

Progress-Based Metric: Practical
Issues of Implementation –
Paratext & progress.Bible

Session description and goals

- This is a work session designed to dig into the practical issues inhibiting implementation of the measurement system presently designed upon the interface between Paratext and progress.Bible.
- Issues identified in recent surveying will be highlighted. Technical solutions will be explored. Next steps will be identified.
- Critical attendees are those with functional responsibilities associated with the technical implementation of Paratext, progress.Bible and/or near front-line utility of either tool.

Backdrop for Experiential Learning: Test Period Progress Metric

- Progress.Bible asked to compile a very high level progress metric, a count of the total chapters ready for publication from active Paratext projects.
- Purpose is to inform remaining 2019 fund distribution decisions
- First data gathered July 1
- Trial period through September 30
- Reported four metric deltas over the period
 - Increase in engagement to PT project alignment
 - Increase in PT plan interpretability
 - Increase in PT projects reporting
 - Increase in number of chapters ready for publication

Survey Questions

Mission Mutual survey of ETEN Implementing Partners leaders: ETEN Progress-Based Metric – Survey of Experiential Learning

- Question 1: Interpretable Paratext plans
- Question 2: Additional issues in preparing for progress-based metric
- Question 3: Issues in interactions with field partners
- Question 4: Steps for which guidelines for implementation would help
- Question 5: Ideas about additional technology solutions
- Question 9: What seems most helpful about a more refined progress-based-metric

Q1 Partners have reported issues when attempting to build refined / interpretable project plans into Paratext in place of existing plans (a necessary exercise to achieve reportable status in the measurement system).

- Attempting to change a project to a new project plan mid-stream results in loss of project progress to date. (4) [Solution pending with Paratext software?]
- No pathway is provided to map existing plan-progress data into a new plan's stages within the software. [Solution pending?]
- Complexity of project plans makes them difficult / unusable for teams (3) [Solution: New simpler base plans available]
- No means to communicate to progress. Bible how to interpret a project plan
- [Partial solution: agencies implementing base plans using meaningful stage names]
- Incremental approach to translation and publishing is not accommodated in the software. [more in Q2]
- Sheer scale of the task, with many projects needing to be migrated and plans updated

Q2 What additional issues (if any) have you experienced when attempting to prepare for utilization of the refined progress-based-metric system?

- Whole process is not well understood; Process is not scalable
- Teams cannot easily figure out what the Registry ID is for their project.
[Solution: progress.Bible accepts either Paratext guid or Registry Id.]
- Project Managers not assigning tasks because it is difficult to do this using the current Assignments and Progress tool interface
- Entering and verifying dates and scopes in the Registry is difficult
- Getting people into the habit of reporting progress in Paratext as they work.
- Working with and assisting partners (who are the primary workers in Paratext) to transition to a new plan when it does not appear to serve any of their felt needs.
[More related to Q3]
- Other reporting methods are in use
[Path to solution: progress.Bible team open to learn about and use these from the agencies;
Solution for some: Registry progress data approval ability]

Q3 implementing partners have reported issues in the interactions with field partners necessary to influence their utilization of Paratext and/or their choice to release data flow through Paratext

- Projects marked as Confidential will not flow into the Paratext Registry.
[Solution: Data does flow for all projects into the updated Registry. That was not true of the original design.]
- Unclear what data is being harvested from Paratext, so it is hard to know if it is being reported accurately or interpreted properly.
[Path to solution: more communication about the Registry progress contents; sharing documentation page on Registry data to technical audience]
- Needing to grant permissions “manually” in Paratext... requires contacting and requesting the local translation teams to “grant” access to our organization, for purposes of tracking. ... creates an unintended negative perception of “control” that is perceived as contradictory to the values of common framework.
- Making all the projects metadata match up between paratext and progress.bible is a meticulous process. [Path / aid to solution: progress data readiness dashboard; more in Q4]

Q4 Are there steps necessary for implementation of the progress-based-metric system for which specific guidelines for implementation might accelerate and/or ease the process of implementation? Please describe the steps of implementation for which guidelines might be helpful.

- Work out a joint policy on the collection of progress data [a topic for the concurrent “Philosophy” discussion]
- “Governance” team for metadata in Paratext, with participation of progress.Bible
- Roundtable discussion with implementing agencies, [Paratext team], progress.Bible, and Mission Mutual [as we are having now 😊]
- Real time dashboard responsive to changes made by teams [Partial solution: Progress Readiness Dashboard]
- 3rd party technology “audit” of progress metrics
- More / better Instructions:
 - for converting (mapping) progress data into a new plan in a project
 - for achieving alignment between an engagement in progress.Bible with a project in Paratext
 - for ensuring the interpretability of plans
- Some Paratext Registry functionality suggestions

Q5 some ETEN implementing partners have ideated about additional technology solutions that (perhaps in concert with Paratext and progress.Bible design) might reduce some of the challenges being experienced. Please describe any such ideas briefly.

- Agency willing to share current in-house progress tracking system model
- Means to provide progress data directly to progress.Bible [also mentioned in Q2]
- Use existing unadvertised method for updating / approving progress data within Registry, extend method beyond API
- Increase visibility of how progress.Bible determines
 - progress readiness [present]
 - calculates progress metrics [future, as they have not been decided yet]

Q9 What seems most helpful (to our collective pursuit of the All Access Goals) about the application of a more refined progress-based-metric?

- Create a separate way whereby Progress.Bible can collect progress data from the different progress tracking tools that agencies have and map this data back into the progress that the Progress.Bible team is already reporting. [p.B agrees with this, anticipating improvement to high level progress metrics and significant expansion of progress analytics for the agencies themselves]
- It will inspire us to more progress. It will directly reward progress with more resources which will lead to more progress.
- The Paratext functionality is good, but should be enhanced with new functionality that assists with project planning on a year-by-year basis.
- Seeing a more complete picture of the work that is being done. By aggregating this information we will be better equipped to identify and apply lessons of success... learn from those successes, and apply those lessons elsewhere.
- Provides management data for decision making. Allows the movement to have aggregated data for fund-raising, for collective strategizing, for mobilization of staff, and to solidify collaboration.
- Getting a realistic view of progress in order to identify opportunities and challenges.

Additional resources

Progress Readiness Dashboard

