Facilitator Guide: Session 3 - Quality Assurance Framework

Session Information

- **Duration:** 30 minutes
- **Format:** Presentation
- **Presenter:** WP3 Lead or QA representative
- **Slides:** 20260801*1200*WP3*Session3*QAFramework.pdf (6 slides)

Pre-Session Checklist

- [ ] QA templates ready to share
- [ ] Review rubric examples prepared
- [ ] Checklist documents accessible
- [ ] Link between WP3 and WP6 (QA) clear
- [ ] Examples of quality issues to discuss

Detailed Agenda

Time	Activity	Slide
0:00-2:00	Introduction to QA	1
2:00-8:00	Quality standards	2
8:00-15:00	Peer review process	3
15:00-22:00	Deliverable checklists	4
22:00-27:00	Assessment rubrics	5
27:00-30:00	Continuous improvement	6

Slide-by-Slide Talking Points

Slide 1: Title

- QA is everyone's responsibility
- Not just a final check - built into process

Slide 2: Quality Standards

Key messages: - Content, pedagogical, technical, professional standards - 4 ECTS = 100-120 learning hours - EU microcredential framework alignment

Emphasize: "Quality is not optional - it's essential for credibility"

Standards to highlight: - Competency-based learning outcomes - Active learning approaches - WCAG 2.1 AA accessibility - Current, accurate content

Slide 3: Peer Review Process

Key messages: - Three levels ensure thorough review - Each level has specific focus - Asian review is crucial for localization

Walk through each level: 1. Intra-team: Technical accuracy (5 days) 2. Cross-team: Pedagogical quality (5 days) 3. EU-Asian: Regional relevance (7 days)

Important: "Build review time into your planning"

Slide 4: Deliverable Checklists

Key messages: - Checklists ensure completeness - Different requirements for each deliverable - Check before submission

Highlight key items: - D3.1: All 5 modules complete, peer-reviewed - D3.2: Attendance documented, feedback collected - D3.3: Materials localized, implementation guide

Slide 5: Assessment Rubrics

Key messages: - 4-point scale (Exemplary to Beginning) - Minimum standards: avg >= 3.0, no criterion below 2 - Content accuracy must be >= 3

Explain scoring: - 4: Exceeds expectations - 3: Meets expectations - 2: Needs improvement - 1: Major revision needed

Slide 6: Continuous Improvement

Key messages: - Feedback collected throughout - Analyze, plan, implement, verify - Lessons learned captured

Emphasize: "Quality is a journey, not a destination"

Key Points to Reinforce

1. **Quality standards are non-negotiable** - Materials must meet EU standards
2. **Review time must be planned** - Don't squeeze reviews at the end
3. **Asian input is valuable** - Helps ensure materials work in ASEAN context
4. **Document everything** - Creates accountability and learning

---

Common Questions & Answers

Q: What if materials fail review? A: Revision required. Address feedback and re-submit. Built into sprint schedule.

Q: Who decides if materials pass? A: Average of reviewer scores. If borderline, team lead decides.

Q: How do we handle disagreements in review? A: Team lead mediates. Focus on objective criteria.

Post-Session Actions

1. Share QA templates and rubrics
2. Confirm review assignments
3. Add review periods to sprint calendar
4. Set up feedback collection mechanisms

Templates to Distribute After Session

1. Quality Review Checklist

2. Material Assessment Rubric
3. Feedback Collection Form
4. Change Log Template

Co-funded by the European Union

Licence and attribution

GREEN FINANCE WP3 Kick-off Facilitator Guide, Session 3

Co-funded by the European Union. Published by the GREEN FINANCE project, an Erasmus+ Capacity Building in Higher Education action, grant agreement 101237817.

Free to use, copy and adapt under Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0), creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. Attribute it to the GREEN FINANCE consortium, Erasmus+ grant 101237817.

This copy was published at https://digital-ai-finance.github.io/Green-Finance/wp3kickoff-feb2026/guides/WP3_FacilitatorGuide_Session3.pdf

The project site is https://digital-ai-finance.github.io/Green-Finance. A question about this file goes to joerg.osterrieder@utwente.nl.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Licence page added 3 September 2026.