2019_11_18_Project_management_committee

Participants: Antti , Annica, Vera, Tarja, Anu (minutes) Monique, Hanni

Not present: Vera

Agenda and meeting notes

Agenda

1. Previous meetings
    a. The meeting was opened at 14:00
    b. Minutes of the previous project management committee (PMC) on October 28th were accepted.
2. Project road map
    a. Status report following the road map table (finance; progress: key performance indicators; deployment; risk identification)
        i. Road map monthly view
            1. Framework architecture
            2. Analytics
            3. Prototype development:
            4. Communication & dissemination:
            5. Deployment and evaluation
                a. External evaluation: Draft version of the report to be fact checked between November 15th-19th
                b. The WP leaders are in the process of reading and commenting the text at the moment.
                    i. Comments to the newest version, please (linked above)
                    ii. WP leaders aim to add their comments by tomorrow 10 am after which the steering committee will read the evaluation report through.
                c. Fact check for FINEEC to be ready by 19.11.
            6. Project management
                a. Monthly financial figures to be sent to the coordinator
3. Reporting
    a. Deliverables reporting - timeline for reporting

    - To be reported in November - for information
        ○ D8 Project road map (WP1)
        ○ D9 Project management and steering group meetings (WP1)
        ○ D33 Impact evaluation study (including external evaluation by FINEEC) (WP4)
            ▪ Check-up tomorrow
        ○ D38 Presentations and publications (WP5)
            ▪ Egle to check that her conference presentations and papers are included.
        ○ D39 Targeted workshops and seminars in cooperation with WP2 (WP5)
        ○ Additional document: Europass case study
        ○ Steering committee´s meeting notes will be ready today. Only small additions to the deliverables were brought up.
4. Final review
    - Periodic report (second project year) + final report (whole project) ready by January 9th - other deliverables in the original timetable
        a. Flight schedules delivered
        b. Preparation meetings in December / January - Monday afternoons
        c. The objective is to have the final report ready before the Christmas holidays.
            i. Some of the WP leaders find it difficult to find time for reporting in December.
            ii. In order to cope with the situation, the PMC agreed to utilize the previous reporting as much as possible.
            iii. Antti will keep the time slot for weekly meetings (on Mondays at 2 pm) in the calendar in case there is need to get to together to discuss the reporting.
        d. Hanni asked how the final report relate to the external evaluation.
            i. Antti answered that there will be some repetition of course. The final report is from our perspective and we can refer to the external evaluation in the text.
5. Other
    - Edufutura forum Jyväskylä (16.11.)
        ○ Around 30 people attended the workshop. Good feedback.
        ○ Annica will present the project´s results in "osaamisen ennakointifoorumi" organized by EDUFI next week. It will the last official dissemination event of the project.
    - Closing event for the project team members in Helsinki (28.11.)
        a. Let Antti know by tomorrow whether you are going to participate.
    - Sustainability plan: action points
        ○ Please, fill in the table based on the sustainability plan and the additional document "further development of prototype".
6. Closing of the meeting
    a. The meeting was closed at 14:55.

WP LEADERS: Please update the current situation (status report) with each task to this table and add what should be done by next PMC. The traffic lights are assigned to both the previous month (current status) and the next month (foresight) to indicate if the task is on track and how its outlook appears.

Green = Progressing as planned in the modified project plan and roadmap.

Yellow = Delays or deviations. Guidance needed.

Red = Major challenges. Replanning needed.

