the support of an ideas' contest. As other lab cases were more linked to educational products, each session with Lab4Ed was positively challenging and ELIG members had to adapt themselves to the case's characteristics, the intended objectives, and the innovator's expectations.

- After the end of the HoTEL project, some of the reviewers will continue the support to other Lab4Ed actions and products' development. This commitment was possible due to the healthy interaction and working environment created among all actors.

10.4 ELIG Multiplication seminar

Name of the event	Innovation in education: Tools and methods for success
Place of the session	Escola Superior de Educação - Instituto Politécnico do Porto
Day and time of the session	2014/04/08
Link to the session recording	http://www.lab4ed.pt/index.php/en/noticias/35-workshop-resumo
Number of participants	31

[1] Stakeholders

- The workshop gathered educational actors from several action fields:
  - Educational innovators and young entrepreneurs;
  - Universities' professionals;

MEN_oN   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

- Higher education teachers (from both public and private universities)

- Vocational education and training teachers;

- MOOC's and e-learning trainers;

- University students.

- A general promotion over higher education institutions and through digital communication channels was made, and personal invitations were done to guarantee the presence of relevant educational leaders and professionals.

- Sessions were free of charge to participants, and a coffee break between sessions was held in order to open space for a networking time between professionals, young entrepreneurs and students.

- The participants in this session that filled in the attendance list were:
  - Andreas Meiszner
  - Kelwyn Looi
  - Ana Faria
  - Ana Filipa Braga
  - Ana Rita Craveiro
  - André Gigante
  - André Malho
  - Bernardo Canha
  - Dárida Fernandes
  - Flávia Vieira
  - Francisca Ribeiro
  - Glória Monteiro
  - Inês Pinho
  - Ivana Schmejkalova
  - Joana Barbosa
  - João Leite Castro
  - João Sousa
  - Julce Mary Cornelsen
  - Lília Barbosa
  - Maria Inês Baptista
  - Michel Santos
  - Mónica Ovaia
  - Paulo Guedes
  - Paulo Vaz
  - Pedro Bandeira
  - Rafael Pedrosa
  - Ricardo Loureiro
  - Rita Fontes
  - Sarka Hynkova
  - Sofia Caetano
  - Vitor Passos

[2] Session methodology (Please provide a brief list of actions, preparation, tools and strategy that you have undertaken to carry out this session)

- The workshop drew upon two different sessions.

- Session One: focused on 'Concepts and Models' such as the applicability, usefulness and integration of analytical tools like the Pearson Efficacy Framework, and how those could enhance already established innovation support models, structures and processes. The session programme included:

  - An introduction into Pearson's Efficacy Framework;

  - An exercise: using the Efficacy Framework and the Outcomes and Evidence criteria, participants examined the innovation potential for these 3 fields of innovation: MOOCs, Learning Analytics, Educational Games;

  - An open discussion on the applicability of the efficacy framework within the Portuguese higher and adult education context;

  - Introduction to the 'Alive in the Swamp' document as a resource to support transversal ideas and more specific questions to the development of digital innovations.

- Session Two: focused on 'Tools and Techniques', provided an introduction to the methods that are for example used within Pearson, and particularly with regards to its Efficacy Framework. This session allowed the audience to apply this framework to their on-going and future projects, developed in some university subjects that link ICT with education. The topics explored covered the following:

  - Introduction to Efficacy at Pearson;

  - Case Study exercise to examine and use the Efficacy Framework;

  - Discussion around the use of the Efficacy Framework in scholarly projects, such as 'ClassDojo'.

[3] Objective/s of the session (Detailed) (150 to 300 words)

- The main purpose of the workshop was to evaluate how analytical tools, such as the Pearson Efficacy Framework, could enhance already established innovation support models, structures and processes. The workshop continued on from a 2013 workshop at the Online Educa Berlin conference and introduced the Efficacy Framework, and explore its applicability as a tool to support technology-enhanced learning innovations.

- An inherent objective of both sessions was to introduce the HoTEL project to participants, as well as its objectives, intended outcomes and, most of all, possible benefits to the target group.

- Objective of Session One was to provide a more conceptualized presentation of innovative support tools and methods, and to acquire some constructive critical input provided from teachers and educational experts.

- The second session of the workshop aimed to allow participants to develop an understanding of the principles governing the framework, so that they could see its application to their own projects and ideas.

[4] Analysis of the session (Based on the objectives and in contrast with the outcomes: obstacles, strengths, expectations met, et cetera) (150 to 300 words)

- Feedback provided from the participants do include the following aspects:

4.1. How you did experience the workshop discussions?

In general, participants share the opinion that the workshop did allow them to build up capacity, but that the format might still be improved. Participants perceived the workshop discussions as relevant, pertinent, suitable, knowledge generator, useful, and interesting in the way that it brought together visions of educational actors from several different action fields. An aspect to be improved for future workshops was that it would be easier to understand the context and applicability of the subject if it was given alongside more illustrative practical and local relevant examples from a successful case, either local or national.

4.2. How did you rate the usefulness of the Efficacy Framework as a tool to support technology-enhanced learning innovations?

Participants found that the Pearson Efficacy Framework can be indeed a suitable analytical tool, and that it can act as foundation for project building in different areas. One participant said that most of the Efficacy Framework questions should be part of a good teacher reasoning. However, even though it would add a value, some pointed out that teachers and the educational system, in general, show too much resistance when similar tools are presented and an implementation is tried.

4.3. Take-away from the session?

Two key take away experiences that were put forward by participants was an increased understanding about the usefulness and applicability of an assessment tools with regard to efficacy and, secondly, how difficult it can be to innovate in education against the traditional mentality teachers have regarding change.

[5] Implementation actions (Immediate and future implementation actions coming out of the session) (150 to 300 words)

- General lessons learnt from the two workshop sessions with regards to innovation support are:

  - Practical examples, particular those that have a local relevance and using cases that are familiar to participants, appear to be a valuable vehicle so to allow for the autonomous self-directed application of analytical tools such as the Pearson Efficacy Framework;

- Consideration of language as a barrier should not be neglected and a translation of any type of information might be considered;

- Keeping complexity moderate by breaking down complex topics in well-defined and clearly understandable chunks do further support participation opportunities as well as autonomous self-directed application;

- Draw and consider existing constructs, prevent the attempt to re-invent the wheel. Some individuals drew some comparisons in between the Pearson Efficacy Framework and other constructs, such as the action research cycle.

[6] Success criteria (You describe this implementation as a success or not, and based on what criteria) (150 to 300 words)

- As this open workshop had different objectives than the implementation sessions held in the practical lab cases, it's not possible to outline how it would be likely to succeed. Even though, the majority of the initially established objectives were achieved, and a large number of expectations were met, thus it's possible to define this session as a successful event.

[7] Assess the implementation session (average)

-> Rating from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I think that the session has been useful and positive	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	
I would repeat the experience	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	
I am satisfied with the organisation of the session	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	
I am satisfied with the participation of the end-users	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
I am satisfied with the balance between the content presentation and my participation possibilities	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	

[8] Assess the outcomes of this implementation (150 to 300 characters)

Statement	Overall rating	Comments
The outcomes will help you improve your innovation	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐	
The outcomes are relevant to your local context related needs	① ② ③ ④ ⑤ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒	

[9] Suggestions and improvements for next session (150 to 300 words)

- Some conclusions could be taken after the workshop. For instance, although it's pertinent to have a diversity of participants, ranging from students to teachers and administrators, a workshop addressed specifically to a target-group would be more productive.

- Some of the initial expectations weren't met, mostly regarding the introduction of the Pearson Efficacy Framework as a tool to support the development of educational products, services and processes. One of the main reasons put forward by participants was the lack of comprehensiveness by the participants when some terms were outlined. As non-native English speakers, some confusion came out and the discussion turned more around the terms rather than the terms applicability itself. In this sense, language should be adapted in a next workshop, at least when it comes to complex constructs.

- Participants mentioned that they would like to see more illustrative practical and local relevant examples. While all participants had close ties to the education sector, in the one form or the other, it was felt that their different action fields bring along different meanings for the presented concepts, and thus illustrative practical and local relevant examples would help to establish a common language framework.

[10]   Any other general or specific comment about the implementation

- No further comments.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

11. Annex 1 – EFQUEL- Self-Assessment Reports (Form A)

11.1 Case 1 Best Practice Community on Quality in OER

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-01-1-3-01[12]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	Best Practice Community on Quality in OER		
Date Received:	01/06/14	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol		
Notes	39.	All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	40.	The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access.
	41.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	SEQUENT Consortium	
Date Completed:	25/05/14	**Contact email:**	george.ubachs@eadtu.nl

description of the innovation	
Name:	*SEQUENT Best Practice Community*
Purpose:	The innovation intends to allow e-learning providers to access a best-practice database on quality in e-learning, to help them in compliance with e-learning quality labels (including e-excellence and UNIQUe)
Stage of Development:	Initial – Idea
Description	

The product will take the form of a web-portal, which will host a collection of verified and peer-reviewed best practices in e-learning from educational institutions around the world, who have undergone quality certifications for e-learning. The portal will be mapped to a number of quality certifications, including the e-Excellence Quality label and the UNIQUe quality label. Thus, a user will be able to cross-reference examples of best-practice against any of the criteria in these quality labels, thus being able to benchmark their institutional performance against cases in the database.

Critically, the tool will allow for new cases to be submitted as new experiences are gained, and for discussion to be organised around the cases, in the forms of ratings and comments –

---

[12] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

allowing for a professional community to be built up around the cases.

value proposition
Target Groups: • Educational institutions including HEIs, private course providers, and public training institutes. Specifically: QA staff within these institutes
Value Propositions
The service will allow users to use a self-assessment process done as part of QA as an opportunity to network with, learn from and implement lessons based on leaders in the field.
Prior Art
The service will draw its initial database from an archive of detailed peer-assessments done for previous quality schemes.
Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each)   • Reduce the Risk in Certification Procedures   • Turn Self-Assessment into a Learning Experience   • Learn from the Best
Innovative Element
The main innovative elements are: • The specificity of the database, with cases being tied to individual criteria   • The professional networking element, allowing users to tie cases to real individuals, and make

	contact with them
Product Demonstration	Product is still in idea-stage. No demonstration available
Product Literature	Product is still in idea-stage. No demonstration available

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Create software infrastructure for service	Tool developed to specifications
	Pre-Populate service with cases	At least 100 examples of practice included.
	Launch beta	15 beta-testers recruited
Mid-Term (18 months)	Regular Traffic	30 institutional users
	Impact on Quality Certification-Sales	Improve sale of quality-certifications by 30%.

Analysis	
*describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above*** (max. 20 words each)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
- Service is based on expert knowledge, and creates value out of archives - Integrates with existing ongoing activities - Improves value-proposition of other services	Strategy for recruitment of beta-testers, and criteria for selecting the best-cases still undefined
Opportunities	Threats
Strong opportunity for recruitment of new clients by increasing value-added of quality services	Short lead-time for development

development plans
product development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The operational objective for the next 6 months is to develop the service to the point that it will be ready for a public beta.

