



## ET2020 Working Group on Digital and Online Learning

18-19 March 2015, Rue Joseph-II 70, B-1000 Brussels, Room 00/013

### Meeting Minutes

The 3rd meeting of the ET2020 Working Group on Digital and Online Learning on 18-19 March 2015.

**Participants from the European Commission:** Deputy Head of Unit Bodo Richter (EAC.B3); Mario Roccaro (EAC.B3); Konstantin Scheller (EAC.B3), Paolo Battaglia (EAC.A1), Bénédicte Robert (EAC.A1), Klara Engels-Perenyi (EAC.B1), Karianne Helland (EAC.B2), Geraldine Libreau (EAC.B2).

**Chair:** Bodo Richter, Deputy Head of Unit (EAC.B3).

### Working group members

- **Countries:** Christian Schrack (AT); Jan De Craemer (BE-fl); Marios Miltiadou (CY); Anastasia Economou (CY); Michael Kaden (DE); Anja Janum (DK); Carlos Medina Bravo (ES); Thomas Vikberg (FI); Nathalie Terrades (FR); Alen Culjak (HR); Marta Hunya (HU); Rita Sexton (IE); Lucia Scalas (IT); Vaino Brazdeikis (LT); Vincent Carabott (MT); Belle Teunissen (NL); Maria Teresa Godinho; Lars Olof Mikaelsson (SE); Borut Campelj (SI); Lucia Divicanova (SK); Andrej Kurucz (SK); Danijela Scepanovic (RS); Inci Balamir (TR). Berit Johnsen (NO); Jan Peter Strømsheim (NO).
- **Other stakeholders:** Ilze Trapenciere (ETUCE); Marcel Mizzi (UEAPME); Sarah Kik (EFEE); Yves Epelboin (EUNIS); Alessandro Brolpito (ETF).
- **External experts:** Mitja Jermol (Jozef Stefan Institute); Panagiotis Kampylis (IPTIS); Agnes Aguilo (P.A.U. Education); Hanne Shapiro (Danish Technological Institute); Simon Fuglsang Østergaard (Danish Technological Institute).

This meeting report provides an overview of presentations and key points raised during the workshops and plenary discussions. **All presentations and rapporteurs' notes from the smaller workshop group discussions have been uploaded to Yammer.**