Main goals and project results	Responsible / Work package	Identified risks (constantly monitored)	Key Performance Indicators (KPI) - measurements	Done by September 16th **Current: Past month**	Status	To be done by October 7th **Foresight: Next month**	Deliverables to be updated
Framework architecture Main architecture aspects and system requirements Ecosystem and modules user scenarios	WP2 • EDUFI: Pauli, Annica • CSC: Ari, Antti, Anu Deployment WP4 • Gradia: Tarja • CSC: Ari, Antti, Anu • EDUFI Pauli, Topias	International deployment: "To tailor the functionality of this framework so that it´s **suitable across Europe**" (Annex I p.3) • suitable, interested international partners missing • "in cooperation with international partners/networks" (Annex I p.4) Is "improved recognition practices" included? (Annex I p.3) "particularly addressing the needs of the citizen at risk of exclusion" - is this clear enough? (Annex I p.4)	Deployment progress monitoring • evaluation events progressing as planned • possible new partners joining deployment • how many of such partners willing to join the deployment in other countries	Minedu, EDUFI, associate partners and Ministry of Labour evaluation workshops held Architecture design updated Workshop in Cologne May 14th • framework evaluation with German stakeholders Updates to current sketches by Pauli / OPH, and further documentation on technical architecture	International deployment Netherlands: It is not possible to download Diploma Data from the Dutch Diploma Register in the Framework because of the lack of information that is available in the Dutch DR to use it properly in the CompLeap Framework. • Work in progress: make a document where these findings are explained.	Deploymetn workshop in Estonia September 18th Virtual workshop in Croatia September 20th Reporting to be finalized	D21 Feedback and specifications to user scenarios D25 Technical documentation, including glossary, model and architecture D27 Pilot deployment of the architecture (Tarja, Ari, Pauli) D30 Report on pilot deployment of architecture (evaluation? Tarja, Topias, Ari, Pauli)
Analytics prototype • Finnish national curriculum (ePerusteet) mapping to ESCO • Recommendation system	WP2 TF-LEA • UOulu: Hanni, Egle, Antti, Abhi • EDUFI: Annica Deployment WP4 • Gradia: Tarja • UOulu: Hanni, Egle, Antti K. • CSC: Antti, Anu • EDUFI Topias	• Legal and other restrains to use actual user data • Preparation of user scenarios suitable to use outside Finland • "Learning environments and analytics form an integrated part of the project proposal to explore the alternative ways to support learner" (Annex I p.4) • "Various feedback loops such as analytics about learner profiles, graduate feedback or national competence requirements" (Annex I p.4)	Development progress monitoring: • progressing in cooperation between UniOulu, EDUFI and Reaktor Deployment progress monitoring • detailed plan for deployment of analytics in additional document M18 where is this? > link (review feedback) • international partners interested and joining Compleap analytics work (measurable)	Uni. Oulu to research and carry out ontology mapping from ePerusteet to Esco Competencies Uni. Oulu found the task of re-classifying ESCO keywords infeasible. This task is not being continued anymore by any project participant. Uni. Oulu will focus on providing user competences based on prior verified education (study units based on Koski data). The task has been discussed together and Uni. Oulu has provided initial results. The results were difficult to evaluate and did not seem to be at an immediately usable level, yet. Further iterations of the task are being carried out by Uni. Oulu at the moment. If the competence break-down is successful, the education unit-based competences can be added to the POC user interface, given sufficient time to do this. Recommendations: Both ePerusteet and Tarjonta services have been crawled for data and prepared for modeling The first version of the recommendations API has been implemented and deployed. The user interface has been connected to use the API and the actual end-to-end functionality has been demoed.	International deployment • Netherlands: Analyse 'How to support Dutch citizen in exploiting data for Live Long Learning'. Item is on the Backlog for DR_team DUO. Resource and finance problem.		D28 Pilot deployment of analytics prototype (Tarja, Antti K., Egle, CSC, EDUFI) D31 Report on pilot deployment of analytics (Egle, Tarja, Hanni, Edufi) D26 Three prototypes (???)

Learner plan prototype incl 3 modules	WP3 / WP4		Development progress	Work in progress and accomplished work	Netherlands	Deliverables

Learner plan prototype incl 3 modules
 	
• Initial functionalities incl. interface, content and associated services
• Reference group review of functionalities
• Finalized definition of functionalities incl. interface, content and associated services
	WP3
	• EDUFI: Annica, Marcus, Outi
	• Reaktor
	
	Deployment
	
	WP4
	• Gradia: Tarja
	• EDUFI: Annica, Topias
	• UOulu:
	• CSC: Antti, Anu
		There is already a substantial backlog of prioritized additional features and other work items; many of these will go beyond the scope of this POC, but can serve as informational artifacts or a possible starting point for future development.
		
