ODEdu
OPEN DATA EDUCATION

Deliverable 7.2

Interim Quality Assurance Report

Author(s):	Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
	Efthimios Tambouris (UOM)
	Maria Zotou (UOM)
Editor(s):	Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)
	Efthimios Tambouris (UOM)
Responsible Organisation:	UOM
Version-Status:	V1 Final
Submission date:	30/06/2017
Dissemination level:	PU

Deliverable factsheet

Project Number:	**562604-EPP-1-2015-1-EL-EPPKA2-KA**
Project Acronym:	**ODEdu**
Project Title:	**Innovative Open Data Education and Training based on PBL and Learning Analytics**

Title of Deliverable:	**D7.2 – Interim Quality Assurance Report**
Work package:	**WP7 – Quality Assurance**
Due date according to contract:	**30/06/2017**

Editor(s):	**Konstantinos Tarabanis (UOM)**
	Efthimios Tambouris (UOM)
Contributor(s):	**All partners**
Reviewer(s):	**-**
Approved by:	**All Partners**

Abstract:	This document documents the interim SWOT analysis and risk analysis performed by partners as well as the status of deliverables' peer reviews so far.
	Summing up interim SWOT analysis' results, 19 strengths and weaknesses were identified during the project's internal analysis, while the external analysis identified 10 opportunities and four threats.
	The interim risk analysis has identified 11 risks that should be taken into consideration during the 2nd half of the project.
Keyword List:	**Risk, quality, SWOT, plan, monitoring**

Consortium

	Role	Name	Short Name	Country
1.	Coordinator, academic partner	University of Macedonia	UOM	Greece
2.	Open Data expert	Open Data Institute	ODI	UK
3.	Problem Based Learning expert	Aalborg University	AAU	Denmark
4.	Technology enhanced learning expert	AcrossLimits	AcrossLimits	Malta
5.	Dissemination partner	Association of Information Technology Companies of Northern Greece	SEPVE	Greece
6.	Open / Linked Data technologies expert	ProXML	ProXML	Belgium
7.	Local Authorities partner	Linked Organisation of Local Authorities	LOLA	Belgium

Revision History

Version	Date	Revised by	Reason
v01	05/05/2017	UOM	Circulation of first draft for contributions
v02	12/05/2017	UOM	Contributions from partners added
V1	27/06/2017	UOM	Final contributions added and final version ready for submission

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.

Disclaimer:

This project has been funded with support from the European Commission. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Table of Contents

List of Figures

List of Tables

List of Abbreviations

The following table presents the acronyms used in the deliverable in alphabetical order.

Abbreviation	Description
CA	Consortium Agreement
EACEA	Education, Audiovisual and Culture Executive Agency
IPR	Intelligence Property Rights
SWOT	Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities Threats
WP	Work Package

Executive Summary

ODEdu project aims to establish a Knowledge Alliance between academia, business and the public sector that will boost Open Data education and training.

WP7 is the Quality Assurance work package for ODEdu. Its main aim is to provide quality monitoring mechanisms that will guarantee the results' superiority as well as the timely progress of the project. A quality assurance strategy and a corresponding plan will specify the procedures and criteria for the overall quality assurance of the project results and will provide co-ordination of the testing and quality checks that will be undertaken in the course of the work of the other WPs.

The present deliverable is the second deliverable of WP7, D7.2 – Interim Quality Assurance Report. Its purpose is to report all quality assurance mechanisms undertaken during the first half of the project.

More specific, this deliverable focuses on the following aspects and analyses:

- The interim SWOT analysis for the ODEdu project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The interim risk analysis for the ODEdu project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The presentation of performed peer reviewers for each technical deliverable of the ODEdu project as well as the plan for all future peer reviews.

The interim internal SWOT analysis identified a set of strengths, such as the composition of the consortium, the existence of clear objectives and measurable results, as well as a clear work plan that guides the achievement of said results, the selection and integration of existing technological tools and platforms as well as the integration of different local contexts to the new educational approach. On the other hand, the weaknesses and neutral items identified include the need for more frequent communication amongst the partners, the need for more specific decision making processes and clearer coordination amongst task leaders. These weaknesses will be addressed in the second half of the project, through setting of regular communication opportunities amongst the consortium as well as amongst WP or Task leaders.