In particular, the following activities will be undertaken:
- Research into the archives of participating quality certifications to extract the initial set of case studies
- Design of the Tool
- Coding of the software
- Integration of the software into SEQUENT websites
- Recruitment of initial testing partners

Research into the archives will be undertaken by a dedicated team of researchers consisting of staff of the quality certifications, as well as sub-contracted experts. Software development will be entirely sub-contracted, and will proceed in only three stages for accelerated development, namely mockup → alpha → beta, with feedback being given at the end of each of these stages.

The product has an extremely short time-to-market, and therefore proper project-management will be key to avoiding delays.

marketing & promotion strategy

The product will not be branded, but rather serve as an add-on service to the quality-certifications which it supports. As such, the marketing & promotion strategy involves integrating the service with the websites of quality assurance schemes using it, as well as revising the promotional materials of such quality assurance services to include references to the service.

pricing strategy

The service will be offered for free in perpetuity. It will be funded with proceeds from the quality certifications, and serve to improve the value-proposition offered when applying for the quality certifications. As such, it is intended to increase the volume of quality certifications on offer.

11.2 Case 2 MOOC on Quality in e-Learning

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-02-1-3-01[13]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	MOOC on Quality in e-Learning		
Date Received:	05/07/14	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol	
Notes	42. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 43. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 44. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Anthony F. Camilleri, EFQUEL
Date Completed:	05/07/14	**Contact email:** anthony.camilleri@efquel.org

description of the innovation	
Name:	Massively Open Online Course on Quality in e-Learning
Purpose:	The MOOC is intended to distil the knowledge on Quality in e-Learning available amongst the experts within the EFQUEL Network, into a single corpus capable of being deployed easily to quality professionals around the globe.
Stage of Development:	In Development
Description	

Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words)
The service consists of an **online course.** The service consists of two parts, namely the *creation* and the *operation* of the online course.

The MOOC-creation is intended to serve as an activity to strengthen a professional network of e-learning professionals, which are brought together within the structures of EFQUEL. EFQUEL will host a number of workshops, both online and presentially allowing these experts to weigh in on the content and structure of the MOOC. This is intended to be an ongoing activity, with new versions of the MOOC being released yearly to reflect the state of the art.

The MOOC-provision has the aim to:
- Demonstrate the proper operation of a quality cycle in the context of an institution providing e-learning

---

[13] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

- Show educators and administrators how to integrate quality principles into instructional design processes, as well as into the overall operations of institutions

- Highlight the use of EFQUEL quality & certification tools as a valid way to conduct external peer-assessment of the quality systems.

value proposition
Target Groups: • Decision makers   • Quality professionals   • E-learning practitioners, i.e. course managers and designers
Value Propositions
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)
The MOOC will support and enrich a knowledge-oriented community of professionals around the topic of Quality for e-Learning.
The MOOC will provide an introduction into the field for education professionals who are faced with the challenge of transforming traditional learning environments.
Prior Art
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words)   The service improves upon an informal consultation service EFQUEL offered its' members on demands, in terms of ad-hoc trainings.   In terms of infrastructure, the MOOC will utilise the methodology and software of the European Multiple MOOC Aggregator initiative (http://www.europeanmoocs.eu).   In terms of pedagogical theory, it will divide modules according to the theory of: • Connect – an introductory section to orient the participant to the week's content and activities.   • Activate/Demonstrate – the main focus of content and activities for the week.   • Consolidate – the reflective element of the week, where participants reflect on what they have learnt and consider the relevance to their own practice.
Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each)

For potential members of the MOOC-Creation Community:
- Help define the state of the art in e-learning quality management

For potential learners:
- Get acquainted with e-learning quality management
- Update your quality-management skills for the digital age

Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words) To our knowledge this is the only attempt globally to set up a community-authored curriculum for this topic, and the only open course (critically available for self-study) on the topic available globally.

Product Demonstration	The product is still in development, and therefore no demonstration is currently available.
Product Literature	Marketing literature is not available. However, public planning documents are available at: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1OWICiJsVC1XCCQl_VEMSYOSvSk4ZCwU GBIFE5sX-yho/edit#

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Engage e-learning Quality Community in the authoring of the course	Minimum 10 persons directly involved in authoring of course materials
	Finalise course and prepare it for launch	Final version of course available on EMMA MOOC Platform, sign-ups open
Mid-Term (18 months)	Complete first round of course	Minimum 100 participants complete course
	Continue to engage e-learning community	An additional 10 persons become involved in drafting second version

		of the course

analysis
*describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above***   (max. 20 words each)

Strengths	Weaknesses
• Draws together significant network of experts, representing state-of-the-art in topic area • No entry-barriers for people to follow completed course •	• Informality of network and 'commitment by promise' may lead to development delays • Wide range of experts involved will mean significant resources invested in coordination of the group
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Possibility to involve e-learning experts outside EFQUEL's internal network • Significant reputational gain for EFQUEL as a result of course • Possibility to recruit new 'junior' members to informal professional network, by interacting and communicating with them in the corse	• First such product-offering from EFQUEL: risk of unforeseen development obstacles, leading to reputational damage • Insufficient targeting or description of value-proposition might lead to lower proportion of signups than envisaged.

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The bulk of the production for the product will be done within the next 6 months. The next steps and deadlines are as following:

30th August: Curriculum, Learning Outcomes Finalised, and authors designated for all modules within the curriculum. Plan foresees 6-8 modules being described.

30th August – 14th October: Author-teams (we envisage 2 authors per module) will develop content for their assigned modules, in line with a MOOC development template provided by EFQUEL

15th October: Author teams will complete the first draft of their module in line with a template, and publish these online for public review.

16th October – 15th November: Comments and edits to the content of the MOOC will be received through a public consultation process, organised in collaboration with the Open Educational Ideas initiative (www.idea-space.eu)

15th December: Author Teams complete module content, incorporating edits from public consultation.

16th December – 30th January: MOOC Content uploaded online, filming of lectures takes place.

1st February: Product Launch

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

'Creation Phase' Marketing:

Recruitment of the professional network to author the course will happen through individual pitches made in-person or via e-mail/phone to members of EFQUEL's network of quality professionals (who have already indicated expertise and interest in the topic area), as well as to representatives of key stakeholders who are active in the field such as GIZ, ICDE, ITC/ILO etc.

'Delivery Phase' Marketing

Marketing will take place through the following channels:

- distribution lists of affiliated networks: information about the MOOC will be included in e-newsletters distributed by EFQUEL, EADTU, EDEN and 3-4 other stakeholder associations. It is estimated that this will reach approximately 3500 e-learning and/or quality professionals

- inclusion of MOOC in online directories: a launch notice and link to the MOOC will also be

included in all the major online MOOC directories, in particular Open Education Europa • promotion at events: the MOOC will be promoted by means of leaflets distributed at Media & Learning 2014, Online Educa 2014, the HOTEL final workshop and other e-learning events

pricing strategy
Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.   The MOOC will be offered entirely free of charge and will be financed from EFQUEL's own resources, together with support from project funding.

11.3 Case 3 Open Recognition Clearinghouse

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-03-1-3-01[14]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**Open Recognition Clearinghouse**		
Date Received:	28/07/2014	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol		
Notes	45.	All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	46.	The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access.
	47.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Grainne Conole	
Date Completed:	28/07/2014	**Contact**	gcc7@leicester.ac.uk

---

[14] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

	email:	

description of the innovation

Name :	*Open Recognition Clearinghouse*
Purpose :	The innovation seeks to build a web-tool which will use crowd-sourcing principles to facilitate information exchange in the recognition of learning achieved through non-traditional means in Higher Education Institutions.

Stage of Development:	Research Project

Description

The recognition tool will support institutions in recognising open learning, by using crowd-sourcing techniques to reduce the workload involved in recognising open learning.

Using the tool an institution will be able to:

- **OER course providers will be able to use the learning passport to register data on the OER course** - its content and curriculum, any certification options available, the equivalency of the certificate to qualification frameworks, and other critical information. Thus, a recognising institution would be able to base a recognition decision on verified information using a standard template, which is already in the database, eliminating the need for extensive research as part of the recognition procedure.
- **Recognising institutions will be able to share their research** on the equivalency of Open Education certifications to their own national qualification frameworks. The exercise of mapping the certification to the qualifications will be recorded using a standard format, and shared with the community of VMPass institutions.
- **Increase efficiency of recognition processes** - Where an Open Education certificate has been researched by any HE within the VMPass network, the information on that recognition process will be stored in the clearinghouse database. This will save a third institution attempting to recognise the same certification from re-doing the same research. They will instead be able to access the research already done, and take their own recognition decision based on it, annotating and improving the record as they go.

The clearinghouse workflow is visualised below:

value proposition		
Target Groups:	• Officials responsible for recognition of learning/qualifications within Higher Education	
Value Propositions		
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)		
The innovation creates transparency and trust around new and non-traditional forms of teaching/learning, giving recognition officials the necessary information and confidence to allow them to make appropriate decisions on recognition.		
The innovation reduces the amount of time it takes to process a recognition request, by allowing institutions to share their findings, and avoid duplication of research		
Prior Art		
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words) The model for the ,learning passport, which serves as the data-collection tool in the platform, is		

adapted from a proposal made in the OERTest project, and published in "Open Learning Recognition"[15].

Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each) • Extend and apply your prior learning validation procedures to ope learning • Reduce and simplify the workload in recognising open learning • Allow your students to take advantage of high quality open learning from around the world
Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words) The main innovative element is that of using crowd-sourcing to enhance recognition-of-learning procedures. To our knowledge this is entirely unique globally.

Product Demonstration	Currently in design phase.
Product Literature	Ref #1: *Product brochure:* http://vmpass.eu/wp-content/uploads/VMPass_brochure.pdf

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Clearinghouse leaves alpha-development stage	Announcement of public-beta testing
	Pool of live beta-testers recruited	20 institutions recruited into living lab for purpose of testing
Mid-Term (18 months)	Multiple recognition procedures facilitated by the clearinghouse	150 recognition procedures facilitated

analysis	
*describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above*** *(max. 20 words each)*	
Strengths	Weaknesses

[15] Camilleri, A. F., Ferrari, L., Haywood, J., Maina, M., Pérez-Mateo, M., Montes, R., … Tannhäuser, A.-C. (2012). *Open Learning Recognition: Taking Open Educational Resources a Step Further*. (A. F. Camilleri & A.-C. Tannhäuser, Eds.). Belgium: EFQUEL - European Foundation for Quality in e-Learning. Retrieved from http://openaccess.uoc.edu/webapps/o2/handle/10609/21341

• Market research shows that product is addressing a real problem faced by many institutions • AGILE software development allows for rapid deployment of products, and iterative improvement of specifications • Strong and influential consortium of partners supporting the project	• Only 'alpha' version will be ready for start of academic year. Public beta will be launched 2 months into the semester, meaning that it will probably used for recognition processes only in early 2015. • • • •
Opportunities	**Threats**
• If testing proves successful, the product has the potential to be used by every Higher Education Institution in Europe. Since it's success depends on level of crowd-sourcing, there is a very significant first-mover advantage.	• Recognition of Learning is an infamously bureaucratic procedure – slow movement by HEIs may inhibit take up, or prevent product from reaching critical mass in time for it to show success

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The initial development of the clearinghouse will take place in the next 6 months. During the period, we will see:

- Preparation of a technical specification for the clearinghouse
- Issue and award of a development tender
- Creation of an alpha-version of the tool and collecting feedback
- Launch of a public-beta version of the tool

Software Development will take place using AGILE methodology[16], with weekly sprints taking place over 6 weeks for the alpha, and a further 6 weeks for the beta.