		Increasing the number of backlog items at this point is likely not beneficial.
		
		• "Technological solution will be easily adaptable to different geographic locations and circumstances" - is it? (Annex I p.4)
		• "Several separate modules that are connected" (Annex I p.4), "Since each building block would be modular and autonomus"
		• "Iterative development process runs within partner organization in the Netherlands and results in a final product that is the project aimo to implement at least in Finland and Netherlands" (Annex I p.16)
			Development progress
			
			   ◦ development progressing as planned
			
			Deployment progress
			
			• detailed plan for deployment of learner plan in additional document M18 (review feedback)
			• amount of end-users
			• amount of other staff involved
			• international partners interested and joining Compleap learner plan work (measurable)
				Work in progress and accomplished work:
				
				Multiple critical user interface features have already been implemented, deployed to the test environment, and demoed
				
				https://poc.compleap.testiopintopolku.fi/
				
				• Validating the POC's design with the target groups:
				
				  effort ongoing to get to validate the designs with the target user groups
				
				  Preliminary report available here:
				
				• Finding out user interests:
				
				  The user interface for finding out user interests has been designed, implemented and demoed
				
				• Education information for foreigners:
				
				  A design has been done how the lack of Koski information can be compensated for in the case of users with no Koski information (i.e., foreigners' use case)
				
				  The user interface for the design has also been implemented and demoed
				
				  Connecting the user interface to relevant data (i.e., connecting national ISCED classification to corresponding ePerusteet information) has to be done still
				
				National education classification (2016) has been added as the data source for the feature for gathering foreigners' education information.
				
				Koski mock data:
				The usage of Koski mock data (pre-defined user profiles) has been designed, implemented, and demoed.
				The POC comprises four profiles matching the main focused user groups:
				Two profiles: graduated from a vocational institution (nature, arts)
				Two profiles: discontinued vocational studies (technical, social)
					Netherlands:
					
					It is not possible to download Diploma Data from the Dutch Diploma Register in the Framework because of the lack of information that is available in the Dutch DR to use it properly in the CompLeap Framework.
					
					There are a lot of different organisations who has this kind of information. It would be very complex to implement this.
					
					• Work in progress: make a document where these findings are explained.
						D20 Running prototypes in cooperation with WP3
						
						D24 Open source code for all components, including example code
						
						D25 Technical documentation, including glossary, model and architecture
						
						D26 Three prototypes

				User testing: User tests have been carried out with participants from Ohjaamo, Gradia, and test users recruited by Tutkimustie, with the following main findings: No critical problems were found in the interactions of primary functionalities. Especially the section displaying suggested education was deemed useful. Agenda, steering group 5/2019 The group of potential users who would significantly benefit from the version being implemented given the technical and time related restrictions of wp3 is quite small. The test sessions have been debriefed and the outcomes have been reported, together with a break-down of potential actions. **Deployment:** A user testing training has been held and planned with Gradia to assist in a successful piloting phase *10.4. 2019.*			
Case Study with Europass	WP5 DUO / EDUFI	Willingness of Europass to start a cooperation	Workshop(s) organised succesfully in Compleap - Europass collaboration	Europass Innovation WG meeting in Budapest in June - virtual participation Europass meeting in Groningen 4th July - preparations going on Eva Neffling doing a desk study on this issue.			D39 Targeted workshops and seminars
Engaging communications of project results	DUO all contributing		Measurable data about the efficiency of communication • events • publications • social media • website	Good news from Finland Autumn dissemination event preparations Final seminar preparations			D22 Final seminar in cooperation with WP4 and WP5
Effective management of project	CSC		Monthly financial reporting and monitoring in monthly project management committee meetings • monthy reporting (tem plates)			Action points for the whole project team based on the remote review in June 2019.	

Main goals and project results	Definition of concepts	Responsible / Work package	Identified (constantly

Indicators (KPI) - measurements	Done so far	To be done	Deployment