The interim external SWOT analysis identified opportunities of the project's impact on the Open Data domain, such as the potential to create innovative pedagogies on applying PBL in the Open Data context, growing number of companies and governments working with or publishing Open Data, growing the number of open educational resources within the area of Open Data and contributing to the design for learning research communities on innovative technologies and learning approaches. Threats identified during the same external analysis include the limited

experience with open data trainings in the three sectors as well as the low priority Open Data seem to have in the political agenda of most European countries.

Additionally, the consortium performed an updated risk analysis by providing WP-specific risks based on the lessons learnt from the 1st half of the project's lifetime. In total, 11 risks were identified, including possible issues that can risk the project's success, such as limited meetings and communication within the consortium, non-successful integration of the DD_PBL model developed in WP2 with the Open Data content developed in WP3, insufficient or non-targeted dissemination towards public institutions and difficulty to reach the indicated numbers of activities and events for results' dissemination.

Finally, the report provided an overview of the peer-review process for the six deliverables that were submitted in the 1st half of the project, and included an updated allocation of reviewers for the deliverables to be submitted in the 2nd half of the project.

1 Introduction

1.1 Scope

This deliverable presents the interim analysis of risk, SWOT and overall quality for ODEDU. The methodology followed is not described in the present document but in the previously submitted D7.1 Quality Assurance Plan.

1.2 Audience

The intended audience for this document is the ODEdu consortium and the European Commission.

1.3 Structure

The structure of the document is as follows:

- Section 2 presents the interim SWOT analysis
- Section 3 presents the interim risk analysis
- Section 4 presents the status of the peer reviews of technical deliverables
- Section 5 concludes the document

2 SWOT Analysis

SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis is adopted as a suitable method for performing project self-evaluation (**Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**). SWOT analysis and the process for applying it in ODEDU is available in D7.1 Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we proceed directly to the results of our interim SWOT analysis.

	POSITIVE	NEGATIVE
INTERNAL	Strengths	Weaknesses
EXTERNAL	Opportunities	Threats

Figure 1. SWOT analysis concept

2.1 Interim SWOT in ODEdu

This section presents the results of the interim SWOT analysis as identified by all project partners.

2.1.1 Internal analysis

Internal analysis focuses on studying the strengths and weaknesses of the ODEdu project. The results of the internal SWOT analysis are depicted in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.** and are structured as follows:

- The first two columns denote the number and description of the item, i.e. the 17 items to be rated as strengths or weaknesses,

- The third and fourth columns denote the average rate allocated by the consortium partners in M2, as well as the characterisation assigned – either S for strength, W for Weakness, or N for Neutral,

- The fifth and sixth columns denote the average rate allocated by the consortium partners in M12, as well as the characterisation assigned – either S for strength, W for Weakness, or N for Neutral,

- The seventh column includes provided comments or suggestions.

Table 1. Internal SWOT analysis, Strengths / Weaknesses

No.	Item	Initial rating		Interim Rating		Comment / Suggestion
1	Size of consortium	4,3	S	4,2	S	
2	Composition of consortium	5,0	S	4	S	

3	Collaboration between participating partners	4,3	S	3,4	N	Some Partners potentially contributing more to supporting task.
4	Communication between participating partners	4,3	S	2,7	W	Potentially scheduling a call series, as they are proving hard to arrange individually
5	Consortium meetings	5,0	S	2,8	W	Scheduling a meeting to review progress
6	Decision-making process / consensus-drawing process	4,3	S	3,6	N	
7	Allocation of work	4,0	S	3,8	S	
8	Coordination of work - synchronization of related tasks and processes	4,3	S	3,1	N	It is recommended to have more online meetings to integrate better the different tasks.
9	Exchange of information - level of transparency between related WPs and involved partners	4,3	S	3,9	S	Could be improved by through more frequent communication.
10	Technological innovativeness	3,7	N	3,6	N	Untested
11	Scientific/technical capacity of partners for the specific project	5,0	S	4,5	S	High level of knowledge of the partners in their respective areas.
12	Sufficiency of resources (budget, time)	4,0	S	3,8	S	
13	Existence of clear objectives and measurable results	3,3	N	4	S	
14	Existence of clear work plan to achieve project's objectives	4,3	S	4	S	
15	Existence of clear methods to measure project's success	3,7	N	4	S	
16	Sufficiency of risk management methods	4,3	S	4	S	
17	Existence and use of a clear Quality Assurance System	4	S	3,8	S	
18	Selection and integration of existing technological tools/platforms	4	S	4,2	S	

19	Integration of different local contexts to the new educational approach	4,3	S	4	S	

2.1.2 External analysis

From an external viewpoint the SWOT analysis focuses on the analysis of threats and opportunities in the project's environment. The results of the external SWOT analysis are depicted in Table 2.

