WP5-A12

Sustainability and Exploitation Plan for the REMOTE Standards and Implementation Guide

REMOTE
Erasmus+

REMOTE: Assessing and evaluating remote learning practices in STEM

Document Title	WP5-A12 Sustainability and Exploitation Plan for the REMOTE Standards and Implementation Guide
Project title:	REMOTE: Assessing and evaluating remote learning practices in STEM
Programme:	Erasmus +
Action type	KA220-HED – Cooperation Partnerships In higher education
Project Number:	Grant Agreement N°: 2022-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000085829
Authors and Project partners:	By D.A. Maisano, L. Mastrogiacomo and F. Franceschini ***OID*** ***Organisation*** E10209101 Universitat de Girona (UdG) E10186177 Universitat Internacional de Catalunya (UIC) E10209398 Politecnico di Torino (PoliTo) E10032297 Agencia per a la Qualitat del Sistema Universitari de Catalunya (AQU) E10209514 Universidade Do Minho (UMinho) E10262945 Agenzia Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca (ANVUR) E10199535 Agencia De Avaliaçao e Acreditaçao Do Ensino Superior (A3ES)
Project duration:	36 months: 01/11/2022 - 31/10/2025
Project website:	http://epsapp.udg.edu/remote

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.

INDEX

Executive summary 3
1. Purpose, scope, and objectives of the sustainability and exploitation plan 5
1.1. Purpose of A12 within the REMOTE project 5
1.2. Scope: sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide 5
1.3. Target users and stakeholders 6
1.4. Relationship with Deliverable A11 6
2. Main exploitable results of the REMOTE project 7
2.1. REMOTE standards for remote assessment in STEM 7
2.2. Implementation guide for Higher Education Institutions 7
2.3. Added value for quality assurance systems and policy development 8
2.4. Expected long-term impact on remote assessment practices 8
3. Sustainability and exploitation framework 8
3.1. Two-level sustainability model: strategic and operational 9
3.2. Roles of quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions 9
3.3. Continuous improvement as a guiding principle 10
3.4. Alignment with European and international quality assurance frameworks 10
4. Level 1 – Strategic sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards 11
4.1. Objectives of strategic-level sustainability 11
4.2. Key actors and governance structures 11
4.3. Step-by-step sustainability roadmap based on the Deming cycle 12
4.3.1. Planning – defining review priorities and scope 12
4.3.2. Implementation – consultation and piloting 12
4.3.3. Evaluation – analysis of feedback and evidence 13
4.3.4. Improvement – formal revision and adoption 13
4.4. Stakeholder engagement and feedback mechanisms 13
4.5. Review cycles, responsibilities, and indicative timelines 13
4.6. Exploitation through quality assurance and policy processes 14
5. Level 2 – Operational sustainability and exploitation at Higher Education Institution level 14
5.1. Objectives of institutional-level sustainability 14

5.2. Institutional actors and responsibilities 15
5.3. Step-by-step sustainability roadmap based on the Deming cycle 15
5.3.1. Planning – alignment with updated REMOTE standards 15
5.3.2. Implementation – updating assessment systems and practices 15
5.3.3. Evaluation – monitoring indicators and collecting evidence 16
5.3.4. Improvement – corrective actions and enhancement 16
5.4. Use of the REMOTE implementation guide as a reference tool 16
5.5. Institutional timelines, milestones, and reporting 16
5.6. Integration into internal quality assurance systems 16
6. Coordination between strategic and operational levels 17
6.1. Feedback flows from Higher Education Institutions to quality assurance agencies 17
6.2. Use of implementation evidence to inform standards revision 18
6.3. Ensuring coherence between updated standards and institutional practices 18
6.4. Governance and communication mechanisms 18
6.5. Closing the sustainability loop 19
7. Risk analysis and mitigation measures for sustainability 19
7.1. Strategic-level risks and mitigation strategies 19
7.2. Institutional-level risks and mitigation strategies 20
7.3. Ensuring continuity beyond the project lifetime 21
8. Long-term sustainability, dissemination, and exploitation strategy 21
8.1. Integration into regular quality assurance cycles and accreditation processes 22
8.2. Dissemination through quality assurance networks and professional communities 22
8.3. Synergies with future European and international initiatives 22
8.4. Updating mechanisms beyond the REMOTE project duration 23
9. Conclusions and practical recommendations 23

Sustainability and Exploitation Plan for the REMOTE Standards and Implementation Guide

31th of October 2025

Executive summary

The increasing use of remote and hybrid assessment in higher education, particularly in STEM disciplines, requires not only robust quality frameworks but also mechanisms to ensure their long-term relevance and effective use. In this context, the REMOTE project developed a set of standards and an associated implementation guide to support high-quality remote assessment practices. Deliverable A12 builds on these results by defining a sustainability and exploitation plan that ensures their continued validity, adoption, and improvement beyond the project lifetime.

