



HECOF D5.1 Pilot monitoring and evaluation methodology

ERASMUS-EDU-2022-PI-FORWARD (Partnerships for Innovation - Forward Looking Projects)

ERASMUS-EDU-2022-PI-FORWARD-LOT1 | ERASMUS-LS (ERASMUS Lump Sum Grants)



Higher Education Classroom Of the Future

HECOF D5.2 First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement

Disclaimer:

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.

This document is issued within the frame and for the purpose of the Higher Education Classroom Of the Future project. This project has received funding from the European Union's Erasmus+ Framework Programme under Grant Agreement No. 101086100.

This document and its content are the property of the HECOF Consortium. All rights relevant to this document are determined by the applicable laws. Access to this document does not grant any right or license on the document or its contents. This document or its contents are not to be used or treated in any manner inconsistent with the rights or interests of the HECOF Consortium or the Partners detriment and are not to be disclosed externally without prior written consent from the HECOF Partners. Each HECOF Partner may use this document in conformity with the HECOF Consortium Grant Agreement provisions.

(*) Dissemination level.-Public — fully open (automatically posted online) Sensitive — limited under the conditions of the Grant Agreement

EU classified —RESTREINT-UE/EU-RESTRICTED, CONFIDENTIEL-UE/EU-CONFIDENTIAL, SECRET-UE/EU-SECRET under Decision 2015/444



**Co-funded by
the European Union**

This project has received funding from the European Union's Erasmus+ Framework Programme under Grant Agreement No. 101086100.

Work Package: WP5	
Authors:	<p>NURO: Christian Tismer, Jason Horn</p> <p>ADAPTEMY: Ioana Ghergulescu</p> <p>NTUA: Maria Karoglou, Marina Stramarkou</p> <p>POLIMI: Ada Giannatelli</p> <p>KT: Evangelos Rigas</p> <p>SIMAVI: Ana-Maria Dumitrescu</p>
Status:	draft
Due Date:	M26 – 28/02/2025
Version:	V2.0 Final Version
Submission Date:	28/02/2025
Dissemination Level:	PU

HECOF Profile

Grant Agreement No.:	101086100
Acronym:	HECOF
Title:	Higher Education Classroom Of the Future
URL:	https://hecof.eu/
Start Date:	01/01/2023
Duration:	30M

Partners

 konnektable TECHNOLOGIES	KONNEKT ABLE TECHNOLOGIES LIMITED (KT)	IE	COO
	ETHNICON METSOVION POLYTECHNION (NTUA)	EL	BEN
 POLITECNICO MILANO 1863	POLITECNICO DI MILANO (POLIMI)	IT	BEN
	NUROMEDIA GMBH (NURO)	DE	BEN
 SIMAVI <i>Software Imagination & Vision</i>	SIMAVI SOFTWARE IMAGINATION & VISION	RO	BEN
	ADAPTEMY LIMITED	IE	BEN

Document History


Version	Date	Author (Partner)	Remarks/Changes
0.1	01.12.2024	NURO	Draft – Structure
0.2	23.12.2024	NURO	Working Shared Document
0.3	21.02.2025	All Partners	Contributions to the shared document
1.0	21.02.2025	NURO	Merged and review version
1.1	27.02.2025	NURO	Merged and pre-final version
2.0	28.02.2025	NURO	Format, minor changes, final version

Executive Summary

The objective of this report is to summarize the first evaluation implementation of the initial **"Higher Education Classroom Of the Future" (HECOF)** version and user requirements refinement to prepare the second evaluation and impact assessment.

The document provides an overview of the **HECOF project**, dealing with digital transformation of education by **utilizing AI and VR**. It delves into the first evaluation preparation, implementation, and findings. Participating students gave an **overall positive feedback** with excitement on the HECOF implementation usage and **significant enhancement** of their improvement in learning confidence, understanding and mastering of topics. With their positive feedback they also **provided valuable insights for improvement** of the initial HECOF version to enhance the co-development towards the final HECOF version. **For details see Section 6.**

Please rate the following HECOF learning experiences based on how much each contributed to your understanding and retention of the material.



HECOF piloting is implemented at **two pilot universities in the field of chemical engineering.**

- **Pilot 1: NTUA**, chemical extraction process
- **Pilot 2: POLIMI**, bioreactor

With this report the project **HECOF (Higher Education Classroom of the Future) reached milestone MS6 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement"**.

The evaluation activities of WP5 were implemented in strong collaboration with WP4, the agile development. HECOF follows a state-of-the-art hybrid development methodology [2] with Lean/UX in WP2 (see D2.1), learning design in WP3 (see D3.1 and D3.2), and "Agile development of HECOF system" in WP4.

The **HECOF evaluation and monitoring methodology** employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative metrics from system performance and learning analytics with qualitative feedback from users. The methodology integrates current research for AI-adaptive learning and VR training to assess the system's impact [3], [4], [5]. Six evaluation dimensions are discussed: a) Technical functionality, b) System performance and system accuracy performance, c) Pedagogical impact, d) Satisfaction and perceived usefulness, e) Usability Evaluation, f) Social Impact and Presence.

Future work of HECOF will be based on the outcome of evaluation 1, the agile co-development will **finalize** the HECOF System. The final version of HECOF will be assessed by the **second evaluation**. Findings of WP5 about user satisfaction and system performance of the HECOF system will be reported in **D5.3 "Final evaluation and impact assessment"**. This report will provide insights to technical aspects, pedagogical impact, satisfaction, perceived usefulness, usability, and social impact for the HECOF approach of a novel AI driven adaptive and immersive learning environment.

This will **achieve milestone MS7 "Second round of pilot activities are implemented"**.

Abbreviations and acronyms

Abbreviation	Definition
AI	Artificial Intelligence
API	Application Programming Interface
HECOF	Higher Education Classroom of The Future
NTUA	NATIONAL TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY OF ATHENS: ETHNICON METSOVION POLYTECHNION
LPAD	Laboratory of Process Analysis & Design
M#	Project Month Number
MS#	Milestone Number
ML	Machine Learning
MVP	Minimum viable product
POLIMI	POLITECNICO DI MILANO
PH#.#	Phase Number
T#	Task Number
VR	Virtual Reality
W#	Week Number (ISO 8601)
WP#	Work package Number

Table of Contents

HECOF D5.2 First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement	1
HECOF Profile.....	2
Partners	3
Document History	4
Executive Summary.....	5
Abbreviations and acronyms.....	6
Table of Contents.....	7
1 Introduction.....	9
1.1 Purpose of the Document and Follow-Up	9
1.2 T5.5 description: Evaluation and Impact assessment.....	9
1.3 About the Project.....	9
1.4 HECOFC Overall Objective.....	10
1.5 Specific Objectives and Deliverables in WP5	10
2 WP5 Structure.....	10
2.1 Phases in HECOFC	11
2.2 Phases of WP5.....	11
2.3 Related HECOFC Milestones	12
2.4 Schedule of WP5 (Timetable).....	12
3 Partners Roles and Obligations in WP5.....	13
3.1 KT – Coordinator, Technical Lead, Backend, Data Lake, and Deployment.....	13
3.2 NTUA – Use Case Partner 1, Chemical Extraction Process	13
3.3 POLIMI – Use Case Partner 2, Bioreactor	13
3.4 NURO – XR Lab Editor and Player, Pilot Planning and Reporting.....	13
3.5 SIMAVI – Dashboard and API, Pilot Preparation, Running and Monitoring	14
3.6 ADAPTEMY – Adaptive learning, AI, and User Training.....	14
4 Evaluation and Monitoring Methodology	15
4.1 Theoretical Approach	15
4.1.1 Technical functionality	15
4.1.2 System Performance	15
4.1.3 Pedagogical Impact.....	15
4.1.4 Satisfaction and Perceived Usefulness	16
4.1.5 Usability Evaluation	16
4.1.6 Social Impact and Presence.....	16

5	Implementation	17
5.1	Phases of WP5.....	17
5.2	Combined Events for Deployment and User Training	18
5.3	Integration Events for Adaptive AI and VR Lab.....	18
5.4	Pilot Evaluation Process and Implementation	19
5.5	Monitoring.....	20
5.6	Evaluation 1	20
5.6.1	Pilot 1 NTUA.....	21
5.6.2	Pilot 2 POLIMI.....	22
5.7	Upcoming Evaluation 2	24
6	Results	24
6.1	Pre-Survey	24
6.1.1	Demographics.....	24
6.1.2	Perceived usefulness	29
6.1.3	Social Presence and Interactions.....	31
6.1.4	Self-Efficacy and Engagement.....	32
6.2	Post-Survey	33
6.2.1	Perceived Learning Gain	33
6.2.2	Learning Experience Rating.....	34
6.2.3	Self-Efficacy and Engagement.....	39
6.2.4	User Satisfaction	44
6.2.5	System Usability.....	46
6.2.6	Social Presence and Interactions.....	51
6.2.7	Students' Recommendations and Feedback	52
6.3	User Requirements Refinement	55
6.3.1	Adaptive Learning platform.....	55
6.3.2	XR Editor and Lab	56
6.3.3	Dashboard.....	57
6.3.4	Backend.....	57
7	Conclusion and Future Work	57
	List of Tables.....	58
	List of Figures.....	58
	References	60

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of the Document and Follow-Up

This is the first report **D5.2** of T5.5 "Evaluation and Impact assessment" and summarises the outcome from HECOF T5.2 "**Preparation**", T5.3 "**User Training**", T5.4 "**Pilot Running and Monitoring**", and conduction of the **first HECOF evaluation**. D5.2 "**First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement**" describes the implementation of the first HECOF evaluation and **refines** D2.1 "User Requirements and Functional Specifications" and D5.1 "Pilot monitoring and evaluation methodology". With this report the project **HECOF** (Higher Education Classroom of the Future) **reached milestone MS6 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement"**.

Future work of HECOF will be based on this outcome. WP4 "Agile development of HECOF system" will **finalize** the HECOF System. The final version of HECOF will be assessed by the **second evaluation** in PH3.6. Findings of WP5 about user satisfaction and system performance of the HECOF system will be reported with **D5.3 "Final evaluation and impact assessment"**.

1.2 T5.5 description: Evaluation and Impact assessment

As described in the HECOF grant agreement:¹

"T5.5 will carry out an overall assessment and evaluation of the system in terms of system performance issues and the social impact of using the system in HEIs including perspective of students and lecturers on the potential positive and negative effects of using it. The T5.5 will implement an impact assessment survey amongst the users of the system that will be applied at the end of the pilot activities. Based upon the participant feedback in T5.4 gathered by M24, T5.5 will provide recommendations for redesign the prototype for a further implementation iteration in T4.10."

1.3 About the Project

"**Higher Education Classroom Of the Future**" (HECOF, ERASMUS+ GA No 101086100) initiative aims at revolutionising higher **education teaching practices and education policies** by creating systemic change. A multidisciplinary team develops and tests an innovative **personalised, adaptive** way of teaching, that exploits the digital data from students' **learning activity in immersive environments** and uses computational analysis techniques from data science and AI. This also necessitates the development and uptake of **safe and lawful AI**, that respects fundamental rights by providing insights on **ethical and legal issues** around the design of the system. The project focuses on the field of **Chemical Engineering**, with involvement of **students and teaching staff**, from two pilot universities. HECOF technology has a clear potential to be mainstreamed in the vocational education and training sector for employees in the chemical engineering sector. Therefore, HECOF will support the first strategic priority of the **Digital Education Action Plan** (2021-2027), the development of a high-performing digital education ecosystem, by building capacity and critical understanding in all type of education and training institutions on how to exploit the opportunities offered by digital technologies for teaching and learning at all levels and for all sectors and to develop and implement digital transformation plans of educational institutions.

HECOF follows a state-of-the-art **hybrid development methodology** [2] with Lean/UX in WP2, adaptive learning concepts [3], [4] in WP3, and SCRUM in WP4 in a phase frame defined in WP1, and refined in WP5, see section 2.

¹ HECOF GA, Associated with document Ref. Ares(2022)8365788 - 02/12/2022

1.4 HECOF Overall Objective

The primary goal of the HECOF project is to **drive systemic change in higher education** by promoting innovation in teaching practices and national education reforms. This will be achieved by developing and testing an **innovative, personalized, and adaptive approach to teaching** that utilizes digital data from students' learning activities **in immersive environments** and incorporates computational analysis techniques from **data science and AI**.