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

The project plan envisages 3 phases of dissemination, namely:

Dissemination activities will fall into three categories, namely:

Phase	Objective	Activities
Recruitment Phase	Recruit institutions to a living lab which will test the recognition clearinghouse	Specialised recruitment seminars held online and alongside major TEL conferences
Operations Phase	Raise awareness of activities of clearinghouse /living lab, and of benefits to institutions	Academic papers, conference appearances, website, news, newsletters
Sustainability Phase	Expand operations of clearinghouse by engaging new institutions, based on evidence of project	Launch conference, one-on-one meetings with stakeholders, continued promotion as in operations phase

Currently, the initiative is at the end of the recruiting phase, in which it has organised several conference appearances and online seminars in a bid to recruit institutions into a living-lab to

---

[16]   More information about AGILE methodology available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agile_software_development

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

test the tool. Tying up the recruitment phase will involve contacting participants which took part in these seminars and expressed initial interest, to follow up and solidify commitments of participation. This is being done by means of personalised invitation letters to each lead.

As the public beta-testing phase starts promotion will initially focus on general media opportunities – in particular industry-specific media and blogs, to announce the start of the public beta, to be followed later by marketing at events, and recruitment of more partners by the currently existing partners within the network.

pricing strategy

Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

Currently, a pricing strategy still needs to be developed. Following testing, a feasibility study will primarily investigate three options:
- Payment by subscription / per item, by recognition offices
- Support by government entities
- Other options, in particular advertising

11.4 Case 4 SEVAQ+

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-04-1-3-01[17]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	SEVAQ+		
Date Received:	30/07/2014	**Verified**	Anthony F. Camilleri

---

[17] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

		by:	

sheet protocol		
Notes	48.	All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	49.	The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access.
	50.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Deborah Arnold	
Date Completed:	28/07/2014	**Contact email:**	Deborah.Arnold@u-bourgogne.fr

description of the innovation	
Name:	Shared Quality Evaluation – SEVAQ+
Purpose:	SEVAQ+ is a combined tool and approach for the shared evaluation of quality in technology-enhanced learning. + is designed to be used by a range of learning organisations to evaluate the quality of any teaching and learning supported by technology, whether it concerns totally online distance courses or blended learning.
Stage of Development:	Commercialised
Description	

Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words)

SEVAQ+ follows a logical structure inspired by the EFQM quality framework, combined with the Kirkpatrick evaluation model. To design a questionnaire, you can choose which Criteria and Sub criteria you wish to focus on (achievement of learning goals, efficiency of the technical support, effectiveness of the pedagogical approaches, quality of the learning resources,…). These criteria are organised within an overall framework of Resources, Processes and Results. The SEVAQ+ tool then proposes a series of statements: you choose those which best reflect the reality of the context you wish to evaluate. As a respondent, you will find the same structure as above. Depending on the type of questionnaire, you will either be asked to answer by yes or no, or to rate your level of agreement with each statement and to say how important this aspect is. In the overview of results, the "critical areas for improvement" will be reflected: meaning the areas that are rated low on quality but very important for obtaining a good learning experience.

With SEVAQ+:
- Teachers and trainers can design questionnaires to gather feedback on what learners really think of their learning experience.
- Training managers can get the full picture by designing questionnaires for the different stakeholders involved. For example trainers might think that the collaborative work is highly effective, yet the learners themselves might have a completely different view!

- Organisations can use the results of SEVAQ+ to benchmark against others using SEVAQ+
- Learners get the chance to give their point of view and contribute to improving the quality of learning…

value proposition
Target Groups: • Small training organisations • Higher education institutions • The corporate world • Small non-profit associations and NGOs
Value Propositions
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective.** What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)
SEVAQ allows for the design, deployment and analysis of quality-assurance questionnaires in a matter of mere hours, by the teacher administering the course – radically reducing the amount and nature of resources which are usually necessary to perform these procedures.
Prior Art
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words) Not Applicable
Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each) • SEVAQ+ is a shared evaluation tool for evaluating the quality of your e-learning programmes and blended learning programmes • SEVAQ+ provides quality assurance by evaluating and by offering improvement suggestions for your course organisation • SEVAQ+ is a worthwhile investment for your organisation, not an extra cost.
Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words) The main innovation in SEVAQ arises out of: - Integration of guided survey design, deployment and analysis tools - The ability to create surveys from templates (700 question database is included), and still be able to customise the surveys at any level of granularity. This gives the tool ease-of-use, customisability and breadth of coverage.

MEN⊘N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

Product Demonstration	A free demonstration account may be downloaded by following this link: http://www.sevaq-plus.preau.cci-paris-idf.fr/php/formateur/choix_compte.php?lang=en
Product Literature	The product handbook can be downloaded from: http://cdn.efquel.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/3/files/2012/03/SEVAQ-Handbook_EN.pdf

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Harmonise Brand Across entire Service	Migration to new Web-Platform Completed
	Increase clients	Sell 15 accounts and gain 45 test-accounts
Mid-Term (18 months)	Launch 'Pro' and 'Global' Options	Successful launch of product, and sign-up of first client for each product

Analysis	
describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your strategy to achieve the objectives above (max. 20 words each)	
Strengths	Weaknesses
• Product fully developed, significant interest shown in commercial version during piloting phase. • Pilots have proven reliability of service and low maintenance costs – already running for 3 years	• No dedicated sales staff to implement strategy – being done in supplemental time by other staff • No sales support exists in Polish, Lithuanian or Dutch
Opportunities	Threats
• Since the tool saves significant human resources (in QA departments), and there	• Lack of professional sales staff may struggle to get message across

MEN*o*N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uni*R*   *e*fquel   AtoS   ELIG.org

is no comparable tool on the market, there are significant opportunities for sales and growth. • Tool is especially well suited for small-to-medium size training providers and corporate training departments	• Breadth of features, and technical nature of topic complicates messaging

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The R&D work is currently limited, as the project is already being commercialised. In the next 6 months we envisage to complete:
- Full integration of the website and the tool-proper into a single visual image and under the same domain
- Addition of Dutch translation to the tool (current languages include English, French, German, Italian, Lithuanian and Polish.

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

The current marketing strategy has the following objectives:
- Ensure maximum promotion of SEVAQ in order to get a high number of SEVAQ users
- Keep current users on board
- Make the tool known in other languages
- Provoke interest in the corporate world

The proposed actions over the next 6 months include:
- Harmonise branding across the product
- Create a lead-database of at least 100 potentials - mixed between 70% small training organisations and 30% HEIs, to begin converting to clients
- Follow-up with mailings to all of the potentials, and phone calls to at least 3 leads weekly
- Create a standard online-demonstration script, for follow-up meetings
- Send out a quarterly newsletter to current users, to enhance retention
-

pricing strategy

Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers

to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.
The pricing strategy is outlined at this address: http://sevaq.efquel.org/sevaq-tool/account-type/

11.5 Case 5 ECBCheck Community & Tool

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	A-05-1-3-01[18]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**ECBCheck Community & Tool**		
Date Received:	31/07/2014	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol	
Notes	51. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 52. The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access. 53. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.
Sheet completed by:	Maria Holguera, GIZ
Date Completed:	30/07/2014	**Contact email:**	maria.holguera@giz.de

description of the innovation	
Name:	European Capacity Building Check – Tool and Review Community
Purpose:	ECBCheck is a quality improvement scheme for E-Learning programmes. It supports organisations to measure how successful their e-learning programmes are and allows for continuous improvement though peer collaboration and bench-learning.
Stage of Development:	Commercialised
Description	
Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words) ECBCheck forms a participative quality environment which allows its members to benefit in a variety of ways by having access to tools and guidelines for their own practice on the one hand, and being able to obtain a community based label on the other hand. Three stages to quality are suggested:	

---

[18] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MEN∂N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

1. Members of the ECBCheck professional community document their commitment to quality by joining
2. The ECBCheck professional community provides access to and allows sharing of guidelines, tools as well as experiences for quality development for its members
3. On the basis of a detailed self-assessment process, members can enter into mutual peer-review partnerships to improve the quality of their e-learning offers.

The core of the ECB-Check service is a fully-online review process and tool, which allows any individual to submit an assessment, forward it for review, and benchmark the review results. Reviewers are selected from a community of persons who have already undergone the self-assessment and review process themselves.

value proposition

Target Groups:	• Quality managers of e-learning coursesr

Value Propositions
Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)
The innovation provides an easy to access, cheap method of self-assessment and review of e-learning courses & programmes.
By participating in evaluation, participants are able to involve themselves and share best-practice with a global community of quality managers in the field of e-learning.

Prior Art
What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words) Not applicable.

Key Messages
What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each) • ECBCheck is an accelerator for quality improvement and innovation for e-learning programmes in capacity building. Providing international benchmarks, it dramatically enhances the efficiency and effectiveness of capacity building processes which are using partly of fully technology-enhanced learning. • ECBCheck process is structured in several stages and offers a clear structured approach in

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

each of the accreditation steps.
- ECBrCheck provides an accreditation as a result but encourages continuous quality improvement and focuses on innovation. It ensures continuous quality improvement since it serves as a review instrument for self-assessment of programmes.

Innovative Element
Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words)   From a content perspective: • Compared to other quality initiatives in the area of technology-enhanced learning, ECBCheck has a focussed approach, relating to e-learning programmes as a whole and not only to learning software. ECBCheck builds on broad stakeholder involvement.   From a software perspective: • ECBCheck is the only fully virtual tool for self-assessment and review of e-learning.

Product Demonstration	You can sign-up and perform a self-assessment from the URL below: http://www.ecb-check.org/assessments/
Product Literature	ECBCheck Toolkit: http://cdn.efquel.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/4/files/2012/07/OpenECBCheck-Quality-Criteria-2012.xlsx ECBCheck Handbook: http://cdn.efquel.org/wp-content/blogs.dir/4/files/2013/01/Open-ECBCheck_handbook.pdf

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Total courses certified through ECBCheck	15
	Number of reviewers in community	30
Mid-Term (18 months)	Total courses certified through ECBCheck	55
	Number of reviewers in community	80

analysis	
*describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above*** (max. 20 words each)	
Strengths	Weaknesses

• ECBCheck already a well-known product with a distinct pedigree • Major revamp of online tool has just been completed, significantly improving client experience • Continued strong support in promotion from community of stakeholders including EFQUEL, GIZ and ITC/ILO	• Most business comes from a small community of repeat-clients • Participation in community between reviews is lower than desired
Opportunities	**Threats**
• Launch of Spanish language platform should significantly increase scope of certification • New platform will significantly decrease time spent on administration, increasing time for promotion • Increased intensity of promotion events should lead to new clientele	• Several competing certifications on the market – although they have different service offering and profile, institutions tend to only buy 1 product • Challenging to match qualified reviewers to self-assessments in multi-lingual environment.