**Day 1: 18 March 2015**

---

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topics discussed</b>
09.00	<p><b>Welcome from the Commission</b></p> <p>Bodo Richter, Head of Unit EAC.B3, welcomed the participants to the 3rd WG DOL meeting and presented the team from DG EAC.</p> <p>In the wake of the reorganisation exercises, some units have been moved to other DGs. The WG DOL remains in DG EAC. Although the unit is new to this specific agenda, they are not new to the business and have worked with other WGs in the past.</p> <p>There was no WG meeting in December. This essentially means that everybody needs to work a bit harder to reach the WG goals by the end of October 2015 when the mandate of the WG expires. The mandate might be renewed until the end of 2015, but the aim should be to reach the goals by October.</p> <p>There are two more WG meetings before the end of the mandate – one in June and one in October.</p> <p>There is a lot of interest in the work of the WG and digitalisation in general is high on different EC flagship agendas. Once the mandate has expired, the work of WG DOL will feed into another WG and therefore it is very important that the output produced in WG DOL is as usable for future purposes as possible.</p> <p>Please use Yammer to exchange ideas and for advancement of work relevant in the WG context.</p>
09.20	<p><b>Junker Agenda and Objectives of ET2020 Working Group on Digital and Online Learning</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Paolo Battaglia, EAC.A1</u></p> <p>Paolo Battaglia informed the WG about the ECs Investment Plan for Europe and how education and training can benefit from it.</p> <p>The Investment Plan consists of three pillars: (1) The European Fund for Strategic Investment (EFSI); (2) Project Pipeline; (3) Better regulation and administrative simplification.</p> <p>During the autumn of 2014, the MS' submitted more than 3000 'illustrative projects' – out of which 152 projects relate to education.</p> <p>During 2015, EFSI will be operational and the first projects will be funded. In connection with this, an 'Advisory Hub' (single point of entry) and an 'Investment Committee' (focus on selection criteria) will be created. EFSI is expected to be up and running by the end of June 2015.</p> <p>In 2015-2016, project platforms to promote educational investment will be created.</p> <p>The plan has a three-year horizon (2017), after which the EU guarantee expires.</p> <p>Everybody is encouraged to spread the word to relevant stakeholders. Stakeholders from both education and digital communities can apply.</p> <p>The presentation has been uploaded to Yammer including illustrative projects submitted in the autumn of 2014.</p> <p><b>ET2020 Working Groups: Where do we stand?</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Bénédicte Robert, EAC.A1</u></p> <p>Bénédicte Robert presented the mandate of the ET2020 WGs and gave an outlook of future</p>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>tasks. Six WGs, including the WG DOL with more than 400 experts from MS and stakeholders, exist under ET2020. The WGs are planned to continue as they are.</p> <p>The ET2020 framework has four objectives and 13 priority areas. WG DOL is part of implementing the fourth objective on 'Enhancing creativity and innovation'.</p> <p>In addition to reaching the outputs set forward in the mandate, the WGs are also regarded as valuable peer learning activities for MS representatives.</p> <p>The presentation has been uploaded to Yammer, including the roadmap of the WGs.</p>
09.50	<p><b>Brief update of the work of the WG and introduction to the agenda</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Mario Roccaro, EAC.B3</u></p> <p>During the 3rd WG DOL meeting, Outputs 1, 4, 5 and 6.</p> <p><i>Output 1:</i> Models of effective organisational change in educational institutions towards innovative and open learning environments and guidelines transferring these to national and local contexts.</p> <p><i>Output 4:</i> Overview report of regional and national portals on OER, their learning repositories and functioning; their open access policies, their strategies to interconnect across Europe with an OpenEducationEuropa portal.</p> <p><i>Output 5:</i> Report mapping stakeholders' views (with focus on the MS) on the impact of the EU legal copyright framework on education and training.</p> <p><i>Output 6:</i> Report on new trends through online and digital learning and their policy implications for education.</p> <p>A country focus workshop centred on Output 2 is in the pipeline and a volunteer country to host this workshop is needed. Some countries have already expressed interest in hosting the workshop.</p>