This document addresses sustainability and exploitation at two complementary levels. At strategic level, it focuses on the long-term maintenance, review, and policy-oriented exploitation of the REMOTE standards by national, European, and international quality assurance organisations. At operational level, it addresses the sustained use and continuous updating of remote assessment systems within higher education institutions, based on the latest approved version of the standards and implementation guide.

The sustainability and exploitation plan is structured around a continuous improvement logic inspired by the Deming cycle. At both levels, sustainability is achieved through planned review, evidence-based evaluation, stakeholder engagement, and systematic improvement. Feedback from institutional implementation plays a central role in informing strategic updates, while updated standards guide institutional enhancement.

The document identifies the REMOTE standards and the implementation guide as the main exploitable results of the project and outlines how they can be embedded into quality assurance processes, accreditation frameworks, and institutional quality systems. By doing so, the plan supports coherence between internal and external quality assurance and promotes transparency, comparability, and trust in remote assessment practices.

By providing a structured and realistic approach to sustainability and exploitation, this deliverable ensures that the REMOTE project outcomes evolve from project-based outputs into stable, widely used reference frameworks. Through coordinated action by quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions, the REMOTE standards can continue to support the development of fair, transparent, and high-quality remote assessment in STEM over the long term.

This work has been developed by the partnership of the Erasmus+ co-funded project 'REMOTE: Assessing and evaluating remote learning practices in STEM'

1. Purpose, scope, and objectives of the sustainability and exploitation plan

The starting point of the sustainability and exploitation plan is the clarification of its purpose, scope, and objectives. These elements define how the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide are intended to be maintained, updated, and used beyond the project lifetime, ensuring long-term relevance and impact in the field of remote assessment in STEM.

1.1. Purpose of A12 within the REMOTE project

The purpose of Deliverable A12 is to define a structured and realistic plan to ensure the sustainability and exploitation of the main results of the REMOTE project, namely the REMOTE standards for remote assessment in STEM and their associated implementation guide.

The plan translates sustainability into concrete processes, responsibilities, and timelines, enabling project partners, quality assurance agencies, and higher education institutions to maintain, update, and operationalise the REMOTE framework over time. In doing so, A12 complements the implementation roadmap presented in A11 by extending its logic beyond initial adoption towards long-term consolidation and continuous improvement.

1.2. Scope: sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide

The scope of this document is limited to the sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide. Sustainability is understood as the capacity of these outputs to remain relevant, usable, and aligned with evolving pedagogical, technological, and regulatory contexts. Exploitation refers to their systematic use in quality assurance processes, institutional practice, and policy development.

The plan explicitly addresses sustainability at two interrelated levels:

- A **strategic level**, focused on the review, updating, and policy-oriented exploitation of the REMOTE standards by national, European, and international quality assurance organisations;
- An **operational level**, focused on the continuous use and updating of remote assessment systems within higher education institutions, based on the latest approved version of the standards and guidelines.

The document does not introduce new standards or technical specifications. Instead, it provides a framework for ensuring that existing project results remain active reference tools over time.

1.3. Target users and stakeholders

The sustainability and exploitation plan is addressed to a broad set of stakeholders involved in quality assurance and assessment in higher education.

Primary target users include:

- National quality assurance agencies responsible for accreditation, evaluation, and audit processes;
- European and international quality assurance organisations, particularly ENQA and INQAAHE;
- Higher education institutions delivering STEM programmes and responsible for assessment design and quality assurance.

Secondary stakeholders include academic staff, students, institutional leaders, policy makers, and external partners such as employers or professional bodies, whose feedback and experience contribute to the continuous improvement of the REMOTE framework.