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The service development strategy for the next 6 months includes:
- Launching a Spanish version of the website and tool
- Signing an agreement with the government of Malta for use of ECBCheck as a national certification
- Improvement (and simplification) of the signup and login process for the technical tool.

marketing & promotion strategy

Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words.

The marketing strategy in the next 6 months rests on four pillars:
- Promotion in collaboration with stakeholders: this involves promotion of the service at various quality assurance themed events, in particular:
  - ENQA General Assembly in Zagreb, Croatia
  - EADTU Annual Conference in Krakow, Poland
  - European Quality Assurance Forum (EQAF) in Barcelona, Spain
- Promotion of the certifications amongst members of the community, in particular through the contact databases of EFQUEL and GIZ, as well as the general list of all persons who have come in contact with the service
- Expanding relationships with current customers: contacting current customers on a 1-to-1 basis and persuading them to increase the number of certifications they are purchasing from ECBCheck.
- Creation of 'certification hubs' – a network of global promoters and resellers of certification services including ECBCheck

pricing strategy

Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

The pricing scheme can be consulted at:
http://www.ecb-check.org/application/pricing/

11.6 Case 6 Open review communities

to be filled in by investigator				
Ref:	A-ww-x-y-zz[19]	**Lab:**		
Innovation:				
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**		
sheet protocol				
Notes	54.	All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.		
	55.	The innovator should attach or make reference to a demo of their product – in the form of a video/report explaining it, a login to access the service or other appropriate means of access.		
	56.	All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Innovator.		
Sheet completed by:	Anne-Christin Tannhäuser INNOQUAL			
Date Completed:	dd/mm/yy	**Contact email:**	actannhauser@gmail.com	
description of the innovation				
Name:	*Open review communities*			
Purpose:	*What is the innovation for? (max. 40 words)* Support research and practice in the area of innovation & quality in e-learning through. Creating an open review community will - address shortcomings of the traditional double-blind review process - Contribute to a more open and transparent scientific dialogue - Support authors & expert reviewers with a more diversified perspective on their manuscripts - complement procedures already in place: double-blind review and open access to submitted manuscripts			

---

[19] A = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (always 1 for this form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

Stage of Development:	Initial – Idea / Research Project / Pilot / Prototype / Commercialised
Description	

Describe the nature of the product/service. What does it do? (max. 500 words)

The service will arrange for local events dedicated to open comments on manuscripts submitted to the International Journal for Innovation and Quality in Learning INNOQUAL. The journal publishes the latest submissions as online discussion papers (open review) while under-going the scrutiny by two selected reviewers (double-blind review), i.e. it has a hybrid review process in place. For the first 2 issues comments have been invited by the by the scientific community and practitioners in the field through the EFQUEL network with limited success. The new open review will strengthen the aspect of community building by inviting partners to arrange for and promote "commentathons" for open review.

value proposition	
Target Groups:	*Who are your main potential clients / users? (max. 4)* • Researchers in technology-enhanced learning (TEL) and e-learning • Practitioners in TEL and e-learning • Quality managers in education (those comprise authors, reviewers and readers of INNOQUAL)

Value Propositions

*Describe how your innovation will bring an advantage to your target groups, **from your perspective**. What problems does it solve? (Max 3 statement x80 words each)*

The reviewers and authors will benefit from a more diversified feedback on the submitted papers from more than 2 – albeit expert – dedicated reviewers. It is assumed that the open review in form of "commentathons" will contribute to a higher quality publication and authors will benefit from a more open and transparent scientific dialogue.

Commentathon organizers will benefit from higher visibility among the INNOQUAL readers and reviewers. They will be presented as official partners of the respective INNOQUAL issue. The co-operation will be highlighted in the editorial. If events are organized in the frame of HEI teaching involving learners, the commentathons offers the opportunity to openly review educational research, developing review competences, getting acquainted with open science formats in the field and using ICT to contribute for learners at bachelor, master and/or Ph.D. level. Real participation in scientific practice for (Ph.D.) student group will be an asset.

Researchers as well as practitioners in the TEL/e-learning, innovation and quality will have the chance to enter a dialogue on a common topic of interest within the field in a specific time frame. Sharing critique and debating newest insights from research and practice in the field of innovation and quality in the field of learning will network people with similar interest.

Prior Art

What existing services does your innovation improve upon, replicate, draw upon? Provide references where appropriate. (max. 300 words)

The service is inspired by "Hackathons" and "Editathons", i.e. events of intense collaboration on digital projects, which have contributed to the creation and improvement of new software and (clusters of) Wikipedia articles. Organizing events of that kind has become an established practice in the IT industry and INNOQUAL will transfer the concept to the field of scientific and practice-related publishing in education.

Key Messages

What are the 3-5 main messages you will use in marketing to your target groups? (max. 30 words each)

- contribute to a more open and transparent scientific dialogue in the area of education and innovation – Become an INNOQUAL commentathon partner
- Join the open review of latest INNOQUAL papers
- Interested in discussing Quality in (E-)Learning and MOOCs. Comment on our papers share your thoughts

Innovative Element

Describe the <u>main innovative element</u> – what does your product/service do different? (max. 100 words)

Based on a desk-top research INNOQUAL will be the only journal with a hybrid review approach, engaging open reviewers in through local and network events.

Product Demonstration	*Please provide instructions on how to view a demonstration of the product/service being evaluated.* *The open review takes places from this page:* *http://innoqual.efquel.org/discussion-paper/* *Commentathon as concept are described here:* *http://innoqual.efquel.org/about-innoqual/about-commentathons/*
Product Literature	Ref #1: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* Ref #2: *Describe the product literature in attachment.* ….

Please reflect on the strategic objectives related to the promotion of your product/service		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Find commentathon partners	3 Commentathon partners found
	Local/network events engage TEL/e-learning experts and practitioners in open review	At least 5 individuals participate per

		commentathon
	Gather comments on discussion papers which are of value to authors and reviewers	At least 2 thirds of discussion papers have 5+ comments
Mid-Term (18 months)	Repeat the commentathon for issue 4 of the journal	3 Commentathon partners found

analysis

*Describe the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats related to the implementation of your **strategy to achieve the objectives above***   *(max. 20 words each)*

Strengths	Weaknesses
  • Build on the existing INNOQUAL (board members') network • Good fit with activities through social media among experts and practitioners of e-learning and TEL • Extends the hybrid review procedure already in place. •	 • No financial remuneration to partners involved • No established low/free-of-cost software available for open reviews. To fully benefit from the open review, authors should own a google account • No former experiences with local/network events around review
Opportunities	Threats
  • • Connects with specific interests of potential commentathon partners for special issues	 • No interest to engage in the activity as commentathon partner without financial support • Little readiness of experts

• Potential interest in open access networks and scientific follow-up • Higher visibility of the INNOQUAL journal •	(other than HEI students) to openly comment on discussion papers, low participation in • Little reaction from authors themselves on open review comments or do not take the open comments into account when revising their manuscripts • Expert (double-blind) Reviewers do not take the open comments into account when judging the submission for potential publication

development plans
Product/service development strategy

Please give an overview of your R&D strategy in the next 6 months. The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.
 	
Goal 1: Find commentathon partners
    • Extend information on the new service at the journals website
    • Create instructions for commentathon partners
 	
Goal 2: Engage TEL/e-learning experts and practitioners in open review
    • Circulate news about commentathons through dedicated social media, the EFQUEL newsletter and the EFQUEL Innovation forum 2014
    • Inform authors and reviewers about the service, motivate them to take future open comments into account for revisions and review judgement
    • Answer follow-up questions
 	
Goal 3: Host local commentathon at EFQUEL Innovation Forum 2014
    • Place event in programme and prepare 1-1,5 hour session
 	
Goal 4: Improve Open review system and management of google docs along the process

marketing & promotion strategy
Please give an overview of your marketing & promotion strategy in the next 6 months. How do you intend to promote your product/service concretely? Which actions will you implement? What are the potential barriers that might prevent your success? How do you think you can measure your success?. Max. 500 words. Circulate news about commentathons through dedicated social media, the EFQUEL newsletter and

the EFQUEL Innovation forum 2014
Invite Blog and Facebook posts by commentathon partners
Tweet invitation to the open review in general and specific papers through the @INNOQUAL and @EFQUEL channel

pricing strategy

Please give an overview of your pricing strategy in the next 6 months (in case you have one). The overview should include: concrete goals of the strategy, actions to be undertaken, barriers to success (risks) and success benchmarks. Max. 500 words.

INNOQUAL is an open access journal which does not charge author processing fees. It is financed by EFQUEL and funding through specific projects (e.g. TQM to kickstart, the OEI project later on)

12. Annex 2 – EFQUEL- Review Reports & Consolidated Review Reports (Forms B and C)

12.1 Case 1 Best Practice Community on Quality in OER

to be filled in by investigator				
Ref:	B-01-1-3-01[20]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks	
Innovation:	Best Practice Community on Quality in OER			
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**		

sheet protocol	
Notes	57. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	58. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	59. .
	60. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	61. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Sandra Feliciano, ESTGF-IPP and ISEC
Date Completed:	20/08/2014 **Contact email:** felicianosandra@gmail.com

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Yes as will be a good learning tool to prepare candidates for certification assessments.*	
Harmonisation	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[20] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MEN⌀N   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

| **Note** | |

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Because it is perpetually free.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *There are no marketing materials yet, so the answer above concerns only the 3 marketing sentences.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The innovation implies disclosure of results from previous (and future) certification assessments. This violates the principle of confidentiality, therefore requiring prior approval by the institutions assessed. This approval may or may not be given which constitutes a risk for the innovation.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *No comment.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

Yes, if the above mention authorizations to disclose confidential information if given by the institutions.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?

