

04/09/2017

Greetings, introduction.

1.1 TRAINING

AP (Italy) - share experience on training, Q&E IT data: positive evaluation, + improve technical training (how-to)

MK (Germany): we have received a lot of appreciation from the teachers.

Suggestions: next time we should maybe plan activities a bit more in advance.

GG (Turkey): at the beginning they had 3 schools, then had to involve one more. attendants: mostly preeschool t.s but also primary school t.s, technologists, psychologists. first experience with DST: asked more time to improve their tech-skills. had 1 more hour. highlight: practice more.

Most teachers were preschool teachers. They found the training to be sufficient and appropriate. Since it was their first experience, they asked to have more hours to improve their technological skills.

Teachers said that the experience would have been more effective if they had more experience. Overall, their responses are positive.

TN (Finland) - 4 k.s (2 Jyvaskyla, 2 Helsinki). except module 1, training session in single school. Q&E: module 2, 4 could have been longer. qualitative feedback from questionnaire + interviews: content was considered relevant (theoretical module less than oth.s)

Observations: participants were enthusiastic about the topic; didn't put as much effort to Module 3 as intended; hands-on activity preferred

General observations:

- Riccardo we should have maybe focused on technical aspects.

Educational experiments

Germany: the kg teachers were quite a lot so they had to postpone some projects. I agree on the fact the groups should be smaller.

Some of the teachers told us that it was maybe too long for them to work on the stories for 4/5 weeks.

They are not used to focus on a single activity for many hours in a row: that was the main weakness.

Positive points: teachers and children enjoyed the activities. Meeting with the teachers on a regular base was a positive dimension of co-division.

The teachers maybe felt a bit overwhelmed with the activities.

Turkey: weaknesses and strengths. (See the word file given to each participant).

Implementing the required activities requested the permission of the Ministry. They needed parents to sign up many documents: in the process, some parents gave up, overwhelmed by the high numbers of documents needed. Some of the parents even took off their permissions: that's way they have a decreasing number of children involved in the project. Because of the missing children, the lost many data. The workload has been found to be way excessive, causing a general negative self-assessment. Even tough teachers are used to technological devices; they experienced a general excitement in using technologies in didactical activities. They had 6 classes in total. observation. First at the beginning,. Second while children were creating digital stories. They combined the observations:

- Main weakness: schools did provide only a very limited amount of devices (laptops were destined only to teachers). Preschools don't have, generally, enough technologies.
- Many schools did not have a technology expert to support them with upcoming problems.

1.2 EDUCATIONAL EXPERIMENTS

AP (Italy) - strenghts: observers followed projects, regular meetings; weak points: "old" teachers' individual competence in ME low, collective competence guaranteed by atelierist's intervention or "young" t.s; medium group management (8) difficult to make everyone active: often splitted in small groups an made more projects; using TUI children are more autonomous than using GUI, risk to be controlled: tinkering prevails on storybuilding --> build the story in advance; note from Yearly Summaries: it would be OK to have special areas in schools for experiencing devices.

MK (Germany) - t.s had to postpone projects due to work overload; children seem more interested in working on thecnology than in the project; they are not used to focus on one topic/activity for 2 hours, that was a problem; t.s work load was a lot for them. positive: c.n and t.s. enjoyed the activities; meeting with t.s on a regular base

GG (Turkey) - had to obtain parents' permission (sign many documents, some gave up), asked schools to take c.s to university to use i-theatre, difficult; t.s felt work overloaded --> negative self assessment; although they are used to tech. devices, felt excited in educational use; 4 schools attended the training, 6 classes. observations: 1st at the beginning, 2nd at midterm point, when building DST; main weak point: computers are available but intended for t.s' use, not c.'s; no tech teacher to support teachers; group size was not always under control, they mixed.

TN (Finland) - tools used: J1 i-theatre, iMotion, iMovie, Book creator (iPad); J2 iMovie, Book creator, Puppets Pal; H1 same as J2; H2 toontastic 3D

slightly different ways of organising the projects depending on teachers;

1.3 observations/Discussion:

Positive overall experience (also sparked parents' interest); challenges related to time constraints: finding enough time (pressure to complete a certain number of stories), and opportunities to focus on working on a story with a small group of children at a time; **BALANCING BETWEEN TEACHERS' GUIDANCE AND CHILDREN'S AGENCY.**

consistency of the groups: some changes in personnel; not all children will be the same who participated in spring; some groups had younger (2-3 y) or older (6 y); challenges with documenting the process.

tips and suggestions

providing an A4 sheet with the most crucial instructions: number of stories, instructions for filling in the project sheet; **EMPHASISING THE IMPORTANCE OF FAMILIARISATION WITH THE TOOLS BEFORE STARTING THE ACTIVITIES** (the teachers by themselves and with the children).