Table 2. External SWOT analysis, Opportunities

No.	Opportunity	Suggestion
1	Potential to create innovative pedagogy on applying PBL in an open data context	Apply learning design and test in three sectors (higher education, public and private organizations).
2	Growing political awareness on open data	Reach out to many participants and organizations.
3	The different open data initiatives spread the knowledge about open data	Link the project website with the different open data initiatives
4	Growing number of open educational resources within the areas of open data	Share those open educational resources through the project webpage (for externals) and through the project email (for the internal partners)
5	Design for learning research communities are developing innovative technologies and learning approaches	Follow up on different technologies for teaching and learning
6	Growing of companies applications of open data	Collect good examples of innovative applications and share through the website.
7	Growing number of governments publishing (linked) open data	Cross-disseminate good practices, and include those practices in training materials
8	Horizontal networking	Partners who are key players should "introduce" / "promote" the project to other networks
9	Movement from quantity in data publishing to data quality, wherefore more and more diverse skills are needed at the public sector side.	Give more emphasis to data quality assessment, data cleaning skills
10	Interest in data and data literacy is still growing	Do not limit our reaching out to 'open' data

Table 3. External SWOT analysis, Threats

No.	Threat	Suggestion
1	Little experience with open data training in all three sectors (higher education, public and private organisations).	Difficult to attract relevant, qualified users to take part in project

2	Open data is lower on the list of political priorities within a number of EU member states and the European Commission	Work with champions to demonstrate value of open data through clear cases in all segments and in relation to (new) political priorities. Work with governments to ascertain political backing.
3	Difficulties recruiting a sufficiently large number of interested participants to courses	Work both top-down ("management's orders") and bottom-up (creative visibility for the project and incite demand for courses)
4	Fragile political support for opening up data	Aim data literacy skills for everyone, independent of data being open or not.

3   Risk Management

The overall process for managing risk in the ODEdu project has been described in detail in D7.1 - Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we proceed directly to the results of our interim risk analysis.

3.1   Interim Risk analysis

In the interim risk analysis, the consortium has identified 11 risks for the overall project. These are analysed in the risk registry in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**.

The most important risks identified are:

- Lack of meetings and communication within the consortium.

- Non-successful integration of the DD_PBL model developed in WP2 with the Open Data content developed in WP3.

- Insufficient or non-targeted dissemination towards public institutions.

- Difficulty to reach the indicated numbers of activities and events for results' dissemination.

Table 4 ODEdu Interim Risk Registry

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
General Project Risks										
0.1	**Lack of meetings and communication within the consortium**	Not understanding the task being undertaken, progress of support that may be required	9	9	81	Improve communication with call scheduling or arranging face to face meetings to discuss progress	7	4	28	When difficulties arise for consortium meetings scheduling, partners will endeavour to schedule more bilateral or WP-based / Task-based meetings.
0.2	**Personnel alterations**	Potential effect on the work plan and partners' communication	7	3	21	Partners will reduce probability by trying to keep the same employees assigned to the same roles in the project and build robust working processes. Partner organisations will employ more than one person in this project and will ensure a smooth process for responsibilities' re-allocation in order to ensure continuation as much as possible.	6	3	18	All partners will try to communicate knowledge of the project to the new team members in order to familiarise them with the project work and integrate them smoothly in the project team. The online documentation in the website private area will also contribute to this.
WP1 Risks										
WP2 Risks										

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
WP3 Risks										
3.1	**Lack of contribution to task from partners**	Inadequate knowledge on how to structure courses based on the PBL model.	3	5	15	Improve engagement in outputs from other partners	3	4	12	Some academic partners can provide PBL teachings/methods to improve content
3.2	**It will be difficult to develop and run inspiring and effective learning trials if the DD_PBL model developed in WP2 and the OD content developed in WP3 is not well integrated.**	Lack of innovation and impact.	5	5	25	Ensure that all courses / trainings are structured based on the DD_PBL model.	4	3	12	Close cooperation between the WP2 and WP3 leaders for courses models' adoption of the DD_PBL model.
WP4 Risks										
4.1	**Insufficient or non-targeted dissemination towards public institutions**	Low participation grade from public sector employees	6	6	36	Ensure specific (channeled) dissemination towards public sector institutions using best practices, examples, etc.	4	4	24	Frequent communication with public sector members from partners with such networks.
4.2	**Limited number of innovative results (e.g. applications, data etc.)are generated during the trials**	Potentially limits the impact of the project to the audiences(ODI)	6	6	36	The ODEdu Consortium will define the scope of an innovative output in the bounds of the project. Creative ways will be sought in order to produce innovative outcomes from the trials. Trials will be designed with outputs in mind. All partners coordinating or delivering trials will be involved in the design process to ensure suitability for	4	6	24	Ongoing monitoring required throughout trials to optimise outputs, transferring outputs that are not fully developed to other trials for potential completion.

