

Final review minutes

Thursday 23rd ^{sh} January		
Final Review		
T i me	Topic	Lead
8. 4 0- 9. 00	Private meeting between the Reviewers and the Project Officer	
9. 0 0- 9. 10	Round of presentations of the Review's attendees	
9. 1 0- 9. 30	General introduction to : · Project objectives <ul style="list-style-type: none">• overview of the project objectives for the reporting period in question• External evaluation of the project (FINEEC)	Antti Laitinen (CSC)
9. 3 0- 9. 45	Q&A	No comments from the reviewers

9.45-10.15	<p>Requirements and architecture design (WP2)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Learner-centered framework architecture design · D20 Running prototypes in cooperation with WP3 · D21 Feedback and specifications to user scenarios 	<p>Annica Moore (EDUFI), Hanni Muukkonen (UOulu), Antti Laitinen (CSC)</p> <p>Q: is there an inventory made on what already exists in the registers in EU-countries, which data exists, what is not digital yet? Description of services in Finland that potentially can be connected? A: Explained at the end of the sustainability plan.</p> <p>Q: why not highlighted the potential of architecture framework and the connections in the video and other elements, not clear message. Achitecture as the important outcome, interested in understanding the connections foreseen in the project. List of preliminary key actors and their connection points, how they could benefit, what is the potential. Explicate how could be used and taken up by others. how could they tap on the potential? So far the richness and the potential is not to be grasped in the video. Two user groups: the developers of services and the end users of the services (use case). A data model and service model, to be picked up by developers, chance to be the "de facto" and standard that others will pick up.</p>
10.15-11.30	Q&A	
11.30-12.15	<p>Prototype development (WP3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · D24 Open source code for all components · D25 Technical documentation · D26 Three prototypes 	<p>Annica Moore (EDUFI)</p> <p>Q: GitHub, could not download it, got errors in recommendation engine. Not enough technical information, more info on training the recommendation, instructions, data to train and replicate what has been done. Some data files missing? Should be fixed.</p> <p>Q: involvement of the stakeholder, NEET, the involvement of this group was narrowed. Using with a counsellor, in an assisted way. Need to consider the priorities of NEET and consider more visual solutions, labour market options a priority for neets. Lessons learned on the approach and to recommend alternative approaches, clarify this.</p> <p>Documentation needed on why could not gain access to and focus on NEETs, clarifications needed.</p> <p>DEL 25 has technical descriptions, extend the materials added to Github. Documentation, code and data, upload the documentation. Website is not enough, since it will be archived. Maintenance at EDUFI, relates to the sustainability plan.</p>
12.15-1.30	Q&A	
1.45-3.45	Coffee Break	

1 1: 4 5- 1 2. 15	<p>Deployment and evaluation (WP4)</p> <p>• D27 Pilot deployment of the architecture</p> <p>• D28 Pilot deployment of the analytics prototype</p> <p>• D29 Pilot deployment of learner plan prototype</p> <p>• D30 Report on pilot deployment of the architecture</p> <p>• D31 Report on pilot deployment of the analytics</p> <p>• D32 Report on pilot deployment of learner plan prototype</p>	<p>Tarja Puura (Gradia), Hanni Muukkonen (UOulu), Antti Laitinen (CSC)</p> <p>Q: piloting in the Netherlands, was the prototype piloted there?</p> <p>Competences related to education is not available in the Netherlands, recommendations were in Finnish.</p> <p>Not possible to arrange a real piloting</p> <p>Q: How has it been dealt with how the data in different countries, expectation that data exists? data housed in different organization, break silos.</p> <p>Q: Could learn from NL, framework as long-term roadmap, rather than an ecosystem that could be adapted. In Germany, some elements could be adapted because of some data may be available. Other countries, point of reference, a vision for the future.</p> <p>Which elements are directly adaptable, for the 5 countries, which elements can be directly adapted, which not? What can be taken? This should be documented in piloting D30. Capture the lessons learned on different levels, which data. How can fit into a larger vision of learner-centred ecosystem. Three levels (architecture, case study in Finland, how to use in a different country).</p> <p>Communicating at and to three levels to take further the results:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Vision, architecture, roadmap to decision makers, lessons learned, recommendations (also in different countries) 2. prototype, usefulness, usability how to make the service better, to end-users, reaching out to endusers, "this is how it could work, example Finland" 3. developers taking further the service from GitHub. how can be taken over in other contexts, reference implementation, practical, developing, locally have access to something they can test. <p>How to promote to them? Even outside Finland?</p> <p>By slightly refocusing the communication, translate communication to roadmap: towards decision makers and developers. Addressing explicitly the offer to the three levels. What has been identified as valuable.</p> <p>Repackaging what has been reached: Bringing forward in and for the sustainability plan, marketing and reaching out to target groups. Shorter summary, reaching out to target groups.</p> <p>pilot deployment of architecture: recommendations, what do they have to do so they are able to use it? to integrate sources, recommendation what to do, how to go ahead.</p> <p>Q What does it take work for the counsellors? Data is existing, but it is personal data (database law in Finland).</p> <p>Q Future of the platform, because of data protections, some of the barriers will overcome? Yes, the law can be changed. But we don't know how long it will take. New Studyinfo service by the end of this year.</p> <p>Q: what about results from Croatia and Estonia meetings?</p> <p>sustainability: to understand what elements could a country use, you need to take account of the different levels (e.g., legal barriers, availability of resources and data, existing services, end-user need)</p>
1 2. 1 5- 1 2. 30	Q&A	