- Local
- Regional/national
- <mark>EU</mark>

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

<mark>Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, ~~HR managers of the steel sector company~~)</mark>

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)

- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- <mark>It will contribute to organisational change</mark>

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

<mark>Policy makers, decision makers at education institutions, researchers, teachers, trainers</mark>

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-ww-x-y-zz[21]	**Lab:**	Prof. Networks
Innovation:	Best practice community on Quality in OER		
Date Received:	1.6.2014	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	3. .
	4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ulf Ehlers
Date Completed:	1.8.2014	**Contact email:**	Ulf.ehlers@web.de

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer

The approach links quality approaches directly with best practice examples and makes quality in substance more accessible, understandable and discoverable.
It is presenting the possibility for a growing number of cases to be added, so that users can discover quality practices from other contexts as well.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[21] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer *The concept is presenting all relevant information in one place and is thus going beyond the normal quality handbook in which it is often difficult to immediately understand the relevance of the quality system presented.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Y/n	---	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer *Product is still in staging process, no marketing materials available as of yet.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Y/N	N	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer *No significant time is needed. In case the adopter wants to contribute to the databse, the time needed is little, but benefits could be high because the access to the other case studies can be beneficial.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer *The indicators are SMART*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	*y*
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer
The development and adoption plan is very ambitious and should maybe allow for a bit more time. However, it is comprehensive.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing

- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national
- EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
    Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
    Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
    Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

General information				
Ref:	C-01-05-1-1	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks	
Innovation:	**Best practice community on Quality in OER**			
Date Received:		**Verified by:**		

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	Mainly Innovative service
Nature	Both disruptive and incremental
Current process stage	Between invention and Concept development

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Implementation phase	Development
Territorial level covered	EU
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	It will lead to organisational change and improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	Mainly policy makers, teachers and trainers but also decision makers at education institutions and researchers

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

<u>Collective Review Outcome</u>

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*Learning advantage:* It will be a good learning tool to prepare candidates for certification assessments as the approach links quality approaches directly with best practice examples and makes quality in substance more accessible, understandable and discoverable. It is presenting the possibility for a growing number of cases to be added, so that users can discover quality practices from other contexts as well. Creating a web-portal for quality certification schemes for e-learning will stimulate the development of a quality culture in a professional community and thus improve the potential for better learning. The web-portal will be a good basis for better understanding between Quality assurance agencies for higher education and the e-learning community.
2	E*fficiency:* The concept is presenting all relevant information in one place and is thus going beyond the normal quality handbook in which it is often difficult to immediately understand the relevance of the quality system presented. A web-portal will help course developers, institutions and training companies find relevant quality assurance tools in one place and save time and effort. The community of users will be an advantage for networking and improvement of own quality assurance schemes.
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* Product is still in staging process, no marketing materials available as of yet.
4	*Difficulty to introduce:* On the one side no significant time is needed. In case the adopter wants to contribute to the database, the time needed is little, but benefits could be high because the access to the other case studies can be beneficial, as the web-portal will be

	accessible to anybody interested in quality assurance. On the other hand, the innovation implies disclosure of results from previous (and future) certification assessments. This violates the principle of confidentiality, therefore requiring prior approval by the institutions assessed. This approval may or may not be given which constitutes a risk for the innovation.
5	***Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:*** Although the time table is very tight, the plan is realistic, but requires good management. The indicators are SMART
6	***Quality of Adoption Plan:*** One the one hand the project partners have a comprehensive adaptation plan as well as already fully developed products and are likely to achieve the goals. On the other hand the project has a short time limit and needs good management to reach the objectives. The above mention authorizations to disclose confidential information will influence the on time realisation.

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	***Learning advantage:*** Strengthen the links to public quality assurance agencies
2	
3	***Clarity-of-concept:*** Develop plans for contact and influence the Quality assurance agencies. Further develop marketing material.
4	
5	
6	

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?**

	➢Innovative product ➢Innovative service <mark>XX</mark> ➢Innovative process
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢Disruptive <mark>X</mark> ➢Radical ➢Incremental <mark>X</mark>
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢Recognition ➢Invention <mark>X</mark> ➢Concept development<mark>X</mark> ➢Concept evaluation ➢Prototype development ➢Prototype evaluation ➢Product testing ➢Other
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢Development<mark>XX</mark> ➢Pilot ➢Scale ➢Mainstream
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢Local ➢Regional / National ➢European Union <mark>X X</mark>
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢Individual actors ➢Multiple actors ➢Wide range of actors <mark>X X</mark>
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢It should contribute to organisational change <mark>X</mark> ➢It should have an impact on the learning processs ➢It should improve the range of technological products or

	services available in the field <mark>X</mark>
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ Policy makers <mark>X X</mark> ➢ Decision makers at local level ➢ Sector ➢ Researchers <mark>X</mark> ➢ Teachers <mark>X X</mark> ➢ Trainers <mark>X X</mark> ➢ Students ➢ Other decision makers at educational institutions <mark>X</mark>

12.2 Case 2 MOOC on Quality in e-Learning

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-1-3-01[22]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**MOOC on Quality in e-learning**		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	6. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 7. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 8. . 9. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 10. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ingeborg Bo, Ingeborg Bo Consult
Date Completed:	07.08.14 **Contact email:** ingebob@online.no

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Indirectly through the creation of a MOOC on quality for professionals in e-learning. The tool will be easily accessible for users who want to improve their e-learning products**.**	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[22] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The innovation will be an open course developed by professionals in a community of sharing which will be a great advantage to the users.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Y/n	N	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Has not been developed yet.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The whole idea of this innovation is that it is open and easily accessible for anybody. Recommendation: Plan for promotion	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Detailed and clear plan.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement A clear plan. Success will require good management.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product X
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical X
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development X
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development X
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local

- Regional/national
- EU X

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company) X

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes X
- It will contribute to organisational change

Quality improvement schemes will be must more accessible to users.

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?
All stakeholders

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-2-3-01[23]	**Lab:**	Lab on professional networks
Innovation:	MOOC on quality in e-learning		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	11. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 12. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 13. . 14. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 15. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Alastair Creelman, Linnaeus University, Sweden

Date Completed:	18/08/14	**Contact email:**	alastair.creelman@lnu.se

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Iterative and open course design process enables stakeholders the opportunity to be part of the initiative from the start. The MOOC format enables the formation of new learning communities, knowledge sharing and the opportunity to feed experience into the next iteration of the course. A good example of sustainable course development.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

---

[23] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y

Description

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

I am not aware of any similar courses that are equally open. The approach addresses several needs in one solution – skills development, community building, knowledge sharing, collaborative course development etc

One danger of this approach is that it relies on the goodwill and voluntary contributions of experts and stakeholders. If everyone contributes as promised there are considerable advantages in terms of costs and resources but if some experts are unable to give priority to the development this can seriously delay the implementation.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	N

Description

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

There are at present no marketing materials available because the project is still in the "creation phase" so I have to answer NO to this question. The planning process is openly accessibly on Google Drive giving the target group an insight into the course design process but this is not aimed at the potential participants. The marketing plan however clearly shows how information about the course will be disseminated

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The course will be funded by project finances and participating organisations. There will be no significant investment involved and the course will be run free of charge.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Only risk being the commitment of the experts involved in course design and implementation. If anyone is unable to prioritise this work it can lead to delays. Maybe a contingency plan and/or risk analysis for this could be included.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

High reliance on the enthusiasm and goodwill of the course designers but otherwise fully feasible.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- <mark>Innovative product</mark>
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- <mark>Radical</mark>
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- <mark>Concept development</mark>
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- <mark>Development</mark>
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

- Regional/national
- ==EU==

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

==Wide range of actors== (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- ==It will have an impact on the learning processes==
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

This innovation concerns all stakeholders and will be of interest to a wide range of people involved in education.

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-02-3-3-01[24]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	MOOC on Quality in e-Learning		
Date Received:	22/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	16. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 17. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 18. . 19. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 20. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Sandra Feliciano, ESTGF-IPP and ISEC
Date Completed:	20/08/2014 **Contact email:** felicianosandra@gmail.com

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It is a new subject offered in a MOOC form. It will also be a good learning tool to prepare candidates fort to implement quality management practices in their institutions and get prepared for certification assessments.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[24] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Because it offered in a MOOC form (Open/free and online).*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *There are no marketing materials yet, so the answer above concerns only the 3 marketing sentences.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It is a new topic offered in MOOC form, so the target groups have to be mobilized to adhere to this new form of delivery of learning.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	N	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The indicator 100 participants is short for a MOOC, which implies a "Massive" participation.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *No comment.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national

- EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, ~~HR managers of the steel sector company~~)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Policy makers, decision makers at education institutions, researchers, teachers, trainers

General information			
Ref:	C-02-05-3-1	**Lab:**	**Professional networks**
Innovation:	**MOOC on Quality in e-Learning**		
Date Received:		**Verified by:**	

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	Mainly Innovative product but also service
Nature	Mainly radical but also incremental
Current process stage	Its in the concept development stage with already some prototype development
Implementation phase	Development
Territorial level covered	EU
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	It will lead mainly to improving the learning process but also to organisational change
Involved stakeholders	All stakeholders (policy makers, teachers, trainers, decision makers at education institutions and researchers)

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Feedback
1	*Learning advantage:* It is a new subject offered in a MOOC form. It will also be a good learning tool to prepare candidates fort to implement quality management practices in their institutions and get prepared for certification assessments. The tool will be easily accessible for users who want to improve their e-learning products. Iterative and open course design process enables stakeholders the opportunity to be part of the initiative from the start. The MOOC format enables the formation of new

	learning communities, knowledge sharing and the opportunity to feed experience into the next iteration of the course. A good example of sustainable course development.
2	E*fficiency:* The innovation will be an open course developed by professionals in a community of sharing which will be a great advantage to the users. The approach addresses several needs in one solution – skills development, community building, knowledge sharing, collaborative course development etc One danger of this approach is that it relies on the goodwill and voluntary contributions of experts and stakeholders. If everyone contributes as promised there are considerable advantages in terms of costs and resources but if some experts are unable to give priority to the development this can seriously delay the implementation.
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* *There are at present no marketing materials available because the project is still in the "creation phase". The marketing plan however clearly shows how information about the course will be disseminated*
4	*Difficulty to introduce: There should be no significant difficulty in introduction as the course will be funded by project finances and participating organisations. There will be no significant investment involved and the course will be run free of charge. However, as this is a new topic offered in MOOC form, the target groups have to be mobilized to adhere to this new form of delivery of learning.*
5	*Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:* In general the indicators are SMART as there is a detailed and clear plan. Only risk being the commitment of the experts involved in course design and implementation. If anyone is unable to prioritise this work it can lead to delays. Maybe a contingency plan and/or risk analysis for this could be included. However, the indicator of 100 participants is short for a MOOC, which implies a "Massive"participation.
6	*Quality of Adoption Plan:* The activities are most likely to be achieved as there is a clear plan. However there is a High reliance on the enthusiasm and goodwill of the course designers and success will require good management.

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*Learning advantage:* Strengthen the links to public quality assurance agencies
2	

3	***Clarity-of-concept:*** Further develop marketing material.	
4	***Difficulty to introduce:*** Plan for promotion	
5		
6		

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ Innovative product <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Innovative service <mark>X</mark> ➢ Innovative process
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ Disruptive ➢ Radical <mark>XX</mark> ➢ Incremental <mark>X</mark>
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ Recognition ➢ Invention ➢ Concept development<mark>XX</mark> ➢ Concept evaluation ➢ Prototype development <mark>X</mark> ➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ Development<mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Pilot ➢ Scale ➢ Mainstream
Territorial level	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?**

covered	
	➢ Local ➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union <mark>XXX</mark>
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors <mark>XXX</mark>
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢ It should contribute to organisational change <mark>X</mark> ➢ It should have an impact on the learning processs <mark>XX</mark> ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ Policy makers <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Decision makers at local level <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Sector <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Researchers <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Teachers <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Trainers <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Students <mark>XXX</mark> ➢ Other decision makers at educational institutions <mark>X</mark>

12.3 Case 3 Open Recognition Clearinghouse

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-1-3-01[25]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**Open Recognition Clearinghouse**		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	21. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 22. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 23. . 24. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 25. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ingeborg Bo, Ingeborg Bo Consult
Date Completed:	07/08/14 **Contact email:** ingebob@online.no

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
A better system for recognition of prior learning through non-traditional means I HE-institutions will improve learning opportunities both in HE-institutions and informal and non-formal setting.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[25] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Crowd-sourcing will be a cost efficient method. Informal exchange of information and experiences will be facilitated.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement A little early but the plan looks good. Recommendation: The recruitment phase must be given attention. Pricing strategy missing.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The aim is that the users can find relevant information by themselves.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Recommendations: Time frames and schedules could be better clarified.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Good planning, but a difficult theme to make a success.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product X
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical X
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge) X
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development X
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local

- Regional/national
- EU X

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company) X

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes X
- It will contribute to organisational change

A overview of systems for recognition of prior learning will have an impact on the conditions for learning both in informal, non-formal and other organised settings.