HECOF has defined four specific objectives, while this document focuses on SO4:

- **SO1:** To design and develop instructional content and a personalized adaptive learning system in immersive learning environments with a conceptual focus on "Chemical Engineering" academic discipline
- **SO2:** To engage teaching staff and students in shaping and co-designing the learning system
- **SO3:** To foster the development and uptake of safe and lawful AI that respects fundamental rights by providing insights on ethical and legal issues around the design and ethical educational deployment of AI-based technologies for teaching and learning.
- **SO4:** To pilot and assess the performance of the HECOF prototype system at the EU level, in a "Chemical Engineering" real classroom setting in two pilot studies, in terms of (i) effective and adequate learning experience (completeness), (ii) perceived benefits compared to traditional pedagogical model (quality), and (iii) user experience (acceptance).

1.5 Specific Objectives and Deliverables in WP5

WP5 addresses HECOF objective SO4 by six specific objectives:

- 1) Recruit students for the pilots and setup the pilot environment.
- 2) Train the teaching staff and students on how to use the HECOF solution.
- 3) Identify the starting level of knowledge, skills of students involved in pilot tests.
- 4) Fully operate and test the HECOF components and architecture on piloting experiments aimed to validate the HECOF prototype solution from a usability and end-user point of view.
- 5) Provide feedback and recommendations for HECOF system refinement in WP4.5) To validate the HECOF prototype solution from a usability and end-user point of view.
- 6) Evaluate the effectiveness of the HECOF prototype solution, the potential positive and negative effects of using AI in an immersive learning environment for personalized adaptive learning from the point of view of the pilot studies' participants

T5.1 planning of WP5 targeted on fulfilling all these objectives as described in D5.1. As **guideline for HECOF Phase 3 "Monitoring and evaluation"**. This deliverable **D5.2 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement"** will be succeeded by **D5.3 "Final evaluation and impact assessment"** in M30 after the second evaluation. "WP4 Agile development of HECOF system" will receive this document for refinement of the development. D5.3 as final resume of WP5 will be delivered to "WP6 Communication, dissemination and exploitation".

2 WP5 Structure

WP5 handles the implementation of **Phase 3: "Monitoring and evaluation"** (Month 22-Month 29) - addressing **SO4 "To pilot and assess the performance of the HECOF prototype system at the EU level, in a "Chemical Engineering" real classroom setting [...]"**.

Based on input from **WP2 "Requirements analysis & privacy, social and ethical impact assessment"**, **WP3 "Instructional strategies and assessment design"**, and **WP4 "Agile development of HECOF system"**. The agile co-development in WP4 and WP5 will continuously improve the HECOF system and training exercises.

Evaluation 1 was based on MVP1, released in M22 as D4.1. Outcome of the first evaluation will refine D2.1, and D5.1 by this document to adapt the development in WP4 and prepare the final evaluation.

The co-development will be continued based on the first evaluation outcome to prepare MVP2 for the final evaluation 2.

Evaluation 2 will assess the D4.2 "HECOF Integrated system- Final release", delivered in M26. The outcome of pilot 1 and 2 will be analysed and compiled into D5.3 Final evaluation and impact assessment.

HECOF piloting will be implemented at two pilot universities in the field of chemical engineering.

- Pilot 1: NTUA, chemical extraction process
- Pilot 2: POLIMI, bioreactor

2.1 Phases in HECOF

HECOF is organized in four interrelated phases:

- Phase 1: Preparation (Month 1-Month 12) - Obj. addressed:SO1, SO2, SO3 (WP1,2,3)
- Phase 2: Implementation (Month 13-Month 26) - Obj. addressed:SO1 (WP4)
- Phase 3: Monitoring and evaluation (Month 22-Month 29) - Obj. addressed:SO4 (WP5)
- Phase 4: Dissemination and exploitation (Month 3-Month 30) - Obj. addressed: SO5, SO6

To enable WP5 fulfilling all these objectives, T5.1 performed the piloting planning as described in this document to initiate phase 3 of HECOF.

2.2 Phases of WP5

WP5 implements phase 3 "Monitoring and evaluation" and is structured in 8 sub phases:

1. PH3.0: Planning of methodology (WP5, T5.1 NURO) D5.1 M21
2. **PH3.1:** Preparation of pilot activities (WP5, T5.2, E5.1 & E5.2 SIMAVI)
3. **PH3.2:** Users Training (WP5, T5.3, E5.2 & E5.4 ADAPTEMY)
4. **PH3.3:** Evaluation 1 running and monitoring (WP5, T5.4 SIMAVI)
5. **PH3.4:** Analytics of the outcome and refinement of D2.1 & D5.1 by D5.2 M24 (WP5, T5.5 NURO)
6. PH3.5: Agile development of MVP2 (WP4, KT, all partners)
7. PH3.6: Evaluation 2 running and monitoring (WP5, T5.4 SIMAVI)
8. PH3.7: Analytics of the outcome and impact assessment by D5.3 M30 (WP5, T5.5 NURO)

Focus of this report are phases PH3.1 – PH3.4, PH3.0 was reported by D5.1, upcoming phases will be reported by D5.3.

Table 1 presents an overview of phase 3 as GANTT chart in week granulation, details of the sub phases are in section 5.1 of the Implementation.

HECOF WP5 Time Line																																																				
M19	M20	M21	M22	M23	M24	M25	M26	M27	M28	M29	M30																																									
Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Sep 2024	Okt 2024	Nov 2024	Dez 2024	Jan 2025	Feb 2025	Mrz 2025	Apr 2025	Mai 2025	Jun 2025																																									
Q3			Q4			Q1			Q2																																											
01.+ 08.+ 15.+ 22.+ 29.+	05.+ 12.+ 19.+ 26.+	02.+ 09.+ 16.+ 23.+	30.+ 07.+ 14.+ 21.+ 28.+	04.+ 11.+ 18.+ 25.+	02.+ 09.+ 16.+ 23.+	30.+ 06.+ 13.+ 20.+ 27.+	03.+ 10.+ 17.+ 24.+	03.+ 10.+ 17.+ 24.+ 31.+	07.+ 14.+ 21.+ 28.+	05.+ 12.+ 19.+ 26.+	02.+ 09.+ 16.+ 23.+ 30.+																																									
W27	W28	W29	W30	W31	W32	W33	W34	W35	W36	W37	W38	W39	W40	W41	W42	W43	W44	W45	W46	W47	W48	W49	W50	W51	W52	W01	W02	W03	W04	W05	W06	W07	W08	W09	W10	W11	W12	W13	W14	W15	W16	W17	W18	W19	W20	W21	W22	W23	W24	W25	W26	W27
... Phase 2: Implementation (M13-M26)																																																				
Feature freeze:																																																				
... Phase 4: Dissemination and exploitation (M03-M30)																																																				
WP5 (M19-M30, SIMAVI) Pilot testing, evaluation and impact assessment																																																				
Phase 3: Monitoring and evaluation (M22-29)																																																				
PH3.0 Planning, T5.1			PH3.1 Preparation		PH3.2 Training		PH3.3 Eval 1		PH3.4 -> D5.2		PH3.5 Agile Development MVP2		PH3.6 Eval 2		PH3.7 Compile D5.3																																					
			TBD		TBD						TBD																																									
			D4.1						D4.2																																											
			D5.1				D5.2								D5.3																																					
M19	M20	M21	M22	M23	M24	M25	M26	M27	M28	M29	M30																																									

Table 1: HECOF Phases overview with a focus on WP5

2.3 Related HECOF Milestones

- MS6 (M24): First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement. The milestone was reached in time, even when this document was submitted by a delay in M26. Findings were given to the agile development work package in advance.
- MS7 (M30): Second round of pilot activities are implemented, and the effectiveness of the proposed learning environment and user satisfaction is assessed

2.4 Schedule of WP5 (Timetable)

Phase / Event	Month	Responsible	Step
PH3.0	M20-M21	NURO	T5.1 Planning, D5.1 M21
PH3.1	M22/M23	SIMAVI	T5.2 Preparation, E5.1 + E5.2
PH3.2	M22/M23	ADAPTEMY	T5.3 Training, E5.3 + E5.4
E5.1 + E5.3	M22	NTUA	Preparation and training event for Pilot 1
E5.2 + E5.4	M22	POLIMI	Preparation and training event for Pilot 2
PH3.3	M23/M24	SIMAVI	T5.3 Pilot Running and Monitoring, Evaluation 1
Eval 1.1	M24	NTUA	Evaluation 1 / Pilot 1
Eval 1.2	M24	POLIMI	Evaluation 1 / Pilot 2
PH3.4	M26	NURO	D5.2 “First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement”
PH3.5/ PH2	M25-M26	KT	WP4 agile development of MVP2
PH3.6	M27–M29	SIMAVI	T5.3 Pilot Running and Monitoring, Evaluation 2
Eval 2.1	TBD	NTUA	Evaluation 2 / Pilot 1
Eval 2.2	TBD	POLIMI	Evaluation 2 / Pilot 2
PH3.7	M30	NURO	T5.5 Evaluation and Impact assessment, D5.3

Table 2: Piloting and Evaluation Timetable

3 Partners Roles and Obligations in WP5

The HECOF partners roles and obligations during the execution of the pilots are defined by this section, in order of beneficiary number.

3.1 KT – Coordinator, Technical Lead, Backend, Data Lake, and Deployment

The overall roles of KT are coordinator of HECOF (WP1, WP6) and technical lead (WP4).

KT delivers the first release of the HECOF system by D4.1 as input for the pilot 1. In WP5, T5.4 KT is the provider of the backend and data lake developed in WP4. (T4.3 – T4.7).

- Deployment of the HECOF infrastructure
- Support
- Maintenance and bug fixing
- Contribution to D5.1, D5.2 & D5.3

Findings of pilot 1 (D5.2) will be incorporated in the second development phase of WP4. KT delivers the final release of the HECOF system by D4.2 as input for the pilot 2.

3.2 NTUA – Use Case Partner 1, Chemical Extraction Process

Use case partner for pilot 1, chemical extraction process.

- Hosting E5.1 & E5.3
- Performing evaluation 1 & 2 by integration into the teaching.
- Provide feedback to D5.2 & D5.3
- Contribution to D5.1

3.3 POLIMI – Use Case Partner 2, Bioreactor

Use case partner for pilot 2, bioreactor.

- Hosting E5.2 & E5.4
- Performing evaluation 1 & 2 by integration into the teaching.
- Provide feedback to D5.2 & D5.3
- Contribution to D5.1

3.4 NURO – XR Lab Editor and Player, Pilot Planning and Reporting

The overall role of NURO is technical partner of HECOF responsible for user requirements (WP2, D2.1, D5.2), pilot planning and reporting (D5.1, D5.3). In WP4 NURO is responsible for the VR-LAB exercise experience and integration with Adaptemy AI, and adaptive learning (T4.1) and supports API development and integration (T4.8, T4.9).

In WP5 NURO is responsible for the pilot and evaluation planning (T5.1, D5.1), and reporting. Compiling pilot 1 outcome into D5.2 as feedback to WP4 (T5.4), and pilot 1 outcome into D5.3 as feedback to WP6 (T5.5). NURO delivers the outcome of T4.1 to the first release of the HECOF system by D4.1. In WP5, T5.4 NURO is the provider of the VR-LAB editor and exercise experience developed in WP4. (T4.1) in co-creation with the educators of the pilot sites.

- Delivery of editor and XR player software.
- Delivery of basic XR exercises.
- Support of the teaching staff to adapt the exercise.
- Technical support.
- Maintenance and bug fixing.
- Delivery of D5.1, D5.2 & D5.3.

Findings of this document will be incorporated in the second development phase of WP4. NURO delivers the final release of the HECOF XR components to D4.2 as input for the pilot 2.

3.5 SIMAVI – Dashboard and API, Pilot Preparation, Running and Monitoring

The overall role of SIMAVI is technical partner of HECOF responsible for piloting and evaluation implementation (WP5). In WP4 SIMAVI is responsible for the HECOF dashboard (T4.9) and integration with NURO's XR technology (T4.8, T4.9).

The dashboard will provide a way to visualise the personalised learning path including details about history and behaviour of their learning progress alongside with the roadmap for knowledge needed to plan and perform exams.