Depending on the affordances of different tools, different kind of behaviors emerged.

We could check the results in order to find whether there is correspondence between our observations and the data..

Depending on the kind of tool used, children played a different role: the more protagonist they were, the simpler were the stories.

WE could check if, when using simpler applications, stories tended to be simpler. Instead, when using more complex devices, teachers tended to intervene more: consequently, the stories tended to be more complex. Is it possible to guarantee that the same children are going to be the protagonists of the second iteration?

It would be advisable for children to first explore the devices and playing with them: this way they could then focus more on the stories, instead of risking to just play with them.

When working with the ipads, children focused on the stories. When working with I theatre, children tended more to play.

By getting confident with the devices in advance, children could then show a more complex use of I theatres.

Depending on the app used, different behaviors emerged.

We have generally noticed that teachers felt overwhelmed with the workload given to them.

Since two questionnaires contained many common questions, we could simplify them, in order to make the workload less heavy for the teachers.

In some cases, the yearly summary were better filled.

Unimore and Coopselios team will take care of proposing a new version of the questionnaires (done)

We have to give teachers more flexibility. In some of the German schools involved, children are not used to work continuously on the same project. Main problems are: continuity and customization.

Teachers felt unsure of the reliability of their answers (based on the fact that they felt not to have enough time to assess the complex processes involved). We could put in comparison the data with the answers given to the open questionnaires part.

We have 2 activity reports (we could simplify by eliminating one of them). Since many teachers did both at the end of the year, we could eliminate the first report.

In the project sheet, we could merge the 6th and the 7th sections and call it just "activity report"

About the flexibility issue, we could allow teachers to develop a story in one single day, so to make it easier for them to organize the activities.

Number of children involved in each groups: 8 children in a single group appears to be an excessive number. By splitting groups, we would then have many more digital stories.

Since we need a minimum amount of children involved, it would be difficult to just reduce the groups.

Andrea Z: in the next meeting with the teachers, we could advise them to let the children explore the devices before proposing them to start the digital story telling activity. By doing so, children could familiarize with technologies before using them in a more complex way. Teachers should maybe plan in advance what type of stories they would like to create: this way, they won't have to focus too much on the devices.

2.1 afternoon - RESEARCH

Unimore + coopselios: main findings

Germany: the research is still in process: it is therefore still not possible to discuss findings.

The post production part has been done, in most cases, by teachers.

Teachers did lot of post production: hard to analyze

Turkey: maybe we should specify in the activity report, if the digital devices were mostly used children or teachers. We can specify if the children were protagonists in different aspects (production or post production).

Turkey: add to activity report a specific point on devices were used by t.s, or c.n or both, for production or during introductory activities. differentiate which technology was used by who.

implementation of projects

DS evaluation. mainly scripts --> goal directed (t.s support)

are actually stories? recordings of children play.

narrating voice in heard but ununderstandable

music: only when t.s suggested (would you like to add music?)

HW used: computer-process and product (by teachers)

tablet: product (by teacher) product by children

smartphone: process by t.s

product (by c.n)

sections and variables: separated categories y/n in: only child/only teacher/both/none

rq2 data pertaining to the process: only project sheets

data from ys: medial literacy skills evaluation

item about awareness of audience: not aware [MK: some were]

rq3, teacher competences

partner specific RQ: social emotional development (part added to Project Sheet, combined with data from YS)

Finland : main findings

analysis process ongoing

n. of stories 20

varying scope of the stories: from broad multi session projects to quick, improvised stories made with one app in one sitting

computer used only to finalize stories; wide range of different types of stories (difficult to define the type); a coherent story arc / episodic structure is present only in a few stories (some are more about exploring what can be done with tech)

sometimes difficult to define the amount of s s provided

some stories have elements of different types of narratives

not always easy to decide whether some story grammar aspects are present or not

media elements: sometimes consist of more than one product type (es still images + movie)

Yearly summaries: t.s said it was difficult to assess specific aspects

country-specific data collection: t.s and c.n interview

2.2 discussion:

When teachers present **movies or clips** showing children playing, we should not consider them as being digital stories, and maybe reminding teachers what we consider being a digital story.