10.10	<p><b>Towards a Framework of Digitally Innovative Educational Organisation – lessons learnt from existing frameworks and online tools across Europe</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Panagiotis Kampylis, Institute for Prospective Technologies Studies (IPTS)</u></p> <p>Pan Kampylis presented the ongoing work in terms of developing a Framework for a Digitally Innovative Educational Organisation.</p> <p>The aim is to develop a conceptual framework and a self-assessment questionnaire so that educational organisations from all sectors can review their strategies and improve their capacity to innovate and open up learning environments through ICT.</p> <p>There are currently several initiatives in the different MS; however, there is a lack of common understanding and conceptual approach at the European level.</p> <p>The plan is to have the conceptual framework ready by July 2015 and the self-assessment questionnaire ready by March 2016.</p> <p>The draft conceptual framework consists of seven cross sector areas (key areas) and it is possible to include relevant specific areas. Please give feedback on relevant sector specific areas that should potentially be covered.</p> <p>The seven key areas are Learning practices; Teaching practices and professional development; Leadership practices and strategic planning, Openness and Networking, Curricula and content, Assessment and impact, Technological and physical infrastructure.</p> <p>The areas are elaborated on in more detail in the presentation and a roadmap for the next steps in the ongoing work can be found on Yammer.</p>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>The next steps in the ongoing development work include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- March 2015 – Feedback on the draft conceptual framework from the WG DOL.</li><li>- April 2015 – Consolidation of the conceptual framework and the area specific building blocks.</li><li>- May/June 2015 – Expert and stakeholders consultation on the conceptual framework and building blocks.</li><li>- June 2015 – Presenting and validating the conceptual framework and building blocks during the next WG DOL meeting.</li><li>- July 2015 – Validated and consolidated framework in place</li><li>- Sep/Oct 2015 – Development of the self-assessment questionnaire</li></ul> <p>The conceptual framework and building blocks will be discussed in Workshop 1.</p> <p>The methodology and examples of frameworks and tools evaluated in the ongoing work can be found in the presentation slides on Yammer. There is still room for adaption of the framework so the MS experts are encouraged to give there feedback.</p>
10.45	<p><b>Case study: Ways and means of Opening up Education in Slovenia: an insider view</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Mitja Jermol, Jozef Stefan Institute Ljubljana Slovenia.</u></p> <p>Mitja Jermol presented the OpeningUpSlovenia initiative, an initiative that holistically embraces the ECs Opening up Education Communication.</p> <p>The initiative has received the ‘Best Scientific Project’ award from UNESCO.</p> <p>The presentation highlighted that there is a need and demand for bringing flexibility into the relatively rigid educational systems and focus more on personalised education. EU can play a leading role in the innovation and experimentation of Open Education and bring the necessary flexibility to traditional educational systems.</p> <p>With this initiative, Slovenia wishes to take the lead at EU level in the Opening up Education initiative set forward by the EC. Slovenia can act as a ‘test bed’ for developing, testing and deploying best practices in this context.</p> <p>More information on the initiative as well as examples of ongoing activities can be found in the presentation on Yammer. If there are any other questions, please e-mail them to Mitja Jermol.</p>
11.30	<p><b>Workshop 1: Discussion on Output 1 (Models of effective organisational change in educational institutions towards innovative and open learning environments and guidelines transferring these to national and local contexts)</b></p> <p>The MS representatives were divided into three work groups.</p> <p>The discussion points were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Do you agree with the proposed key areas of the framework?</li><li>- Are there any missing or irrelevant areas that should be merged?</li><li>- Do you agree with the terminology and description of key areas?</li><li>- What are the main uses of the framework?</li><li>- Do you know of other relevant frameworks?</li></ul> <p>Each of the groups appointed a rapporteur to take notes from the group discussions. The notes will be uploaded to Yammer.</p> <p><b>Discussion in plenary of Workshop 1 outcomes</b></p> <p>Each rapporteur was asked to give a brief presentation of the outcome of the group</p>

