Exten.(D.T.)²: Minutes of Meeting (draft)

Educational Technology Lab, School of Philosophy, NKUA Athens, Greece

19 -21 March 2025

PHYSICAL ATTENDANCE LISTS: Link can be found for all three days **here.**

The meeting was also atended online by:
- LNU: Ahmed TAIYE MOHAMMED
- NKUA: Marianthi GRIZIOTI (19 & 21 March; NB: 20 March on-site)
- NTNU: Sofia PAPAVLASPOULOU
- OU: Thea HERODOTOU
- SIMPLE: Alkis SOTSENKO

Links to : AGENDA & PRESENTATIONS OF ALL SESSIONS

FOR INFORMATION

The minutes below for the 3-day meeting have been compiled by the Project Manager, Shamim Patel (LNU). Special thanks to Chritina Greka and colleagues at NKU for taking and sharing their notes.

Note: The minutes follow the order of the final approved agenda linked above.

Day 1: Wednesday 19 March 2025

09.30-09.45:
WELCOME & APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA (Lead: NKUA: Chronis Knyigos)

Marcelo Mildrad (LNU - Coordinator) sent apologies for being unable to attend due to family reasons. In his absence Chronios Knyigos (Leader of the Scientific Advisory Board) and Christina Gkreka (NKUA) acted as Chairs, and welcomed everyone to the project's sixth bi-annual physical meeting at NKUA. Short introductions followed for Helena Ledermann (TCD), and the teachers Ola Brorson and and Jonathan Hansson who were participating from the ERASMUS program, from Växjö, Sweden.

The agenda was approved. The meeting was quorate.

09.45-11.15:
REVIEW OF THE INTERNAL M27 S&T REPORTING (ALL) .
Folder with Individual WP Reviews: NB: For WP2, WP3 and WP6 Internal Reviewers asked Qs directly.

WP2 – Internal Reviewer: Richie (TCD)
- Qs: How has an "accessible" framework been created (language and practicalities) for different users? How were stakeholders selected and what was the consultation process with stakeholders? How does framework fit in with DT model we have come up with? How is the framework implemented in real-world classrooms and how do you know it is going to be accessible to all students? Legacy of framework: how will it be disseminated and followed up?
- *As & Comments: We give specific guidelines. We have interviewed, asked and received feedback and "role-based" insights from people from diverse backgrounds; The framework includes a link to the model. Chronis: to highlight this "Technical Affordance to augment the efficacy of DT in education", EU should give us funding to continue".*

WP3 – Internal Reviewer: Katrien (UGent)

- Qs: Are tools used by all Partners? Why do you use some technologies and not all of them? Purpose, use and practicalities of Activity Plans? What happens with APs when the project ends? How do you know that APs are/will be used by teachers? How are teachers going to implement your plans since they are all in English? Can teachers develop tools, material, find the OpenLearn Course etc. themselves especially if they do not have English as first language.
- *As & Comments: choice of usage is dependent on context and tchildren's needs. By applying some of the technologies, we have richer results and can gain more insights on the impact of specific tools in DT activities. APs are often co-designed by a teacher and a researcher, so teachers are aware of it and it guides their DT implementation. We will anonymize the personal details on APs and upload them on our project websites. We are planning to translate, nQuire has already been translated.*

WP4 – Internal Reviewer: Filothei (SIMPLE)

- See Filothei's presentation for Qs/critical reflections/improvements.
- What are new features, how did we decide on them? What are the positive connections to DT? Can these technologies be implemented in classrooms without your support? Can everything work without support from project partners after project end?
- *As & Comments: We are talking about emerging technologies so logically there will be a curve. This is works in progress and there has been much progress. Even the findings have not been published yet. We are constantly revising. Making the whole thing more accessible is in progress too. We will check thoroughly after a first evaluation on the use of technologies has been done. This is also new since we are not talking about learning analytics but skills analytics. Challenges, implementations and difficulties will be reported in final technical report.*

WP5 – Internal Reviewer: Sagun/Thea (OU)

- See OU presentation for Qs/critical reflections/improvements.
- *As & Comments: See 14.30-16.30 session below which covers School Interventions and APs in depth.*

WP6 – Internal Reviewer: Christina (NKUA)

- Why are there different learning modules? Do you propose DT as a methodology to teach teachers about DT? Comment on different strategies in different countries:
- *As & Comments: Introducing things to people with different experience; personal choices of teachers: which tool/environment best facilitates the needs of the course.*
  *Chronis: May have 1 or 2 indicators of **receptiveness of the context** (having to do with how teachers receive the framework and the project, regarding cultural background/experience/acceptance). Also crucial is political/administrational/structural differences among countries, regarding **institutional dynamics.***
  Re, European Credentials: We are working on it; we are already highly certified as universities.