By addressing both quality assurance bodies and higher education institutions, the plan supports a shared understanding of sustainability responsibilities across the higher education ecosystem.

1.4. Relationship with Deliverable A11

Deliverable A12 is closely aligned with Deliverable A11, which provides a roadmap for the implementation of the REMOTE standards at institutional level. While A11 focuses on how to implement the standards, A12 focuses on how to sustain and exploit them over time.

Together, the two deliverables form a coherent framework: A11 supports structured and quality-assured adoption of the REMOTE standards, while A12 ensures that this adoption evolves into long-term, embedded practice supported by continuous review, feedback, and improvement at both strategic and operational levels.

2. Main exploitable results of the REMOTE project

The REMOTE project has produced a set of coherent and interrelated results aimed at improving the quality, transparency, and reliability of remote assessment in STEM in higher education. These results constitute the basis for sustainability and exploitation activities and are intended to be used beyond the project lifetime by quality assurance agencies, higher education institutions, and other stakeholders.

2.1. REMOTE standards for remote assessment in STEM

The core exploitable result of the project is the set of REMOTE standards for remote assessment in STEM. The standards define a structured quality framework covering governance, assessment design, technological infrastructure, capacity building, interaction, integrity, accessibility, information management, and public information.

Each standard is articulated through indicators and minimum evidence requirements, enabling both implementation and evaluation. This structure supports consistent interpretation across institutions and quality assurance contexts and makes the standards suitable for use in accreditation, evaluation, and internal quality assurance processes.

As a shared reference framework, the REMOTE standards are designed to be adaptable to different national and institutional contexts while maintaining a common understanding of quality expectations in remote assessment.

2.2. Implementation guide for Higher Education Institutions

A second key exploitable result is the implementation guide for higher education institutions, developed in Deliverable A11. The guide translates the REMOTE standards into a practical, step-by-step roadmap that institutions can use to design, implement, monitor, and improve remote assessment systems in STEM.

By linking standards to implementation phases, indicators, and evidence, the guide supports operational adoption and facilitates institutional self-evaluation. It also provides a common language for dialogue between institutions and external quality assurance agencies.

The implementation guide is a critical exploitation instrument, as it lowers barriers to adoption and supports consistent and sustainable use of the REMOTE standards in institutional practice.

2.3. Added value for quality assurance systems and policy development

Beyond their direct use by higher education institutions, the REMOTE standards and implementation guide provide added value for quality assurance systems and policy development.

For quality assurance agencies, the framework offers a structured basis for evaluating remote and hybrid assessment practices, supporting consistency, transparency, and comparability across evaluations. It can be used to complement existing standards and guidelines, particularly in contexts where remote assessment is expanding rapidly.

For policy makers, the project results provide evidence-based guidance on quality requirements for remote assessment in STEM, supporting informed decision-making at national and European level.

2.4. Expected long-term impact on remote assessment practices

The long-term impact of the REMOTE project is expected to materialise through the sustained use and continuous updating of its main results. By providing a stable yet adaptable quality framework, the project supports a shift from ad hoc or emergency remote assessment practices towards systematic, transparent, and pedagogically sound approaches.

Through strategic exploitation by quality assurance agencies and operational adoption by higher education institutions, the REMOTE standards and implementation guide can contribute to improved assessment quality, enhanced trust in remote assessment outcomes, and greater alignment across the European and international higher education landscape.

3. Sustainability and exploitation framework

The sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE project results require a coherent framework that links strategic policy development with operational institutional practice. This framework provides the conceptual structure underpinning the roadmaps presented in Sections 5 and 6 and clarifies how sustainability is organised, governed, and monitored over time.

The framework is based on a two-level model and a continuous improvement logic, ensuring that the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide remain relevant, usable, and aligned with evolving quality assurance expectations.

3.1. Two-level sustainability model: strategic and operational

Sustainability of the REMOTE standards is organised across two interdependent levels.

The **strategic level** focuses on the long-term maintenance, revision, and policy-oriented exploitation of the REMOTE standards and guidelines. This level is led by national, European, and international quality assurance organisations and ensures that the standards remain aligned with regulatory frameworks, educational policies, and emerging developments in remote assessment.

The **operational level** focuses on the continuous use, monitoring, and improvement of remote assessment systems within higher education institutions. At this level, sustainability is embedded in institutional governance, assessment design, support services, and internal quality assurance systems.