SIMAVI is WP5 lead and responsible for the pilot and evaluation preparation (T5.2, E5.1, E5.2) and running (T5.4). SIMAVI delivers the outcome of T4.1 to the first release of the HECOF system by D4.1. In WP5, T5.4, SIMAVI is provider of the dashboard and API developed and integrated in WP4 (T4.8, T4.9, T4.10).

- Preparation and implementation of E5.1, E5.2.
- Delivery of editor and XR player software.
- Delivery of basic XR exercises.
- Support of the teaching staff and students.
- SIMAVI collects the user feedback.
- Maintenance and bug fixing.
- Contribution to D5.1, D5.2 & D5.3.

The findings of pilot 1 (D5.2) will be incorporated in the second development phase of WP4.

SIMAVI delivers the final release of the HECOF dashboard and API to D4.2 as input for the pilot 2.

3.6 ADAPTEMY – Adaptive learning, AI, and User Training

The overall role of ADAPTEMY is technical partner of HECOF responsible for learning design for AI-based adaptive learning (WP3), and AI driven adaptive learning technologies (WP4). Moreover, in WP4, Adaptemy is responsible for HECOF's AI-based Adaptive Learning Component that will integrate and configure the Adaptemy AI Adaptive Learning Engine as per HECOF's Learning Design (T4.2), co-development with KT's of the HECOF ML and data analytics modules (T4.3, T4.4, T4.5) and the integration with NURO's XR technology.

In WP5, ADAPTEMY is responsible for the user training (T5.3, E5.2, E5.4). ADAPTEMY delivers the outcome of T4.2 to the first release of the HECOF system by D4.1. In WP5, T5.4 ADAPTEMY is the provider of the adaptive learning technology developed in WP4. (T4.1) based on the learning design (WP3).

- Preparation and implementation of E5.2, E5.4.
- Delivery of AI and adaptive learning components.
- Support of the teaching staff.
- Technical support.
- Maintenance and bug fixing.
- Contribution to D5.1, D5.2 & D5.3.

Findings of pilot 1 (D5.2) will be incorporated into the second development phase of WP4.

ADAPTEMY delivers the final release of the HECOF adaptive learning modules to D4.2 as input for the pilot 2.

4 Evaluation and Monitoring Methodology

4.1 Theoretical Approach

The approach for HECOF evaluation employs a mixed-methods approach, combining quantitative metrics from system performance and learning analytics with qualitative feedback from users. The evaluation methodology was developed in the Evaluation preparation phase and presented in D5.1. The methodology integrates current AI-adaptive learning and VR training research to assess the system's impact [3], [4], [5].

Evaluation dimensions:

- **Technical functionality:** system uptime, API success rate, response time, VR performance.
- **System performance:** system accuracy performance.
- **Pedagogical impact:** learning improvements and effectiveness.
- **Satisfaction and perceived usefulness:** student and teacher experience.
- **Usability Evaluation:** learning experience in learning loops, VR and overall system usability.
- **Social Impact and Presence:** evaluation through interviews and surveys.

4.1.1 Technical functionality

The technical functionality of the AI engine and VR experience play critical roles in ensuring smooth, uninterrupted learning experiences for students and educators. One of the key aspects is **system uptime**, which refers to the percentage of time the system is operational and accessible. Another crucial metric is the **API success rate**, which tracks the percentage of successful data requests made to the AI engine. In terms of **response times**, the goal is to keep a low latency (i.e., <1s). For the VR experience key metrics are **start time** for the VR exercise (i.e. < 3s) and **frame rate in VR** also the previous described response time of the AI API. VR start time and AI response time providing users with near-instant feedback and ensuring that adaptive learning paths adjust in real-time, maintaining optimal performance across various usage scenarios is essential to guarantee that **students experience seamless, personalised learning**. For the usage of head mounted VR devices a high frame rate (i.e. >60fps in VR, >30fps on desktop) is mandatory to have a **comfortable VR experience** and avoid the occurrence of VR sickness.

4.1.2 System Performance

The accuracy of the Adaptemy **AI engine** is a key measure of its effectiveness in delivering **personalised and adaptive learning** experiences. **System accuracy** refers to the AI's ability to correctly predict student outcome to assessment questions and further on to make predictions about learning needs. This is achieved by building a **learner model** based on evidence from the learner interactions.

To measure system accuracy effectively, we will focus on students who have provided sufficient **initial evidence**, such as completing early assessments. This approach helps mitigate the cold start problem, which occurs when the AI system lacks enough data **to make accurate predictions** or personalise learning paths effectively. By waiting for students to complete some initial work, we ensure that the AI has gathered enough meaningful data to make informed decisions. High accuracy directly impacts recommendations, **fostering a more personalised and efficient learning journey**.

4.1.3 Pedagogical Impact

The pedagogical impact of the HECOF AI and VR experience will be measured through key metrics that track learning improvements and overall effectiveness. One of the primary indicators of learning

effectiveness will be the **learning gain per session per concept**, which measures how much students improve in their understanding of specific concepts after each learning session. This will be closely monitored through **learning analytics**, which provide insights into student progress and mastery of concepts, allowing us to track incremental improvements over time. Additionally, **pre- and post-tests** will be used to quantify learning outcomes, measuring the difference in student performance before and after engaging within the pilot. Other important metrics include the module **completion rate**, and **concept mastery rates**. These measures will provide a comprehensive view of the effectiveness of the AI-driven adaptive learning approach in enhancing student outcomes.

4.1.4 Satisfaction and Perceived Usefulness

The satisfaction and perceived usefulness of the HECOF system are essential for ensuring both students and teachers have a positive experience with the system. This dimension evaluates the **perceived usefulness**, where students and teachers evaluate how beneficial the AI-driven personalization and VR simulated exercises are in achieving their learning and teaching objectives. Lastly, the evaluation will focus on **overall user satisfaction**, evaluating how satisfied students and teachers are with the platform's ability to enhance their learning and teaching experiences without overwhelming them with complexity or technical difficulties. Furthermore, this dimension will evaluate the HECOF prototype solution through the lenses of the **potential positive and negative effects** of using AI in an immersive learning environment for personalised adaptive learning from the point of view of the pilot students' and teachers' participants.

4.1.5 Usability Evaluation

The usability evaluation of the HECOF system will focus on how effectively it supports seamless learning experiences through adaptive learning loops, the integration of **virtual reality (VR)**, and overall system usability. In the context of **learning loops**, the goal is for students to progress through these loops without disruptions. The inclusion of **VR** adds another dimension, offering immersive, interactive experiences that make learning more engaging. However, the usability of VR components will be evaluated based on their ease of use and whether they enhance, rather than complicate, the learning process. Another aspect for immersive training is the **well-being in VR** [5] and the usability of the flat 3D desktop version as fallback. Lastly, the system's **overall usability**—including navigation, and ease of use—will be assessed to ensure that both students and teachers can use the platform effectively without extensive training or technical issues. Furthermore, this dimension will test the HECOF AI, VR and data analytics components aiming to validate the HECOF prototype solution from a usability and end-user point of view. Students and teachers will provide **feedback and recommendations** for HECOF **system refinement**.

4.1.6 Social Impact and Presence

In AI-adaptive learning systems without direct collaborative features, evaluating **social impact** and **social presence** focuses on how the system fosters interaction between students, teachers, and the platform itself. Metrics such as **teacher-student interaction frequency** and **peer engagement levels** can reveal the system's ability to promote social learning and connection. Surveys on **social presence** and **perceived isolation** provide insights into whether students feel supported or disconnected during their learning experience. Tracking these dimensions ensures that, even without built-in collaboration, the system encourages meaningful interaction and reduces feelings of isolation through its dashboards, human computer interfaces and Virtual Tutor. While the initial requirements analysis a **multi user experience in VR** was rejected by students and educators to avoid complex time coordination effort. After evaluation 1 this option for social interaction was reviewed and discussed. It was preferred to have the personal exchange beside the system in the learning groups.

5 Implementation

5.1 Phases of WP5

WP5 implements phase 3 "Monitoring and evaluation" in 8 sub phases:

- **PH3.0:** Planning of methodology (WP5, T5.1 NURO) D5.1 M21
- **PH3.1:** Preparation of pilot activities (WP5, T5.2, E5.1 & E5.2 SIMAVI)
- **PH3.2:** Users Training (WP5, T5.3, E5.2 & E5.4 ADAPTEMY)
- **PH3.3:** Evaluation 1 running and monitoring (WP5, T5.4 SIMAVI)
- **PH3.4:** Analytics of the outcome and refinement of D2.1 & D5.1 by D5.2 M24 (WP5, T5.5 NURO)
- **PH3.5:** Agile development of MVP2
- **PH3.6:** Evaluation 2 running and monitoring (WP5, T5.4 SIMAVI)
- **PH3.7:** Analytics of the outcome and impact assessment by D5.3 M30 (WP5, T5.5 NURO)

Details of these phases are described in D5.1 "Pilot monitoring and evaluation methodology" elaborated in **PH3.0**. This document focuses on implementation of PH3.1 - PH3.4 to prepare PH3.5 - PH3.7. Since SIMAVI's solution was still under development during the first pilot phase, it was decided that only Adaptemy's web interactive dashboards were to be used for that phase. The final version will deal with this task by having the application-based interactive dashboards connecting to the data lakes in order to retrieve all relevant data.

PH3.1 had been implemented with a transition to PH3.2 by combining events for setup and training and the pilot sites of NTUA and POLIMI in a combination of online and onsite events.

Outcome from **PH3.2** educators feedback and **PH3.3** students feedback was discussed, analysed, and compiled into this report **D5.2 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement"**. D5.2 is the refinement of "D2.1 User Requirements and Functional Specifications", and D5.1 to enable the agile development of MVP2 in phase 3.5. **With the end of this phase, milestone MS6 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement" is achieved.**

Related to phase 2 "Implementation", WP4 will continue the **agile co-development** based on this document. During this phase, the HECOF system will be finalised, and training and exercises will be also refined in collaboration with the educators of the pilot partners. SIMAVI will concentrate on finalizing the interactive dashboard and participate in the training events. As part of this activity, both the professors and the students will interact with the dashboard and will learn how to use it. Relevant feedback from this experience will be reported in the next deliverables. The training events will follow the same pattern as the previous ones.

This **PH3.5** and phase 2 will end with the deployment of "**D4.2: Integrated system - Final release**", the final and feature complete prototype of the HECOF system in **M26 to enable the final evaluation in PH3.6**.

Upcoming **PH3.6:** Evaluation 2 Running and Monitoring will as **first step, prepare the final evaluation. Exercises will be finalised** in collaboration with educators of the pilot partners and technical partners. Evaluation 2 will be implemented at both pilot sites by integration in the teaching activities with a runtime of at least one week.

Objective of this second evaluation is to collect feedback and data to enable the final phase PH3.7. SIMAVI will implement the same approach in both evaluation phases, with a more detailed and tailored approach during the second one, due to prior experience and also increased availability of the tools.

Upcoming **PH3.7:** Analytics of the Outcome and Impact Assessment. The **last phase of WP5** will analyse and summarise the **piloting outcome**. At the end of the pilot activities. T5.5 will implement and apply an impact assessment survey amongst the users (students and educators) of the system. Findings about user satisfaction and system performance of the HECOF system will be reported with **D5.3 "Final evaluation and impact assessment"**. This report will provide insights to technical aspects, pedagogical impact, satisfaction, perceived usefulness, usability, and social impact for the HECOF approach of an novel AI driven adaptive and immersive learning environment.

Results of the piloting will be presented and delivered with the report D5.3 "Final evaluation and impact assessment" in M30 to close the activities of WP5.

5.2 Combined Events for Deployment and User Training

The events for phases PH3.1 and PH3.2 had been organized as combined events to have synergy effects and reduce travelling. The **HECOF Training Course** was designed to introduce both students and teachers at pilot partner sites NTUA and POLIMI to the HECOF system, which integrates AI-adaptive learning, virtual reality (VR) exercises, and smart performance measurement and analytics. The training provided students with hands-on experience while helping teachers understand how to configure AI-driven learning loops, create VR content, and use analytics to enhance their teaching strategies.

For students, the training was structured into four modules. The first module introduced the HECOF system and AI-enhanced learning, explaining how the Adaptemy AI Engine personalised learning and how VR enhances engagement. The second module offered an interactive demo, allowing students to navigate the platform, experience adaptive learning loops, experience a VR exercise, and explore GenAI-powered learning activities like Think-Pair-Share. The third module focused on smart learning analytics, demonstrating how HECOF tracks performance, provides immediate feedback, and helps students identify learning gaps. The final module was a Q&A and feedback session, where students asked questions and shared their experiences using the system.