WP7 – Internal Reviewer: Sofia (NTNU)

- See NTNU presentation for Qs/critical reflections/improvements.
- Further Qs: Do we/how do we pilot this toolkit with teachers? How is the Toolkit related to the Framework?. Need to include the Toolkit in WP3 resources.
- *Comments: Carina produced a large deliverable; we need some cohesion and should describe the transition between Cycle 2 and 3: for example, what questions were excluded or changed, etc. and a clear summary of the process.*

WP8 – Internal Reviewer: Sofia (NTNU)

- See NTNU presentation for Qs and detailed comments and feedback.
- *Further comments: Highlight dissemination activities by continuously updating webpage as requested by reviewers. DT projects productions/models that are "advertisable" so consider promoting at popular level through social media in a digestible form (short videos, tik tok etc.) for for the wider public in parallel with formal-style dissemination to the academic community.*

WP9 – Internal Reviewer: Shamim (LNU)

- See LNU presentation for Qs/critical reflections/improvements
- *Further feedback: New ethical issues arise with analytics and AI which should be taken into consideration and declared when asking for permission from teachers/students (re, how we are planning to exploit the data, etc).*

11.15-11.30: TEA/COFFEE BREAK

11.30-12.30:
REPORTING ON THE MAIN KPIs: (Lead: OU: Sagun)
Link to presentation here

Actions/To Do: All to fill this link with teacher orgnisations, conferences etc. you have considered, or aim to consider, to reach out to teachers and policy stakeholders in your country in Year 3.

Other info: There will be a policy conference in Brussels with sister projects towards the end of September, aimed at 100 stakeholders. All are welcome to attend and more news will be shared shortly.

12.30-13.30:
MEETING THE TARGET OF THE OPEN LEARN CREATE COURSE
(Lead OU: Sagun Shrestha) Link to presentation here.

Following feedback the course is refined and ready. An email will be sent during the week beginning 24 March 2025 with a flyer to be communicated/forwarded to all our networks. The link of the course should be forwarded to teachers that participate in WP3 and WP6 activities.
Actions/To Do: All to fill in plans their to reach out with the potential teachers/users in this document.

Sagun will contact partners and ask that one person from each partner nominate someone to assist him with monitoring Google forms in which teachers request credentials to use the Exten(DT)² Platform during their participation in an OpenLearn Create Course, and provide credentials to those teachers.

13.30-14.30:
LIGHT LUNCH BREAK

14.30-15.15:
WP5: SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS & ACTIVITY PLANS: PART A
(Lead NKUA: Marianthi & Chrisina)
Link to: WP General Presentation_Year 3 Interventions and APs here.
Link to Individual Partners' School Interventions and APs here.

The session focused on exploitation of ET, how we use the technologies in classrooms and difficulties/challenges so far.
- Emphasis on "multiple entry points" to engage students with different needs and backgrounds.
  - Christina underlined iterative design in close collaboration with the teacher.
- All NKUA interventions have enabled LA.
- Consider encouraging or suggesting to teachers to use the toolkit.

Actions/To Do: ALL Please upload interventions and material in according folders **by 31st May 2025.**
Two reviewers needed: Filothei and Katrien volunteered.

Christina: Issues related with the nQuire need to be addressed. When working on nQuire inside the classroom it seems a bit "weird" when asked to give online feedback, in terms of working simultaneously all together but apart. They may be easily distracted or lose interest and motivation. Furthermore, the classroom is not a fertile ground for reflection and deep thinking required for a valuable feedback.

Sagun: Proposes giving this task to do after hours as an element that supports "hybrid" DT in project.

Some technical issues related to nQuire implementation waere highlighted; e.g., passwords.