The interaction between these two levels ensures that standards are informed by institutional practice and that institutional practices evolve in line with updated quality expectations.

3.2. Roles of quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions

Quality assurance agencies and higher education institutions have complementary responsibilities within the sustainability framework.

Quality assurance agencies are responsible for:

- Coordinating the review and updating of the REMOTE standards;
- Integrating the standards into external quality assurance processes;
- Facilitating stakeholder consultation and dissemination;
- Ensuring coherence across national and international contexts.

Higher education institutions are responsible for:

- Implementing the REMOTE standards using the latest approved version;
- Embedding remote assessment into internal quality assurance systems;
- Generating evidence and feedback based on institutional practice;
- Contributing to continuous improvement through structured reporting and evaluation.

Clear role definition supports accountability and avoids duplication of effort.

3.3. Continuous improvement as a guiding principle

Continuous improvement is the central principle underpinning sustainability and exploitation. The framework adopts a cyclical approach inspired by the Deming cycle, linking planning, implementation, evaluation, and improvement at both strategic and institutional levels.

At strategic level, this cycle supports periodic review and updating of standards based on evidence from practice. At institutional level, it supports systematic enhancement of assessment systems in response to updated standards and internal evaluation results.

This shared improvement logic ensures alignment between policy development and operational practice.

3.4. Alignment with European and international quality assurance frameworks

To ensure legitimacy and long-term uptake, the sustainability framework is aligned with existing European and international quality assurance frameworks. In particular, the REMOTE standards are designed to complement the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG) and to be compatible with quality assurance practices promoted by ENQA and INQAAHE.

This alignment facilitates integration into existing accreditation and evaluation processes and supports cross-border recognition and comparability of remote assessment practices.

4. Level 1 – Strategic sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards

(European, national, and international level)

This level addresses the long-term sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide as a shared reference framework for quality assurance in remote assessment in STEM. It focuses on policy-oriented, strategic actions aimed at ensuring that the standards remain current, credible, and aligned with evolving educational, technological, and regulatory contexts.

Sustainability at this level is achieved through structured review, stakeholder engagement, and continuous improvement processes coordinated by quality assurance organisations at national, European, and international level.

4.1. Objectives of strategic-level sustainability

The objectives of sustainability and exploitation at strategic level are to:

- Ensure the long-term validity, relevance, and credibility of the REMOTE standards;
- Integrate the REMOTE standards into national, European, and international quality assurance frameworks;
- Establish structured mechanisms for regular review and updating of the standards and implementation guide;
- Promote consistent interpretation and use of the standards across countries and institutions;
- Exploit implementation evidence from higher education institutions to inform policy development and standards revision.

4.2. Key actors and governance structures

Strategic sustainability relies on coordinated action by established quality assurance organisations, each operating at a different level:

- **National Quality Assurance Agencies (NQAs)**, responsible for applying and contextualising the REMOTE standards within national regulatory frameworks and accreditation processes;

- **ENQA**, acting as a coordination and reference point at European level, supporting coherence, comparability, and alignment with the European Standards and Guidelines (ESG);
- **INQAAHE**, facilitating global dissemination, dialogue, and alignment with international quality assurance practices.

Clear governance arrangements should define responsibilities for coordination, decision-making, and revision of the standards, avoiding fragmentation and duplication of effort.

4.3. Step-by-step sustainability roadmap based on the Deming cycle

Strategic sustainability follows a cyclical process inspired by the Deming cycle of continuous improvement.

4.3.1. Planning – defining review priorities and scope

At the planning stage, quality assurance organisations jointly define:

- The scope of the review (full revision or targeted update of specific standards or indicators);
- Emerging trends in remote assessment in stem, including technological developments, pedagogical innovations, and regulatory changes;
- Priorities based on evidence from institutional implementation and external evaluations;
- Timelines and responsibilities for the review process.

This phase may be coordinated at European or international level to ensure coherence, while allowing national contextualisation.

4.3.2. Implementation – consultation and piloting

During implementation, draft revisions of the REMOTE standards and guidelines are developed and tested through:

- Structured consultations with stakeholders, including heis, students, academic staff, QA professionals, employers, and technology providers;
- Analysis of implementation reports and evidence submitted by heis;
- Pilot applications of revised standards in selected accreditation or evaluation exercises.