---



---

**Time**

**Topics discussed**

---

discussions.

Group C: (Presented by Spain)

In general, the Group C agreed with the relevance of the proposed main areas and no obvious areas are missing. There was consensus that the block 'Teaching practices and professional development' is highly relevant, and changes to the learning environment happen through teachers and trainers. This specific block is a driver of change, which should be emphasised in the final framework document.

It will be relevant to formulate some sort of vocabulary of terminologies and definitions for a better common understanding across MS and educational levels of the conceptual framework.

There appears to be one major unanswered question that needs to be addressed. Who are the users and what is the intended use of the framework? Institutional level vs. Ministerial level? Internal evaluation/use vs. External evaluation/use?

Even though there are some uncertainties as to whether this framework can be adapted in different country contexts, the group acknowledges the usefulness of a common and wider conceptual framework.

Group B: (Presented by Belgium)

On a general note, there is some confusion as to what is meant with an 'Innovative Educational Organisation'. This probably needs to be clarified.

Group B also discussed whom the conceptual framework concerns. The general view of the group members was that the framework is more relevant at the institutional level than the ministerial level. Some blocks are more relevant at the institutional level while others appeal more to the ministerial level. However, it has to be made clear which levels the framework concerns.

The block 'Assessment and impact' refers to educational organisations having a particular strategy for innovation. This should be revised as it is not necessarily relevant with a separate innovation strategy at each organisation, as it may be more relevant to have an innovation strategy for a group of schools, etc.

Group B also discussed if this framework will be effective in use across all MS, as some countries already have many of the features in place. However, in some MS this framework has the potential to add a lot of value.

Group A: (Presented by UEAPME)

The main discussion in Group A also centred around whom the users of the framework should be and how they will use it. It is important to define clearly whether it is aimed at internal or external use, or both, and to what degree students should be asked/involved.

It appears to be unfit to use this framework and self-assessment tool for comparison among MS.

There was a consensus among the group members that it is necessary to dissect the blocks, so that it becomes clear what they are based on exactly. Then it will also be more relevant to decide whether the framework should consist of fewer blocks by merging existing blocks. If the tool is to be effective, it is also important to look at relevant indicators for the assessment and the weight assigned to different indicators.

The security of minors in terms of content and the aspect of copyright infringement should

