

# Agile EDU First European Dialogue Lab

SUMMARY REPORT

20 December 2023



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

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

# Contents

<a href="#"><u>Summary of key points</u></a>	3
<a href="#"><u>Reflective question 1: How are key concepts (e.g. data, datafication, data literacy) related to each other in your country/institution?</u></a>	4
<a href="#"><u>Reflective question 2: How can European and international actors support a better understanding of the concepts and the relationships between them?</u></a>	7
<a href="#"><u>Reflective question 3: What type of strategic planning is needed for schools, local authorities, central ministries to address datafication?</u></a>	9
<a href="#"><u>Reflective question 4: How can European and international actors support better strategic planning at all levels?</u></a>	12
<a href="#"><u>Commentary and reflection</u></a>	15

## Summary of key points

The first of three European Dialogue Labs in the [Agile EDU project](#) took place online in the morning of 10 November 2023. The aim of the event, hosted by [European Schoolnet](#), the project coordinating body, was to enable the 37 invited participants to share and discuss perspectives, successes and challenges in relation to common issues arising from the first series of Country Dialogue Labs in Denmark, Sweden, Norway and Spain, and, in doing so, to experience the dialogue approach to developing mutual understanding in complex policy areas. This summary is based on plenary presentations, transcripts of recordings of discussion groups, feedback from rapporteurs and contributions to the conferencing chat feature. The four commentaries on the discussion groups are the work of European Schoolnet and draw out a few main points across the discussions.

Prior to the dialogue lab, participants were provided with the EU Dialogue Lab 1 (EU DL1) programme, information about the project and the literature review and conceptual framework, one of its first outputs.

Project manager Alex Kirchberger (European Schoolnet) welcomed participants and outlined the rationale and key features of the three-year Agile EDU project co-funded by Erasmus+ running to December 2025. Phase 1 is research and dialogue, building the instruments to build a set of case studies (e.g., My school choice (SE), Feide (NO) and Adaptive learning technologies (NL)) and learning stories based on a literature review and workshop, a survey of ministries of education and four country dialogue labs, ending with EU DL1 which closes this first phase. In later stages there are validation workshops and further dialogue labs, leading to guidelines and recommendations, a MOOC on educational data and its uses and a final conference. The literature review defines terms such as educational data, datafication, data literacy and platformisation and includes an analytical framework comprising three pillars: data regulation, rights and privacy; data in use for teaching and learning; data governance.

Professor Kay Livingston described the Dialogue Lab approach: structured one day workshops (half a day if online) for knowledge exchange and idea generation, underpinned by theories of learning, sociolinguistic theories, and theories of community building and engagement. Reflective questions are designed to stimulate and focus dialogue between different stakeholders with multiple perspectives. DL reports make participant views, comments, and experiences on the specific topics visible. Although this is the third project that uses this approach at country level, this is the first one at European level. A number of common themes emerged from the four Country Dialogue Labs (CDLs) to date, for example, definitions vary, opportunities and challenges in using data for learning, a lack of strategic planning and the need for research to identify how data use improves learning and which data should be collected by whom and for what purpose.

## Discussion groups

Participants were automatically assigned and moved to one of five breakout rooms for the first of two 30-minute discussion sessions, their composition enabling a good mix of backgrounds and organisations, with a different set of participants in the second session from the first. The structure was the same in both sessions: participant introductions and an introduction to the topic led by one of the project partners, participant dialogue framed by two reflective questions (although more time tended to be spent on the first question in each session), and a rapporteur feeding back the main points in a plenary session. Thanks are due to all who contributed experiences and ideas to the discussions.

Framing the discussions Kay Livingston said that the words ‘Wild West’ were used to describe the national state of play concerning the implementation and use of educational data in two of the reports from the country dialogue labs, raising the challenge of conceptual understanding and managing the use of educational data while taking into account differences in contexts and tailoring solutions, and ensuring equity and inclusion (to be covered in a later European Dialogue Lab).