About the group of children: we consider 4 to 8 to be a reasonable number.

How to analyze open-ended questions: Goksu presented various proposals regarding the analysis.

We could support the data with some comments.

About the main goals and objectives of the project: should we keep them or change them?

Keeping them would allow us to compare different practices aimed at the same goal.

The development of new specific goals should then not become a central issue for next year's activities: instead, the core should be more about trying to find new solutions and practices aimed at fostering media literacy in ECEC.

About the project sheets: we should probably manage to obtain more specific informations about the main actors in some activities (mainly, who did what – teachers/children)

Some variables are not easy to correlate with media literacy competences, but we could keep them since they provide relevant informations.

In the sixth section there is maybe a repetition of elements already present in the 3rd section: we could then eliminate the repetition in the 3rd section. However, in the 3rd, right after, there is a question directly correlated to it, so we should find a solution. WE should then maybe cut up some irrelevant parts (irrelevant for the qualitative analysis).

We could also decide what items we will analyze in terms of quantitative research, and keep the other items for their general values (they provide important infos): this seems to be the most shared solution – we could “flag” the items we will evaluate and keep the other questions anyways, which could then be useful for other purposes.

A general question about the project plan:

Digital story making process: In Germany, it has been found to be a non-relevant item, while in Turkey it resulted an important one. The colleagues from Karlsruhe propose to delete it, or at least to have it deleted from their own project sheet, since it is not going to be a useful item in terms of quantitative analysis.

We could keep the activity plan as it is, and then let the teachers fill it more or less precisely. In this case, we should then stress the items particularly interesting for our quantitative interests.

Digital story making process (activities and tasks performed in order to develop, revise, finalize and review the digital story) – this item could become a closed one, aimed at inquiring whether or not children were the protagonists.

AZ - HOW TO ANALYZE OPEN ENDED QUESTIONS: starting from sub categories Goksu has presented, which were drawn upon TK data from Project sheets and yearly summaries, adding others if emerging from other countries' data

GG - we could keep the same objectives (would allow us to compare different practices aimed at the same goal)

AZ - we could cut section III (except "objective"), then in section VI (report) ask one more Q.n. or explicitly ask more details about tech. use (who used what for which purpose). --> reformulate 2nd item in "activity report" section

GG - keep all section III, SUPPORTIVE INFORMATIONS – OUT OF CROSS-COUNTRY DATA ANALYSIS. agree on which variables to analyse

all agree

05/09

3.1

Since the instruments are in their final version, for this year we should not make any further changes. We already used the instruments, as they are to evaluate this year's digital stories. If we want to edit the documents, we could then just discuss it today and then edit them via web (google docs).

The project sheet is the document, which is going to be used soon by the teachers: if we want to edit it, we should do it as soon as possible.

Introductory activities is probably the most difficult item to analyze. We should then decide which parts we are interested at analyzing. We keep section IV as it is.

Use of digital technologies: we could explicitly ask teachers who used what (if technological devices and softwares were used only by them or by both teachers and children).

We could also create a schema (table) aimed at clarifying who used what and with which purpose.

We could just live the question regarding the purposes, to then interfere from the answer if it's about the product or the process.

Section VI: we could merge **Digital story making process** and **Use of digital technologies** in single item, by creating a box regarding all the aspects involved in both items (Karlsruhe's colleagues will make a proposal, aimed at finalizing the document by the end of this week, with feedbacks due at the end of next week).

Andrea wonders whether we should add a column in order to inquire the autonomous use of the devices. In particular, it could be interesting to evaluate if the support of the teachers brought to an autonomous use of the devices (did the children use them in a "guided way" or did they use it mostly autonomously?)

Story evaluation sheet: Goksu proposed some changes last week.

Suggestions have been made regarding many aspects. We could leave the instrument as it is for this year, and renew the instrument for the analysis that will be carried next year (second iteration).

About the narrating voice (is there a narrating voice heard?): we should differentiate two separate cases: if the narrating voice is clearly understandable or if it's hardly hearable.