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
						audience, length of trial, type of event etc.				
WP5 Risks										
5.1	**Difficulty to evaluate the validity of the results**	Difficulty to draw homogenous conclusions and assess the added value of each result.	2	8	16	The ODEdu consortium will consult the already set success indications on the project results when performing evaluations, along with a robust evaluation methodology that will be planned.	1	8	8	Partners will utilize existing evaluation models and frameworks that will guide the evaluation process.
5.2	**Difficulty to interpret the Learning Analytics results from the trials**	Problems providing insights to educators and learners through learning analytics	3	6	18	UOM, UAH and OUNL have extensive expertise on Learning Analytics. All partners will closely examine the analytics results and produce insights for successful evaluation.	1	6	6	Further study on the exploitation of learning analytics will be carried out.
WP6 Risks										
6.1	**Difficulty to reach the indicated numbers of activities and events for results' dissemination**	Problems in promoting the project's results.	8	8	64	All partners will engage in dissemination activities and will utilize their networks and communication channels for sufficient dissemination activities.	2	8	16	All partners will organize themselves activities and events for the dissemination of the results and reach to stakeholders for participation.
WP8 Risks										
8.1	**Inadequate partners' coordination**	Potential deviation in work plan and objectives'	7	7	49	Project management will be responsible for efficiently managing	5	6	30	If conflicts over financial issues do occur, the

No.	Risk	Effect	Pr	Im	RF	Mitigation Measures	Pr*	Im*	RF*	Contingency Measures
		accomplishment .				the consortium and ensuring that each partner will be acting according to his assigned responsibilities and roles.				consortium plans to confront them by organizing a meeting for partners to negotiate having the coordinator as a leader. Standard voting procedures will be followed according to the provisions of the CA. In case, however, of extreme financial issues, the consortium will follow the appropriate, European legal procedure.
8.2	**Conflicts over financial issues**	Potential deviation in work plan and results' quality.	6	7	42	ODEdu consortium, having the coordinator as a leader, will be responsible for assessing and examining costs, spending, and excess issues on budget for ensuring the appropriate distributing of the project's budget.	5	7	35	In case of serious problems in the communication of the partners, the coordinator will be responsible for organising a meeting to find out and confront the communication problems.

4   Peer Review of Deliverables

Being committed to delivering results of outmost quality, the consortium adopted and followed a peer review process for all deliverables of the project. The detailed procedure for deliverables' review as well as the review report template have been described in D7.1 - Quality Assurance Plan; for this reason in the present deliverable we directly report the progress of peer reviews during the first reporting period.

During the first reporting period 8 reviews of technical deliverables were performed. For objectivity reasons, the review partners were always different than the leading partner of the deliverable. The reviews have been performed by personnel of the partner organisations and relevant review reports have been filled in the designated template and are available in the project's knowledge repository.

In all of these cases the reviews were timely performed allowing for deliverables' revision before submission to the European Commission (EC). In general, the consortium follows an open, collaborative process of deliverable creation and review since all working versions of the deliverables are being uploaded in the knowledge repository (Google Drive) and are constantly monitored and commented upon by all consortium partners.

The list of all deliverables that were subjected to peer review in the first period of the project is available in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**, while Table 5 depicts the reviews planned for the second reporting period.

4.1   Allocation of reviewers

All implementation deliverables of ODEdu will be peer reviewed, which essentially means that only management deliverables (deliverables of WP7 and WP8) will be excluded from the peer review process. The list of all deliverables that were subjected to peer review in the first 18 months of the project is available in **Σφάλμα! Το αρχείο προέλευσης της αναφοράς δεν βρέθηκε.**, while Table 5 depicts the reviews planned for the second reporting period.