## Discussion group session 1

The reflective questions for the first group session were:

- 1: How are key concepts (e.g. data, datafication, data literacy) related to each other in your country/institution?
- 2: How can European and international actors support a better understanding of the concepts and the relationships between them?

Rapporteurs for each group fed back the main discussion points on both questions in a plenary session afterwards.

**Reflective question 1: How are key concepts (e.g., data, datafication, data literacy) related to each other in your country/institution?**

### Group 1

- It is relatively easy to identify the hopes and possibilities of datafication as well as its negative aspects, but there is a lack of research and evidence for them; indeed “there is still a real question about whether datafication is in any way serving positive purposes in education.” A lack of clear concept definitions hinders productive discourse.
- Datafication is more problematic in countries with decentralised education systems where schools have different levels of tech adoption.

- Small education technology (EdTech) businesses may lack the competence and skills to be able to understand and use datafication.
- Young people's data literacy (including algorithm literacy and AI literacy) is not just for school but their whole lives. They voice a sense of fatalism, "they feel that knowledge will never give them the power required to combat the avalanche of datafication." They need to understand how consent is formed and what the many clauses in consent forms mean.

## Group 2

- Schools are in a difficult position concerning data use and consent: "it's hard to explain something that you don't understand yourself." Students, teachers, parents, and policy makers are uncertain about data: "In some schools, there isn't even a very, very basic level of digital literacy among the staff." A lot of schools are getting left behind. Data literacy may be covered at policy level but is not covered in teacher education. Consequently, there is a loss of trust and a sense of fatalism: "most of the solutions are there, but you cannot get them in the system."
- The issue is how to understand data as a concept. Datafication and platformisation are about how data is taken up for both commercial and educational purposes, to create new products and new educational opportunities through learning analytics and personalisation for example. Teachers have long collected data on students but what is new is the scale of data, how it can be used and the fact that commercial interests are in play and big tech companies are creating new ecosystems.
- Platformisation enabling parents to view their child's progress data directly can reduce discussions and bypass students, reducing their agency. An initiative in Belgium aims to aggregate and interpret data from different sources and present it in a form that makes sense to schools.

## Group 3

- Interest about educational data varies across countries. It is high in Denmark where there are discussions about how to relate the vast amount of data being collected in school to the competencies of teachers and what teachers can do with it. In Greece interest is low and restricted to GDPR issues: data protection and privacy. Finland, with a highly decentralised education system, is "slowly but steadily" advancing towards national standards for educational data and has a single sign-on system.
- How to organise access to data and make best use of available data collected nationally for use locally in schools. In France a data hub stores data from a virtual learning environment accessible to both local authorities and companies providing the VLE.

## Group 4

- Can – and should – data on students' academic performance, socioeconomic background and health be linked to support teaching and learning? This raises concerns over GDPR compliance, ethics, safety and privacy and about managing enormous amounts of data: "There is too much data" and this may not be good for teacher wellbeing. Teachers need more analytical skills.

- Terms such as data, data for learning and data literacy are nebulous and need to be defined clearly; the challenge is to conceptualise data within the educational system and identify what can be done with it. Datafication can be defined as the collection and the analysis and the use of data as a basis for decision making at different levels in the school system, from schools and municipalities, aggregated at national level “to make wise decisions.” Countries differ in terms of which part of the data debate they tackle and the self-efficacy of education actors concerning data literacy. In some countries, the debate about data use and privacy is driven by the EdTech sector instead of the education authorities.
- At global level there are basic connectivity issues, e.g., lack of internet for 1 out of 3 of the world’s lower secondary schools, and data in most schools in the developed world countries work in both analogue (paper-based) and digital form.