This phase ensures that proposed updates are grounded in real institutional practice and are feasible across diverse contexts.

4.3.3. Evaluation – analysis of feedback and evidence

Evaluation focuses on assessing the effectiveness and clarity of the revised standards by:

- Analysing feedback from consultation and pilot activities;
- Identifying ambiguities, overlaps, or gaps in standards, indicators, or evidence requirements;
- Reviewing consistency with existing qa frameworks, including the esg and relevant international guidelines.

Findings are documented and used as the basis for informed decision-making.

4.3.4. Improvement – formal revision and adoption

The improvement phase leads to:

- Formal approval of updated versions of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide;
- Publication and dissemination through QA networks and official communication channels;
- Definition of transition arrangements, including guidance on the adoption of updated standards by HEIs.

This closes the cycle and initiates a new planning phase for future reviews.

4.4. Stakeholder engagement and feedback mechanisms

Sustainable exploitation of the REMOTE standards depends on systematic stakeholder engagement. Quality assurance organisations should establish permanent feedback mechanisms, such as surveys, thematic workshops, and expert panels, to collect input from:

- Students and student representative bodies;
- Academic and assessment staff;
- Institutional leadership and qa units;
- External stakeholders, including employers and professional bodies.

Stakeholder input ensures legitimacy, transparency, and responsiveness of the standards over time.

4.5. Review cycles, responsibilities, and indicative timelines

Strategic review cycles should be regular and predictable, for example every three to five years, with the possibility of interim updates in response to major developments.

Responsibilities for coordination, drafting, consultation, and approval should be clearly assigned, and indicative timelines communicated to all stakeholders.

4.6. Exploitation through quality assurance and policy processes

Exploitation at strategic level occurs through the systematic use of the REMOTE standards in:

- Accreditation, evaluation, and audit procedures;
- Policy development related to digital education and assessment;
- Capacity-building activities for QA professionals and institutions.

Through these mechanisms, the REMOTE standards become embedded in long-term quality assurance practice rather than remaining a project-based output.

5. Level 2 – Operational sustainability and exploitation at Higher Education Institution level

(Institutional implementation of updated REMOTE standards)

This level focuses on the sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards within individual higher education institutions. It translates updated standards and guidelines into continuous institutional practice, ensuring that remote assessment systems evolve in line with external quality expectations.

Sustainability at this level is operational and tactical, embedded in institutional governance, assessment design, and quality assurance systems.

5.1. Objectives of institutional-level sustainability

The objectives of sustainability and exploitation at HEI level are to:

- Ensure continued alignment of institutional remote assessment systems with the latest REMOTE standards;
- Integrate remote assessment into regular institutional quality assurance and review cycles;
- Use implementation evidence to improve assessment practices over time;
- Ensure consistency, transparency, and fairness in remote assessment across programmes.

5.2. Institutional actors and responsibilities

Operational sustainability requires the coordinated involvement of:

- Institutional leadership, responsible for strategic alignment and resource allocation;
- Academic units and programme teams, responsible for assessment design and delivery;
- Quality assurance units, coordinating monitoring, evidence collection, and reporting;
- Technical and support services, ensuring reliability, accessibility, and user support.

Clear allocation of responsibilities supports continuity and accountability.

5.3. Step-by-step sustainability roadmap based on the Deming cycle

At institutional level, sustainability also follows a cyclical improvement process.

5.3.1. Planning – alignment with updated REMOTE standards

Institutions begin by analysing the most recent version of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide. This includes:

- Mapping existing assessment policies and practices against updated standards;
- Identifying gaps, priorities, and risks;
- Defining an institutional action plan with responsibilities, timelines, and milestones.

5.3.2. Implementation – updating assessment systems and practices

Implementation focuses on:

- Updating assessment regulations, procedures, and guidance;
- Adapting assessment methods, tools, and platforms as required;

- Providing targeted training and support for staff and students.

Actions are proportionate to institutional context while ensuring coverage of all relevant standards and indicators.

5.3.3. Evaluation – monitoring indicators and collecting evidence

Evaluation is based on the systematic monitoring of indicators associated with the REMOTE standards. Institutions collect and analyse evidence such as:

- Policy documents and assessment artefacts;
- Platform usage data and technical reports;
- Feedback from students and staff.

