

# Mid-term review notes

9 . 0 0 - 9 . 10	Round of presentations of the Review's attendees
9 . 1 0 - 9 . 30	<p>General introduction to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Project objectives</li> <li>• Overview of the project objectives for the reporting period in question</li> </ul>
9 . 3 0 - 9 . 45	<p>Q&amp;A</p> <p>no comments</p>
9 . 45 - 1 0 30	<p>Requirements and architecture design (WP2)</p> <p>what are used approaches for identifying competence needs? how are competences evaluated, is ESCO used in the background? Advice: make it more visible in the documents</p> <p>what were the concrete activities that you came up with this framework for the services, stakeholders contacted? coherence of the process : have stakeholder needs been collected, what has been the activities, what they have said, their feedback? And how it's been used? Which criteria were used to select these services? How is stakeholder involvement and feedback documented? Advice: show the track record of the process, the criteria, stakeholder needs collected, plans validated by references groups, what they have added new and how they took the initial sketches, and evidenced. Description in the deliverable, user scenarios, how and what kind of feedback from reference group, how was the design changed based on it, new ideas from the defence groups. Description of the process in more detail so it can be used e.g., in Italy in a similar process.</p> <p>APIs? use of various data, lot of work. Where in this framework is the work that you do in the pilots? not the entity of the framework within this project, framework is a vision?</p> <p>What does the right to study entail? National context details, important to highlight them, make visible the different layers.</p> <p>Two different concepts vision of the ecosystem, another element is the framework that every country could use, need to provide very clear indicators for it. Used as interchangeable, but they are not, need to separate and specify. Crucial to describe the cooperation, use of ESCO and Europass and linkage to them.</p> <p>Requirements description, what is the process of deciding which requirements are dropped and which are advanced? Is there a way to track this, somewhere described?</p> <p>Learning analytics:</p> <p>Other target groups than teachers and students, when have they been involved, what are the plans to involve them?</p> <p>Paper reporting at EU? provide details of the conceptual review paper and the interview study, what interview question were used, documentation.</p> <p>Designing the visualization and getting feedback from the end-users on the prototype &gt; a little bit late, should have been started already. If presented with detail this could be state-of-the-art , need to have more detail and test with the end-users use of the prototype.</p> <p>Regarding all user requirements and ecosystem and architecture, learning analytics:</p> <p>Relying on the deliverable was not enough to understand, needed to look into e-duuni, but there is a need to take key elements out of there to present the full ecosystem and the architecture framework. Not just explain the end-results, but also the way you got there.</p>

1 0 . 3 0 - 1 0 : 45	Q&A
1 0 . 4 5 - 1 1 . 15	<p>Prototype development (<b>WP3</b>)</p> <p>How user select the education competences where is mapped to? Identified vs unidentified, mapping free text to study profile?</p> <p>new, unidentified user, how to support, provide value, and "catch" such user?</p> <p>What is the jobs section?</p> <p>Concern: have the mock-up, why do you need the html, if the data is also mock-up?</p> <p>WP3 is late, this is a concern, what is the plan for going forward? Updating the project roadmap. With the delay, what is the plan B?</p> <p>What is the Beta version? Now planned to be ready in M18, if not, how is it going to affect the other activities?</p> <p>Is there a risk that the prototype will not be delivered by the end of the project? Will be checked if they are achieved. Especially concerning objectives three and four. Exemplify each part of the system in the running prototype.</p> <p>Advice: Map which element are included in the prototype, e.g. 4 elements, why these represent four most important, e.g. "the self-awareness", "selection of learning opportunities (including learning analytics)". The criteria links to the proposal, builds upon the elements in the existing system (in Finland), but what is feasible in the timeframe. Clarify this role, key functionalities should be in the prototype. Results: The schematic architecture and its theoretical description and the visualized version in the beta prototype. important to combine as the output.</p> <p>Be applicable to some other countries, how these things here can be mapped to other countries. Describe the existing conditions, elements of the architecture, where other potential partners can link to, provides a roadmap for other countries.</p> <p>What is available beyond Finland, especially associate partners? This provides also another possible criteria: Grant agreement, what is available in Finland, and what is available with the other countries, especially the associate partners.</p> <p>Agree on slide of learner plan modules slide 31 as the objective.</p>
1 1 : 1 5 - 1 1 . 30	Q&A
1 1 . 3 0 - 1 1 . 45	Coffee Break