For teachers, the training also has four modules emphasizing the configuration of AI tools, VR content creation, and data-driven teaching strategies. The first module provided an overview of HECOF's pedagogical foundations, explaining how the Adaptemy AI Engine adapts learning paths and learning experiences through learning loops and how teachers can use VR for customized educational experiences. The second module focused on configuring the AI engine to align with learning goals and provided a walkthrough of the NURO XR Editor for creating VR-based exercises. The third module covered smart learning analytics, showing teachers how to interpret student performance data, adjust their instruction based on real-time insights, and ensure ethical data handling. The final module was a Q&A and feedback session, allowing teachers to discuss HECOF's applications in the classroom and to provide feedback on its implementation.

Overall, the HECOF Training Course ensured that students gain an understanding of the engaging **adaptive and VR learning experience**, while teachers learn to **personalize education** through AI and learning loops and VR tools. The structured training sessions helped both groups understand HECOF's capabilities, experience interactive demonstrations, and provide feedback, making the system more effective for modern education.

5.3 Integration Events for Adaptive AI and VR Lab

In parallel to the ongoing co-development, preparation, and training events, Adaptemy and NURO implemented technical **integration** meetings for setting up communication between NURO's VR Lab and Adaptemy's Backend (12.11.2024, 15.11.2024, 22.11.2024, 09.12.2024).

Topics:

- Establishing transmission of **user telemetry data** (left & right hand position, orientation and point direction, head position, orientation and look direction).
- Establishing transmission of **step completion** data (lab exercises are divided in different steps, after each step a unique id is sent to the backend).
- Passing parameters to with the HOPPER link that is used in the Adaptemy platform to invoice the VR Lab. Information about **level 1, 2 or 3** of the lab exercise is passed to Portal Hopper (level 1: introduction to the apparatus, level 2: guided experiment, level 3: challenge experiment - not implemented in evaluation 1 yet)

5.4 Pilot Evaluation Process and Implementation

Following the user training workshops, **students participating** in HECOF project were provided with credentials to access the system. This ensured that they had the necessary authentication to engage with the platform and its various learning experiences. Upon their initial login, students were redirected to a **pre-survey** designed to assess their perceptions and **expectations** regarding the system.

The pre-pilot survey **gathered comprehensive baseline information** about students' **demographics**, prior **experience** with technology, and their initial perceptions of AI-driven and VR-enhanced learning. It collected data on age, gender, education level, and field of study, providing insights into the diversity of the student group. Additionally, it assessed students' familiarity with virtual reality, adaptive learning, and AI-powered educational tools, using a scale to gauge their prior exposure and comfort levels. Another key aspect of the survey focused on students' current technology use for learning, including their primary **device preference** (desktop, laptop, tablet, smartphone, or VR headset). The survey also aimed to measure perceived usefulness of VR and AI-driven feedback, asking students how much they believed these tools would enhance their understanding of complex concepts and improve their learning experience. Furthermore, it explored **social presence** and interaction expectations, determining whether students anticipated meaningful engagement with teachers and peers after using the system. Lastly, the survey examined self-efficacy and engagement, evaluating students' confidence in mastering the subject, their engagement with traditional learning methods, and their biggest learning challenges. This data provided a foundational understanding of students' expectations and readiness for adaptive AI and VR-integrated learning, setting the stage for comparative analysis in the post-pilot phase.

The next phase involved **adaptive testing**, conducted based on insights from the pre-pilot study. This assessment aimed to tailor the learning experience by identifying each student's initial proficiency level and areas requiring further development. Once the adaptive testing was completed, students engaged with a range of interactive learning experiences within the system. These experiences included guided mastery, where they followed structured learning pathways, revision and reinforcement learning, where students revised previous learned concepts, and think-pair-share activities, facilitated by an AI agent to promote collaborative problem-solving. Additionally, a dedicated session was conducted for interacting and evaluating the Adaptive VR experience, enabling them to immerse themselves in an interactive, responsive learning environment tailored to their individual needs.

To conclude the pilot evaluation, students were directed to a **post-survey** link. The post-pilot survey assessed the impact of HECOF by evaluating students' perceived learning **gains**, engagement and **self-efficacy**, usability experiences, and **overall satisfaction** with the system. One of the primary areas of focus was **perceived learning gain**, where students rated how much their understanding of the subject had improved and how well the adaptive learning features helped them achieve their **educational goals**. They also rated the contribution of different learning experiences, including guided learning, reinforcement activities, think-pair-share interactions, and the VR learning loop, identifying **which components were most beneficial**. Another key component of the survey was **self-efficacy** and engagement, where students reflected on how their confidence in learning had changed and how **engaging** they found AI-driven feedback and VR simulations compared to traditional methods. The survey also captured insights on the AI's effectiveness in identifying positive aspects and challenges, **perceived usefulness**. In terms of usability, students provided feedback on the ease of navigating the system, the intuitiveness of the AI Virtual Tutor, and their comfort using VR tools, including any occurrences of VR sickness. Additionally, the **post-survey assessed social presence and interaction**, asking whether the system helped them feel connected to their instructors and peers. Finally, students shared their overall satisfaction, likelihood of recommending the system, and **suggestions for improvement**. Furthermore, a post-diagnostic assessment was conducted within the system to measure the learning progress and **compare** it against the initial adaptive testing results. For POLIMI pilot evaluation 1, challenges arose in obtaining sufficient responses to the post-survey, leading to an alternative qualitative approach that relied on interviews to gather student feedback as well as an

additional survey for the VR experience. For NTUA pilot evaluation 1, the post-survey was complemented by short interviews with students regarding their perceived experience.

5.5 Monitoring

Throughout the pilot, response rates for both the **pre-survey and post-survey** were closely monitored, and reports on participation numbers were provided to the pilot implementation teams at POLIMI and NTUA. This ensured that **engagement levels and data collection were tracked effectively**. Additionally, initial learning analytics offered insights into user activity. For the main VR learning session, the implementation team was physically present on-site, ensuring smooth execution and immediate **support** for students. Simultaneously, teams from the implementation partners were available online, providing technical assistance and real-time troubleshooting to optimize the learning experience if needed. This coordinated approach allowed for **proactive monitoring**, technical support, and seamless adaptation to any challenges encountered during the pilot.

5.6 Evaluation 1

The objective of Evaluation 1 was to gather user **feedback for the agile development** to support the co-development of HECOF System version 2 (D4.2) that will be tested in evaluation 2, and collect performance data from the HECOF system. Evaluation 1 was based on D4.1 "HECOF first Minimum Viable Product (MVP)", released in M22 with customizations performed in the preparation and training phase. The detailed planning for evaluation 1 was elaborated in T5.2 preparation of pilot activities.

Evaluation 1 was **conducted at both pilot sites** with a focus on the usage of the HECOF system in the teaching activities by students and teachers.

At pilot 1, **NTUA** the evaluation was held in **December (17, and 19) of 2024** with a group of **17 students** participating. At pilot 2, **Polimi** the evaluation was held on **December 10, 2024** with a group of **14 students**.




Figure 1: Students performing exercises in the HECOF VR Laboratory

5.6.1 Pilot 1 NTUA

The **NTUA** use case is about the extraction of bioactive materials from olive leaves. In December (17, and 19) of 2024 a group of NTUA 17 students participated at the 1st evaluation of the HECO system. The evaluation runtime was about 10 hrs in total. The students participated with enthusiasm in the whole process.



Figure 2: Evaluation 1 - XR Lab Testing by Students at Pilot 1 NTUA

Pilot 1 Events

- 5 Meetings: Co-Development / Preparation of Evaluation (25.10.2024, 01.11.2024, 08.11.2024, 12.11.2024, 19.11.2024)
 - Introduction to World Builder software
 - sharing of Lab Exercise World Builder project with teachers
 - refinement & co-development of the XR Lab Exercise
 - testing the Lab Exercise in VR and non-VR with the equipment at NTUA
- E5.1 + E5.3 Combined preparation and training event for Pilot 1 (30th Oct 2024)
- Test Runs for Evaluation 1 (05.12.2024 & 12.12.2024)
- Evaluation 1 (17.12.2024 & 19.12.2024)
 - students doing VR experience one by one with one headset (meta quest 3 ??)
 - runtime: about 2 hours & 2 hours

Here are some comments from them: "I really enjoyed the whole process, this is how future education should be!; Or "It was a great experience, easy to use!", or "I enjoyed every moment and I've learned a lot about the exercise, before going to the laboratory". Only one student has performed the real extraction experiment before entering the VR environment. Furthermore, few of them had previous experience in a VR environment. All students were easily and successfully navigated into the VR environment, followed the instructions and completed the test with success. The ones that were more familiar with such an environment pushed the system at its limits. Everyone expressed the interest to participate at the next stage of the evaluation and were very enthusiastic of how this AI-VR learning approach will change in the 2nd evaluation.

5.6.2 Pilot 2 POLIMI

The POLIMI use case is about bioreactor assembly and usage. On **December 10, 2024** a group of **14 students** participated at the 1st evaluation of the HECOF system. The evaluation runtime was about 10 hrs in total.

E5.2 + E5.4 Combined preparation and training event for Pilot 2 (31st OCT 2024)

The event was implemented onsite at POLIMI and led by ADAPTEMY.

Co-development sessions POLIMI

2 Co-Development Sessions (13.11.2024, 14.11.2024) and a Test Run (06.12.2024) were held online.

Participants: reference teacher (instructor of the Biotechnology and Clinical Manufacturing course); instructor previously involved in the HECOF focus group (November 2023); 2 instructional designers from METID; 1 person from the technical support staff; Nuro (participating remotely)

Topics addressed:

- Nuro presented the World Builder software and the Lab Exercise World Builder to the instructor of the Biotechnology and Clinical Manufacturing course
- Collecting the instructor's remarks with respect to the state of progress of the implementation of the VR features agreed in November 2023 - remarks were collected here [Remarks_November14th.docx](#)

Outcomes:

Polimi team wrote to Nuro that, in terms of priorities, to perform evaluation 1 it is essential for the reference teacher to have in the VR:

- the assembly of the bioreactor divided into the 3 configurations (batch, fed-batch e perfusion, as agreed in November 2023)
- the locker room.

Pilot 2 evaluation was held in a VR facility called virtual lab, which is a classroom equipped with 15 desktop computers (Windows 10) equipped with Meta Quest 2 headsets and marked boundary areas. A test run was held in the same classroom on December 9 involving the instructor, METID, technical support staff and Nuro participating remotely.

People involved

- The pilot involved 14 students from the Biotechnology and Clinical Manufacturing course, both females and males.
- The course instructor took part in the pilot and actively led the session
- 2 instructional designers from METID participated to document the session along with students' remarks
- 1 person from the technical support staff was there to support users

Duration

1.5 hour

Tasks

Students were asked to operate simultaneously and individually:

- enter the Adaptemy platform
- wear the headset
- access the VR, enter the locker room and use the bioreactor with the hand grips
- fill in a questionnaire ([before the post-survey questionnaire](#))

Remarks

Establishing a state-of-the-art, human-centric co-development approach based on LEAN UX and aligning roles according to agile principles for pilot 2 required significant effort and was time consuming. While differences in perspectives remained, a functional collaboration was ultimately achieved.

The remarks below were shared with Nuro by email.

- Due to the belated delivery of the prototype it was not possible to identify possible issues related to the use scenarios of the VR: the differences among the configurations of the bioreactor were not clear as it was not possible to simulate variations of volume and growth of bacteria while starting the process
- Start button: how does it work depending on the bioreactor configuration? It should be clear to the user which parameters (volume variation, bacteria growth) he/she can verify and how they impact on the bioreactor – in other terms, the user should be able to experience in a realistic way that the system responds differently under different operational conditions, with targeted feedback depending on the error
- Improving the connection between the parts of the bioreactor that the student sees on the bench and content on the PC screen on the right
- Suggestions highlighted in orange to guide the assembling of the bioreactor should be configurable, so that they don't show/can be deactivated to nudge the user can retrieve content from memory, especially in case the student uses the VR application more than once
- Many users during the VR session found themselves too far down from VR application elements (e.g. too low to push the button to open the door) or "out of the scene", without the possibility to reach the proper height – please bear in mind that, following many tries, it does not seem to depend on the setting of the equipment

In addition to that, we observed that during the VR session some students had to move back and forth from the bench because otherwise they couldn't manage to reach the objects that in the real world might be within their reach on the bench.