1 2. 3 0- 1 3. 00	Dissemination, communication, exploitation (WP5) · D22 Final seminar · D38 Presentations and publications · D39 Targeted workshops and seminars · Europeas case study	Vera Wemer, Monique Leegte (DUO) Valued: External evaluation was an important document Dialogue with Europass, was it not possible to extend the discussions and prepare a roadmap with them? Support the European dimensions. Taking care of the leads: actions to get in contact, message out, awareness of what can be used. Europass, Studyinfo, Cologne? All-digital.org could be approached for potential synergies https://all-digital.org
1 3. 0 0- 1 3. 15	Q&A	
1 3: 1 5- 1 4. 00	Lunch Break	
1 4. 0 0- 1 4. 30	Project management · D3, D4 Standard management report · D7 Standard progress report · D8 Project road map · D9 Project management and steering group meetings	Antti Laitinen (CSC)
1 4. 3 0- 1 4. 45	Q&A	

1 4. 4 5- 1 5. 15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Finance, Use of resources 	<p>Antti Laitinen (CSC) – WP leaders on each WP</p> <p>It is possible to reallocate budget between partners.</p> <p>EDUFI subcontracting amount, needs to be checked.</p> <p>Resources left, also other costs. Could have been used for deployment to improve the impact of the project.</p> <p>DUO more costs than budgeted (30K€).</p> <p>Transfer from EDUFI to Duo is possible, just divided according to costs.</p> <p>Estimated costs were off, shows in the final use of resources.</p>
1 5. 1 5- 1 5. 30	Q&A	
1 5. 3 0- 1 5. 45	Coffee Break	
1 5. 4 5- 1 6. 15	<p>Evaluation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> External evaluation of the project (FINEEC) D33 Impact evaluation study D23 Sustainability plan 	<p>Antti Laitinen (CSC) – WP leaders on each WP</p> <p>Discussion about start of the project and availability of personnel (stealth mode).</p> <p>Sustainability: essential to target the three levels.</p> <p>Create an offer for users, developers, facilitators and leaders; articulated offer, supported by materials. How to convert from potential to actual user: Studyinfo and Europass. Missing from the documents.</p> <p>Eduuniwiki stays</p> <p>Compleap website: Duo, would be good to host longer.</p> <p>Upload documents on some publicly available website, making the outcomes available at least 3 years.</p>
1 6. 1 5- 1 6. 30	Q&A	
1 6. 2 0- 1 6. 50	Private meeting between the Reviewers and the Project Officer – Outcome of the review	

<p>1 6. 5 0- 1 7. 00</p>	<p>Feedback and recommendations from the Project Officer and the Reviewers</p>	<p>Recommendations:</p> <p>Congratulate on the successful ending of the project, appreciate the two main outputs, need to make these elements available to create impact</p> <p>repost will outline suggestions</p> <p>submit d23 attendum three main parts</p> <p>1. brief doc 20 pages or less addressing decision and policy makers, explain key recommendations for using fremafork arch, data, high-level elements for users, lessons learned 1 page NL, and other countries.</p> <p>basic information they need, bringing it together from separate documents.</p> <p>2. Github: all tech specification for developers, open sources code to try out and further develop, tech specifications, interphase and code, verify that all is working for external developers. Some bits/files missing, especially how to train the model, data and script for training. (testing by other partner). an assigned person for contacting and support</p> <p>3. Draft a plan on key step to integrate Compleap to Studyinfo and Europass. Who will engage from the consortium.</p> <p>From providing the info to plan on how to implement. Proactive contacting and writing key steps towards integration (without such promise).</p> <p>Matter of repackaging, no new materials, to communicate more effectively. Two months time.</p> <p>Draft review report in two weeks. final review report once the updated metrials are submitted.</p> <p>Money for preparing the report and coming to the review till the end of January. Project closed so other money cannot be used.</p>