2019_02_06_Steering_committee_meeting_minutes

Compleap steering committee meeting

Date: 6 February 2019

Time: 12 - 14 (Finnish time)

Location: CSC office Espoo, Keilaranta 14, meeting room Nuuksio

Steering committee:

- Stina Westman, Director, CSC – IT Center for Science (Chair)
- Raakel Tiihonen, Director, Finnish National Agency for Education
- Susanna Pirttikangas, Professor, University of Oulu
- Dik van der Wal, Manager International Services, Dienst Uitvoering Onderwijs
- Rauni Gylden, Student service manager, Gradia Jyväskylä - **virtually**
- Tomi Kytölä, Senior officer, Ministry of Education and Culture - **joined at 12:13 and stepped out at 13:25**
- Antti Laitinen, Project manager, CSC – IT Center for Science (Secretary)

Visitor:

- Anu Märkälä, CSC – IT Center for Science (assistant)

Agenda (**supporting material / slides**)

1. Welcome and opening
    a. Meeting was opened at 12:04 by the chair.
2. Greetings and presence
    a. Rauni Gylden attends the meeting virtually.
    b. There have been changes in the composition of steering committee as Vera Mol has taken over WP5 lead. Dik van der Wal replaces her as DUO´s steering committee member. The steering group would like to thank Vera and welcome Dik.
    c. Steering group members and visitors introduced themselves.
3. Approval of the agenda
    a. It was agreed that the 7th item "Financial matters" will be transferred under 6th item "Midterm review" and that the items 6 a, b and c will be discussed together under the midterm review umbrella.
4. Approval of the previous meeting memo
    a. No comments on the previous memo articulated. The previous meeting memo was approved.
5. Management update
    a. Partner/associated partner update
        i. Review of current situation
            1. National collaboration with Redu and OSAO is going well. Salpaus on the other hand has been rather passive. Weather we need another partner for piloting is a question worth thinking of. However, we need to discuss first with Salpaus on their role in the piloting. It was decided that **Antti/CSC will plan together with Tarja Puura (Gradia) and Topias Kähärä (Edufi) how they approach Salpaus (Decision 25 - Decision log)** There are two concerns: 1) their associated membership and 2) the practical plans for piloting
            2. International piloting in Germany will be done with Die EU Geschäftsstelle der Bezirksregierung Köln. Piloting in Netherlands is still under preparation. SBB and SurfNET have shown interest and DUO is taking care of the next steps in this respect. Framework deployment should start this spring and piloting of the learner plan will follow after the summer holidays.
            3. The Commission expects a lot from us. The added value of the prototypes to other EU-countries has to be clearly expressed and the work we do well documented.
    b. Steering committee decision log review - Antti Laitinen presented the current state with the decisions
        i. Decision No.24: Framework architecture updates
            1. The framework can map many national infrastructures to the model.
            2. Therefore, multiple instances of the architecture model should be published. (e.g. Finnish national service ecosystem, local ecosystem)
        ii. Decision No.23: Mid-term review and reporting (see 6 a)
            1. The project team got constructive feedback in the review. A road map and a holistic plan for the rest of project have to be sent to the Commission by the end of February.
        iii. Decision No.22: Piloting plan
            1. This **working document has to be updated as part of the project roadmap** (**See earlier Decision 22**)(see 6 a)
            2. Phases and different deliverables to be deployed should be marked.
        iv. Decision No:21: Video production
            1. The first promotional video is almost ready and it will be added to the Compleap website soon.
        v. Decision No:20: Positioning the Compleap prototypes internationally (see 6 a)
            1. Dik Van der Wal is a member of the new New Europass advisory group and can connect to there with CompLeap matters. There is also one member from the Finnish Ministry of Education in the group. The work is in progress and the new Europass still needs time for practical solutions to emerge. It also good to note that there are differences between countries how active their Europass centres are.
        vi. Decision No. 7: software code licensing
            1. The idea is to use EUPL as the license. It is an official EU license used by EDUFI. As a copy-left license any further work will carry it, too.
            2. **There are still some open questions concerning the software code lisencing. Antti Laitinen will collect this information and the final version will be approved in the project management committee and presented in next steering committee** (**See earlier Decision 7**)

