2nd Online call minutes

Editor(s):	K. Tarabanis, E. Tambouris
Author(s):	K. Tarabanis, E. Tambouris, M. Zotou
Responsible Organisation:	UOM
Version-Status:	V1 Final
Date:	08/04/2016
Dissemination level:	RE

Revision History

Version	Date	Revised by	Reason
0.1	01/04/2016	UOM	First version ready
1	08/04/2016	UOM	Final version ready

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

1.1   Meeting information

The 2nd online call for the PBL3.0 project was carried out on 30/03/2016 using the Skype tool. The purpose of the call was the discussion on the initial WPs and the coordination of the next actions.

1.2   Participants and apologies

Online call participants are provided in Table 1.

Table 1. PBL3.0 2nd online call participants

No.	Organization	Participant Name
1	UOM	Maria Zotou
2	AAU	Evangelia Triantafyllou
3		Olga Timcenko
4	OUNL	Christian Stracke
5		Katerina Riviou
6	UAH	Elena Garcia Barriocanal
7	BOC	Peter Martos

2 Decisions and actions per meeting session

2.1 WP1 session

AAU delivered the final version of D1.1 to partners.

UOM delivered the final version of D1.2 to partners.

OUNL provided initial information on their discussion with Maastricht University on the PBL MOOC they carried out.

2.1.1 Decisions

UOM will submit the final versions of D1.1 and D1.2 to the Agency.

UOM will send the first version of the D1.3 by the end of May.

2.1.2 Action plan

Table 2. Actions decided for WP1

No.	Action	Responsible	Deadline
1	Submit D1.1 and D1.2 to the Agency	UOM	31/03/2016
2	Send first version of D1.3	UOM	30/05/2016

2.2 WP2 session

2.2.1 Decisions

UAH will send the first version of the model by the end of May based on feedback from D1.1 and D1.2.

2.2.2 Action plan

Table 3. Actions decided for WP2

No.	Action	Responsible	Deadline
1	Send first version of D2.1	UAH	30/05/2016

2.3 WP6 session

2.3.1 Decisions

All partners will send feedback to AAU regarding past and possible interesting future dissemination activities for D6.1.

UOM created a [Google spreadsheet](#) so that all partners can record relevant Journals and Conferences for future scientific articles. Partners will start filling out the sheet with suggestions.

UOM provided new versions of the templates for deliverables, deliverable peer reviews and project presentations based on the selected logo (shown in Annex I).

The poster will be re-designed based on the partners' comments. The new version will be provided by AAU when it is ready.

The leaflet will be designed and shared by AAU when it is ready.

AAU will bring copied versions of the materials in the next face-to-face meeting.

UOM will incorporate partners' comments and provide a new version.

AAU will create social media accounts for the project.

2.3.2 Action plan

Table 4. Actions decided for WP6

No.	Action	Responsible	Deadline
1	Send feedback on dissemination events for D6.1	ALL	07/04/2016
2	Provide new version of poster	AAU	07/04/2016
3	Create new version of project website	UOM	09/04/2016
4	Provide first version of leaflet	AAU	10/04/2016

2.4   WP8 session

2.4.1 Decisions

The next meeting will take place on 10/05/2016 – 11/05/2016 in Copenhagen, Denmark.

The meeting will be hosted in Aalborg University's offices.

UOM will prepare the meeting agenda.

AAU will provide feedback on the location, recommendations for accommodation and means of transportation.

3   Summary of actions

The following table provides a collection of all actions described above in chronological order.

No.	WP	Action	Responsible	Deadline
1	WP6	Send first version of D6.1	AAU	30/03/2016
2	WP1	Submit D1.1 and D1.2 to the Agency	UOM	31/03/2016
3	WP6	Send feedback on dissemination events for D6.1	ALL	07/04/2016
4	WP6	Provide new version of poster	AAU	07/04/2016
5	WP6	Create new version of project website	UOM	09/04/2016
6	WP6	Provide first version of leaflet	AAU	10/04/2016
7	WP1	Send first version of D1.3	UOM	30/05/2016
8	WP2	Send first version of D2.1	UAH	30/05/2016

Annex I – New versions of templates

Deliverable template

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

I

Deliverable x.x

[Deliverable name]

Author(s):	[Name (Organisation)]
Editor(s):	[Name (Organisation)]
Responsible Organisation:	[Organisation]
Version-Status:	Vx.x Draft/Final
Submission date:	dd/mm/yyyy
Dissemination level:	[PU/PP/RE/CO]

This project has been funded with the support of the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union
© Copyright by the PBL 3.0 Consortium

Figure 1 First page of deliverable

Deliverable factsheet

Project Number:	562236-EPP-1-2015-1-EL-EPPKA3-PI-FORWARD
Project Acronym:	PBL3.0
Project Title:	Integrating Learning Analytics and Semantics in Problem Based Learning

Title of Deliverable:	Dx.x – [Del name]
Work package:	WPx – [WP name]
Due date according to contract:	dd/mm/yyyy

Editor(s):	[Organisation]
Contributor(s):	[Organisation]
Reviewer(s):	[Organisation]
Approved by:	All Partners

Abstract:	...
Keyword List:	...

Figure 2 Deliverable factsheet

Dx.x [Deliverable name]

Table of Contents

Figure 3 Suggested Table of Contents

Review report template

Review Report for Dx.x [Deliverable Name]

Co-funded by the
Erasmus+ Programme
of the European Union

Review Report for

Dx.x [Deliverable Name]

Reviewer(s):	[Name (Organisation)]
Review Organisation:	[Organisation]
Deliverable Lead Partner:	[Organisation]
Deliverable Due Date:	dd/mm/yyyy
Version of Deliverable Reviewed:	Vx.x
Review Date:	dd/mm/yyyy
Dissemination level:	CO

This project has been funded with the support of the Erasmus+ programme of the European Union
© Copyright by the PBL 3.0 Consortium

Figure 4 First page of review report

Review Report for Dx.x [Deliverable Name]

1 Evaluation

This section refers to your overall evaluation of the deliverable. Please mark each of the criteria in Table 1 with an X to the column of your choice. Mind that 1 is the lowest and 5 is the highest (best) grade in the scale.

Table 1. Overall evaluation result

	1	2	3	4	5
Technical/Scientific value					
Structure					
Clarity					
Relevance to objectives					
Applicability of results (if relevant)					

Figure 5 Evaluation criteria and results

2 Recommendation

This section refers to your recommendation as regards the quality of the deliverable. In Table 2 there are three options to choose from; you should choose only one of the three options and justify your decision in the respective table cell.

Table 2. Recommendation for the deliverable

Options	Justification
Report has sufficient quality as is:	
Report needs minor re-writing (please specify):	
Report needs major re-writing (please specify):	

Figure 6 Recommendations

Presentation template

Figure 7 Initial page of presentations

Figure 8 Slide of presentations