Table 5. Reviewers and deadlines for ODEdu deliverables on 1st half of the project

| Deliverable | Leader | Nature | Diss Lev | Reviewer | Indicative dates due | | Submission to EC |
					To Reviewer	Reviewed	
D6.1 - Dissemination plan and material	SEPVE	R&O	PU	LOLA	15/04/2016	22/04/2016	M4 30/04/2016
D1.1 – Stakeholders Needs Regarding Open Data	ProXML	R	PU	ODI	17/06/2016	23/06/2016	M6 30/06/2016

D1.2 - Living Labs analysis	ProXML	R	PU	ODI	17/06/2016	23/06/2016	M6 30/06/2016
D2.1 - Data-driven PBL model	AAU	R	PU	UOM	17/06/2016	23/06/2016	M6 30/06/2016
D1.3 - Open Data technological study	ProXML	R	PU	AcrossLimits	16/09/2016	23/09/2016	M9 30/09/2016
D2.2 - Open Data learning processes and analytics	UOM	R	PU	ProXML	16/12/2016	23/12/2016	M12 31/12/2016
D3.2 - Open Data VET course for private and public employees	ODI	R	PU	AcrossLimits	02/06/2017	09/2017	M18 30/06/2017
D6.2 - Dissemination activities Report	SEPVE	R	PU	AAU	02/06/2017	09/06/2017	M18 30/06/2017

Table 6. Reviewers and deadlines for ODEdu deliverables on 2ⁿᵈ half of the project

					Indicative dates due		
Deliverable	Leader	Nature	Diss Lev	Reviewer	To Reviewer	Reviewed	Submission to EC
D3.1 - Open Data university course	ODI	R	PU	UOM	10/07/2017	17/07/2017	M19 31/07/2017
D6.4 - Interim Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	SEPVE	R	CO	AcrossLimits	10/07/2017	17/07/2017	M19 31/07/2017
D3.3 - Educational and training platform	AcrossLimits	W/R	PU	UOM	08/12/2017	15/12/2017	M24 31/12/2017
D3.4 - Educational and training platform Version 2.0	AcrossLimits	W/R	PU	ODI	08/06/2018	15/06/2018	M30 30/06/2018
D4.1 - University pilots report	ODI	R	PU	UOM	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D4.2 - VET pilots report	ODI	R	PU	AcrossLimits	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D5.1 - University pilots	UOM	R	PU	AAU	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36

							31/12/2018
evaluation report							
D5.2 - VET pilots evaluation report	UOM	R	PU	ODI	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D6.3 – Final Dissemination activities Report	SEPVE	R	PU	UOM	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018
D6.5 - Final Exploitation and Sustainability Plan	SEPVE	R	CO	AcrossLimits	07/12/2018	14/12/2018	M36 31/12/2018

5   Conclusions

The purpose of this deliverable was to present the interim risk analysis and quality assurance for the project.

- The interim SWOT analysis for the ODEdu project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The interim risk analysis for the ODEdu project according to the methodology defined previously in the project.

- The presentation of performed peer reviewers for each technical deliverable of the ODEdu project as well as the plan for all future peer reviews.

The interim internal SWOT analysis identified a set of strengths, such as the composition of the consortium, the existence of clear objectives and measurable results, as well as a clear work plan that guides the achievement of said results, the selection and integration of existing technological tools and platforms as well as the integration of different local contexts to the new educational approach. On the other hand, the weaknesses and neutral items identified include the need for more frequent communication amongst the partners, the need for more specific decision making processes and clearer coordination amongst task leaders. These weaknesses will be addressed in the second half of the project, through setting of regular communication opportunities amongst the consortium as well as amongst WP or Task leaders.

The interim external SWOT analysis identified opportunities of the project's impact on the Open Data domain, such as the potential to create innovative pedagogies on applying PBL in the Open Data context, growing number of companies and governments working with or publishing Open Data, growing the number of open educational resources within the area of Open Data and contributing to the design for learning research communities on innovative technologies and learning approaches. Threats identified during the same external analysis include the limited experience with open data trainings in the three sectors as well as the low priority Open Data seem to have in the political agenda of most European countries.

Additionally, the consortium performed an updated risk analysis by providing WP-specific risks based on the lessons learnt from the 1st half of the project's lifetime. In total, 11 risks were identified, including possible issues that can risk the project's success, such as limited meetings and communication within the consortium, non-successful integration of the DD_PBL model developed in WP2 with the Open Data content developed in WP3, insufficient or non-targeted dissemination towards public institutions and difficulty to reach the indicated numbers of activities and events for results' dissemination.

Finally, the report provided an overview of the peer-review process for the six deliverables that were submitted in the 1st half of the project, and included an updated allocation of reviewers for the deliverables to be submitted in the 2nd half of the project.