6. Current news
   a. State of the art of the project activities for information
      i. WP timelines and updates (for reference)
         1. Status of prototypes
            a. New subcontracting from Reaktor for EDUFI has been agreed upon and it seems promising since the developers are familiar with Koski register.
            b. It is vital to finish this so that other WPs can continue their work.
         2. Monthly webinars
            a. **AP The webinar 26.2. has to be planned so that it takes into account necessary replanning and gets real measurable feedback from participants. (Decision 26)**
         3. Workshop 14.3.
            a. **AP Invitation and agenda will be circulated to the the steering group (Decision 26)**
      ii. Mid-term seminar in Helsinki December 4th
         1. There were 57 participants in the seminar.
         2. Unfortunately we could not collect wide feedback from the stakeholders because there was presumably a glitch with the system.
      iii. Deliverables reporting
         1. Main project deliverables are due by the end of May.
         2. We need to split them into measurable sub goals so that we can keep track on them.
      iv. Mid-term reporting and review
         1. Mid-term reporting material
            a. Material submitted to the EC on January 17th consisted of the technical report and financial reports.
            b. Review presentation and main points are available in wiki https://wiki.eduuni.fi/x/_ijTB
         2. Feedback from project officer and reviewers:
            a. They raised e.g. budget and deliverable timings as issues of concern. Next steps are described below.
            b. **Modified project plan to be submitted by the end of February to project officer (Decision 27)**
               i. Antti will ask the project officer what happens after the end of February and how do we know if our plan was accepted. We should structure the plan so that it shows what we have already changed, what we are going to change within the context of the Grant agreement, and what we are proposing for their decision.
               ii. Also a Plan B should be prepared in case we cannot succeed in our goals.
               iii. **Project roadmap:** (Deliverable 8, not yet submitted) **to be updated to wiki as a living document (Decision 28)** meaning that it should be updated throughout the rest of the project. The roadmap should fulfill the following objectives:
                  • Show that we are in control.
                  • fit into one page that collates existing information, efforts and plans
                  • cross WPs and deliverable boundaries
               iv. **Finances:** plan for changes with the budget (subcontracting etc.) **(See Decision 27)**
                  • Internal re-allocations of resources between different WPs will be made if needed.
                  • Each partner should check their current situation.
                  • Necessary reallocations between partners or subcontracting
               v. **Prototypes**: WP3 resources and the prototype development
                  • There is an additional document in M18 describing functionalities in beta version for May and for September. e.g. what are the criteria for selection, specification, functionalities (EDUFI)
                     ○ It clarifies project plan: concept and what is a prototype.
                     ○ Shifts the emphasis to components that are usable in the international context, e. g. learning analytics.
               vi. **Deployment:** How to organize and document the deployment (Finland + Netherlands + Germany) **(A s a part of Decision 27)**
                  New task from the mid-term review to make a case study on Compleap & Europass and possibilities for collaboration (to be reported as part of WP4 - Deployment)
                  • The case study is an opportunity to go beyond the Finnish-Dutch context and create impact on the European level. If Europass system interface and data form Europass would feed into Compleap and vica versa, it would be a a clear indication that digital environment can be linked to Compleamp. This in return would feed into project´s sustainability and impact.
                     ○ AP Duo will contact EMREX user group and check if they are able to join the Compleap deployment.
                     ○ AP CSC will contact Nordforum and check if that network can help with the deployment.
            c. Deliverables below are to be updated by the end of February. Please, note that they need to be updated with a new section: New feedback gained between due date and M12. The Commission wants to hear more about the methodology behind them.

               i. Del. 35 Stakeholder management plan (DUO)
               ii. Del. 18 User scenarios (EDUFI)
               iii. Del. 15 Desk research (EDUFI)
   d. Financial matters moved here (Antti Laitinen)
      i. Finance reports Follow-up on resource spending
      ii. All: 33% of PMs used, 19% of costs used
         1. CSC: 47% of PMs used, 29% of costs used
         2. EDUFI: 22% of PMS used, 14% of costs used
            a. EDUFI has not been able to accomplish having their own regular staff involved in the project as was desired. Lot of other development ongoing. Changes to subcontracing
         3. Oulu: 40% of PMs used, 27% of costs used
            a. Oulu has a person in recommender systems and analytics available for the project.
         4. Gradia: 36% of PMs used, 11% of costs used
         5. DUO: 50% of PMs used, 37% of costs used

     b. Emerging issues
          i. Risk management plan and emerging risks
               1. Steering committee notes that the personnel risks that have been identified before have actualized. Now we are on the track of replanning.
          ii. Building international network
               1. Search for a Dutch piloting partner ongoing
          iii. Communication and information sharing
               1. Organizing the information
     c. Upcoming events
          i. Prototype development
               1. Plan to be made
          ii. Reference group collaboration
               1. Next webinar 26.2. with the topic "a demo session on our CompLeap prototype".
               2. How could we get measurable feedback and input for the next development steps in CompLeap project?
          iii. Piloting collaboration with the associated partners

7. Next steps
     a. Steering committee meetings
          i. It was decided that the next steering committee meeting will take place on Friday 29.3. at 10-12 am. Doodle will be circulated if the time and date are not convenient. The status review according to the updated project plan is on the agenda.
          ii. Big deliverables due at the end of May so it is wise that the steering committee meets before that.
     b. Roadmap
          i. CSC will draft a suggestion and it will be circulated with the notes.
     c. Replanning (As a part of Decision 27)
          i. AP: Susanna will inform CSC and Edufi what the costs would be for additional expert joining the team.
          ii. AP: CSC will check project officer whether transfers between WPs or internal contracts are preferred.
          iii. AP: Planning meeting (prototype planning and resourcing) to be discussed in the PMC. Erja Nokkanen is also to be invited from EDUFI.
          iv. AP: The status of all WPs will be checked in PMC meeting on Monday.
     d. Resubmissions - each deliverable leaders takes changes
     e. Decision items: the items coming from midterm review
8. Any other business
     a. The official midterm report to be circulated in a week. An extra steering group meeting can be organize if needed.
9. Closing the meeting at 13:53.

Background material:

• Project website: https://www.compleap.eu/

• Shared working area in Eduuni: https://wiki.eduuni.fi/display/csccompleap/CompLeap+Home

• Project plan: https://wiki.eduuni.fi/display/csccompleap/Application+documents?preview=/54692026/58187308/Annex%20I.docx