15.15-15.30: TEA/COFFEE BREAK

15.30-16.30: WP5: SCHOOL INTERVENTIONS & ACTIVITY PLANS: PART B

Teachers participated on-line and shared their views, together with partners who have been involved in school interventions:

- Feedback from UK teacher 1: shared her experiences from working with ChoiCo and SorBET: Students created games with ChoiCo regarding public transport. Each stakeholder in the game had to have gains from the design of the transport. A challenge is to be able to follow all the groups. Feedback was beneficial since they gave each other the feedback the teacher would give. Grouping was also a challenge, not all students contributed. Maybe it would be good after the collaborative project to have them do an individual one too, so that assessment is easier.
- Feedback from UK teacher 2: A second teacher highlighted time-constraints regarding the implementation of the school interventions. She has noticed students reserach skills were not enough to allow them to participate smoothly in the project. This means that it is maybe better that the content related to the DT issue is taught before the project starts. The fact that there was not one solution to the problem addressed made them uncomfortable. However they learnt to deal with uncertainties.
- Belgian/Swedish: Interventions/Sustainability in the textile industry: Textile & math teachers need to collaborate. Sometimes there are huge gaps between students' backgrounds. Also there is a tendency to focus on marking and assessment of students. Dashboard has been used.
- Feedback from interventions in Greek Schools: Challenges include time constraints (in service teachers). Definition of Challenge (pre-service teachers) and online delivery. There has been a variety of educational contexts (special needs school, high school-long project in "Sports Violence", vocational school, industry-DT session among co-workers).
- Feedback from Norwegian Interventions: Choico/GearsBot + nQuire: Difficulties in integrate nQuire in the activity in practice; teachers report some technical difficulties. Missions do not show up in the Explore tab. New teacher accounts cannot be created without emailing the administrative team, etc. NTNU used the Dashboard and they have provided all the material so that their interventions can be implemented online. They have involved 204 students. Need for close collaboration with WP4 on how to implement the Dashboard.

Christina: Requested written guidelines/practical tips for teachers to use the Dasboard

Sofia: Re, school context overview archive: What about using this again this year? It contains useful information for us, so we should use it this year, too.

16.30: END OF DAY ONE

18.00: OPTIONAL VISIT TO MUSEUM

20.00: DINNER AT RESTAURANT "TO KAPODISTRIAKO", KOPOSTIS PALAMAS, AKADIMAS 48, ATHENS

More Photos **HERE** (Thanks to everyone who shared and uploaded).

Day 2: Thursday 20 March 2025

09.30-10.30:
UPDATES ON THE LEARNING ANALYTICS DASHBOARD (Lead: LNU: Alisa LINCKE)
- LA ENVIRONMENT
- PRESENTATION & DISCUSSION OF EXAMPLES (CHOICO & SORBET)

10.30-11.30:
USE OF LEARNING ANALYTICS (DISCUSSION & BRAINSTORMING)
(Leads: LNU: Alisa LINCKE & SIMPLE: Filothei CHALVATZA)

The focus on the first part was how LA can be useful to teachers. Plans, issues, e.g., how to evaluate individuals, and possible solutions were covered.

The linked Presentations WP4 Dashboard and ALA Progress provided an overview of the latest updates to the predefined Dashboard and demonstrated the four tools: ChoiCo, SorBET, Gears, and MaLT2. Each tool was presented with a live demo to showcase its functionality and examples from the data collected in school intervention in Year 3. Following the demos, a discussion emerged around the distinction between predefined and authorable dashboards, raising important questions about their scope, flexibility, and intended use.

Dashboard for Teachers and Learners
Problem of disconnection observed between Dashboard and Learning Analytics → a bridge between the two shall be built !!

Christina: investigating instances related to the designing phase and rapid prototypes (for example wide variety of collection of events under game modification])informs us a lot of students' creativity.

Socratis: The teachers should be able to make sense of the data collected and express relationships between them, in order to translate all this into meaningful connections and strategic choices

Chronis: PD courses are needed in order to enhance teachers' pedagogical assumptions and the value of instances, contrary to using Dashboard merely as an assessment tool.

Chronis: Feedback has a variety of functionalities → this shall be highlighted distinctively. What uses can feedback have? What functionalities does it have?
  i. Pedagogical purposes (as a teacher) to plan how they will exploit the information to teach.
  ii. Designing purposes (as a student/teacher, whatever..!!) since everybody in a DT project has the identity of the designer and constantly seems to iterate their prototype/model/game.

