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Starting Questions:

• What does it mean for education to become a ‘unbundled’, ‘multi-sided’ and ‘multi-stakeholder’?
• How do we successfully innovate within a profound changing education ecosystem?
• How is successful innovation defined? Do we use pedagogical, technological, socio-economic, business-economic, or other criteria?
• What are transferable success factors?
Changing value propositions

Points raised in the morning session on ‘Views on the Future of Learning’: What are the possible fields for innovation?

• Platforms
• Accreditation
• Validation / Assessment – online and offline; many opportunities
• Transformation of data into meaning – types of analytics that become available (incl. via Big Data) – Supporting pedagogies & learner guidance
• Content – still static and traditional production model – nothing changed?!?

Innovation mainly in scale, but not in richness (scope)
• Human interaction, social learning, collaboration, ...
• Personalization, Profiles, Portfolios (e.g. ‘My data GPS)
• Process innovation – who does what, why and how (e.g. current MOOC case from constructivist towards machines...)
• Business Model Innovation
Points raised during parallel session
How do we ensure that creativity and entrepreneurship meets market demand and is based on existing good practice and knowledge?

Points raised (1/2):
• Understand that time is the most crucial commodity.
• High-level commitment & guiding principles are required for safeguarding success, and to support decentralization.
  • Centralizing and decentralizing as a constant loop. Unsure of ‘what is better’. This is to say that there appears to be a bouncing for and back on preferences and developments.
• Innovation support models such as the Index Factors Matrix from Pearson are seen as a (research) field that still holds high potential so to understand and predict success. This is well in line with the HoTEL objective and assumptions
• Decisions are often made out of a “point of fear” – Howard Lurie provided some insights from his observation from the US MOOC landscape! His advice in this regards was to have a clear understanding on what do one want to achieve.
How do we ensure that creativity and entrepreneurship meets market demand and is based on existing good practice and knowledge?

Points raised (2/2):
• Be serious about quality control and in case of funded research make “reporting back” a mandatory part. As pointed out by Pears Lea at current it appears it is often only build in, but not used. A question in this regard was also what is measured, outcome only? And who is measuring – needs objectivity as stressed by Andre Richier who did provide some examples on how difficult it could be to keep quality up.
• Demand in EU on Creativity and Entrepreneurship, not limited to innovation but certainly desirable to support and foster innovation.
• Cultural issue: We need to accept failure and learn from it. It seem to be deeply rooted in a European context that one wants to have “risk free” and “highly innovative” at the same time. This would not work and so failure should be accepted – including failure in funded projects.
What are the three things that ELIG should do?

• Build on existing research,
• Build on existing practice,
• Based on the first two build up sensible partnerships.