### Group 5

- Basic connectivity is an issue in some countries worldwide. It is not only a question of collecting and using data but of getting online in the first place. The digital divide is still present.
- Teachers in one country dialogue lab complained about a lack of standardisation. A systematic approach is needed with clear definitions of terms, a focus on teaching and learning, decisions on what is really needed and recognition of the implicit ethical issues. Initiatives should aim to lead to systematic approaches to quality, including quality of data itself, identifying what data there is, what data is really needed and how it can be used to improve learning.
- Clear strategies on datafication are needed at national level, monitoring developments, funding more research, developing common standards (validated nationally to reduce the burden on schools) and producing procurement guidelines. However, it is not easy to implement one size fits all in schools, especially in decentralised systems as in Sweden.
- Standards are needed to help companies integrate products that use data into different platforms. Small start-ups need support and guidance about data use as they feel squeezed out by the global tech players.
- There is excessive fragmentation in education systems (in Germany, for example) resulting in too much for schools to do: “We ask and expect a lot from schools; how to protect them?”. More should be done at municipality and national level, e.g., to support schools on data protection and data usage.
- National level decisions are needed about linking concepts developed at national level to what happens in schools, focusing not on data but on improving teaching and learning and how data can support it.
- An EU-wide strategy focused on meeting needs would be useful, to include a common conceptual framework with regularly updated key concepts, policies, and data harmonisation, with a platform to discuss issues. Efforts should recognise national contexts and autonomy to certify and verify for example.

**Reflective question 2: How can European and international actors support a better understanding of the concepts and the relationships between them?**

**Group 1**

- Standards and rules are needed, and the EU has the power to do this, based on GDPR which, “if used properly and enforced and used in the way it's designed, would come a long way.” Europe could set standards around data practices, transparency, AI use, and data literacy. Regulations and frameworks could help address consent, security, student empowerment, and other issues.
- There is a power imbalance between users and EdTech companies. When an organisation indicates agreement with the terms of a consent form when they use tools and platforms, they may not understand what they are signing up to. Moreover, students themselves may not have signed up to an agreement; until now this “wasn't a problem because it was only used for the public good” but now datafication and its commercialisation pose new difficulties.
- Organisations “don't know what good looks like”; international bodies set standards and provide examples of good practice on consent, transparency, data use and so on.

**Group 2**

- What is best for children? Datafication may inevitably result in more individualisation within education systems, beyond a simple dashboard. It is important to help students exercise their agency when it comes to digitisation. Policy makers and curriculum designers need to be aware of this – hence the importance of influencing them. In Denmark, the ministry is organising webinars to attract more attention and competence in this area.
- There is a lot of publicity of bad practices when something goes wrong, but there is a need to share best practices. This could help reduce gaps between countries (N and S, E and W Europe) and within countries between students from different socioeconomic backgrounds.

**Group 3**

- Recognising that there is confusion over types and sources of data (administrative, research, commercial, educational process data), there was a unanimous call for clarity about what is meant by data.
- Frameworks such as DIGCOMPEDU, guidelines such as ethical guidelines from the Commission and clear definitions of what we want to achieve for what purpose at different levels would be helpful.
- Artificial Intelligence can provide support by analysing and clarifying data coming from learning analytics, whether gathered for administrative, learning or assessment purposes.
- European and international actors can help in understanding what data really needs to be collected and how to feed data back into schools: “There doesn't seem to be a problem in

collecting data and sharing it, but how do we bring it back to the school so that it is useful for teachers and learners?"

- Teacher education could cover not only the use of data but how to protect it.

#### Group 4

- At international level, there is a need for discussions and guidelines and norms, about, for example, where the data is travelling to and who stores the data and what competences and literacies for AI are. UNESCO is working on joining and aligning contributions from different countries on this. Organisations like EUN can build the bigger picture of national initiatives.
- What Europe is doing in terms of regulations such as the GDPR, has effects globally. EU has considerable experience with data which can be a model for other countries. But there are many interesting developments all around the world, which should be followed, not only in the EU.
- There is a need to translate guidelines into legal language, and a data literacy competence framework that includes generative AI.