Reference documents

- questionnaire
https://forms.office.com/Pages/DesignPageV2.aspx?subpage=design&FormId=K3EXCvNtXUKAjjCd8ope6_e9-9cnsqRAh54OdehtK69UQVBXVog1U1JUWTY2N1AwWVRaREMwQLZWVC4u&Token=a2f09d7736f04afcbabb7f9dbf9aca5
- [Remarks we collected during the co-development session Remarks_November14th.docx](#)

5.7 Upcoming Evaluation 2

Objective of evaluation 2 is to assess the outcome of HECOF and collect performance data from the HECOF system. Evaluation 2 will be based on D4.2 "HECOF final Minimum Viable Product (MVP)", released in M26. This is a brief planning for Evaluation 2, in the agile approach of HECOF, detailed planning will be elaborated in phase 3.4 and presented in D5.2.

In a first step, to prepare the final evaluation, training and exercises will be finalised by the educators of the pilot partners in collaboration with the technical partners. Evaluation 2 at both pilot sites with integration in the teaching activities with a runtime of one week.

The outcome of HECOF piloting will be analysed and summarised in D5.3.

The second round of evaluation is scheduled for M28-M29 of the project as per the schedule presented at the beginning of the document. Finer details will be defined closer to the event based on the availability of the partners.

The outcome of HECOF piloting will be analysed and summarised in D5.3.

6 Results

6.1 Pre-Survey

6.1.1 Demographics

Please select your university

33 responses




Figure 3: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - University Distribution of Participants

In Evaluation 1, student participation was distributed between two universities, with the National Technical University of Athens (NTUA) contributing 72.7% of the responses and the Polytechnic University of Milan (POLIMI) contributing 27.3%. A total of 33 responses were collected, providing a diverse sample for evaluating the pilot's implementation and effectiveness across different academic environments.

Select your age range

33 responses




Figure 4: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Age Range of Participants

Most participants were 18-24 years old (78.8%), followed by 25-34 (18.2%), with minimal representation from older groups. This aligns with the typical university student demographic.

Select your gender

33 responses




Figure 5: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Gender Distribution of Participants

The gender distribution showed 54.5% female participants, 42.4% male, and a small percentage choosing non-binary or prefer not to say. This indicates a relatively balanced representation with a slight female majority.

Select your education level

33 responses




Figure 6: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Education Level of Participants

Most participants were pursuing a Bachelor's degree (45.5%) or a Master's degree (39.4%), with smaller representation from high school, PhD, and other categories. This reflects a primarily higher education student demographic.

List field of study

33 responses




Figure 7: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Field of Study Distribution

The most common field of study among participants was Chemical Engineering (33.3%), followed by Chemical Process Engineering (18.2%) and Chemical Sciences (15.2%). Other represented fields included Biomedical Engineering (9.1%), along with smaller percentages in Ichthyology, Process Engineering, and Molecular Simulation. This distribution indicates a strong alignment between students profile and profile of the piloted courses.

Rate your familiarity with Virtual Reality Technology:

33 responses




Figure 8: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Familiarity with Virtual Reality Technology

Most participants had limited familiarity with Virtual Reality (VR) technology. The majority rated their familiarity as 2 (slightly familiar, 33.3%) or 3 (somewhat familiar, 30.3%), while 24.2% reported no familiarity (1). Only 12.1% considered themselves very familiar (4), and no participants rated themselves as experts (5). This suggests that most students had minimal prior exposure to VR.

Rate your experience with Adaptive Learning or AI-Powered Educational Tools

33 responses




Figure 9: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Experience with Adaptive Learning or AI-Powered Educational Tools

Most participants had limited experience with adaptive learning or AI-powered educational tools. The largest group (45.5%) rated their experience as 2 (limited experience), while 27.3% had no prior experience (1). Only 18.2% had some experience (3), and 9.1% reported extensive experience (4), with no participants identifying as experts (5). These results indicate that many students were relatively new to AI-driven learning environments.

Evaluation 1 - Tools and Technologies Used for Learning




Figure 10: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Word-cloud of Tools and Technologies Used for Learning

Participants reported using a mix of traditional and digital learning tools, including search engines (Google, Google Scholar), AI-powered tools (ChatGPT, Perplexity), and scientific resources (ScienceDirect, ACS Publications). Many relied on books, handwritten notes, YouTube videos, and online platforms for their studies. Additionally, specialized software like MATLAB, COMSOL, AutoCAD, and SPSS was used for problem-solving and research. The responses highlight a blended approach to learning, integrating both interactive digital tools and conventional study methods.

What is your current usage of technology for learning

33 responses




Figure 11: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Current Usage of Technology for Learning

Most participants (63.6%) reported using a blended learning approach, combining in-person and digital methods. 21.2% relied primarily on online learning with technology, while 15.2% used in-person methods exclusively. No participants reported being fully online, indicating a strong preference for mixed or hybrid learning environments.

What is your primary device used for learning

33 responses




Figure 12: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Primary Device Used for Learning

The majority of participants (69.7%) used a laptop as their primary learning device, followed by desktop computers (15.2%). Tablets (9.1%), smartphones, and VR headsets had minimal representation, indicating a strong usage of traditional computing devices for educational purposes.

6.1.2 Perceived usefulness

To what extent do you believe VR simulations will enhance your understanding of complex concepts?

33 responses




Figure 13: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Usefulness of VR Simulations for Learning Complex Concepts

Participants shared their initial expectations regarding the usefulness of VR simulations in enhancing their understanding of complex concepts before interacting with the system. A majority (57.6%) anticipated that VR would be very useful (4), while 9.1% expected it to be extremely useful (5). 27.3% were moderately convinced (3) of its benefits, and only 6.1% had slight confidence (2), with no participants believing it would be not useful at all (1). These responses suggest a generally positive expectation of VR as a valuable learning tool, though some participants remained uncertain about its impact before direct experience.

Do you think the personalized feedback from the AI tutor will be beneficial to your learning?

33 responses




Figure 14: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Benefit of Personalized Feedback from the AI Tutor

Participants shared their initial expectations regarding the personalized feedback from the AI tutor before interacting with the system. A majority (45.5%) expected the feedback to be very beneficial (4), while 27.3% anticipated it to be extremely beneficial (5). 21.2% were moderately convinced (3) of its usefulness, whereas only a small percentage (3% each) expressed slight confidence (2) or no confidence (1) in its benefits. These results indicate generally positive expectations for AI-driven feedback as a valuable learning support tool, though some students remained uncertain before experiencing it firsthand.

Do you think the personalized recommendations from the HECOF system will be beneficial to your learning?

33 responses




Figure 15: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Perceived Benefit of Personalized Recommendations from the HECOF System

Participants shared their initial expectations regarding the personalized recommendations from the HECOF system before interacting with it. A majority (54.5%) anticipated that these recommendations would be very beneficial (4), while 18.2% expected them to be extremely beneficial (5). 24.2% were moderately convinced (3) of their usefulness, and only 3% had slight confidence (2), with no participants believing they would not be beneficial at all (1). These responses indicate generally positive expectations toward HECOF's ability to provide meaningful learning support, though some students remained uncertain before experiencing the system firsthand.

6.1.3 Social Presence and Interactions

How often do you expect meaningful interaction with teachers using the HECOF system?

33 responses




Figure 16: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Frequency of Meaningful Interaction with Teachers Using the HECOF System

Participants shared their expectations regarding meaningful interaction with teachers when using the HECOF system. The majority anticipated moderate to frequent interaction, with 33.3% expecting it sometimes (3) and 30.3% often (4). 27.3% expected rare interaction (2), while a small percentage (9.1%) believed interaction would never occur (1). No participants (0%) expected very frequent interaction (5). These results indicate mixed expectations, with some students anticipating consistent engagement with teachers, while others expected a more self-directed learning experience.

Do you think that the HECOF system helps you feel connected to other students?

33 responses




Figure 17: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Impact of HECOF on Student Connection

Participants shared their expectations about whether the HECOF system would help them feel connected to other students. The majority (45.5%) remained neutral (3), while 30.3% disagreed (2) and 9.1% strongly disagreed (1), indicating that many students were skeptical about the system fostering a sense of connection. A smaller portion of participants (12.1% agreed (4) and 3% strongly agreed (5)), suggesting that only a few students initially expected the system to enhance peer interactions.

6.1.4 Self-Efficacy and Engagement

How confident are you that you can achieve a high level of mastery in this subject by the end of the learning period (pilot)?

33 responses




Figure 18: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Self-efficacy as initial Confidence in Achieving Mastery

Participants expressed their initial confidence levels regarding their ability to achieve a high level of mastery in the subject by the end of the learning period. The majority (51.5%) felt confident (4) in their ability, while 6.1% were very confident (5). A neutral stance (3) was taken by 33.3%, whereas 9.1% reported slight confidence (2), and no participants indicated a complete lack of confidence (1). These results suggest that most students entered the pilot with a positive or neutral outlook on their ability to succeed, though some remained uncertain about their mastery potential before engaging with the system.

How engaged do you currently feel with your learning methods?

33 responses




Figure 19: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Current Engagement with Learning Methods

Participants reflected on their current engagement levels with their learning methods before using the HECOF system. The majority (66.7%) reported feeling engaged (4), while a small percentage (6.1%) described themselves as very engaged (5). 21.2% maintained a neutral stance (3), whereas 6.1% reported slight engagement (2), and no participants (0%) indicated a complete lack of engagement (1). These results suggest that most students felt reasonably engaged with their existing learning methods, though some saw potential for improvement.

Students also described their biggest challenges as an open answer. The responses indicate that students face several key challenges in their learning process.

The most frequently mentioned difficulties include:

- Understanding complex material - many students struggle with comprehending difficult topics, processing large amounts of theoretical knowledge, and applying what they learn effectively.
- Time management & workload - balancing academic workload, assignments, projects, and personal life was a major concern for many students.
- Motivation & engagement - some participants mentioned staying motivated and focused, particularly when faced with difficult coursework or uninspiring teaching methods.
- Lack of practical application- Several students highlighted the lack of hands-on experience, laboratory work, and real-world applications in their studies, suggesting a need for more practical learning opportunities.
- Exams & evaluation - concerns related to oral exams, memorization-heavy assessments, and the pressure of evaluations were also noted.

These findings suggest that students would benefit from more interactive and applied learning methods, improved time management strategies and guidance, and greater support in engaging with challenging material.

6.2 Post-Survey

6.2.1 Perceived Learning Gain

How much do you feel your understanding of subject has improved after using the HECOF system?

10 responses




Figure 20: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Improvement in Subject Understanding After Using HECOF

Participants assessed how much their understanding of the subject improved after using the HECOF system. Half of the respondents (50%) reported a significant improvement (4 - Very much), while 40% indicated a moderate improvement (3 - Moderately). A smaller portion (10%) felt their understanding was extremely improved (5). Notably, no participants rated their improvement as slight (2) or nonexistent (1). These findings indicate that the HECOF system contributed positively to students' learning, though the extent of improvement varied among individuals.

To what extent do you feel that the AI-based adaptive learning features helped you achieve your learning goals?

10 responses




Figure 21: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Effectiveness of AI-Based Adaptive Learning in Achieving Learning Goals

Participants evaluated how well the AI-based adaptive learning features helped them achieve their learning goals. The majority (70%) reported that the features were considerably helpful (4), while 10% found them fully effective (5). A smaller portion (20%) felt they were only somewhat helpful (3), and no participants rated them as slightly helpful (2) or not helpful at all (1). These results indicate that most students found the AI-based adaptivity beneficial for their learning, though only a few considered it completely effective.

6.2.2 Learning Experience Rating

Please rate the following HECOF learning experiences based on how much each contributed to your understanding and retention of the material.




Figure 22: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Helpfulness of HECOF Learning Experiences

Participants rated how different HECOF learning experiences contributed to their understanding and retention of material. The VR learning experience received the highest ratings, with a majority marking it as extremely helpful (5). The AI tutor (chatbot) was also well-received, with many participants rating it very or extremely helpful. Guided Mastery, Reinforcement (Revision), and Think-Pair-Share activities were generally rated moderately to very helpful, with only a few students finding them slightly helpful. These findings suggest that students found AI-driven Virtual tutor and immersive VR learning experiences the most impactful.

