



Project no.

28051

Project acronym

eMapps.com.com

Project title

MOTIVATING ACTIVE PARTICIPATION OF PRIMARY SCHOOLCHILDREN IN DIGITAL
ONLINE TECHNOLOGIES FOR CREATIVE OPPORTUNITIES THROUGH MULTIMEDIA

Instrument SPECIFIC TARGETED RESEARCH OR INNOVATION PROJECT

Thematic Priority Information Society Technologies

Deliverable D11

Report on monitoring of test implementation

Due date of deliverable: 01.02.2008

Actual submission date: 08.04.2008

Start date of project: 01.10.2005

Duration: 30 months

Organisation name of lead contractor for this deliverable: MDR Partners

Revision :

Final

Author:

Rob Davies

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the Sixth Framework Programme (2002-2006)		
Dissemination Level		
PU	Public	√

Contents

1 Introduction.....3

2 Process and timing5

3 Work objectives6

4 Quality Assessment.....8

5 Quality of work: overall conclusions9

1 Introduction

This document provides a short end-of-project report on the progress made by the partners from each New Member State in implementing the game platform in the 17 schools participating in eMapps.com. The report provides a basis for assessment of the extent and quality of progress across the 8 countries.

MDR, in its role as Quality Assurance partner has carried out a continuous process of progress monitoring throughout the project and has, with Cross Czech the project co-ordinator, sought to take remedial action where needed, in dialogue with partners and schools, as a group and individually, using the following opportunities in particular:

- reviewing completed Game Matrices and other reports supplied by partners;
- discussions at the second eMapps.com Summer School held in Torun, Poland (June 2007);
- individual monitoring visits and direct communications with partners;
- individual parallel sessions organised at the second eMapps.com regional workshop in Tallinn, Estonia (October 2007)

This Deliverable responds mainly to the agenda set out in WP5 Task 1 of the project workplan:

Iterative test activities

1.1 The NMS lead partners, supported by Ciberespacio and Cross Czech, will pilot version 1 of the games platform, following the first Summer School, in all 16 participating school test sites.

1.2 MDR will establish procedures for monitoring, evaluating and 'troubleshooting' formatively these activities through specific visits to each site, establishing mentoring, twinning and peer partnering arrangements, ensuring a functioning 'help desk' facility etc

1.3 The NMS lead partners, supported by Ciberespacio and Cross Czech, will utilise Version 2 of the games platform (available after testing at second summer school in Month 18) to organise out-of-school joint activities in designing and playing interactive games, involving schools, libraries and other organisations in each of the NMS participant areas, building on the knowledge gained in WP 1 on modes of interaction between these organisations

It addresses the following stated objectives of WP5:

- *To pilot test the eMapps.com application platform in the two regional test sites, based on primary schools, in each of the 8 participating NMS.*
- *To enhance the ability and interest of an identified group of children in these test sites to create, search and modify networked information resources and share these in real time using a full range of mobile, games and content creation technologies.*
- *To involve and promote joint work with schools by other community organizations (libraries, museums, Parent Teacher Associations) which support children's learning and extend the scope and opportunity for learning 'anytime, anyplace' using ICT.*

The evaluation instrument used by MDR for D11 has taken a task-by-task approach to monitoring and assessment of the specific project tasks involved in the test implementations. These tasks are to a large extent defined by the Matrix document provided to partners by Ciberespacio, following the first project summer school and subsequent regional workshop. The main evidence used to make this assessment (other than prior knowledge gathered throughout the project by MDR) is visible on the eMapps.com website, in particular through the following specific sources.

<http://emapps.info/index.php/eng/Games-Toolkit/Game-Portfolio/Game-Matrix2>
<http://emapps.info/index.php/eng/Schools-Portfolio>

2 Process and timing

The results of the test implementation work done by each partner have been assessed according to ten specific sets of results, the first 8 of which were established primarily by Ciberespacio prior to the beginning of the implementation process:

1. Define the School Curricula that is part of the game
2. Children's cognitive profile
3. Game Story
4. Plot Story cut and levels
5. Upload game content to teachers' platform
6. Game Play
7. Play the game at local level
8. Conclusions and report on problems
9. Use game version 2 in out-of-school activities
10. Link game content descriptions to Living Map of Europe

The original timetable for completion of these activities was as follows:

	2007												2008		
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar
1															
2															
3															
4															
5															
6															
7															
8															
9															
10															

In practice completion dates were somewhat less regular than this pattern. Nevertheless, as shown by the table below only 9 from 80 cells indicate 'work not done' and 7 of these are attributable to a single partner.