#### Group 5

- Teachers need support focused on their own and their school's needs. Increased levels of data literacy in schools are needed, beginning with raising awareness of the need for such competence (among the public as well). Schools need to know what data actually is, and how to use it smartly, 'gathering it once and using it three times, rather than gathering three times and using or not using it'.
- Build a sense of agency, not just building competences learning how to apply them.
- Teachers' digital competence should include the use and impact of data, and ethical considerations about what data is used for. ('the most difficult question') This is missing in the current DIGCOMP framework.
- At national level: reduce the burden on schools through having clear strategies based on teachers' and schools' needs, with a common platform, research, common standards and validation and, possibly, a team of stakeholders "testing all the products and all the integrations so that everybody can get support and not do everything themselves." Consider a layered approach to avoid duplication of effort, e.g., who has access to transactional data, who to the underlying algorithms. Harmonisation at EU level would help in this respect.

Commenting after group feedback on the first two questions in a plenary session, Kay Livingston noted:

- How the voice of students is coming through with their concerns about informed consent, who owns data, parents seeing data before they do and concern that data is increasingly being used for commercial uses rather than the emphasis being on educational uses



- The challenge of uncertainty about the meaning of data and datafication limiting the potential of the use of data to improve learning and teaching.
- There are interesting and helpful examples already out there to be shared but the issue is how to use the huge amount of data being collected to improve teaching and learning. This was also raised in the country dialogue labs. The European framework and other frameworks can help, but a better understanding is needed about how much schools know about what framework there are and how to use them.
- There is a lot of work in different places; how to join up expertise and get a sense of direction in terms of using data to improve learning and teaching?
- Importance of teachers and their students having agency to take action and use data to transform teaching and learning. In research studies agency holds different meanings depending on the theoretical framing. The understanding of agency here, concerns the capacity to act in a certain situation and take action that transforms current practice. This is not only about an individual's capacity to act it is also about the conditions that enable the individual(s) to act. It is not only a matter of providing support to develop individuals' digital competences, it is also about the conditions that enable them to have agency to take action (for example, conditions that authorise access to data, providing professional development opportunities to enable them to know how to use the data to improve learning and teaching, and creating and developing school environments that support them in taking transformative action.

## Discussion group session 2

In discussion session 2, again 30 minutes long, the composition of groups was changed to enable people to get to know more colleagues and to hear about their perspectives. Two further reflective questions were discussed arising from another common theme evident in country reports of CDL1:

3: What type of strategic planning is needed for schools, local authorities, central ministries to address datafication?

4: How can European and international actors support better strategic planning at all levels?

Feedback was provided by group rapporteurs (groups 1 – 5).

**Reflective Question 3: What type of strategic planning is needed for schools, local authorities, central ministries to address datafication?**

### Group 1

- Schools, EdTech businesses and others are creating their own solutions for legal and ethical matters, authorisation procedures and data organisation. They would benefit from having such

standards drawn up at national level, which would not only avoid duplication of effort but also enable more interoperability.

- More cooperation between stakeholders than there is at present is needed, while respecting students' and parents' agency. Schools mistrust EdTech businesses and don't see them as a partner but as a "big bad monster is out to steal their data."
- The key question is what the purpose of gathering data is: "What are the results that we are trying to achieve? Why are we collecting data? Just because we can doesn't always mean that we should." School leaders and teachers are more comfortable if they have a clear framework on what needs to be collected. However, if goals and plans go into too much detail that schools are expected to comply with, it may become a goal in itself for schools, even if they do not reflect the purpose of the plan. There is therefore a trade-off between standards drawn up by a national or international organisation and what each school, region or district is allowed to standardise.

### Group 2

- Strategic planning is not always at government level. Planning and strategy development take place at a lot of different levels depending on the country. Reality is different from guidelines, so it is important to share best practices and solutions that work, for example with GDPR (which is often poorly enforced), or interoperability without which "One teacher is reading numbers from database A to another teacher who puts them into database B because of the lack of interoperability."
- Guidelines and frameworks are not an effective way to reach teachers; a more down-to-earth approach is needed. Hubs can help connect to schools, raise awareness, and help practitioners use the guidelines.