Socratis: Analytics should not be confused with feedback.

Brainstorming/Sharing ideas and examples in groups of 2-3
(see individual slides of Learner Visualisations here)

The session concluded with an engaging brainstorming activity, where participants were divided into groups. Each group selected a specific user type (e.g., learner or teacher), chose a learning tool, and developed a scenario or use case illustrating how the Dashboard could support that user. Several insightful suggestions for improving the predefined Dashboards were received which will be considered in the next iteration of development.

NKUA (re, 2 scenarios/examples in MaLT2) asked for more detailed analytics regarding textual programming indicators, so as to look for valuable qualitative information in order to note:
- What motives or patterns students may follow
- Matters of importance in the editing of the text
- What is added/modified/combined?
- History of the procedure definition/What do you want to know [as a teacher] from the history of the code?

Examples related to ChoiCo:

- The values used and the variability among students to see if the values make sense in the context of the game. Unique solutions can show originality.
- To see how students can set and reach landmarks within the game, gives us some measure of progress.
- The time it takes to reach these landmarks can be an indicator of motivation and engagement.

11.30-12.00: TEA/COFFEE BREAK & BUFFER

12.00-13.00:
OVERVIEW OF UPCOMING DELIVERABLES UNTIL THE END OF THE PROJECT
(Lead LNU: Shamim PATEL)

Two internal reviwers were agreed for each of the remaining 12 deliverables

A short presentation was made for each of the remaining deliverable including planned content and timeline. The presentations slides with this information are linked here in order of due submission date:
- D5.3 & D5.4;; D6.2 (June '25)
- D2.2 and D2.3 (July '25)
- D4.4; D7.3; D8.3 & D8.4, D9.3 (Moved from Aug '25 to Nov '25 if extension approved)

- Deliverables were asked to be kept short and concise.
- A max number of sides was asked to be adhered to, for the EC experts eviewers who will be reviewing all deliverables simultaneously at the end of the project (i.e., preferably <30 sides; max 40 sides where needed). Additional information to be included in appendices.
- Where a version 1 of a deliverable of the same name has already been submitted, Shamim will send a url to where the v1 of the deliverable can be linked to, or included as a foot note.
- Where much of the content of a final/v2 deliverable's is the same as previously, new sections/additions should be highlighted to help the EC experts avoid having to read the same content twice

The following points were additionally asked to be taken into consideration by all to ensure the deadlines for producing the deliverables could be met.

- Upload Activity Plans by 15 April 2025
- Final information regarding students, school contect, number of sessions (Upload screenshots, photos, School Context Overview) by 10 May 2025
- **SOS:** Partners should <u>double check</u> that in the excel file the number of participants meet the numbers presented in the school context overview.

13.00-13.30:
REVIEW OF INDIVIDUAL PARTNERS' REMAINING BUDGET
(Lead LNU: Shamim PATEL)

Shamim went through the budgets and financial reporting at M27 both at the the overall project level and for individual partners in this presentation.

All partners should review their comments, where applicable, and address them at final reporting. The aim is to avoid review comments from the EC and any delay in final payment.

All Partners, including those finishing at M36 should allocate travel funding for at least 1 person to attend and present at the Final EC Review. It was also recommended that as many partners as possible be represented at the policy evnt being organised at the end of September /(see Day 1 above).

Some Questions partners were asked to think about for future OMT meetings before the summer:
- What level can we maintain a free version of the Platform and website after the project ends?
- In case a partner has an unutilised budget, how should it be utilised?

13.30-14.30:
LIGHT LUNCH BREAK

13.30-14.30:
FINAL REVIEW PREPARATION: COMMENTS FROM PREVIOUS REVIEW
Link to EC Experts Report and Presentation on EC Experts 5 main Recommendations
(Lead LNU: Shamim PATEL)

Progress on the the EC's 5 main recommendations were presented and discussed further. Related presentations can be found in the link here; and the Recommendations Control Sheet here.

To Follow up:
A small section – approx one third to one half page per recommendation will need to be included as part of the final reporting:

- Recommendation 1: OU input & NTNU input is available; to cordinate further with TCD.
- Recommendation 2: WP4 partners input available.
- Recommendation 3: NTNU input and TCD input is available.
- Recommendation 4: OU input available
- Recommendation 5: OU input avilable.

