



## PR2A3: External & Internal Review

Author:

**Ave Matsin, Audrey Scrugham,  
Mathilde Lind - TARTU**

Editor

**Christina Kanellou - eCHOing  
Assistant Coordinator & Help Desk**

Version Status

**Draft 2**

Submission Date

**dd/mm/yyyy**

Dissemination Level

**PU**

## Deliverable Factsheet

Project Number:	<b>2021-1-NO01-KA220-HED-000031986</b>
Project Acronym:	<b>eCHOIng</b>
Project Title:	<b>Recovery of cultural heritage through higher education-driven open innovation</b>
Title of Document:	<b>PR2A2: External &amp; Internal Review</b>
Output:	<b>O10</b>
Editor(s):	<b>Christina Kanellou</b>
Contributor(s):	<b>TARTU, NTNU</b>
Reviewer(s):	<b>Audrey Scrugham, TARTU Alexandra Angeletaki, NTNU</b>
Approved by:	<b>All Partners</b>
Abstract:	<b>Internal &amp; External Review of 6 modules (1 module of the online course by each partner) at intermediate stage: review and adaptations to make modules ready for PR2A4.</b>
Copyright	<b>Creative Commons License 4.0 International</b>
Please cite as	<b>Matsin A., Scrugham A., Lind M. 2023. PR2A3: External &amp; Internal Review.</b>

## Consortium

The consortium governing the project is adequately representing a wide range of expertise, as 4 Higher Education Institutions and 1 university library (NTNU, Scuola Superiore Sant’Anna, Sofia University ST Kliment Ohridski, University of Tartu) join hands with a web education specialist (Web2Learn) and an NGO of 16 cultural associations: OSYGY. This mix of knowledge, skills, experiences and networks guarantees a layered approach toward a diverse range of stakeholders.

	Name	Short Name	Country
1	<b>Norwegian University of Sciences and Technology</b>	NTNU	Norway
2	<b>Scuola Superiore di Studi Universitari e di Perfezionamento Sant’Anna, Pisa</b>	SA	Italy
3	<b>Web2Learn</b>	W2L	Greece
4	<b>Sofia University St Kliment Ohridski</b>	SU	Bulgaria
5	<b>University of Tartu</b>	UT	Estonia
6	<b>Federation of Women Association “Kores of Cyclades”</b>	OSYGY	Greece

## Revision History

Version	Date	Revised by	Reason
V0.1	31/10/22	Audrey Scrugham, TARTU	Addition of Internal Review Checklist
V0.2	11/11/22	Audrey Scrugham, TARTU	Edit of Internal Review Checklist
V0.3	14/11/22	Audrey Scrugham, TARTU	Addition of External Review Checklist
V0.4	21/11/22	Audrey Scrugham, TARTU	Edit of External Review Checklist
V0.5	28/11/22	Alexandra Angeletaki, NTNU	Addition of “name” and “institution” on Checklists
V0.6	05/12/22	Audrey Scrugham, TARTU	Addition of modules, target groups, content and location sections
V0.7	20/12/22	Alexandra Angeletaki, NTNU	Edit of NTNU’s module

### Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

### Disclaimer:



This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This deliverable reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.



## Table of Contents

Deliverable Factsheet	2
Consortium	3
Revision History	4
Table of Contents	5
List of Abbreviations	6
Executive Summary	7
Introduction	8
Online Modules	9
Feedback Checklist	10
External Reviewers	13

## List of Abbreviations

The following table presents the acronyms used in the deliverable in alphabetical order.

Abbreviations	Description
HEIs	<b>Higher Education Institutions</b>
CHO	<b>Cultural Heritage Organisation</b>
OI	<b>Open Innovation</b>
PR	<b>Project Result</b>



## Executive Summary

After the delivery of 6 modules (1 module of the online course by each partner), the modules were reviewed internally (peer reviewed between partners) and externally. Then adaptations were performed in order to make modules ready for the next phase. After the internal and external review (PR2A3), a piloting phase of 19 students from NTNU followed and their comments were also taken into consideration for the adjustment of the final versions of the modules (PR2A4).

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1. Content

6 modules (15 learning hours/module, 90h total, a 45 min)

## 1.2. Target Group

Staff of all levels and students of HEIs. Also, stakeholders in the cultural and the creative sector and cultural organisations.

## 1.3. Location of The Course

The open online course will be launched on the University of Tartu's platform: [Sisu@UT](#)

*An example of the online platform currently in use:*

[Home | MOOC: Multilingual Education](#)



## 2 Online Modules

### 2.1. Module 1: W2L, Greece

Open innovation in academia-society cooperation: examples of cultural heritage preservation in a crisis situation.

### 2.2. Module 2: Sofia U, Bulgaria

Datafication of Collections: Opportunities for Innovation in the novel European Data Space for Cultural Heritage.

### 2.3. Module 3: Sant'Anna U, Italy

Development of an Open Innovation approach through the co-creation of Immersive Virtual Heritage applications.