### Group 3

- In addition to the need for developing data literacy and competence, the ethical dimension must be addressed, for example, can students opt out of sharing their data?
- We need to know which data we are talking about, whether it is all needed and whether it is poor quality and unsuitable for analysis.
- A holistic approach is needed in strategic planning involving teachers, local authorities, the students themselves, parents, and school staff.
- There is a lot of heterogeneity and nuances across and within countries, therefore mapping and contextualising are important.
- Continuous evaluation is needed to check whether feedback mechanisms are useful and how easy it is for other stakeholders to provide their inputs, and also to adapt strategies and plans to new developments in technology: "we always feel like that we have to catch up and run towards them instead of being on top of them."

#### Group 4

- EU countries are already good on data governance but there is a lot to do on the actual use of data and implementation to make a positive difference. National plans already exist in some Nordic countries.
- A whole government approach is needed. The education system doesn't exist in a vacuum and education ministries, local authorities and the school administrations have to coordinate with others. There should be harmonisation so that the datafication and data use is not something exclusive to education.
- It is important to clarify responsibilities at all levels and avoid duplication of effort, which can result in the 'ridiculous' situation where "a municipality with 200 students and 40 teachers and one person spending half his time working on the GDPR framework."
- Is it always good to decentralise and give local authorities freedom or is there a case for centralising datafication and not go the decentralisation way?

#### Group 5

- The first challenge is coordinating student data across a 'patchwork quilt' of responses between municipalities and national level, in Nordic countries for example where each municipality tries to solve issues themselves, creating a larger national challenge owing to huge variation in schools' approaches to handling data: "who has the data, who has control?" In Finland a network has been created to discuss data issues, comprising schools, universities. EdTech companies including the global players (they too are asking for guidelines). "It's a long road to where the teacher and learner are on the same page as national level. They use data but there are issues, much unification and standardisation to be done."
- The second challenge is to open up conversations between EdTech companies and practitioners and leaders. Although they are often siloed, their needs are actually similar, particularly concerning AI. National approaches could help address this, helping understanding and breaking down what the legal frameworks mean to them. If, for example, transparency is important, a tool is needed to help school leaders and EdTech companies figure out if their tools are compliant and what a requirement for transparency means in practice. National authorities could identify which data are needed for learning, who is responsible, where to start.
- The third challenge is that although recently there has been a welcome surge of guidelines, principles and strategic plans from both public (e.g., UNESCO) and private sector entities to help schools see where data is going and make possible agreements with EdTech providers, there is a problem if school leaders and EdTech companies do not actually know how to apply them, guidelines are "stuck in conceptual space." The focus and work now is to jointly turn guidelines into practical tools to help decision makers procure digital technologies, involve the right people in conversations around procurement, support an informed transition and introduction of tools into schools, and monitor compliance using quality assurance mechanisms.

**Reflective question 4: How can European and international actors support better strategic planning at all levels?****Group 1**

- When data is shared at different levels (school, local, national) there is a risk of using it for excessive control or surveillance by central or local authorities (this could apply to data from SELFIE or similar tools for example). This could result in too much data: “We keep on collecting something and we don't really know why.”
- Cooperation needs a framework to support it. The EU could conduct surveys to gather stakeholders’ feelings and encourage them to share data to help produce strategies.
- Focus on teachers’, school leaders’ career-long competences. And those of decision-makers because it is they who decide on the content of initial teacher education.

**Group 2**

- More strategic dialogues with each other would be beneficial, not just frameworks from one player.
- Work on a smaller scale, with curators closer to schools.
- Strengthen connections between government and the private sector concerning standardisation and regulation: “The public sector is doing its best to deal with the opacity and the potential exploitation by the private sector.”

**Group 3**

- European frameworks are important, but they need to be contextualised.
- Mapping is important but so is disseminating the results and translating them into practice, to make sure that stakeholders can share best practices and, for example, ensure digital equity by design.
- Technical barriers make it difficult for teachers to, for example, extract data from one tool for use in another one.
- Such barriers can mean that trust is lost. Everybody, not just the experts, should feel empowered to act and use data and know about it.

