

Milestone Deliverable Review Report

Deep Funding Round: 4

Project code: DFR4-MISC3

Project title: Building an Exponential Tech Learning Community

Milestone number: 1

Milestone deliverable:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1pJW3DrEIXTP3Bm8KcTJHJkIO7u5c2po1/view?usp=sharing>
and https://miro.com/app/board/uXjVKtWli2c/?share_link_id=165798533445

Date: 11/06/2025

Status: Accepted

Feedback (Why accepted, why rejected?):

This milestone is about the setup of the project, and is supposed to produce several documents, viz:

- Project charter
- Project Schedule and Roadmap
- Resource Allocation
- Team Roles and Responsibilities
- Kickoff Meeting Agenda and minutes.

The info given in the milestone says that the project was run on a Miro board, and that the wrong Miro link was given last time. This milestone submission gives the correct link, and helpfully includes specific links to where the materials listed above are to be found on the Miro, which is much better-organised than the last version of this milestone.

However, I'm not entirely convinced that the formats in which some of the required information has been delivered is effective, or that it matches what is expected. Particularly,

- the "Project Charter" - to me, a "charter" is a written *document* (and the project's milestones also call it a "document") - but what has been delivered is a 6-minute video, with no timestamps, transcript, or description - so any time someone wants to access the core document of what the project is about (and maybe compare what is being done with what is supposed to be being done), they need to sit through a 6-minute video. Also, the charter video itself, here <https://youtu.be/VjDg2cYn2LE> isn't great quality, with lots of jerky transitions, and garbled audio (e.g. at 1min20 and 2min07). Perhaps not hugely important -

but given that this is supposed to be a foundational document for the project, I'd have expected a bit more care and attention.

- the "project roadmap"- I would expect that a roadmap should map out the overall project plan, and include things such as rough dates, who is responsible for what, who the stakeholders are at each stage, etc - but all we have is a rather vague graphic of "swim lanes". It outlines the elements of the project very broadly, gives no timelines or information on who is doing what, or who the stakeholders are, or how the different areas of responsibility will connect up.

- The "resource allocation" and "team roles and responsibilities" are meant to be separate documents, but the links go to the exact same thing on the Miro board, which is another vague "swim lanes" diagram.

- and the "agenda and minutes of the kickoff meeting" - there is no agenda given, and no information on who attended; and the minutes are quite minimal and vague. What little information there is, 1) says that those present "emphasised the importance of defining scope and engagement" and "agreed that capturing questions and issues helps ensure everyone is on the same page", but there is no evidence that either of these things have actually been done, other than in the most perfunctory and superficial way (the "swim lanes" document); 2) says that there will be a follow-up meeting 5 days later - but there is no documentation of it. The rest of the "minutes" (very short) are quite garbled: "The need for a lead or small group of people to manage the significance of responsibilities in driving the project was determining responsibilities in projects involving multiple responsibilities for making the project happen". ?? Pretty unclear - and, whatever it means, it's also unclear what actual actions were decided on in order to implement it, and whether or not they were done. This is very poor meeting documentation.

However, with all that said - this first milestone is primarily for the proposers themselves, to help them outline and define their work. Although their chosen formats are not ideal, and the work has been done in quite a shoddy way, I'd say that if *they* are happy with it and it fulfils their project-planning needs, then it's OK. So despite some misgivings, I don't think it's worth holding up progress, so I'm approving this milestone.

However, I will be paying close attention to these issues (appropriateness of formats; documentation of progress; conforming to the original rhetoric about the project) in future milestones.

If rejected, suggested changes:

For your future milestones:

If a milestone is supposed to create "documents", then these should probably be presented as actual written documents that are accessible and easy to reference and quote. Note that you can embed a doc in a Miro board.

If you're creating planning materials (such as lists of deliverables, roadmaps, lists of dependencies) they should be structured so as to give the information required in sufficient detail (for instance, a list of dependencies should clearly show how different project elements depend on each other, rather than just listing the elements; a list of deliverables should

include who is responsible for each one, some acceptance criteria (i.e. how you will determine that it's "done"), and ideally some dates. Etc.). And if you create learning materials, they should be high-quality and ready for learners to actually use, not just an outline.

If you're documenting meetings, say who was there; make sure your text isn't garbled; and say what actions were agreed on, who will do them, and whether or not they were done.

If you're creating videos, ensure your audio is of decent quality and not garbled.