In an open question about which HECOF learning experience (Intake, Guided Learning, Reinforcement, Think-Pair-Share, VR Learning Loop) students believe most helped you to achieve your learning goals, participants identified the VR Learning Loop as the most preferred, indicating that they found it

immersive, and hands-on simulations being highly effective. Some participants emphasized that VR helped them visualize complex processes and engage actively with the material.

Other learning experiences, such as Think-Pair-Share and Reinforcement (Revision), were also valued. Some students preferred collaborative learning with the AI (Think-Pair-Share), while others found repetition and revision beneficial for reinforcing concepts. Intake was mentioned once, but Guided Learning was not explicitly selected, suggesting that students leaned towards more interactive and practical learning methods.

These findings indicate that students responded best to immersive and interactive learning, with VR proving to be the most impactful tool in the HECOF system, followed by the AI-based interactivity in learning experience.

How would you rate the learning experience using the Virtual Lab with a VR headset?

10 responses




Figure 23: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Learning Experience Using the Virtual Lab with a VR Headset

Participants rated their learning experience using the Virtual Lab with a VR headset. The majority (60%) found it extremely helpful (5), while 40% rated it as very helpful (4). Notably, no participants rated the experience as moderately helpful (3), slightly helpful (2), or not helpful at all (1). These results indicate a highly positive reception of the VR-based learning experience, suggesting that students found the immersive environment effective for understanding and engaging with the material.

How would you rate the learning experience using the Virtual Lab without a headset (desktop version)?

10 responses




Figure 24: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Learning Experience Using the Virtual Lab Without a Headset (Desktop Version)

Participants rated their learning experience using the Virtual Lab without a VR headset (desktop version). The responses were evenly split, with 50% rating it as moderately helpful (3) and 50% as very helpful (4). No participants rated the experience as extremely helpful (5), slightly helpful (2), or not helpful at all (1). These results suggest that while the desktop version was considered useful, it was perceived as less impactful than the fully immersive VR headset experience.

How would you rate the overall experience of the AI-based adaptive learning technology in the HECOF course?

10 responses




Figure 25: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Overall Experience with AI-Based Adaptive Learning Technology

Participants rated their overall experience with the AI-based adaptive learning technology in the HECOF course. The majority (90%) rated their experience as good (4), while 10% found it excellent (5). Notably, no participants rated the experience as fair (3), poor (2), or very poor (1). These results suggest that students had a generally positive experience with the AI-driven adaptive learning technology.

How would you rate the quality of the course materials (instructional, remedial, quizzes)?

10 responses




Figure 26: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Quality of Course Materials

Participants rated the quality of the course materials, including instructional content, remedial resources, and quizzes. The majority of students provided positive feedback, with 40% rating the materials as good (4) and 30% considering them excellent (5). Another 30% rated the quality as fair (3), while no participants rated it as poor (2) or very poor (1). These results indicate that while the course materials were generally well-received, a few of the students found them only moderately effective, suggesting room for improvement in content creation.

How personalized did the learning experience feel due to the AI-based adaptive learning technology?

10 responses




Figure 27: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Personalization of Learning Experience Due to AI

Participants rated how personalized the learning experience felt due to the AI-based adaptive learning technology. The majority (50%) felt that the experience was moderately personalized (4), while 20% rated it as highly personalized (5). Another 30% found it somewhat personalized (3), with no participants rating it as slightly personalized (2) or not personalized at all (1). These results suggest that most students recognized a good degree of personalization in their learning experience.

Did the AI-based adaptive learning technology tailor the course content to your individual needs effectively?

10 responses




Figure 28: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Effectiveness of AI-Based Adaptation of Course Content

Participants evaluated whether the AI-based adaptive learning technology effectively tailored the course content to their individual needs. The majority (50%) agreed (4) that the AI adapted the content well, while 10% strongly agreed (5). However, 30% remained neutral (3), and 10% disagreed (2), indicating some uncertainty or dissatisfaction with the level of personalization. No participants strongly disagreed (1). These results suggest that while most students found the AI adaptation beneficial, there is room for improvement.

In an open question about suggested improvements, participants suggested improvements for the AI-based adaptive learning technology. The most common recommendation was the improvement of quiz design and structure, including better-formulated questions and more diverse formats.

Other suggestions included:

- More insightful AI feedback - participants felt the AI should provide deeper explanations on questions.
- More diverse question formats - a broader range of question types beyond multiple choice was requested.
- Chatbot enhancements for follow-up questions - some students wanted the ability to ask for more information after answering incorrectly.
- Better accessibility to learning materials - some students found it difficult to locate relevant course materials and requested easier access.

These responses indicate that while students found the AI useful, they desired more depth, variety, and adaptability in assessments and feedback.

Participants shared additional feedback about their experience with the course. The most frequent theme was positive feedback on engagement and learning, with students appreciating the interactive and engaging nature of the course.

Other feedback includes:

- Technical issues and course progression concerns - participant noted that they were forced into a revision cycle without being able to progress.
- Need for better question clarity and diversity - some students found repetitive questions and issues with ambiguous or unclear answer choices.
- Gratitude for participation - participant expressed appreciation for being part of the evaluation and contributing to improving learning methods.
- VR experience praised - participant specifically highlighted that the VR experience was exciting.

These insights suggest that while most students had a positive experience, improving question quality and course flexibility could further enhance the learning experience.

6.2.3 Self-Efficacy and Engagement

6.2.3.1 Perceived Improvement in Self-Efficacy

To what extent do you feel that using HECOF has improved your confidence in understanding and mastering topics in the course?

10 responses




Figure 29: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Improvement in Confidence in Understanding and Mastering Topics

Participants reflected on how using HECOF improved their confidence in understanding and mastering course topics. The majority (50%) rated their confidence improvement as moderate (3), while 40% found it significant (4). A smaller portion (10%) reported an extreme confidence boost (5), and no participants rated their improvement as slight (2) or nonexistent (1). These results suggest that HECOF contributed positively to students' confidence levels, though for most, the improvement was moderate rather than transformative.

After using HECOF, how confident do you feel in your ability to approach new learning challenges independently?

10 responses




Figure 30: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Confidence in Approaching New Learning Challenges Independently

Participants rated their confidence in approaching new learning challenges independently after using HECOF. The majority (70%) felt confident (4) in their ability to tackle new challenges, while 30% reported feeling very confident (5). Notably, no participants rated their confidence as neutral (3), somewhat confident (2), or not confident at all (1). These results suggest that HECOF had a strong positive impact on students' self-reliance in learning, equipping them with the skills and confidence to navigate new academic challenges independently.

6.2.3.2 Perceived Engagement

How engaged did you feel during the different types of learning experiences provided by HECOF (e.g., VR learning loop, AI-guided feedback)




Figure 31: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Engagement Levels Across HECOF Learning Experiences

Participants rated their engagement levels across different HECOF learning experiences, including VR Learning Loop, AI tutor, Think-Pair-Share, Reinforcement, Guided Mastery, and Intake. The VR Learning Loop received the highest engagement levels, with a notable proportion of students rating them as very or extremely engaging. Think-Pair-Share, AI tutor and Reinforcement, Guided Mastery activities also showed good engagement. These results suggest that students were most engaged in immersive and interactive learning experiences, such as VR and AI-driven feedback.

How engaged did you feel with the learning activities in HECOF compared to traditional methods?

10 responses




Figure 32: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Engagement with HECOF Compared to Traditional Learning Methods

Participants rated their engagement with HECOF learning activities compared to traditional methods. The majority (70%) found HECOF activities very engaging (4), while 20% rated them as extremely engaging (5). A small percentage (10%) reported moderate engagement (3), and no participants rated their engagement as low (1 or 2). These results indicate that HECOF provided a significantly more engaging learning experience compared to traditional methods, with most students feeling highly involved in the interactive activities.

To what extent did HECOF make learning feel more interesting or enjoyable compared to traditional methods?

10 responses




Figure 33: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Enjoyment of Learning with HECOF Compared to Traditional Methods

Participants assessed how HECOF made learning more interesting or enjoyable compared to traditional methods. The majority (60%) rated it as considerably more engaging (4), while 40% found it greatly more enjoyable (5). No participants rated the experience as moderately (3), slightly (2), or not at all enjoyable (1). These results indicate that HECOF significantly enhanced student engagement and enjoyment, making learning more interactive and appealing compared to traditional methods.

6.2.3.3 Positive and Negative Aspects of Using AI in HECOF

Participants shared both positive impacts and challenges associated with the AI-driven personalization in HECOF.

Positive Impacts:

- The most commonly mentioned benefit was the AI's ability to help students identify areas for improvement, guiding them toward focused revision.
- Many participants also reported improved concept understanding and an efficient, quick learning process.
- Some students felt that the AI encouraged learning motivation and increased confidence in subject knowledge.

Challenges Faced:

- Most participants reported no challenges, indicating a generally smooth experience.
- The most common issue was a lack of clarity in how to use the AI tools effectively.
- Additional challenges included first-time VR experience difficulties and questions appearing before the related subject was taught (i.e., as part of the diagnostic)

These insights suggest that while AI-driven personalization was beneficial for identifying weaknesses and improving engagement, there is room for improvement in usability and instructional clarity.

How would you rate the AI's effectiveness in helping you identify your strengths and areas for improvement?

10 responses




Figure 34: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - AI's Effectiveness in Identifying Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Participants rated the AI's effectiveness in helping them identify their strengths and areas for improvement. The majority (50%) found the AI very effective (4), while 20% rated it as extremely effective (5). A smaller portion (30%) rated it as moderately effective (3), and no participants rated it as slightly effective (2) or not effective at all (1). These results suggest that the AI was generally successful in guiding students toward self-assessment, though some felt its effectiveness could be improved further.

6.2.3.4 Perceived Usefulness

To what extent do you believe VR simulations did enhance your understanding of complex concepts?

10 responses




Figure 35: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Usefulness of VR Simulations for Understanding Complex Concepts

Participants rated how VR simulations enhanced their understanding of complex concepts. The majority (60%) found them very useful (4), while 30% rated them as extremely useful (5). A smaller portion (10%) rated VR as moderately useful (3), and no participants found it slightly useful (2) or not useful at all (1). These results indicate that VR simulations were highly effective in supporting learning, with most students finding them a valuable tool for grasping complex concepts.

Did you find that the personalized feedback from the AI tutor was beneficial to your learning?

10 responses




Figure 36: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Benefit of AI Tutor's Personalized Feedback

Participants rated the benefit of personalized feedback from the AI tutor for their learning. The majority (60%) found the feedback very beneficial (4), while 20% rated it as extremely beneficial (5). Another 20% considered it somewhat beneficial (3), and no participants rated it as slightly beneficial (2) or not beneficial at all (1). These results suggest that the AI tutor's personalized feedback was well-received, with most students finding it a valuable tool for improving their learning process.

Do you find that the personalized recommendations from the HECO system were beneficial to your learning?

10 responses




Figure 37: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Benefit of AI Tutor's Personalized Feedback

In Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey, participants assessed how beneficial the personalized feedback from the AI tutor was for their learning. The majority (60%) rated it as very beneficial (4), while 20% found it extremely beneficial (5). Another 20% considered it somewhat beneficial (3), with no participants rating it as slightly beneficial (2) or not beneficial at all (1). These results suggest that the AI tutor's personalized feedback was well-received, playing a key role in helping students enhance their understanding and learning process.

How useful did you find the AI-driven adaptivity in achieving your learning goals?

10 responses




Figure 38: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI-Driven Adaptivity in Achieving Learning Goals

Participants rated the usefulness of AI-driven adaptivity in achieving their learning goals. The majority (60%) found it very useful (4), while 10% rated it as extremely useful (5). Another 30% considered it moderately useful (3), with no participants rating it as slightly useful (2) or not useful at all (1). These results indicate that AI adaptivity played a significant role in supporting students' learning goals, though there is room for improvement to make it even more impactful.

6.2.4 User Satisfaction

6.2.4.1 Overall User Satisfaction

Overall, how satisfied are you with your learning experience using HECOF?