1 1 : 4 5 - 1 2 . 15	<p>Deployment and evaluation <b>(WP4)</b></p> <p>How to ensure the commitment of associate partners?</p> <p>The German associate partner, what kind of activities have been deployed there? Specific needs or rules, constraints, what are the challenges related there? Is there a plan to extend the associate partner list? Also look for potential countries that have already systems in place and could serve as an early adopter. (Use the Europass network?). Commitment to deployment not just piloting. Advice: Roadmap of Specific activities, what kind of formal agreement, how to show they have carried out the deployment? "piloting is more feedback" deployment is something else, see Grant agreement. Deployment will have to be explained more, how an associate institution will engage with the framework, not deep needed, but willingness and work to map of existing services against the system in Compleap. An activity that another institution is able to link into the prototype. What kind of process they took and what challenges were present. Asking the question is there something that could be done, what problems should be solved before actual use? A partner in the Europass network? What are the steps they need to follow? Engagement needs to be intensified already before the prototype is there, to prepare resources with associate partners. Associate partner to explain: what is the added value, potential for use and development, what should be solved/developed. Three countries ok, more is a plus.</p> <p>Evaluation and impact study? Who is going to develop the evaluation and impact study, external partner?</p> <p>What is expected, instructions for the project? what is the vision, the offer. actual impact data. Build the indicators, impact time save, money save, usability, level of resources need for use, how easy to be brought on board, workshop in a dissemination, use key players in Europe. Take their own perspective what is the potential impact, based on input from other key players.</p>
1 2 . 1 5 - 1 2 . 30	<p>Q&amp;A</p>
1 2 . 3 0 - 1 3 . 00	<p>Dissemination, communication, exploitation <b>(WP5)</b></p> <p>Stakeholder management plan, expected two deliverables, cannot be exactly the same as the communication plan. Highlight and describe in detail, what kind of activities, and criteria (in deliverable 35). Various types of stakeholder, grouping? getting the stakeholder involved, different communication strategies for the groups?</p> <p>Clarify, interesting aspects for various groups. Strategies "to manage closely" and "to keep informed"</p> <p>Project identity is nicely explicit, website is ok. Acknowledging the funder correctly?</p> <p>new slogan no more has competences, could be misleading. Competence element should come back.</p> <p>Add info on key step to becoming an associate partner.</p> <p>Https: icon, ...replaces by an unsecure site, check and correct.</p> <p>other kinds of dissemination products? animations, consider various audiences</p> <p>how visitor can get more info, add results, architecture, best research</p> <p>del 34: key elements, measurements is this data being tracked and collected? e.g., number of participants, visitors on website, social media channels, linked to website, etc.</p> <p>Sustainability plan: how do you plan to develop it? Is there a strategy already? explain what sustainability means regarding prototype, architecture, open source code, specifics!</p>
1 3 . 0 0 - 1 3 . 15	<p>Q&amp;A</p>

1 3 : 1 5 - 1 4 . 00	<b>Lunch Break</b>
1 4 . 0 0 - 1 5 . 45	<p>Project management WP 1, Deliverables, Finance</p> <p>Deliverable which includes the risks, mid-term report was pointing out the risks, would be important to expand the list of risks and how to deal with it. real risks reflected on, strategies to mitigate the risks. Missing: development is late, for May 2019 anticipate what will come? explain plan B.</p> <p>the list of deliverables in the proposal, project road map, has been postponed, is not visible, should be shared and updated. Open source code (M7 /12) in new list postponed to M18, discrepancy. Alignment needed, this kind of changes need an amendment.</p> <p>DEL 8: M1, M24 in the agreement, version 1, final version on wiki now expected for M 24. "a living document" constantly updated in the wiki, but also visible how is changing. Crucial!</p> <p>Del 24 same, M7, M18, first versions, and updated version. If needed "a living document" constantly updated in the wiki.</p> <p>Documentation of the kick-off, three lines describing what was agreed. Prepare a short summary of consortium meetings.</p> <p>Financial figures:</p> <p>real costs for travelling: merged into other costs, not seeing the detail of travel costs. in the approved budget there is detail on travel costs. The form c is what is asked to fill in. but these are available on wiki.</p> <p>WP1 50% is ok</p> <p>WP2 bulk of the work expected to be done here, worries, why PMs have not been spent.</p> <p>WP3 very concerned, only 10% has been spent. EDUFI has issues. Lot of resources not spent and lot of work to do. possible to ask for subcontracting the PM ( e.g. 30PM). provide clarification, amend annex one. Clear detail on the tasks that are suggested for subtasking.</p> <p>WP4 ok</p> <p>WP5 expected that most of the resources in second year, but ok</p> <p>Make a plan and submit in one month to the project officer and the EC. Need a holistic solution, a package solution.</p> <p>Underspending on the part of EDUFI, Gradia, plans</p> <p>make plans based on what would benefit the project, e.g., a concrete action plan with Europass.</p> <p>Plan of resources on WP 3 and all other needs. make a plan for the changes and this will be addressed by the funder.</p> <p>Compared to delivering what has been promised, scope cannot be reduced.</p>
1 5 . 4 5 - 1 6 . 15	<p>Private meeting between the Reviewers and the Project Officer – Outcome of the review</p>

	Feedback and recommendations from the Project Officer and the Reviewers
1	
6	
.	Recommendations:
1	
5	appreciated the discussion and the presentation, consortium has been working hard, lot of potential.
-	
1	Recommendation 1. elements to be refined. deliverables, resubmit some, stakeholder management plan, user scenarios, how collected, feedback from user, how informed, desk research (introduction needed ). Resubmitted the Del 8, the roadmap in a document format, updated. real plan, problems and solutions envisaged. projects proposal for amendment (activities) in this D8, based on this can suggest amendment. some deliverable suggested to be living documents.
7	
.	
00	Prototypes: additional document in M 18, functionalities in beta versio for May and for September, e.g., what are the criteria for selection, specification, functionalities.
	R3: deployment, clear planning, activities, steps, commitment
	R4: deployment and dissemination, opportunities for going beyond the Fi &NL: make a case study with Europass. Clear indication digital environment can be linked and feed to compleap. This would be a great results for the project, feed into sustainability and impact. Realised with a workshop with Europass system interface and data form Europass feed into Compleap and vica versa. Could create impact on European level.
	Ask for project M 18 prototype, after that a remote review, and feedback from the reviewers.
	Other deliverables one month to resubmit end of February, just add all the descriptions (can add a section, new feedback after M12).
	Definitions:
	Pilot, specific system, piloting at site
	Deployment, talk with their context and people, in different ways. Examine the contextual rules, someone else takes what has been been done and what can be fitted in their contexts. Through an API, make data available for Compleap. Show that can work in another context.