3 Work objectives

The quality of the work undertaken and reported in each country has been assessed by MDR in its capacity as Quality Assurance partner for eMapps.com. The main yardstick used has been a comparison with the stated objectives and requirements of each of the 10 tasks, as follows

Task	Objective/requirement
1. Define the School Curricula that is part of the game	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify at which level of the game applies each subject (history, science, etc) ▪ Explain why that subject was chosen (e.g. needed to make the game work; there is a move to change the way the subject is taught) ▪ Has the game story been built around the school curricula or developed independently, requiring a subsequent fit with the school curricula?
2. Children’s cognitive profile	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a short characterisation of the relevant capabilities of participating children to accomplish the challenges and levels foreseen in the game in the context of their age group
3. Game Story	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide a description of the story behind each game
4. Plot Story cut and levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Complete a provided table dividing the game into relevant sections and levels. ▪ Link the above to specific challenges (puzzles, activities etc)
5. Upload game content to teachers’ platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Create all of the content needed to enable the game (text, audio, video, photos etc) ▪ Link to the map and/or scenarios to be used in the game ▪ Describe the role of Advanced Reality Gaming (ARG) concepts in the game ▪ Upload the content to the eMapps.com game platform ▪ Assign all content to a specific game level ▪ Describe the content objects created for the game ▪ Link these objects to a specific challenge ▪ Explain the role of each object in terms of the activity or learning which children are expected to achieve
6. Game Play	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Identify clearly the role of each type of participant envisaged (Puppet Master, Control Base, Player) ▪ Explain how the content resources created will be administered or managed ▪ Explain how communication and interaction will work in the context of game play (e.g. use of SMS, chat/IM, addition of new objects to the game desktop)
7. Play the game at local level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carry out live playing of the game(s) ▪ Describe modifications needed to make the game work more successfully
8. Conclusions and report on problems	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Assess the overall success of the game testing process

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Describe any logistical, organizational, conceptual or technical problems observed in carrying out the game test ▪ Focus on any conflicts between the narrative, game play, map/scenarios and interactive dimensions of the game
9. Use game version 2 in out-of-school activities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Organise out-of-school joint activities in designing and playing interactive games, involving schools, libraries and other organisation ▪ Report on the results and success of these activities
10. Link game content descriptions to Living Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Provide descriptions for the eMapps.com website

4 Quality Assessment

The following table summarises the results of the quality assessment carried out by MDR at the end of the project, by task and by partner.

Key

	0	Not done
	1	Did not fully meet basic objectives
	2	Satisfied basic objectives
	3	Exceeded basic objectives
	4	Excellent

Task	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Total
Czech Republic CELN	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	3	3	2	20
Estonia Tiger Leap Foundation	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	17
Hungary Berzsenyi	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	18
Latvia Mezazile	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Lithuania IMOTEC	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	21
Poland ICIMSS	2	2	0	3	2	2	2	2	3	1	23
Slovak Republic Elfa s.r.o	3	2	1	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	17
Slovenia LTFE	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	3	1	18
Total	17	12	18	15	14	13	13	12	13	12	139

5 Quality of work: overall conclusions

The table indicates that the performance of the 80 'tasks per partner' can be broken down as followed

- Excellent - 1
- Exceeded basic objectives - 9
- Satisfied basic objectives - 47
- Did not full meet basic objectives - 14
- Were not done - 9

Among the main examples of high quality work were:

Task 3 where Poland produced an excellent imaginative and carefully elaborated game narrative, closely linked to a sophisticated interpretation of children's learning needs in the curriculum

Task 4 where the Czech Republic included a strong and varied definition of targeted (cross) curricula subjects for each level of the game for one of its schools and Lithuania which demonstrated a very close relationship with the narrative storyline through its levels, carefully elaborated in terms of learning content and outcomes

Task 8 where the Czech Republic produced a perceptive analysis drawing on several different stakeholder perspectives

Task 9 where Poland, Czech Republic and Lithuania made use of inter-partner twinning activities to provide new settings for their games

The tasks in which the partners a whole best performed best were:

- Task 3 (the provision of the story behind each game)
- Task 1 (establishing the curriculum areas relevant to their game(s))

The tasks in which the partners performed least well were

- Task 2 (establishing children's cognitive profile)
- Task 8 (drawing and reporting on conclusions after test playing each game in schools)
- Task 12 (linking their game descriptions to the Living map of Europe)

Task 2 appeared to suffer from a lack of clear definition and was consequently not well understood by many participants. Answers were often brief and somewhat confused.

In some cases, work would have merited a higher assessment but the evidence provided related only or mainly to one participating school rather than both, in the country concerned (e.g. Hungary Task 1, 2 and 3) Lithuania Task 2, Czech Republic Task 7, Poland Task 10 etc)

Given the fact that most of the schools and several of the consortium partners were comparatively or completely new to European project work, their overall performance appears quite creditable both in terms of task completion and quality of work.

Three partners had an average score per task indicating performance at or above the satisfaction of basic objectives:

Poland	2.3
Lithuania	2.1
Czech Republic	2.0

Four of the remaining 5 partners were grouped very closely together, each of them showing 3 from 10 tasks where basic objectives were not achieved, although the Hungarian (2) and Slovenian (1) partners each had tasks where objectives were exceeded.

The Latvian partner scored much lower than the other partners: there is little or no evidence that later tasks in the process were completed.