Regarding the subtitles, we should add a specific regarding the presence of both narrating voices and subtitles or if just subtitles are present in the story.

We should also decide how to consider written sound effects (like "boom" or "crash"): are they sound effects? Comic onomatopoeic sound effect.

We could add "sound words" as a variable.

Regarding subtitles used as a "narrating voice" element: should we discourage such use of subtitles? Should we add an extra variable? What if the children asked teachers to write down their dialogues?

If written text is relevant to understand the story, we should take it into account.

Two questions could be asked:

- are subtitles present?
- do subtitles substitute or integrate the narrating voice?

NEXT MEETING'S SCHEDULE

There will be a conference next year in Germany: is it combinable with the next meeting? It's not, since the conference will be most likely too late in the year.

March/April would be good months for scheduling the meeting.

The week before Easter it's unlikely for Professor Contini.

The week right after Easter (5th and 6th could be eligible).

Next week confirmation will be given by Riccardo.

The meeting will be in Karlsruhe.

The money of the second tranche hasn't still been delivered.

Dissemination and exploitation: for the end of September, a draft should be given by each partner, describing what has been realized so far.

Publications: Unimore is about to publish a Manual. A pre-print version can already be found. It also has an appendix.

Is it possible to think of common publication? The guidelines will be a common publication. We could also think of papers written together.

If publications have been already realized, we should send them to Riccardo (abstracts will have to be translated in English; instead, the content can remain in any language – German, Italian, etc).

Self evaluation

- **Suggested schedule**

- **JYU: First draft and questionnaire for partners: End of September**
- **Partners' additions: Mid-October**
- **Final version: End of October**

A report regarding the findings will be realized at the end of the second iteration, and could be used as an initial draft for the common publication (European guidelines).

First iteration's synthesis: each partner could send an initial draft by the December/end of the year.

A shared spss file would be the best option to guarantee a common analysis of the initial results.

Goksu's spss file could be the file shared by each partner.

A good idea would be deciding a sort of order regarding the partners: in that order, the common spss file will be filled with available data.

At the moment we have 4 different spss files: Goksu could share these files in an updated version. At the point, each partner could then put in his own data.

The spss files will be sent from Goksu by the end of next week.

The identification codes regarding each country will have to be checked.

For those who don't have a license for Spss, there is a free-software available on the web, called Pspp.

Digital story evaluation form

Main Idea (one-sentence summary: “top line”) since each story has a different “main idea” description, it’s difficult to combine them anyhow. Eventually, it could be useful to remind us what the stories are about.

A main idea is not present in each story, making it hard to formulate a sentence expressing a core theme.

We could substitute it with “one sentence summary”

Project sheet : Project Theme/Subject should become simply “theme”.

Script stories and goal directed stories: how to interpret them?

Unimore has been excluding the possibility to consider the presence of goal directed elements in scriptical stories.

Instead, Goksu has sometimes taken into account this possibility.

Most of the fictional stories are goal directed: based on the common discussion, we should tend to exclude the possibility of considering the presence of goals in scriptical stories.

Narrating personal stories tends to be incompatible with fictional elements. The bases are scriptical elements, to then arrive to personal stories and, in a successive step, to fictional stories.

We should maybe update the **5th Variable – type of narrative**. We could specify better what we consider like being fictional and what we consider as script elements (Unimore will take care of the document editing).

MEDIA ELEMENTS SECTION IV: we could add a section regarding power point – are they animations or not?

We could add a category called “animated power point”. When do still images sequences become animations? Power point without animations can be considered as a slide show.

What about book creator? Most of the pages were just pictures, but videos were embedded too.

We could maybe create a new specific category.

SECTION IV TECHNOLOGY ELEMENTS: we could delete the keyboard and mouse items (when using a computer, mouses and e keyboards are always used).

SOFTWARE USED will be split in two categories (used by children and used by teachers). The same applies for USER INTERFACE. When analyzing the data, all partners will use Goksu’s box, which comprehends “used by teachers, used by children, used by both and used by none items).

User interface could be excluded from the digital story evaluation form, since it’s not very useful in terms of data collection and it’s only connected to the product. Andrea Z finds it to be useful, but also suggests that we could arrange in a different way. The main preoccupation is losing a relevant information: which software was used to create the story/which was the main instrument used to create the digital artifact.