### 2.4. Module 4: Tartu U, Estonia

Craft as an empowering tool for community and cultural heritage

### 2.5. Module 5: NTNU, Norway

Co-designing projects for the cultural sector. Discover the important processes, tools, and skills needed.

### 2.6. Module 6: OSYGY (Womens Assoc.), Greece

“Survival Skills”: Cultural Heritage & grassroots organizations in the post-covid-era/times of crisis

## 3 Feedback Checklist

Two guides were created for those reviewing the content of all eCHOing online modules, the External Feedback Checklist and the Internal Feedback Checklist.

### 3.1. External

The external reviewers were instructed to make a copy of this document and check off each section as completed and include any additional notes for the full content as well as each individual partners' modules. The external reviewer would send the checklist back to the respective partner they got it from. The External Feedback Checklist looked as follows:

**Name of External Reviewer:**  
**Institution/Affiliation:**

**Structure:**

- Does each module list the sources used with proper citation?
- Does each module contain relevant case studies?

**Content:**

- Are the key facts listed in the introduction and presentation of the case studies of each module?
- Are the learning outcomes clear?
- Is the content clear and easy to read?
- Are all new terms properly defined?
- Do the modules cover concepts that are beneficial for you/your students to learn?

**Impact:**

- Do the modules address the learning outcomes listed in the course design framework, such as:
  - Provide strategies related to cultural heritage to address broader social challenges through collaborative work.
  - Use examples of teaching and learning practices that can be tailored to their own organisations as part of flexible educational models.
  - Identify opportunities for collaboration between HEIs and CHOs that can expand access to lab facilities and other resources for OI.
  - Formulate strategies for local sustainable development through collaborative open innovation projects for social benefit.

- Identify best practices to encourage civic engagement and intergenerational participation in cultural heritage through OI.
- Identify skills and resources for digital transformation based on informative case studies.

#### **Overall:**

- Do the modules flow well together and have a consistent format and style?
- Are the modules beginner-oriented and clarify all new terminology?
- Is there any conflicting information or unnecessary repetition of concepts?

#### **Further comments:**

Any suggestions as to the overall structure of the modules or other thoughts?

Specific notes for individual modules:

Web2Learn:

University of Sofia:

Santa Anna:

University of Tartu:

NTNU:

OSYGY:

## 3.2. Internal

The eCHOing consortium decided to assign a partner with another and peer review each other's module. The reviewing pairs were randomly selected as follows: NTNU with TARTU, OSYGY with Sant'Anna U, and W2L with Sofia U. In the internal reviewing process, the partners were given two ways of reviewing. One would be the same process as with the external reviewing: making a copy of the checklist, completing it and putting the document into the respective partner's module folder in the shared Google Drive. Or they could add comments into the original Google document shared with everyone. The PR2 team considered every partner's expertise valuable and kindly asked to provide input in whichever way preferred. The Internal Feedback Checklist looked as follows:

#### **Structure**

- Does the module have individual units and sub-units?
- Does each unit have a short abstract/intro at the beginning?
- Does each unit and sub-unit have a descriptive title?
- Are learning objectives clearly defined at the beginning of each unit?

### Content:

- Does each sub-unit have 1-2 pages of text with multimedia resources such as videos and links?
- Does each sub-unit have suggestions for further reading?
- Does each sub-unit list the sources used with proper citation?
- Does the module contain relevant case studies?
- Does the module address the learning outcomes listed in the [course design framework](#), such as:
  - Provide strategies related to cultural heritage to address broader social challenges through collaborative work.
  - Use examples of teaching and learning practices that can be tailored to their own organisations as part of flexible educational models.
  - Identify opportunities for collaboration between HEIs and CHOs that can expand access to lab facilities and other resources for OI.
  - Formulate strategies for local sustainable development through collaborative open innovation projects for social benefit.
  - Identify best practices to encourage civic engagement and intergenerational participation in cultural heritage through OI.
  - Identify skills and resources for digital transformation based on informative case studies.

### Follow-up:

- Does the module have a quiz for self-assessment at the end with 6-10 questions?

### Grammar/Design

- Are there any grammatical or formatting errors that need to be fixed? (please mark directly in google doc)
- Is the content clear and easy to read?
- Are all new terms properly defined?

### Further comments:

## 4 External Reviewers

1. [Guro Jørgensen](#), Dr. Museologi Ass. professor at NTNU
2. [Hege Faber](#), Senior Research Librarian at NTNU UB
3. [Insa Muller](#), Associate professor, PhD Museum studies
4. [Isabel Crespo](#) from Europeana.pro
5. [Caterina Bay](#), from Ministero della Cultura (MIC)
6. [Liisi Jääts](#), from the Estonian National Museum, Curator.
7. [Tuuli Tubin McGinley](#), from ERM/Heimtali museum.
8. [Esther Momand](#), a PhD student at NTNU.
9. [Sanita Reinsone](#)
10. [Olga Barkova](#)