Findings are documented and reviewed by appropriate governance bodies.

5.3.4. Improvement – corrective actions and enhancement

Based on evaluation results, institutions define and implement improvement actions. These may include revisions of assessment design, additional training initiatives, technological upgrades, or refinements of support services.

Improvement actions and outcomes are documented, closing the quality loop and informing subsequent planning cycles.

5.4. Use of the REMOTE implementation guide as a reference tool

The implementation guide developed in A11 serves as the primary operational reference for institutions. It supports consistent interpretation of standards, facilitates internal coordination, and provides a shared language for dialogue with external quality assurance agencies.

5.5. Institutional timelines, milestones, and reporting

Institutions should define realistic timelines for sustainability activities, aligned with academic cycles and quality assurance processes. Milestones and progress reports support internal accountability and facilitate external review.

5.6. Integration into internal quality assurance systems

Long-term sustainability is achieved when the REMOTE standards are fully embedded in institutional quality assurance systems, programme reviews, and assessment regulations. This integration ensures that remote assessment remains subject to continuous monitoring and improvement beyond the project lifetime.

6. Coordination between strategic and operational levels

The sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards depend on effective coordination between the strategic level, where standards are reviewed and updated, and the operational level, where they are implemented and tested in institutional practice. This coordination ensures that standards remain grounded in real-world experience while providing stable and coherent guidance to higher education institutions.

The two levels should not operate in isolation. Instead, they form a continuous feedback system in which institutional implementation informs strategic revision, and updated standards guide institutional improvement.

6.1. Feedback flows from Higher Education Institutions to quality assurance agencies

Higher education institutions play a central role in generating evidence on the applicability, clarity, and impact of the REMOTE standards. This evidence constitutes the primary input for strategic-level review and updating.

Institutions should provide structured feedback to national quality assurance agencies through:

- Self-evaluation reports and internal quality assurance documentation;
- Evidence collected during accreditation, evaluation, or audit procedures;
- Summaries of implementation challenges, good practices, and innovative solutions;
- Feedback from students, academic staff, and support services.

National quality assurance agencies act as intermediaries, consolidating institutional feedback and transmitting it to European and international coordination bodies. This aggregation process ensures that strategic revisions are informed by a diverse and representative range of institutional contexts.

6.2. Use of implementation evidence to inform standards revision

Evidence collected at institutional level should be systematically analysed at strategic level to identify:

- Indicators that are difficult to operationalise or interpret;
- Evidence requirements that are disproportionate or insufficient;
- Emerging practices that warrant formal recognition in the standards;
- Areas where technological or regulatory developments require updated guidance.

The use of implementation evidence strengthens the legitimacy and practicality of the REMOTE standards, ensuring that revisions are driven by demonstrated needs rather than abstract assumptions.

6.3. Ensuring coherence between updated standards and institutional practices

When revised versions of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide are adopted, coherence must be ensured through clear communication and transition arrangements.

Quality assurance agencies should:

- Clearly document changes between versions of the standards;
- Provide guidance on transition periods and implementation expectations;
- Align accreditation and evaluation criteria with the updated standards.

Higher education institutions, in turn, should:

- Review their assessment systems against the updated standards;
- Integrate required changes into their internal quality assurance cycles;
- Document alignment and improvement actions for internal and external review.

This coordinated approach ensures continuity, avoids disruption, and supports gradual, sustainable improvement rather than abrupt or fragmented change.

6.4. Governance and communication mechanisms

Effective coordination requires formal governance and communication mechanisms, such as:

- Periodic coordination meetings between quality assurance agencies and representative heis;
- Thematic working groups focused on remote assessment in STEM;
- Shared repositories for guidelines, implementation reports, and good practices;
- Transparent communication channels for announcing updates and collecting feedback.

These mechanisms support mutual understanding, trust, and shared ownership of the REMOTE standards as a living framework.

6.5. Closing the sustainability loop

Coordination between strategic and operational levels completes the sustainability loop of the REMOTE framework. Institutional implementation generates evidence and experience; strategic-level bodies analyze and consolidate this input; updated standards and guidance are issued; and institutions adapt their practices accordingly.