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>also be included in the framework.</p> <p>Some of the group members preferred the 'circle' approach to the framework that was discussed at the previous WG DOL meeting.</p> <p>IPTS will share more information on the ongoing analytical work on the conceptual framework on Yammer, as some of the topics discussed in the workshop groups have in fact already been addressed.</p> <p>The WG members are encouraged to continue to give feedback on the framework through Yammer.</p>
13.00	<p><b>Lunch break</b></p> <p>EAC Country Desk Officers engaged in informal consultations on Country Specific Recommendations with the relevant WG members.</p>
14.30	<p><b>Overview of OER portals and repositories across the EU</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Agnes Aguilo, P.A.U.</u></p> <p>Agnes Aguilo, project manager on the OpenEducationEuropa.eu portal, gave an overview of the ongoing work on an EU level OER repository.</p> <p>The purpose of the repository is to provide a single gateway to European OER. Resources from across the MS are harvested and added to the portal continuously. There is a great variety in the OER resources that are included in the repository.</p> <p>More information on the collection methodology, findings and examples can be found in the presentation slides on Yammer.</p> <p><b>Possible synergies of European OER platforms</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Konstantin Scheller, EAC.B3</u></p> <p>Konstantin Scheller briefly raised the question on what an OER repository should be, as there are very different elements and priorities across OER resources in the MS.</p> <p>Konstantin then prepared the ground for a discussion on how we can ensure that there is easy access to the best possible materials for teachers and how the work should proceed from the MS perspective.</p> <p><u>Questions and short discussions:</u></p> <p>Belgium referred to the existing repository from European Schoolnet and pointed out that it is essential to learn from previous experiences and the work that has been done in terms of OER repositories.</p> <p>EUNIS agreed with Belgium and thinks that there is much more to this project/study than just another OER repository. The work is far from finished, and it should definitely continue.</p> <p>IPTS asked whether the project has studied the underlying business models of the existing private OER repositories. The response was that this has not been done in detail yet.</p> <p>A representative from DG EAC pointed towards the EPALE community and the fact that a repository that also focuses on OER for adult learning would be useful.</p> <p>Lithuania believed that studies to see if a new OER repository would add value should be carried out to avoid creating what is already there.</p>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>Sweden pointed out that teachers to a high degree are demanding some sort of quality stamp on different OER resources.</p> <p>Germany agreed with Sweden that quality management is a very central issue. It could be useful with a common understanding on quality management, which would add much more value than having another portal. The OECD is working on a paper on this topic to be published in June.</p>
15.30	<p><b>Workshop 2: Discussion on Output 4 (Overview report of regional and national portals on OER, their learning repositories and functioning; their open access policies, their strategies to interconnect across Europe with an OpenEducationEuropa portal)</b></p> <p>The MS representatives were again divided into three work groups.</p> <p>The points for discussion in Workshop 2 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Do you think it will bring added value to link (European) OER repositories?</li><li>- Will it be beneficial to have a meta-repository of directory?</li><li>- What next steps would you like to see?</li><li>- Which other cooperation regarding OER would you like to see at EU level?</li></ul> <p>The notes from the group rapporteurs will be uploaded to Yammer.</p> <p><b>Discussion in plenary of Workshop 2 outcomes:</b></p> <p>Each of the rapporteurs was asked to give a brief presentation of the outcome of the group discussions.</p> <p><u>Group A: (Presented by Slovenia)</u></p> <p>The main problem is that there are many challenges associated with connecting the repositories at a national level, and therefore it will be even more problematic to create and operate a meta-repository at the European level.</p> <p>Quality management is very important. This is a huge challenge that needs to be taken care of before at meta-repository really makes sense.</p> <p>Group A agrees that to begin with it would add more value to look at why teachers are only using OERs to a limited extent. The quality of the material, time, equipment and mindset are important factors in this matter.</p> <p>On a general note, some members of the group were doubtful of the added value of yet another repository and believed that it would make more sense to look at existing repositories (e.g. European Schoolnet) to learn from and potentially upgrade.</p> <p><u>Group B: (Presented by Serbia)</u></p> <p>There was general agreement that OER is an important topic and work needs to be done at the EU Level, but a new repository is probably not a pressing issue at the moment and it would be better to upgrade existing repositories.</p> <p>It could be useful to take a closer look at how high-quality OER materials can be translated into different languages for use across MS at higher levels of education. This also calls for more work on legal standards to enable circulation of content across MS.</p> <p>Group B also agreed that the most important question is quality management and work should be done on a common understanding of how quality is defined in this field. EAC should</p>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>have a role in facilitating this important topic.</p> <p>The group also highlighted the importance of more knowledge regarding how teachers make use of OER resources and why they do not use OER more.</p> <p><u>Group C: (Presented by ETUCE)</u></p> <p>Group C concluded that there could be added value with a repository for OER aimed at higher level of education as well as adult learners, but there is no added value in a repository that also encompasses OER aimed at the lower levels of education. There are several constraints in terms of curriculum development standards across MS at the lower levels of education.</p> <p>Language barriers are a big obstacle to the relevance and use of an OER repository at EU level.</p> <p>This group also discussed the whole quality issue. It will be difficult to establish EU wide standards. Peer review was mentioned as a solution, but peer reviews also need standards. For an EU level repository to add value some sort of quality indicators must be developed. Finally, the group agreed that the main issue is not the actual use of a meta-repository, but more the quality issues regarding the use of such a repository.</p>
17.00	<p><b>EduCloud Alliance project – A cooperation project between Finland and Estonia</b></p> <p>Thomas Vikberg, the Finnish representative in the WG DOL, gave an insight into the EduCloud Alliance project.</p> <p>The Finnish and Estonian governments have signed a memorandum of understanding regarding efforts to standardise the digital learning resource market to support national efforts to digitalise education.</p> <p>The EduCloud Alliance consists of a consortium of interested parties (ministries of education, companies, universities, NPOs), which jointly agree on standards regarding learning materials.</p> <p>The presentation slides give further information on the project and are shared on Yammer.</p>
17.15	<p><b>End of day one</b></p> <p>As a concluding remark, the MS representatives were encouraged to look at the OpenEducationEuropa portal to check if there are any obvious repositories missing from their respective countries.</p> <p>The WG meeting will continue tomorrow.</p>