**Group 4**

- Set three to five core goals that can be reached by every country, region, and school. The international community can support knowledge sharing and capacity building.
- Target knowledge sharing activities at appropriate levels as they are not all relevant for all groups. Policy makers, for example, need to understand these processes, but not in the same way as teachers. Knowledge repositories created should be targeted at these different groups.

- Europe can learn from other regions in the world as it is “not the best performer” in all aspects of datafication.
- Students entering initial teacher education today and graduating in five years will face a very different digital classroom than today.

### Group 5

- First, harmonise and align guidelines to move toward a common approach to regulatory procedures and processes. Entities at regional and national levels should work together to harmonise these approaches and regulatory environments.
- Second, ensure these regulations are applied, so that national, international and regional agencies can work together to use them and perhaps provide a list of certified tools. Certification should be automatic once it exists at EU or national level. Norway’s ministry of education is developing guidelines on how to draw up agreements with the private sector and embedding competences related to data use in their new national curriculum. Standards enable interoperability: data can be transferred and exchanged across products and organisations, avoiding data being “locked in” to one particular system or service.
- Third, a clear governance and leadership structure is essential for responsible and effective management of education data. A map is needed showing the essential jobs and functions required at local, regional and national levels, tied to competencies and capabilities (and their development at all levels). The strategy should be both top down and bottom-up, including both teachers and municipalities and national level leaders, and this balance varies according to the degree of teacher and school autonomy in education systems. UNESCO have a [mapping tool](#) showing not organisations but job functions, skills and competences at the macro, meso and micro levels needed to make the strategic planning implementable, e.g., chief security officer; if a function is missing the job cannot be done. European stakeholders are invited to contribute to the tool.

Responding to the rapporteurs’ feedback to both questions in a plenary session, Kay Livingston observed that:

- It is not only about engaging with stakeholders at the policy development stage, but also recognising the importance of involving stakeholders at an early stage so that challenges and suggestions for moving things forward are captured early on, rather than waiting until a policy or guidance framework is implemented.
- In terms of the frameworks, there is the dilemma of balancing on the one hand the clear cry for standardisation to support understanding and coordination, but on the other hand, keeping a sense of agency, local agency and ownership, and flexibility to address context-specific needs.
- Curation, mediating frameworks to schools, is important.
- Stakeholders must be involved. Guidelines alone, whether on paper or in digital form, are not enough. What happens next in the local context if they are only put on a shelf or stored in a digital

file? Opportunities for dialogue to make them understood and enacted in a way that makes sense in a meaningful way need to be planned for and provided. This came up in first country dialogue labs as well.

- There is a need to focus on strategic planning, knowing where the starting point for development is before moving forward as not all countries, municipalities and schools are at the same stage of development. Also, important to keep the focus on strategic planning that is useful and supports learning and teaching. Roles and responsibilities need to be clarified. Not every stakeholder requires the same solution: different groups (e.g., school leaders, school administrators, teachers) are likely to have different purposes for data use and management as well as different professional learning needs. Targeted knowledge exchange and capacity building opportunities should be provided as well as collective opportunities to share concerns, ideas, suggestions, and expertise.
- The UNESCO tool looks useful, particularly the clarification of roles and responsibilities - showing who does what. Other organisations/individuals can also share any materials or tools with the participants of the EU DLs.

Kay Livingston and Alex Kirchberger concluded the dialogue lab by outlining next steps and inviting participants to two future European Dialogue Labs and continue discussions on education data in an email group.

## Commentary and reflection

A number of themes emerged from the discussions at the dialogue lab, together with possible ways forward and recommendations. They were presented to project partners in a meeting after the dialogue lab and will be further discussed and developed.