15.30-15.45: TEA/COFFEE BREAK & BUFFER

15.45-16.45:
TIER 3: PROJECT TECHNOLOGIES
(Lead NKUA: Maria-Stella NIKOLAOU)

In this Presentation Maria Stella went through the 3 Tiers of Project technologies per Tool:
- Tier 1: Fully Functionalities
- Tier 2: ~~New~~ → "*Additional*" Functionalities
- Tier 3 :New/Exprerimental Functionalities

The presentation focused on Tier 3 and included status, demos and plans of remaining work including work in the project extension period, if granted.

16.45-17.45:
HANDS ON USE OF LEARNING ANALYTICS DASHBOARD BASED ON EXAMPLES
(Lead LNU: Alisa LINCKE & SIMPLE : Filothei CHALWATZA)

Participants split into two large groups to participate in practical workshops with hands-on use of learning analytics Dashboard.

17.45: END OF DAY TWO

20.00: WORKING DINNER AT RESTAURANT "TA SKALAKIA"
         DIONISIOU AIGINITOU 32, ATHENS

Day 3: Friday 21 March 2025

09.30-10.00:
EXTEN.(D.T.)² FRAMEWORK AND UPDATES OF WP2
(Lead NTNU: Feiran Zhang & Sofia PAPAVLASOPOULOU)

Feiran went through the WP2 presentation as linked here.

The framework has been designed on the notion tool in order to be more interactive and clickable (click on concepts to get keywords). The framework is also integrated in the OpenLearn course. Here, navigation guidelines have been added for the users. There is also an intro and a checklist.

Suggestion: We can add best practices.

Action/To Do: ALL Send to Feiran photos/material from interventions, especially those highlighting and presenting the framework

10.00-10.30:
PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT YEAR 3 AND UPDATES OF WP6
(Lead UGent: Katrien Strubbe)

Katrien went through the WP6 presentation as linked here.

The presentation provided in-depth information and commentary on PD activities at UGent/NKUA/ TCD/NTNU; methodology developed and tested in Y1 (pilot) and Y2; and Y3 activities at UGent, NKUA (pre-service teachers) and NTNU, TCD (in-service teachers).

10.30-11.00: TEA/COFFEE BREAK & BUFFER

11.00-11.30:
YEAR 3 EVALUATION PLAN AND UPDATES OF WP7
(Lead TCD: Richie HARTE)

Richie went through the WP7 presentation as linked here.

Teachers' toolkit → This includes phrases from the Irish curriculum so that it is relatable to teachers practice. It includes rubrics for assessment as well as self-assesment.

D7.3 will be ready by mid July 2025.

Action/To Do: ALL Encourage teachers to use the toolkit in their interventions (WP3, WP5).

11.30-12.30:
WORKSHOP ON AUTHORABLE FEEDBACK AND ANALYTICS
12.30-12.30:
EXTEN(DT)² PLATFORM: ONLINE COMMUNICATION AND COLLABORATION TOOL
(Lead SIMPLE: Filothei CHALVATZA)

Filothei led the workshop above. Further related information is linked here.
Filothei also went through the Exten(DT)² Platform to make clear the connection with this in realtion to the on-going interventions and feedback from schools.

13.30-14.30:
LIGHT LUNCH BREAK

14.30-15.00:
WP8: ROADMAP FOR PUBLICATIONS AND DISSEMINATION ACTIVITIES
(Lead OU: SAGUN SHRESTHA)

Sagun went through the presentation as linked here.
After discussion agreed we need to emphasise more the kind/quality of journals, rather than number of journals.
Action/To Do: All - To fill in the roadmap for pulications.

Chronis' Suggestion: Let's produce a special issue: "Digital media for DT". Manolis can be contacted to see whether this could be in BJET.
Q: Is there budget for such publications?

Action/To Do: LNU: asked to consider if it can take on such journal publishing expenses

15.00-16.00:
HANDS-ON USE OF THE PLATFORM AND TOOLS
(NKUA & SIMPLE)

This session provided technical support and help on other practical platform infrastructure issues and concerns.

This document summarises some of the tracked issues.

16.00-17.00:
FORMAL CLOSE OF MEETING, FOLLOWED BY CONT. DISCUSSIONS

NKUA was thanked for hosting the meeting, keeping good time and their excellent hospitality.