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?
ALL

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-3-3-01[26]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	Open recognition clearinghouse		
Date Received:	08/08/2014	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ulf Ehlers
Date Completed:	dd/mm/yy — **Contact email:** Ulf.ehlers@web.de

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	5	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		

Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)

Difficult to judge as it is a real forefront innovation with not many possible comparisons

[26] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	5	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Difficult to judge as it is a real forefront innovation with not many possible comparisons*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	5	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The judgement took place on basis of the technical scientific description given in the literature resources related to the service, original marketing materials were not available.*		

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	3	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *We expect that this kind of innovation will only be adopted if the strategy of the organisation is suppoting it – in that case, however, the resource needed are often not the primary concern as it is a full strategic approach.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	7	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The concept is well panned, resources are in place to achieve the aims.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores			
Learning advantage		**Total Score**	
Efficiency			
Clarity-of-concept			
Difficulty to Introduce		/42	
Quality of Objectives/Indicators			
Quality of Adoption Plan			

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-03-3-3-01[27]	**Lab:**	Lab on professional networks
Innovation:	Open recognition clearinghouse		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	26. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 27. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 28. . 29. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 30. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Alastair Creelman, Linnaeus University, Sweden
Date Completed:	18/08/14 **Contact email:** alastair.creelman@lnu.se

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *This is a highly innovative and unique project addressing a major global issue – the recognition of informal and open learning.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
At present there are no tools for recognising open learning and prior learning validation in a cost-effective manner. The proposed clearinghouse solution would improve the efficiency of universities as well as offering considerable advantages to students.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
Good process description and explanation of expected activities in the pdf brochure at http://vmpass.eu/wp-content/uploads/VMPass_brochure.pdf

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N N	
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Development within the framework of current project. The challenge will come after the project phase when a business model will be needed.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n Y	
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Clear phase-by-phase development in information sheet. However the plan lacks deadline dates and checkpoints.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Imperative that a critical mass of institutions sign up for the learning lab phase. Risk analysis if that critical mass is not attained?*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national

- <mark>EU</mark>

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
<mark>Wide range of actors</mark> (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- <mark>It will have an impact on the learning processes</mark>
- <mark>It will contribute to organisational change</mark>

The solution will give learners a recognised framework to showcase their open learning and skills acquired by informal learning as well as offering institutions a cost-effective solution to recognition of prior learning.

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

This innovation ultimately concerns all stakeholders but will impact mostly university leaders, administration and students.

General information			
Ref:	C-03-1-3-1	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**Open recognition clearinghouse**		
Date Received:	22-08-14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	Both product and process innovative
Nature	Radical innovation
Current process stage	Between Invention and Concept development
Implementation phase	Development
Territorial level covered	EU
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	The main impact is on the learning process but also on organisational change. The solution will give learners a recognised framework to showcase their open learning and skills acquired by informal learning as well as offering institutions a cost-effective solution to recognition of prior learning.
Involved stakeholders	This innovation ultimately concerns all stakeholders but will impact mostly university leaders, administration and students.

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Feedback**
1	***Learning advantage:*** This is real forefront innovation with not many possible comparisons. This is a highly innovative and unique project addressing a major global issue – the recognition of informal and open learning. A better system for recognition of prior learning through non-traditional means I HE-institutions will improve learning opportunities both in HE-institutions and informal and non-formal setting.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   efquel   Atos   ELIG.org

2	*Efficiency:* At present there are no tools for recognising open learning and prior learning validation in a cost-effective manner. The proposed clearinghouse solution would improve the efficiency of universities as well as offering considerable advantages to students. Crowd-sourcing will be a cost efficient method. Informal exchange of information and experiences will be facilitated.
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* Good process description and explanation of expected activities in the pdf brochure.
4	*Difficulty to introduce:* Little difficulty to introduce as the development takes place within the framework of current project. The challenge will come after the project phase when a business model will be needed. Another challenge is that this kind of innovation will only be adopted if the strategy of the organisation is supporting it – in that case, however, the resource needed are often not the primary concern as it is a full strategic approach.
5	*Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:* There is a clear phase-by-phase development in information sheet. However the plan lacks deadline dates and checkpoints.
6	*Quality of Adoption Plan:* The concept is well panned, resources are in place to achieve the aims. Imperative that a critical mass of institutions sign up for the learning lab phase. Risk analysis if that critical mass is not attained

	recommendations to improve adoption
	Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*Learning advantage:*
2	
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* The recruitment phase must be given attention. Pricing strategy missing.
4	
5	*Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:* Time frames and schedules could be better clarified, add check points.

6	

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ Innovative product X ➢ Innovative service ➢ Innovative process X
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ Disruptive ➢ Radical X X ➢ Incremental
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ Recognition ➢ Invention X ➢ Concept development X ➢ Concept evaluation ➢ Prototype development ➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ Development X X ➢ Pilot ➢ Scale ➢ Mainstream
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ Local ➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union X X

User target addressed	Which target dimension does the innovation address?
	➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors X X
Potential impact	What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?
	➢ It should contribute to organisational change X ➢ It should have an impact on the learning processs X X ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?
	➢ Policy makers X ➢ Decision makers at local level ➢ Sector ➢ Researchers X ➢ Teachers X X ➢ Trainers X X ➢ Students ➢ Other decision makers at educational institutions X

12.4 Case 4 SEVAQ+

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-1-3-01[28]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	SEVAQ+		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	31. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 32. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 33. . 34. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 35. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ingeborg Bo, Ingeborg Bo Consult
Date Completed:	07.08.14	**Contact email:**	ingebob@online.no

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
SEVAQU+ is a user-friendly instrument for improvement of quality of e-learning programmes. It gives direct feed back from the learners to the trainers and teachers and thus potentially improves learning.
Recommendations: strengthen marketing

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[28] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement It gives immediate feed-back to the trainer/teacher. It is a tool designed directly for the users,	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Clear message in the marketing material. Recommendation: More emphasis on the implementation of the marketing strategy	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The innovator should be capable of implementing the plan provided enough resources and marketing capacity.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The product has been developed and existed for some time. The innovator has enough knowledge to make a realistic plan.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
The activities are based on a solid knowledge of the product based on experiences so far.
Recommendations: resources and staff needed for marketing

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product X
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical X
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge) X
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot X
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?

- Local
- Regional/national
- EU X

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company) X

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes X
- It will contribute to organisational change

Questionnaires with direct feed-back will help teachers and trainers get relevant feed-back so they can improve their teaching material and processes.

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Teachers and trainers

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-2-3-01[29]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	SEVAQ+		
Date Received:	08/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 2. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 3. All sections should be scored on a 1-7 scale, in accordance with the instructions given in each section. 4. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 5. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ulf Ehlers
Date Completed:	dd/mm/yy	**Contact email:**	Ulf.ehlers@web.de

---

[29] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Score:	7	1 = innovation shows less potential for learning than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation shows significant potential improvement over current approaches 7 = innovation shows a high potential improvement over current approaches.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *Innovation is in the flexibility to compose questionnaires on basis of a sound concept but in an individual manner and have very developed analysis tools and visualisation tools.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

efficiency		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Score:	7	1 = innovation is less-resource efficient than current approaches. 3 = innovation shows no significant difference to current approaches. 5 = innovation achieves significant efficiency improvements 7 = innovation high efficiency improvements.
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words)		
Harmonisation Note		*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:		Do the marketing materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Score:	7	1 = marketing material is confusing, and conveys an unprofessional image 3 = marketing material does not make the advantages of the product/service particularly clear, or is not directly relatable to the target group 5 = marketing material is of good quality: it conveys advantages concisely, clearly and shows an understanding of the target group's needs 7 = marketing material is excellent: it convincingly positions the product/service as a clear improvement over current approaches, and addresses the addressed stakeholders' needs precisely
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The handbook and the website are clear and conscise*		

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?	
Score:	*3*	1 = introduction requires an amount of resources which seems disproportionate to advantage 3 = innovation is difficult to introduce, but will recoup investment in the longer term 5 = innovation will be easy to adopt – the effort required is low, and in line with expectations 7 = innovation requires little to no effort to adopt
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *We expect that this kind of innovation will only be adopted if the strategy of the organisation is supporting it – in that case, however, the resource needed are often not the primary concern as it is a full strategic approach.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?	
Score:	*3*	1 = Objectives/Indicators meet 2 of these criteria or fewer 2 = Objectives fully meet 2 of these criteria and partially meet more 3 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria 4 = Objectives fully meet 3 of these criteria and partially meet more 5 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria 6 = Objectives fully meet 4 of these criteria and partially 1 more 7 = Objectives fully meet all criteria
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The development strategy lacks full development and outline of activities employed to achieve the objectives. Therefore it is hard to judge.*		
Harmonisation	*to be filled in by investigator*	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Note	

Quality of Adoption Plan		
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?	
Score:	5	1 = the plan is too ambitious given planned activities and/or available resources 3= the plan may succeed, given some luck and the correctness of all assumptions 5 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and likely to succeed 7 = the plan is well resourced, well planned and supported by significant external supporting factors, and therefore extremely likely to succeed
Description		
Outline the reason for your score (max. 100 words) *The concept is well planned, resources are in place to achieve the aims.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Overview of Scores		
Learning advantage		**Total Score**
Efficiency		
Clarity-of-concept		
Difficulty to Introduce		/42
Quality of Objectives/Indicators		
Quality of Adoption Plan		

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-04-3-3-01[30]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	SEVAQ+		
Date Received:	22/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	36. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 37. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 38. . 39. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 40. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Sandra Feliciano, ESTGF-IPP and ISEC
Date Completed:	20/08/2014	**Contact email:**	felicianosandra@gmail.com

learning advantage		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It allows customization. The risk is that the customization will reduce comparability, which may be also interesting for internal and external benchmarking.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

---

[30] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It allows quick customization of the tool.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *No comment.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

The innovation is already introduced to the market. However, as it is not free and there are free tools in the market it may be challenge to sell.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	N
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

Considering it is not a free tool and that it competes with free tools, the 45 new accounts may be unrealistic.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	*N*
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *See comment above.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain) Comercialization

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national

- EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
 Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
 Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
 Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, ~~HR managers of the steel sector company~~)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?
Policy makers, decision makers at education institutions, researchers, teachers, trainers

MEN☉N Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

General information			
Ref: C-04-1-3-01	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks	
Innovation: SEVAQ+			
Date Received: 22/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg	

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	Mainly Innovative product but also innovative service
Nature	Both radical and incremental
Current process stage	Invention and Commercialization
Implementation phase	Between Pilot and Scale
Territorial level covered	EU
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	Organisational change and changing the learning process
Involved stakeholders	Mainly teachers and trainers but also policy makers, researchers and decision makers at educational institutions

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Feedback**
1	*Learning advantage:* It is user friendly, flexible and allows for customization. It gives direct feed back from the learners to the trainers and teachers and thus potentially improves learning. Risk is that the customization will reduce comparability, which may be also interesting for internal and external benchmarking
2	*Efficiency:* It is a tool designed directly for the users and allows quick customization. It gives immediate feed-back to the trainer/teacher.
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* Clear message in the marketing material. The handbook and the website are clear and concise.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

4	*Difficulty to introduce:* The innovation is already introduced to the market. However, as it is not free and there are free tools in the market it may be challenge to sell. The innovator should be capable of implementing the plan provided enough resources and marketing capacity. Furthermore, a full strategic approach needs to be taken by the organisation.
5	*Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:* The product has been developed and existed for some time. The innovator has enough knowledge to make a realistic plan. However, considering it is not a free tool and that it competes with free tools, the 45 new accounts may be unrealistic. Also the development strategy lacks full development and outline of activities employed to achieve the objectives.
6	*Quality of the Adoption Plan:* The concept is well planned, resources are in place to achieve the aims. The activities are based on a solid knowledge of the product based on experiences so far.

recommendations to improve adoption
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.