10 responses




Figure 39: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Overall Satisfaction with HECOF Learning Experience

Participants rated their overall satisfaction with their learning experience using HECOF. The majority (80%) reported being satisfied (4), while 20% were very satisfied (5). No participants rated their experience as neutral (3), somewhat dissatisfied (2), or very dissatisfied (1). These results indicate a high level of satisfaction among students, suggesting that HECOF was effective in delivering a positive and engaging learning experience.

How likely are you to recommend HECOF to other students?

10 responses




Figure 40: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Likelihood of Recommending HECOF to Other Students

Participants rated how likely they were to recommend HECOF to other students. The majority (50%) indicated they were likely (4) to recommend it, while 40% were very likely (5). A small percentage (10%) remained neutral (3), and no participants rated their likelihood as unlikely (2) or very unlikely (1). These results suggest that HECOF was generally well-received, with most students willing to recommend it to their peers.

6.2.4.2 Usability of Learning Loops and VR Experiences

How easy was it to progress through learning loops experiences without interruptions or technical issues?

10 responses




Figure 41: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Progression Through Learning Loops Without Interruptions

Participants rated how easy it was to progress through learning loops without interruptions or technical issues. The majority (50%) found it very easy (5), while 20% rated it as easy (4). Another 20% remained neutral (3), and 10% found it difficult (2). No participants rated their experience as very difficult (1). These results suggest that most students had a smooth learning experience, but a small portion encountered some challenges or disruptions.

How would you rate the usability of the VR features in facilitating a comfortable learning experience?

10 responses




Figure 42: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usability of VR Features for a Comfortable Learning Experience

Participants rated the usability of the VR features in facilitating a comfortable learning experience. The majority (70%) rated the usability as excellent (5), while 20% found it very good (4). A smaller portion (10%) rated it as good (3), with no participants rating the experience as fair (2) or poor (1). These results indicate that the VR features were highly effective in providing a comfortable and user-friendly learning experience for most students.

6.2.5 System Usability

6.2.5.1 Overall System Usability

How intuitive do you find the navigation within the HECOF platform?

10 responses




Figure 43: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Intuitiveness of Navigation in the HECOF Platform

Participants rated the intuitiveness of navigation within the HECOF platform. The majority of responses were distributed across neutral (30%), easy (30%), and very easy (30%), suggesting that most users found the platform relatively straightforward to navigate. However, 10% of participants found navigation difficult (2), while no one rated it as very difficult (1). These results indicate that while the platform was generally intuitive for most users, some encountered minor difficulties that could be addressed for a smoother experience.

6.2.5.2 Virtual AI Tutor Usability and Usefulness

Do you feel that the system's AI tutor (chatbot) was easy to understand and use?

10 responses




Figure 44: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using the AI Tutor (Chatbot)

Participants rated how easy the AI tutor (chatbot) was to understand and use. The majority (40%) agreed (4) that the chatbot was easy to use, while 30% strongly agreed (5). Another 20% remained neutral (3), while 10% disagreed (2). No participants strongly disagreed (1). These results suggest that most students found the AI tutor user-friendly, but a small portion encountered some usability challenges that could be refined for better accessibility.

6.2.5.3 Learning Analytics usability

Do you feel that the system's analytics tools were easy to understand and use?

10 responses




Figure 45: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using System Analytics Tools

Participants rated the ease of understanding and using the system's analytics tools. The majority (60%) agreed (4) that the tools were user-friendly, while 20% strongly agreed (5). Another 20% remained neutral (3), and no participants disagreed (2) or strongly disagreed (1). These results indicate that most users found the analytics tools accessible and intuitive, but a few participants felt there was room for improvement in clarity and usability.

6.2.5.4 Learning Loops Usability

Do you feel that the system's learning loops experiences (i.e., guided mastery, revision, think-pair-share) were easy to understand and use?

10 responses




Figure 46: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using Learning Loops

Participants rated the ease of understanding and using the system's learning loops experiences (guided mastery, revision, think-pair-share, etc.). The majority (50%) agreed (4) that the learning loops were easy to use, while 10% strongly agreed (5). Another 40% remained neutral (3), with no participants disagreeing (2) or strongly disagreeing (1). These results suggest that most students found the learning loops accessible and functional, but a significant portion remained neutral, indicating potential areas for refinement to improve usability.

6.2.5.5 VR Usability

How intuitive do you find the Virtual Lab exercise?




Figure 47: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Intuitiveness of the Virtual Lab Exercise with VR and PC

Participants rated the intuitiveness of the Virtual Lab exercise using both a VR headset and a PC. For the VR headset, responses were split, with some participants finding it very easy (5) while others did not interact with it. For the PC version, participants generally rated it as neutral (3), easy (4), or very easy (5), suggesting a more consistent usability experience compared to the VR version. These results indicate that while the Virtual Lab was generally considered intuitive, there were differences in ease of use between the VR and PC versions, with VR posing some challenges for some users.

6.2.5.6 Virtual AI Tutor Usability and Usefulness

How useful was the AI-based adaptive learning recommendations and learning loops in guiding your learning and helping you identify areas for improvement?

10 responses




Figure 48: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI-Based Adaptive Learning Recommendations

Participants rated the usefulness of AI-based adaptive learning recommendations and learning loops in guiding their learning and identifying areas for improvement. The majority (60%) found them very useful (4), while 20% rated them as extremely useful (5). Another 20% considered them moderately useful (3), with no participants rating them as slightly useful (2) or not useful at all (1). These results suggest that AI-driven adaptivity played a significant role in enhancing students' learning experiences, with most finding it a valuable tool for improvement.

How useful was the AI tutor in giving answers to your questions in the chat and helping you improve your knowledge?

10 responses




Figure 49: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI Tutor in Answering Questions and Enhancing Knowledge

How easy was it to interact with the AI-based adaptive learning technology and understand its recommendations?

10 responses




Figure 50: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Interaction with AI-Based Adaptive Learning Technology

Participants rated the ease of interacting with the AI-based adaptive learning technology and understanding its recommendations. The majority (70%) found it easy to use (4), while 20% rated it as very easy (5). One participant (10%) remained neutral (3), and no participants found it difficult (2) or very difficult (1). These results suggest that the AI-based adaptivity was generally user-friendly and accessible, though some minor improvements could enhance clarity and interaction.

How easy was it to interact with the AI tutor (i.e., chatbot) and understand its answers.

10 responses




Figure 51: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Interaction with the AI Tutor (Chatbot)

Participants rated the ease of interacting with the AI tutor (chatbot) and understanding its answers. The majority (60%) found it easy to use (4), while 20% rated it as very easy (5). A small percentage (10%) remained neutral (3), while another 10% found it very difficult (1), with no participants selecting difficult (2). These results suggest that while most students found the AI tutor accessible and understandable, some faced challenges that may require improvements in clarity and responsiveness.

6.2.6 Social Presence and Interactions

How often did you experience meaningful interaction with teachers using the HECOF system or during the use of HECOF system?

10 responses




Figure 52: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Frequency of Meaningful Interactions with Teachers

Participants rated the frequency of meaningful interactions with teachers while using the HECOF system. The majority (60%) reported that they sometimes (3) experienced meaningful interactions, while 30% found them to occur often (4). A small percentage (10%) indicated they never (1) had meaningful interactions, with no participants selecting rarely (2) or very often (5). These results suggest that while some teacher-student engagement took place, there is room for improvement in fostering more frequent and meaningful interactions.

Did the HECOF system help you feel connected to other students?

10 responses




Figure 53: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Student Connection Through HECOF

In Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey, participants rated the extent to which the HECOF system helped them feel connected to other students. The majority (50%) remained neutral (3) on the system's ability to foster peer connection, while 30% agreed (4) that it helped them feel connected. A smaller proportion (20%) disagreed (2), and no participants strongly agreed (5) or strongly disagreed (1). These findings suggest that while HECOF provided some level of student connectivity, there is potential for enhancement in fostering a more interactive and collaborative learning environment.

6.2.7 Students' Recommendations and Feedback

6.2.7.1 Students' Improvement Recommendations for HECOF

Participants provided diverse recommendations for enhancing the HECOF system, particularly regarding VR experiences, AI adaptivity, and overall usability. Several responses highlighted the need for improving the VR environment, suggesting enhanced graphics and physics to create a more realistic and user-friendly experience. Additionally, some recommended increasing the complexity of the VR simulations, considering that the system is designed for adult learners.

Regarding AI-driven adaptivity, suggestions included better question structuring, and more interactive learning approaches. A common concern was the difficulty in locating lesson introductions and key learning materials, with some participants advocating for brief introductory slides in each lesson to provide clearer guidance.

The usability and accessibility of HECOF were also discussed, with proposals for allowing both hands to be used simultaneously in the VR lab, integrating a voice feature in the chatbot for greater inclusivity, and offering a less guided experience to encourage independent exploration and problem-solving. While some found the system well-organized, they expressed the need for a balance between structured learning and self-directed discovery.

These insights provide actionable areas for improvement, emphasizing the importance of realistic and engaging VR environments, refined AI personalization, and enhanced usability features to optimize the learning experience in HECOF.

6.2.7.2 Key Moments where the HECOF system made Learning Easier or More Rewarding

Key Moments Where HECOF Made Learning Easier or More Rewarding




Figure 54: Evaluation 1 - Post-survey: word-cloud - Key moments where HECOF made learning easier or more rewarding

Participants highlighted several key moments where the HECOF system made learning easier or more rewarding. The VR simulation was frequently mentioned as a pivotal experience, providing an immersive and interactive way to apply theoretical knowledge in real time. Many students found the VR Lab course particularly engaging, as it allowed them to visualize and reinforce learning. Additionally, adaptive quizzes were identified as rewarding, especially with elements like the Learning Profile updates and grading at the end of quizzes, which provided immediate feedback and a sense of accomplishment. Some participants also appreciated the concept completion messages and structured feedback, which contributed to a more guided learning process. The system's overall structure was praised for being well-organized, with many noting how the adaptive elements contributed to a smooth and intuitive learning experience.

6.2.7.3 Additional Suggested Improvements for HECOF

Evaluation 1 - Post-survey: Suggested Features for Improving HECOF




Figure 55: Evaluation 1 - Post-survey word-cloud: Suggested Features for Improving HECOF

Participants suggested additional enhancements to improve the HECOF system. A key theme was increasing interactivity, with multiple respondents advocating for a more engaging learning experience through collaboration in VR lab courses and student-to-student chat features. Another common recommendation was diversifying assessment methods, with requests for a broader range of question types, including long-answer and computational questions, and reducing the repetition of existing questions.

Additionally, participants emphasized the need for improved content, suggesting more visually engaging instructional elements such as short videos, animations, and interactive features that provide additional knowledge incentives for correct answers. Some also recommended refining AI adaptivity to better tailor content to individual learning styles and preferences (taking into consideration that multiple content types should be available). Overall, these suggestions indicate a strong preference for a more dynamic, personalised, and interactive learning experience.

6.2.7.4 Likelihood of Continued Use and Recommendations for HECOF

The responses indicate a strong inclination toward continued use of the HECOF system, particularly for complex subjects that benefit from interactive and immersive learning. Several participants emphasized its effectiveness in making learning more enjoyable and accessible. The VR and AI-driven elements were highlighted as unique features that distinguish HECOF from traditional learning methods.

Many respondents stated they would encourage others to try HECOF, noting its novel approach and ability to simplify difficult concepts. Some mentioned that their future use would depend on their career path, but they would still recommend the system to younger students for its innovative and engaging qualities. This suggests that HECOF has successfully positioned itself as a valuable tool in higher education, especially in technical and engineering-related fields.

6.2.7.5 Memorable Experiences of Overcoming Learning Challenges with HECOF

The responses reveal mixed feedback regarding whether HECOF helped students overcome specific learning challenges. While some participants stated they could not recall a particular moment, others pointed to key features that significantly supported their learning.

The VR simulation was a notable tool for overcoming conceptual barriers, as it allowed students to conduct experiments and fully grasp theoretical concepts in a practical, immersive way. Additionally, the revision of theoretical questions and instant personalized feedback helped reinforce knowledge and correct mistakes in real-time, enhancing understanding.

Although some students did not experience a major learning challenge, the general sentiment suggests that HECOF provides useful resources to tackle difficulties effectively. Its AI-driven feedback and VR-enhanced learning stand out as pivotal in bridging gaps in comprehension and offering tailored guidance.