---





**Day 2: 19 March 2015**

---

<b>Time</b>	<b>Topics discussed</b>
09.00	<p><b>Update from the Commission on the ongoing policy process in the field of copyright as it relates to education and training</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Daniel Göhring, EAC.B3</u></p> <p>Daniel Göhring provided an update on developments in this field over the past 6 months and the expected work in the months to come.</p> <p>The legislation in the copyright field dates back to 2001, and consequently some parts are rather outdated, as the rapid digitalisation was not taken fully into account at the time. There is a possible revision of the European copyright framework underway as part of the digital single market (DSM) package. A draft report evaluating the EU Copyright Directive from 2001 was published in January 2015.</p> <p>An extensive study titled 'Assessment of the impact of the European Copyright Framework on digitally-supported education and training practices' is currently being prepared. It was initiated in the autumn of 2014 and at the moment only indicative results are available.</p> <p>The presentation slides have been uploaded to Yammer where you can find more information on the objectives, progress and preliminary findings from the mentioned study.</p> <p>As part of the study work, the WG members are requested to contribute by filling out an online questionnaire as well as distributing the questionnaire to relevant stakeholder in their respective MS. It is stressed that it is very important for the further process that the WG members give their feedback. A link to the questionnaire is found in the presentation slides.</p>
09.30	<p>Workshop 3: Discussion on Output 5 (Report mapping stakeholders' views – with focus on the MS – on the impact of the EU legal framework for copyright in education and training)</p> <p>The MS representatives were again divided into three work groups.</p> <p>The points for discussion in Workshop 3 were:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What do you think works well/doesn't work well for the provision of education in the current European copyright framework</li><li>- What are the most important obstacles?</li><li>- What is your vision of a revised European copyright framework – what should be ensured/prevented?</li></ul> <p>The notes from the group rapporteurs will be uploaded to Yammer.</p> <p><b>Discussion in plenary of Workshop 3 outcomes:</b></p> <p>Each rapporteur was asked to give a brief presentation of the outcome of the group discussions.</p> <p><u>Group A: (Presented by Slovenia)</u></p> <p>According to Group A, the main problem when discussing copyright legislation is the lack of awareness, not only at school level but also on the national level. Many teachers do not understand the copyright rules and do not know how to apply the rules especially in a digital context.</p> <p>For example, many teachers use materials in the classroom in completely legal ways, but when they use it as part of learning designs that are uploaded and shared, it becomes a</p>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>problem.</p> <p>The group agreed that the Creative Commons License is very helpful.</p> <p>In terms of what should be ensured in a revised European copyright framework, it was highlighted that work could be done on educational exemptions to be applied on the same conditions across MS.</p> <p><u>Group B: (Presented by Germany)</u></p> <p>Copyright within the field of digital content is a very big grey zone that very few people are able to disentangle. As long as lines are not clear, it hinders the further development of the educational field.</p> <p>It would be useful if a database on legal aspects in the field of education were created to give a clear information to stakeholders.</p> <p>Simplicity and clarity is a big issue, which should be at the core of a revised EU framework.</p> <p><u>Group C: (Presented by Danish Technological Institute, Hanne Shapiro)</u></p> <p>In a sense, it is difficult to discuss what works and does not work for educational provision in the current EU framework, as it is very far from the reality in the classrooms around Europe.</p> <p>An important issue is the reuse of content, as it is not always clear whether the content is copyrighted or not.</p> <p>In terms of legal aspects, it is generally not possible to differentiate unless you are an expert, which most teachers and trainers are not. Some type of legal support solution could be a way forward.</p> <p>Besides the above-mentioned aspects, the rest of the conclusions from Group C were similar to those of the two first groups.</p> <p>As a concluding remark to the discussion, Daniel Göhring stressed that there is currently an extremely open discussion process regarding the drafting the new legal framework. The WG members are encouraged to contact Daniel Göhring with any input they many have for this process.</p> <p>Preliminary country fact sheets from the above-mentioned study on copyrights will be shared on Yammer. MS representatives should look at the fact sheets and give feedback on the respective country fact sheets, if something is not in order.</p>
11.00	<p><b>Presentation on Output 6 (Report on new trends through online and digital learning and their policy implications for education)</b></p> <p><u>Presented by: Konstantin Scheller, EAC.B3</u></p> <p>Konstantin Scheller informed the meeting that a short report on trends through digital and online learning will be made towards the end of the mandate of the WG to highlight important aspects to be looked at going forward. This is important, as it will feed into the definition of the new WG that will take over once the mandate for this WG expires. Even though the WG will work under a different name and a new mandate, some of the work from WG DOL will continue, and most of the WG DOL members will hopefully be represented in the new WG.</p> <p>Konstantin Scheller then called for an exploratory plenary discussion on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What immediate issues come to mind as current issues that need to be addressed in</li></ul>