By institutionalizing this loop, the REMOTE standards move beyond static project output and become a continuously evolving reference for high-quality remote assessment in STEM, aligned with both policy development and day-to-day educational practice.

7. Risk analysis and mitigation measures for sustainability

The long-term sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide depend on the ability to anticipate, monitor, and mitigate risks at both strategic and institutional levels. This section identifies key risk categories and outlines corresponding mitigation measures, ensuring that sustainability processes remain robust, credible, and adaptable over time.

Risk management should be treated as an integral component of the continuous improvement cycles described in Sections 5 and 6, rather than as a one-off activity.

7.1. Strategic-level risks and mitigation strategies

At strategic level, risks primarily relate to governance, coordination, and long-term relevance of the REMOTE standards.

- **Risk of insufficient coordination among quality assurance organisations.** Fragmentation between national, European, and international bodies may lead to inconsistent interpretation or parallel versions of the standards.

Mitigation measures include the establishment of clear coordination mechanisms, formal roles for ENQA and INQAAHE, and agreed procedures for consultation, revision, and adoption of updated standards.

- **Risk of declining relevance due to technological or pedagogical change.** Rapid developments in digital assessment technologies, artificial intelligence, and pedagogical models may render parts of the standards outdated.

Mitigation measures involve regular review cycles, horizon scanning activities, and targeted interim updates informed by institutional implementation evidence and expert input.

- **Risk of limited stakeholder engagement.** Insufficient involvement of HEIs, students, and academic staff may reduce the legitimacy and usability of revised standards.

Mitigation measures include structured stakeholder consultation processes, transparent communication of review outcomes, and the inclusion of diverse institutional contexts in pilot activities.

- **Risk of weak policy uptake and exploitation.** If the REMOTE standards are not embedded in accreditation and evaluation processes, their long-term exploitation may remain limited.

Mitigation measures consist of formal integration into quality assurance procedures, alignment with existing frameworks such as the ESG, and dissemination through professional QA networks.

7.2. Institutional-level risks and mitigation strategies

At institutional level, risks relate to operational capacity, consistency of implementation, and sustainability of practices.

- **Risk of insufficient institutional capacity or resources.** Limited human, technical, or financial resources may hinder sustained implementation of updated standards.

Mitigation measures include phased implementation approaches, prioritisation of critical standards, alignment with broader digital transformation strategies, and use of shared services or support structures.

- **Risk of resistance to change among academic staff or students.** Perceived increases in workload or concerns about fairness and integrity may limit acceptance of updated assessment practices.

Mitigation measures involve transparent communication, early stakeholder involvement, targeted training, and recognition of staff engagement in remote assessment development.

- **Risk of inconsistent application across programmes or faculties** Variation in implementation may undermine transparency and fairness at institutional level.

Mitigation measures include clear institutional policies, central coordination by quality assurance units, shared guidelines, and periodic internal audits or reviews.

- **Risk of over-compliance and administrative burden**
  Excessive documentation or rigid interpretation of standards may reduce sustainability.

Mitigation measures focus on proportionality, use of existing quality assurance data, and alignment of evidence requirements with institutional processes.

7.3. Ensuring continuity beyond the project lifetime

A cross-cutting risk is the loss of momentum once the REMOTE project formally ends. Without institutionalisation, sustainability efforts may diminish over time.

Mitigation measures include:

- Embedding the REMOTE standards into regular quality assurance cycles and accreditation processes;
- Assigning long-term ownership to established organisations and institutional units;
- Maintaining publicly accessible documentation and guidance;
- Ensuring that review and update responsibilities are clearly allocated and resourced.

By proactively addressing these risks, both strategic actors and higher education institutions can safeguard the long-term sustainability and exploitation of the REMOTE standards and implementation guide.

8. Long-term sustainability, dissemination, and exploitation strategy

The long-term impact of the REMOTE project depends on the systematic dissemination, exploitation, and institutionalisation of its main results. Sustainability is achieved not only through periodic review of the standards, but also through their active use in quality assurance processes, institutional practice, and policy development at European, national, and international level.

This section outlines how the REMOTE standards and implementation guide can be sustained and exploited beyond the project lifetime through structured dissemination, integration into existing frameworks, and alignment with future initiatives.