Ref.	Reviewers recommendations and questions
1	*Learning advantage:* Strengthen marketing
2	
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* More emphasis on the implementation of the marketing strategy
4	
5	
6	*Quality of the Adoption Plan:* Resources and staff needed for marketing

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features

Type	What kind of innovation is addressed?
	➢ Innovative product XX ➢ Innovative service X ➢ Innovative process
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?**
	➢ Disruptive ➢ Radical X ➢ Incremental X
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?**
	➢ Recognition ➢ Invention X ➢ Concept development ➢ Concept evaluation ➢ Prototype development ➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other X Commercialization
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?**
	➢ Development ➢ Pilot X ➢ Scale X ➢ Mainstream
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?**
	➢ Local ➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union X X
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?**
	➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors X X
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?**

	➤ It should contribute to organisational change <mark>X</mark> ➤ It should have an impact on the learning processs <mark>X</mark> ➤ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➤ Policy makers <mark>X</mark> ➤ Decision makers at local level ➤ Sector ➤ Researchers <mark>X</mark> ➤ Teachers <mark>X X</mark> ➤ Trainers <mark>X X</mark> ➤ Students ➤ Other decision makers at educational institutions <mark>X</mark>

12.5 Case 5 ECBCheck Community & Tool

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-1-3-01[31]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:	**ECBCheck Community and Tool**		
Date Received:	18/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	41. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 42. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 43. . 44. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 45. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ingeborg Bo, Ingeborg Bø Consult
Date Completed:	07.08.14
Contact email:	ingebob@online.no

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The innovation is a quality improvement tool for e-learning programmes based on peer evaluation. Thus is has a great potential for improving learning.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[31] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
It is a participative quality improvement tool. It creates a professional community of peers. It is fully online. The product is cost-effective in use.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
It has a clear message but needs a stronger focus on marketing in order to reach out.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Strong organisations are already involved. The product has existed for a while and needs a stronger management and marketing in order to reach out.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The product exists already and gives a good basis for implementation.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The product has existed for some time so there should be enough knowledge by the innovator to make realistic plans.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product X
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical X
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge) X
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale X
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?

- Local
- Regional/national
- EU X

Which target dimension does the innovation address?
    Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)
    Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)
    Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company) X

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes X
- It will contribute to organisational change

ECBCheck is a tool made for improvement of e-learning programmes and thus learning processes.

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers? All

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-2-3-01[32]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	ECBCheck community & tool		
Date Received:	19/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	46. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 47. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 48. . 49. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 50. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Alastair Creelman, Linnaeus University, Sweden
Date Completed:	18/08/14
Contact email:	alastair.creelman@lnu.se

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It certainly has considerable potential and embraces an open community-driven model that is not present elsewhere.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[32] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The iterative community-based approach enables institutions to share experience and create communities of interest around e-learning QA. This offers added value to present solutions of self-assessment and then certification without active peer involvement.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *My only worry here is that the name of the product gives little indication of its purpose. Important to identify key features that distinguish this from other certifications. Multi-lingual aspect can be a key feature and should be expanded to other major languages later in the development.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The community approach means that no major investment is required by any part. It does however rely on a critical mass in the community and a great deal of voluntary work. Participants must commit to being active in the community and not simply perform a self assessment.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	N
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The plans lack dates and deadlines as well as contingency plans and risk analysis (admittedly this is not specifically required by the form). Without deadlines it cannot be considered SMART.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *If all activities are successful, yes. However there are many uncertain factors involved that could delay the implementation (lack of a critical mass of active members, agreements not being signed in time etc).*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national
- <mark>EU</mark>

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

<mark>Wide range of actors</mark> (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- <mark>It will have an impact on the learning processes</mark>
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Policy makers and institution management in first place, then teachers and course designers.

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-05-3-3-01[33]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	ECBCheck Community & Tool		
Date Received:	22/08/14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

sheet protocol	
Notes	51. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 52. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 53. . 54. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 55. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Sandra Feliciano, ESTGF-IPP and ISEC
Date Completed:	20/08/2014
Contact email:	felicianosandra@gmail.com

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It is an open tool, which allows potential costumers to study it and learn from it before deciding for certification.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

---

[33] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

efficiency	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *It is available online and the whole process can be done online.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept	
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *No comment.*	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *The innovation is already introduced to the market. However, as it is limited to specific targets, its potential to grow is not being fully explored. ECBCheck sub-products (for b-learning, m-learning, F2F courses) could be develloped and made available to the market.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	N	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement *Considering the comment on the previous question, the envisioned 55 new certifications may be unrealistic.*		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	N
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

See comment above.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain) Comercialization

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national

- EU

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, ~~HR managers of the steel sector company~~)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)

- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Policy makers, decision makers at education institutions, researchers, teachers, trainers

General information			
Ref:	C-05-1-3-01	**Lab:**	**Lab on Professional Networks**
Innovation:	**ECBCheck community & tool**		
Date Received:	22-08-14	**Verified by:**	Ralf Drachenberg

Innovation Classification

Innovation features *	
Type	It is mainly an innovative product but also an innovative service as well as innovative process
Nature	It is mainly radical but can also be considered as incremental and discruptive
Current process stage	There is already a prototype and currently its being commercialised
Implementation phase	The implementation phase is between scale and mainstream
Territorial level covered	EU
User target addressed	Wide range of actors
Potential impact	It will lead mainly to improving the learning process but also to organisational change
Involved stakeholders	It involves all stakeholders but mainly policy makers and institution management, then teachers and course designers.

*see related selection options on page 5 of this form

Collective Review Outcome

main feedback of reviewers and barrier for adoptions	
Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.	
Ref.	**Feedback**
1	*Learning advantage:* The innovation is a quality improvement tool for e-learning programmes based on peer evaluation. Thus is has a great potential for improving learning as it embraces an open community-driven model that is not present elsewhere. It allows potential costumers to study it and learn from it before deciding for certification.

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

2	E*fficiency:* It is very efficient and cost-effective in use as it is available online and the whole process can be done online.It is a participative quality improvement tool. The iterative community-based approach enables institutions to share experience and create communities of interest around e-learning QA. This offers added value to present solutions of self-assessment and then certification without active peer involvement.
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* It has a clear message but needs a stronger focus on marketing in order to reach out. A concern would be that the name of the product gives little indication of its purpose. Important to identify key features that distinguish this from other certifications. Multi-lingual aspect can be a key feature and should be expanded to other major languages later in the development.
4	*Difficulty to introduce:* No difficulty to introduce, as the innovation is already introduced to the market. The community approach means that no major investment is required by any part. It does however rely on a critical mass in the community and a great deal of voluntary work. Participants must commit to being active in the community and not simply perform a self assessment. Furthermore, as it is limited to specific targets, its potential to grow is not being fully explored. ECBCheck sub-products (for b-learning, m-learning, F2F courses) could be developed and made available to the market. It also needs a stronger management and marketing in order to reach out.
5	*Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:* The indicators are not really SMART. The plans lack dates and deadlines as well as contingency plans and risk analysis. In particular the envisioned 55 new certifications may be unrealistic.
6	*Quality of Adoption Plan:* Some activities are more realistic than others (see above) There are many uncertain factors involved that could delay the implementation (lack of a critical mass of active members, agreements not being signed in time etc).

recommendations to improve adoption	
	Reference number – marked Ref. – and their six respective concepts listed above, correspond to the different sections of the self-assessment filled-in by the innovator, as well as the feedback form that followed completed by the reviewer.
Ref.	**Reviewers recommendations and questions**
1	*Learning advantage:*
2	
3	*Clarity-of-concept:* Further develop marketing material.

4	***Difficulty to introduce:*** Development of sub-products should be considered. More marketing activities are needed.
5	***Quality of Objectives, Indicators, Benchmarks:*** *Develop deadlines and carry out risk analysis*
6	

* Innovation Classification Criteria

Innovation features	
Type	**What kind of innovation is addressed?** ➢ Innovative product XXX ➢ Innovative service X ➢ Innovative process X
Nature	**What is the nature of the innovation?** ➢ Disruptive X ➢ Radical XX ➢ Incremental X
Current process stage	**How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?** ➢ Recognition ➢ Invention X ➢ Concept development ➢ Concept evaluation ➢ Prototype development X ➢ Prototype evaluation ➢ Product testing ➢ Other Commercialisation X
Implementation phase	**Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?** ➢ Development X ➢ Pilot ➢ Scale XX ➢ Mainstream X
Territorial level covered	**Which territorial level does the innovation address?** ➢ Local

	➢ Regional / National ➢ European Union XXX
User target addressed	**Which target dimension does the innovation address?** ➢ Individual actors ➢ Multiple actors ➢ Wide range of actors XXX
Potential impact	**What is your opinion on the potential impact of the innovation?** ➢ It should contribute to organisational change X ➢ It should have an impact on the learning processs XX ➢ It should improve the range of technological products or services available in the field
Involved stakeholders	**Which stakeholders should be activated to support the implementation?** ➢ Policy makers XXX ➢ Decision makers at local level XXX ➢ Sector XXX ➢ Researchers XXX ➢ Teachers XXX ➢ Trainers XXX ➢ Students XXX ➢ Other decision makers at educational institutions X

12.6 Case 6 Open review communities

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-ww-x-y-zz[34]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:	Open review communities		
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	
Notes	56. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed.
	57. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A.
	58. .
	59. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered.
	60. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Alastair Creelman, Linnaeus University
Date Completed:	12/09/14 **Contact email:** alastair.creelman@lnu.se

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
This innovation opens up the previously closed and secretive process of peer review and offers post-graduates and academic staff the chance to participate in peer review without the responsibility of being an expert reviewer. Reviewing papers in collaboration with peers gives inexperienced reviewers insights into good practice and inspiration for their own research writing. The combination of open collaborative review and a traditional double-blind review offers both openness and the academic stringency of the traditional approach.