---



---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>next WG</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- What documents do you think we need to read until the next meeting for a more informed discussion next time</li></ul> <p><b>Plenary discussion on items to explore for Output 6 – exploratory discussion</b></p> <p><u>EUNIS:</u> The impact of MOOCs and blended learning on the educational organisations and the changed role of teachers (more mentoring, less tutoring) and students.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> There is a growing need for more flexible learning within the frame of social learning at school. There is an increasing need for allowing talented students to take courses at a higher level and thereby a need for establishing a ‘virtual classroom’. A different problem then arises as the time spent in school is very important in terms of social learning with your peers. It is important to discuss how to combine the two.</p> <p><u>IPTS:</u> The Horizon Report Europe is a good starting point when dealing with trends in education.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> For higher education, the influence of Learning Analytics and Big Data in the educational sector is a very important trend to be discussed. Research on the implications of this is needed.</p> <p><u>Sweden:</u> It is important to focus on how to make it easier for vulnerable groups to participate in and graduate from higher levels of education, by exploiting the opportunities that digitalisation offers.</p> <p><u>The Netherlands:</u> It is important not to forget the digital safety of students and guarantee the privacy of students in terms of all the data that are created using different digital technologies.</p> <p><u>Serbia:</u> We should look more into the possibilities that the online educational gaming offers.</p> <p><u>ETF:</u> There should be more focus on the groups at risk in the educational systems, as digital learning is a great way to learn when traditional class learning is not possible for different reasons. Going forward augmented reality and the Semantic Web look promising in terms of utilisation of data in education.</p> <p><u>ETUCE:</u> It is important to look at the implications of digitalisation on teachers' working conditions and working time in general terms.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> The Finnish educational system is based on equity, which poses some problems as to how to provide equal opportunities to all schools in terms of ICT.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Look at how online professional learning networks works and how they can add value.</p> <p>Konstantin encouraged the WG members to provide relevant documents of interest for the work of the WG and post the documents on Yammer for all to have a look at.</p> <p><u>Ireland:</u> Ireland is currently finalising a 5-year digital strategy for schools in primary and secondary education. It will be published soon and will be shared when possible.</p>
11.30	<p><b>Future Tasks and Next Meetings</b></p> <p><u>Presented by Bodo Richter and Mario Roccaro, EAC.B3</u></p> <p>Mario Roccaro pointed to the fact that Output 2 regarding quality assurance was not discussed during the WG meeting. The plan is to expand Output 2 in a country focus workshop to take place in one of the member countries.</p> <p>Some countries have shown interest in hosting this workshop, but nothing has been decided yet, and all interested host countries can still come forward. A planning committee will be put together and the tentative timing for the workshop is the end of September 2015.</p>

---



## EUROPEAN COMMISSION

Directorate General Education and Culture

Modernisation of Education II: Education policy and programme, Innovation, EIT and MSCA  
**Innovation in Education: EIT and MSCA**

---

Time	Topics discussed
	<p>A short document on quality assurance will be produced as a final output from the country focus workshop.</p> <p>The EC can reimburse the travel costs of people attending the country focus workshop in the same way as for any WG meeting in Brussels.</p> <p>Bodo Richter then presented a date for the next WG DOL meeting, which is tentatively planned to take place on the 17-18 June in Brussels.</p> <p>Finally, the team would like to thank you to all participants for contributing to a fruitful WG meeting.</p>
12.00	<b>End of day two and end of the Working Group meeting</b>

---