8.1. Integration into regular quality assurance cycles and accreditation processes

A key sustainability mechanism is the integration of the REMOTE standards into regular quality assurance and accreditation activities. National quality assurance agencies are encouraged to reference the standards in evaluation criteria, guidelines, and review protocols related to remote and hybrid assessment.

At institutional level, higher education institutions should embed the standards into internal quality assurance systems, programme reviews, and assessment regulations. This integration ensures that remote assessment practices are monitored, reviewed, and improved as part of routine quality assurance, rather than as isolated or project-based activities.

Through this dual integration, the REMOTE standards become a stable and recognised reference point across the quality assurance ecosystem.

8.2. Dissemination through quality assurance networks and professional communities

Dissemination is essential to ensure visibility, uptake, and informed use of the REMOTE standards. Strategic dissemination should be coordinated through established networks and communities of practice, including:

- National and European quality assurance networks;
- International associations such as INQAAHE;
- Professional communities focused on digital education, assessment, and STEM pedagogy.

Dissemination activities may include thematic workshops, webinars, conference sessions, and targeted publications. These activities should emphasise practical implementation experiences, lessons learned, and the added value of using a shared standards-based framework.

8.3. Synergies with future European and international initiatives

The sustainability of the REMOTE standards can be reinforced by aligning them with future European and international initiatives in digital education and quality assurance. Potential synergies include:

- European policy initiatives related to digital transformation in higher education;
- International projects addressing online, blended, and flexible learning models;
- Emerging guidelines on the ethical and responsible use of artificial intelligence in assessment.

By positioning the REMOTE standards as a complementary and adaptable framework, they can be reused and extended in new contexts, increasing their exploitation potential and relevance over time.

8.4. Updating mechanisms beyond the REMOTE project duration

Long-term sustainability requires clear mechanisms for updating the standards and implementation guide after the project ends. These mechanisms should include:

- Assignment of responsibility for coordination and maintenance to established quality assurance bodies;
- Defined review cycles and procedures for stakeholder consultation;
- Transparent publication of updated versions and documentation of changes.

The existence of these mechanisms ensures continuity, predictability, and trust, allowing institutions to plan and adapt their practices in line with evolving standards.

9. Conclusions and practical recommendations

This sustainability and exploitation plan has defined a structured approach to ensuring the long-term relevance, use, and continuous improvement of the REMOTE standards and their implementation guide for remote assessment in STEM. Building on the results of the REMOTE project, the document has translated sustainability into concrete processes operating at two complementary levels: a strategic level, led by quality assurance organisations, and an operational level, embedded within higher education institutions.

The plan emphasises that sustainability is not achieved through static preservation of project outputs, but through their active integration into quality assurance systems, policy frameworks, and institutional practices. At strategic level, the REMOTE standards are sustained through coordinated review, stakeholder engagement, and continuous updating, ensuring alignment with evolving pedagogical, technological, and regulatory contexts. At institutional level, sustainability is realised through systematic implementation, monitoring, and improvement cycles that embed the standards into everyday assessment practice.

Several practical recommendations emerge from this approach. Quality assurance agencies should formally integrate the REMOTE standards into accreditation, evaluation, and audit processes related to remote and hybrid assessment, ensuring consistency and transparency across systems. Clear governance arrangements and predictable review cycles are essential to maintain coherence and credibility over time.

Higher education institutions are encouraged to treat the REMOTE standards and implementation guide as living reference tools, used to regularly review and enhance assessment design, delivery, and quality assurance. Embedding these standards into internal quality assurance systems, staff development programmes, and assessment regulations supports sustainable adoption and continuous improvement.

Effective coordination between strategic and operational levels is critical. Feedback loops linking institutional implementation with standards revision ensure that the REMOTE framework remains grounded in practice while providing stable guidance for institutions and evaluators. This coordination strengthens mutual trust between institutions and quality assurance bodies and enhances the legitimacy of the standards.

Finally, the plan underlines the importance of dissemination and exploitation beyond the project lifetime. By leveraging established quality assurance networks, aligning with future European and international initiatives, and assigning long-term ownership to recognised organisations, the REMOTE standards can continue to evolve as a shared reference for high-quality remote assessment in STEM.

Through the implementation of this sustainability and exploitation plan, the REMOTE project outcomes can move beyond a time-bound initiative and contribute enduringly to the development of fair, transparent, and robust remote assessment practices in higher education.