6.2.7.6 Most Impactful Features of HECOF for Learning Enhancement

The majority of respondents highlighted the VR experience as the most impactful feature of HECOF. The immersive nature of the VR lab course allowed students to engage in hands-on learning, closely simulating real-life laboratory experiences. This feature particularly benefited students who learn best through visualization and interaction, making complex concepts more accessible and easier to retain.

Additionally, revision exercises and personalized chatbot explanations were recognized as valuable tools for reinforcing learning. The AI-driven feedback helped students quickly identify mistakes and understand key concepts without requiring extensive effort, making the learning process more efficient, engaging, and interactive. The overall sentiment suggests that HECOF successfully enhanced the learning experience by integrating adaptive AI feedback and immersive VR simulations.

6.3 User Requirements Refinement

6.3.1 Adaptive Learning platform

Following user feedback and evaluation results, three core areas for refinement have been identified to enhance the AI-based adaptive learning product. These refinements are designed to improve user experience, adaptability, and the overall effectiveness of AI-driven learning. The three areas are:

1. UI/UX Improvements for Learning Loops Navigation
2. Expanded Question Formats – Open Answer as an Additional Content Type
3. User Rating System for AI Chatbot Responses to Assess Quality & Accuracy

1. Refined User Requirements - UI/UX Improvements for Learning Loops Navigation

Summary findings:

- Users reported difficulty in navigating the system
- Some users struggled with transitioning between different learning components

Requirements:

- Improve visual structure and accessibility of key learning loops
- Enhance navigation consistency with clear indicators to move seamlessly between learning components.
- Provide interactive tooltips or a guided walkthrough to help users familiarize themselves with system features.

2. Expanded Question Formats – Open Answer as an Additional Content Type

Summary findings

- Users requested more diverse question types, including open-ended questions to enhance critical thinking.
- Some users found multiple-choice questions repetitive
- There was interest in interactive and applied learning approaches rather than just selecting predefined answers.

Requirements:

- Implement open-ended questions where learners can type and submit their responses, promoting higher-order thinking skills.
- Enable AI-generated feedback on open answers, helping students refine their understanding of concepts.
- Balance multiple-choice with free-text questions to offer a more engaging learning experience.

3. User Rating System for AI Chatbot Responses to Assess Quality & Accuracy

Summary findings

- Some users found AI-generated responses too generic, often rephrasing existing content rather than providing deeper insights.

Requirements:

- Implement a user rating system for AI chatbot responses, enabling learners to evaluate accuracy, clarity, and usefulness.
- Allow users to flag incorrect or unclear responses for review and improvement.
- Use aggregated ratings to continuously refine AI-generated responses based on user feedback.

6.3.2 XR Editor and Lab

Table 1 summarises the VR-Experience requirements refinement to be implemented for evaluation 2 based on evaluation 1 findings. Priority 1 is mandatory, priority 2 is relevant, priority 3 is beneficial, lower priorities topics are not listed.

Prio	Pilot	Topic / Task	Partners involved
1	Both	Startposition in the locker room and transition to the VR Lab conflicted with the physical room. Better physical alignment of both scenarios.	
1	NTUA	Implement Adaptive extraction yield	
1	Both	Implement free exercise (Level 3)	
1	POLIMI	Pass configuration system parameter in Hopper Link (batch, fed-batch, perfusion)	Adaptemy
1	POLIMI	Add connecting tubes from bioreactor to nutrient and harvest tanks. Users should be able to mount them during the assembling process.	
1	POLIMI	Use sliders or knobs to manage flow rates to the bioreactor	
1	POLIMI	Implement the simulation of the effect of flow rate configuration on the experiment	
2	Both	Highlighting of objects during introduction of apparatus	
2	POLIMI	Highlighting of next reactor component to guide the assembling of the bioreactor	
2	Both	Update Materials of existing assets	
2	NTUA	Assure gravity of objects after they have been in a snap field	
3	POLIMI	Lock the position of an element when mounted (during the assembly of the bioreactor): it should not be possible for the user to move or remove it.	
3	NTUA	Prohibit minus values for microwave parameter controls	
3	Both	Improve Mouse Control	
3	POLIMI	Improve position of Power Point control buttons	
3	NTUA	Add Microwave sound effect while it's running	
3	NTUA	Change parameter control buttons to sliders	

Table 3: Evaluation 1 - HECOF VR Lab Requirements refinement

6.3.3 Dashboard

The dashboard developed by SIMAVI was not used in the first pilot evaluation. The cross-platform API will be used also by the Simavi dashboard to connect and get information about all the other components. The information is mainly related to the metrics that are gathered while the students follow a curriculum and then are displayed to the dashboard.

Specific feedback will be available after the second round of evaluation.

6.3.4 Backend

KT's first iteration of the backend and data lake infrastructure was deployed, but not used in the first pilot evaluation, in order to ensure a seamless experience for pilot sessions. Additional components that were not implemented at the time of the first pilot, such as teacher insights and progress metrics, will be included in the second iteration of the backend and second phase of evaluation.

7 Conclusion and Future Work

The HECOF project successfully follows a state-of-the-art hybrid development methodology [2] with Lean UX and a phase driven framework. Co-design was implemented by WP2 (see D2.1) and learning design in WP3 (see D3.1 and D3.2), followed by "Agile development of HECOF system" in WP4 and user testing in WP5.

The document provided an overview of the **HECOF project** (see Section 1 - 3), implementing the digital transformation of education by **utilizing AI and VR**. Based on a mixed-methods approach for **evaluation and monitoring (see section 4)**, the first evaluation preparation, and **implementation** were presented (**see section 5**). With an **overall positive feedback** with excitement on the HECOF implementation and **significant enhancement** of their improvement in learning, confidence in understanding and mastering of topics. With their positive feedback they also provided **valuable insights for improvement** of the initial HECOF version to enhance the co-development towards the final HECOF version. **For details see Section 6 Results.**

With the implementation and analytics of the first evaluation, Milestone MS6 "First evaluation of pilot activities & user requirements refinement" of HECOF was achieved.

Future work of HECOF will be based on this outcome, the agile co-development towards the final HECOF version in **Phase 3.5: Agile Development of MVP2** will be continued. In this phase the functionality of the HECOF System will be updated to initiate **Phase 3.6: Evaluation 2 Running and Monitoring.**

The second evaluation will be conducted at both pilot sites with integration of HECOF into teaching activities. In the final **Phase 3.7: Analytics of the Outcome and Impact Assessment** the outcome of WP5 will be summarised and compiled into **"D5.3 Final evaluation and impact assessment" in M30** to close the activities of WP5 and report about the assessment of the proposed learning environments effectiveness and user satisfaction. This will **achieve milestone MS7 "Second round of pilot activities are implemented"** and support WP1 "Project management and coordination" and WP6 "Communication, dissemination and exploitation" to finalise the project.

List of Tables

Table 1: HECOF Phases overview with a focus on WP5.....	11
Table 2: Piloting and Evaluation Timetable	12
Table 3: Evaluation 1 - HECOF VR Lab Requirements refinement.....	56

List of Figures

Figure 1: Students performing exercises in the HECOF VR Laboratory.....	20
Figure 2: Evaluation 1 - XR Lab Testing by Students at Pilot 1 NTUA.....	21
Figure 3: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - University Distribution of Participants	24
Figure 4: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Age Range of Participants	25
Figure 5: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Gender Distribution of Participants	25
Figure 6: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Education Level of Participants.....	26
Figure 7: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Field of Study Distribution	26
Figure 8: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Familiarity with Virtual Reality Technology	27
Figure 9: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Experience with Adaptive Learning or AI-Powered Educational Tools.....	27
Figure 10: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Word-cloud of Tools and Technologies Used for Learning	28
Figure 11: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Current Usage of Technology for Learning.....	28
Figure 12: Evaluation 1 - Pre-survey - Primary Device Used for Learning	29
Figure 13: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Usefulness of VR Simulations for Learning Complex Concepts.....	29
Figure 14: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Benefit of Personalized Feedback from the AI Tutor.....	30
Figure 15: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Perceived Benefit of Personalized Recommendations from the HECOF System.....	30
Figure 16: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Frequency of Meaningful Interaction with Teachers Using the HECOF System.....	31
Figure 17: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Expected Impact of HECOF on Student Connection.....	31
Figure 18: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Self-efficacy as initial Confidence in Achieving Mastery	32
Figure 19: Evaluation 1 - Pre-Survey - Current Engagement with Learning Methods.....	32
Figure 20: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Improvement in Subject Understanding After Using HECOF	33
Figure 21: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Effectiveness of AI-Based Adaptive Learning in Achieving Learning Goals.....	34
Figure 22: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Helpfulness of HECOF Learning Experiences.....	34
Figure 23: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Learning Experience Using the Virtual Lab with a VR Headset	35
Figure 24: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Learning Experience Using the Virtual Lab Without a Headset (Desktop Version)	36
Figure 25: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Overall Experience with AI-Based Adaptive Learning Technology	36
Figure 26: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Quality of Course Materials	37

Figure 27: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Personalization of Learning Experience Due to AI..	37
Figure 28: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Effectiveness of AI-Based Adaptation of Course Content	38
Figure 29: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Improvement in Confidence in Understanding and Mastering Topics.....	39
Figure 30: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Confidence in Approaching New Learning Challenges Independently.....	39
Figure 31: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Engagement Levels Across HECOF Learning Experiences.....	40
Figure 32: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Engagement with HECOF Compared to Traditional Learning Methods.....	40
Figure 33: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Enjoyment of Learning with HECOF Compared to Traditional Methods.....	41
Figure 34: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - AI's Effectiveness in Identifying Strengths and Areas for Improvement.....	42
Figure 35: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Usefulness of VR Simulations for Understanding Complex Concepts.....	42
Figure 36: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Perceived Benefit of AI Tutor's Personalized Feedback	43
Figure 37: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Benefit of AI Tutor's Personalized Feedback	43
Figure 38: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI-Driven Adaptivity in Achieving Learning Goals	44
Figure 39: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Overall Satisfaction with HECOF Learning Experience.....	44
Figure 40: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Likelihood of Recommending HECOF to Other Students.....	45
Figure 41: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Progression Through Learning Loops Without Interruptions	45
Figure 42: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usability of VR Features for a Comfortable Learning Experience.....	46
Figure 43: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Intuitiveness of Navigation in the HECOF Platform	46
Figure 44: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using the AI Tutor (Chatbot).....	47
Figure 45: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using System Analytics Tools.....	47
Figure 46: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Understanding and Using Learning Loops.....	48
Figure 47: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Intuitiveness of the Virtual Lab Exercise with VR and PC.....	48
Figure 48: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI-Based Adaptive Learning Recommendations	49
Figure 49: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Usefulness of AI Tutor in Answering Questions and Enhancing Knowledge	49
Figure 50: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Interaction with AI-Based Adaptive Learning Technology	50
Figure 51: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Ease of Interaction with the AI Tutor (Chatbot).....	50
Figure 52: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Frequency of Meaningful Interactions with Teachers	51
Figure 53: Evaluation 1 - Post-Survey - Student Connection Through HECOF.....	51
Figure 54: Evaluation 1 - Post-survey: word-cloud - Key moments where HECOF made learning easier or more rewarding.....	52
Figure 55: Evaluation 1 - Post-survey word-cloud: Suggested Features for Improving HECOF	53

References

- [1] HECOF GA, Associated with document Ref. Ares(2022)8365788 - 02/12/2022
- [2] Bianchi, M., Marzi, G., & Guerini, M. (2020) Agile, Stage-Gate and their combination: Exploring how they relate to performance in software development, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.05.003>
- [3] Halkiopoulos, C., & Gkintoni, E. (2024). Leveraging AI in e-learning: Personalized learning and adaptive assessment through cognitive neuropsychology—A systematic analysis. *Electronics*, 13(18), 3762. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3390/electronics13183762>
- [4] Lynch, T., & Ghergulescu, I. (2016). An Evaluation Framework for Adaptive and Intelligent Tutoring Systems. *E-Learn: World Conference on E-Learning in Corporate, Government, Healthcare, and Higher Education* (pp. 1385-1390). Association for the Advancement of Computing in Education (AACE) <https://www.learntechlib.org/primary/p/174082/>
- [5] Matěj Dvořák, et al (2024), "Virtual Reality Sickness and its Impact on the Effectiveness of Virtual Reality Training" <https://journal.esrgroups.org/jes/article/view/5602>

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.



**Co-funded by
the European Union**