---

[34] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY uniR EFQUEL Atos ELIG.org

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

efficiency		
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Although this process could take more time it gives authors a wider range of comments and perspectives than the traditional approach. The side effect of creating a community of interest around a publication is simply not possible otherwise.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Clarity-of-concept		
Guiding Question:	Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?	
Y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Good slideshow outlining methods and objectives in clear terms. Maybe there could be more detailed descriptions of how one or two Commentathon sessions were set up – as a possible guide and inspiration.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Difficulty to Introduce		
Guiding Question:		Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N	N	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Very low costs involved though the innovation depends on voluntary work from all participants (admitted as a weakness in the SWOT analysis).		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks		
Guiding Question:		Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n	Y	
Description		
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Perfectly attainable and realistic, assuming enough volunteers can be recruited.		
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*	

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Once again this depends on recruiting a critical mass of reviewers.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot
- Scale
- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local

- Regional/national
- <mark>EU</mark>

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

<mark>Wide range of actors</mark> (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company)

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)

- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- <mark>It will have an impact on the learning processes</mark>
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Academics

Postgraduate students

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	B-ww-x-y-zz[35]	**Lab:**	
Innovation:	**Open Review Communities**		
Date Received:	dd/mm/yy	**Verified by:**	

sheet protocol	
Notes	61. All information below should be filled in by the assigned reviewer. Word-limits should be respected in all cases and all fields should be completed. 62. The reviewer should use this form to assess the innovation based on the information contained in Sheet A. 63. . 64. Investigator will check all reviews to ensure coherence between scores and reasons for scoring, to identify low/high scorers, and make note of these in the 'harmonisation note' sections. Such sheets will be returned to the reviewers in question to be optionally reconsidered. 65. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.
Sheet completed by:	Ingeborg Boe, Ingeborg Bo Consult
Date Completed:	18.09.14	**Contact email:**	ingebob@online.no

learning advantage	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation improve the potential for learning compared to current approaches?
Y/n	Y
Description	

Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement

Research and innovation highly needed in the area of innovation and quality in e-learning. Any initiative that stimulates innovation and quality enhancement is welcome. Will enhance potential for better learning. The hybrid format for reviewing is an innovation.

Improvement: Stronger focus on the benefit for the parctitioner

---

[35] B = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series number (+1 for each reviewer filling in the form); y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

efficiency
Guiding Question: Does the innovation show advantages over current approaches in terms of resource efficiency (time, cost and/or material resources)

Y/n	Y	

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
The open review community is based on voluntary work building on a community of researchers and practitioners. It is based on the principle of sharing resources. The hybrid approach takes advantages from two methods of reviewing.

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Clarity-of-concept
Guiding Question: Do the marketing/promotional materials associated with the service/product explain its advantages to its target group in a clear and relatable fashion, making the key advantages of the project clear?

Y/n	Y	

Description
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement
It is ok, but the service/product is difficult to market. Recommendations: Personal approach targeted at individuals may prove to be successful

Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Difficulty to Introduce	
Guiding Question:	Does the innovation require an adopter to invest significant resources to introduce the innovation, in terms of cost, disruption to current procedures/systems, infrastructure, training and/or time?
Y/N N	
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement No adopter is needed. Recommendation: More financial recourses needed. Now it is dependent on project money.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

Quality of Objectives / Indicators / Benchmarks	
Guiding Question:	Are the indicators & objectives in the innovator's plan Specific, Measurable, Assessable, Realistic and Time-Bound (SMART)?
y/n Y	
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement Activities are linked to specific events and publications, social media. This is positive and measurable. Recommendation: A plan with a longer perspective	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

Quality of Adoption Plan	
Guiding Question:	Are the activities spelled out in the plan for adoption likely to achieve the aimed for objectives, given the available time and resources?
Y/n	Y
Description	
Outline the reason for your answer, and highlight any recommendations for improvement The outlined activities are based on experiences with the review process and publication of two issues of INNOQUAL. It is expected that the planned activities will benefit from the limited success of that experience. Recommendation: Clarify the possible reasons for the limited success of the former issues.	
Harmonisation Note	*to be filled in by investigator*

What kind of innovation is addressed?
- Innovative product
- Innovative service
- Innovative process X

What is the nature of the innovation?
- Disruptive
- Radical X
- Incremental

How would you classify the process stage of the innovation?
- Recognition (of a problem, a challenge, an obstacle to be overcome with a corresponding opportunity for innovation)
- Invention (solution/idea helping to address the identified problem/challenge)
- Concept development X
- Concept evaluation
- Prototype development
- Prototype evaluation
- Product testing
- Other (please explain)

Based on the above, what is the implementation stage of the innovation?
- Development
- Pilot X
- Scale

- Mainstream

Which territorial level does the innovation address?
- Local
- Regional/national
- EU X

Which target dimension does the innovation address?

Individual actors (i.e: the employees of a company)

Multiple actors (i.e.: the employees of the steel sector companies)

Wide range of actors (i.e.: employees, trainers, HR managers of the steel sector company) X

What is in your opinion the potential impact of the innovation? (please tick relevant answers and explain the reason for your answer)
- It will improve the range of technological products/services available in the field
- It will have an impact on the learning processes   X
- It will contribute to organisational change

Which stakeholders should be activated to support the innovation implementation? (policy makers, decision makers at local level, industry (which sectors), researchers, teachers, trainers?

Researchers, trainers, teachers

13. Annex 3 – EFQUEL - Innovation Progress Sheets (Forms D and G)

13.1 Case 2 MOOC on Quality in e-Learning

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	D-02-1-3-01[36]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	**MOOC on Quality in e-Learning**		
Date Received:	26/09/14	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol	

Notes	66. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process.
	 67. Information in this sheet should:
	     a. Update information filled in in sheet A
	     b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C
	 68. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.

Sheet completed by:	Anthony F. Camilleri, EFQUEL
Date Completed: 26/09/14 **Contact email:**	anthony.camilleri@efquel.org

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**
Value propositions	
Key messages	
Product development strategy	So as to reduce the risk involved in using volunteers, a list of three 'reserve' authors will be created, who will be activated in the case of non-delivery or low-quality product being delivered by any of the author teams.
Marketing & promotion strategy	Aside from the promotion already described under 'delivery phase' marketing, we will add the following activities: • Contacting national/regional QA agencies: each ENQA-member QA agency will be individually contacted, and will be invited to join as well as disseminate the course amongst its staff and collaborators. • Re-sharing through Quality Professional Network – EFQUEL operates a network

---

[36] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

	of quality professionals. They will be activated and asked to act as ambassadors, sharing news of the course amongst their contact networks.
Pricing strategy	

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	*Unchanged from initial plans*	
Mid-Term (18 months)	*Unchanged from initial plans*	

action on recommendations to improve adoption		
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1	**Marketing Plan now includes contacting QA Agencies**	**Contacting min. 25 agencies individually**
2		
3	**No Action. Timeline to develop material was already announced in initial s/a form.**	
4	**Marketing/Promotion Plan updated as per recommendations (see #1 above)**	

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON   uniR   EFQUEL   AtoS   ELIG.org

13.2 Case 3 Open Recognition Clearinghouse

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	D-03-1-3-01[37]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	Open Recognition Clearinghouse		
Date Received:	01/10/2014	**Verified by:**	Anthony F. Camilleri

sheet protocol	

Notes	69. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process.
	70. Information in this sheet should:
	   a. Update information filled in in sheet A
	   b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C
	71. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.

Sheet completed by:	Grainne Conole
Date Completed:	28/07/2014 **Contact email:** Gcc7@leicester.co.uk

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**
Value propositions	
Key messages	
Product development strategy	In line with recommendations, specific deadlines have been set for each stage of the development process: • Preparation of a technical specification for the clearinghouse 15.09.2014 • Issue and award of a development tender 10.09.2014 • Creation of an alpha-version of the tool 15.12.2014 • Collecting feedback 15.03.2014 • Launch of a public-beta version of the tool 01.07.2014 Software Development will take place using AGILE methodology[38], with weekly sprints taking place in the lead up to both the alpha and the beta stages..

---

[37] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

[38] More information about AGILE methodology available at: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agile_software_development

MENON Brunel UNIVERSITY LONDON uniR EFQUEL AtoS ELIG.org

Marketing & promotion strategy	**None. Recommendations on recruitment stage are not relevant, since this stage has already closed.**
Pricing strategy	No pricing strategy has yet been developed, however a plan which will lead up to one has been developed. A committee made up of the partners developing the tool will be set up two investigate three possible options: • User-pricing: this will involve surveying users who are testing the tool, to understand their cost-savings from using it, and using this as a basis for creating a pricing-model. Subscription models, and per-item pricing will be investigated under this scenario • Government-pricing: meetings will be held with European/national/regional policy-makers to investigate the possibility of them purchasing a subscription at these levels, covering all recognition procedures within their jurisdiction • Sponsorship: internet advertising agencies will be contacted to estimate the total revenue from an advertising-based model.

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	unchanged	
Mid-Term (18 months)	unchanged	

action on recommendations to improve adoption		
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1		
2		

3	**Plan for development of pricing strategy outlined.**	**Milestone: creation of pricing strategy by September 2015**
4		
5	**Deadlines added for all parts of the development strategy**	

13.3 Case 4 SEVAQ+

to be filled in by investigator			
Ref:	D-04-1-3-01[39]	**Lab:**	Lab on Professional Networks
Innovation:	SEVAQ+		
Date Received:	01/10/14	**Verified by:**	Anthony Fisher Camilleri

sheet protocol	

Notes	1. All information below should be filled in by the primary innovator, or staff with knowledge of the innovation process.
	2. Information in this sheet should:
	   a. Update information filled in in sheet A
	   b. Reflect the commentary received in sheet C
	3. All data is kept confidential in line with the Non-Disclosure Agreement signed between the Lab Coordinator and the Reviewer.

Sheet completed by:	Deborah Arnold
Date Completed:	30/09/14

Date Completed:	30/09/14	**Contact email:**	deborah.arnold@u-bourgogne.fr

changes to development strategy	
Area	**Changes made**
Value propositions	
Key messages	

---

[39] C = Form Reference (do not change); ww = innovation reference; x = form series; y = lab number, zz = sheet revision number

MENON   Brunel UNIVERSITY   uniR   EFQUEL   Atos   ELIG.org

Product development strategy	
Marketing & promotion strategy	So as to have a dedicated budget for marketing, the partner will attempt to raise funding for a 50% FTE marketing position. In the first instance, the partner will attempt to raise € 12000 from banks, ideally those who members of the European Commission's loan guarantee programme for investing in startups/SME's. If unable to secure loan-funding, the partner will attempt to raise venture capital funding.
Pricing strategy	

strategic objectives		
Type	**Objective**	**Success Indicator**
Short-Term (6 months)	Raise € 12000 in funding to finance marketing operations	€12 000 raised
Mid-Term (18 months)		

action on recommendations to improve adoption		
Ref	**Action in Response to Recommendation**	**Indicator Measurement**
1	Raise € 12000 in funding to finance marketing operations	€12 000 raised
2		
3	Raise € 12000 in funding to finance marketing operations	€12 000 raised

4		
5		
6	Raise € 12000 in funding to finance marketing operations	€12 000 raised