### Reflective question 1: key concepts and their relationship in your country

- **Terms are misunderstood and used differently, leading to fatalism and a lack of trust.**  
Clarify terms such as datafication, platformisation, data literacy and education data and set out evidence for their benefits for education and which type of data is needed to benefit teaching and learning, recognising the implicit ethical issues. This would help buy-in and enable teachers to explain concepts in datafication to students and parents, justify data in education strategies and strengthen agency.
- **High levels of fragmentation and conflicting approaches result in too much for schools to do. National level concepts are disconnected from their daily reality.**  
Establish a balance between school autonomy and central control. More standardisation and harmonisation of, for example, terminology, procedures, and data protection, is needed, especially at national and international level. Mediation is needed between high level statements, guidelines and strategies and reality on the ground.
- **Users lack the knowledge and competences to understand and make full use of datafication.**
- **The scale of interconnection between large datasets is unprecedented and a matter of concern, as is how it can/might be used.**
- **Countries and schools are at different levels of datafication, and many schools are more analogue than digital.**

Recognise that much learning content and many schools are still either analogue (e.g., working with paper-based textbooks and administration) or hybrid.

**Reflective question 2: How International actors can support understanding of concepts and their relationship**

- **Raise awareness of the need for data literacy for all and to raise data literacy levels.**

Topics could include:

What is meant by data and datafication, which types of data support learning?

How Artificial Intelligence might support by analysing data and presenting the results.

Ethical considerations about what data is used for, informed consent, opting out, datafication and personalisation.

Strengthening agency, using data smartly and redressing a power imbalance between tech companies and users.

- **Reduce schools' workload by developing national strategies based on their' needs and avoid duplication of effort.**

Build a common platform hosting guidelines and key research findings:

Consider a layered approach setting out who has access to which data (transactional data, the underlying algorithms)

Determine how best to feed analysis results back to schools so that they can use them smartly.

- **Strengthen international cooperation** to harmonise norms, frameworks, and approaches to ethical issues.

Reduce gaps between and within countries.

- **Share findings from research and best practices to highlight good practice in datafication.**

Highlight successes in reducing gaps between students from different socioeconomic backgrounds.



### Reflective question 3: Types of strategic planning needed at all levels to address datafication

- **Establishing national standards for legal and ethical matters, authorisation procedures and data organisation.**  
Balance centralisation and decentralisation and clarify responsibilities at all levels, to increase efficiency, encourage interoperability, assist EdTech suppliers and ease schools' responsibilities and workload, recognising that this could increase risks related to privacy and commercial exploitation. Adopt a holistic, whole government approach: datafication and data use are not only a matter for the education sector.
- **Co-constructing the standards, bringing together stakeholders.**  
Ensure strategy development and planning take place at all levels, empowering and respecting agency to help build trust between government, schools, parents, students, EdTech companies, etc.
- **Being clear about the purpose of gathering data in strategic planning, focusing on data that impact positively on learning.**  
Ensure data collection arises from a teaching or learning need rather than from management or business. Challenge the use only of data that exists. Avoid over-prescription and the risk that data gathering becomes a goal in itself.
- **Setting up mechanisms to jointly turn guidelines into practical tools.**  
Build in checks to evaluate and monitor guideline use, ensuring stakeholders provide input, and future proof strategies and plans, adapting them to keep abreast if not ahead of, rather than behind, developments in technology.

**Reflective question 4: How European and international actors can support better strategic planning at all levels**

- **Aiming to align guidelines through more international dialogue on harmonisation.**

Certification of EdTech tools and services should be automatic once it exists at EU or national level. Set core goals that can be reached by every country, region, and school.

- **Adopting a common approach to regulatory procedures and processes.**

Strengthen connections between government and the private sector concerning standardisation and regulation. Standards enable interoperability: data can be exchanged across products and organisations, no longer 'locked in' to a proprietary system or service. However, the bigger the dataset the higher the risk of using it for purposes other than those for which it was collected, for example, to sell it for commercial interests to exploit.

- **Focusing on teachers' and school leaders' competences.**

Foster mediation, with curators closer to schools, contextualising frameworks, translating them into practice. Develop the competences of decision-makers too because it is they who devise policy and advise ministers.

- **Having a clear governance and leadership structure to manage education data.**

Map roles and functions required for effective datafication at local, regional, and national levels, tied to competencies and capabilities (and their development at all levels).



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

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.