



**TEXTILE AND CLOTHING
KNOWLEDGE ALLIANCE**

WP5 – Learning Labs final report



LEARNING LABS FINAL REPORT

1. INTRODUCTION

During May 2016(M18),each partner responsible for the task, organised a learning lab in each country involved as partner in the TECLO project. Namely the organising partners were:

1. LCU – Italy
2. Department of Textiles of Gent University – Belgium
3. AEI Tèxtils – Spain
4. TEIPIR – Greece
5. ASITEX – Romania
6. UL – Slovenia
7. FRP – Polonia
8. Guimel – France.

In this report the main results from all the Learning Labs are summarised.

2. METHODOLOGY

The Learning Lab were held following a participatory approach, encouraging individual work as well as group discussion.

All the partners decided for a common structure for the activities of the day. The programme included the following:

- Presentation about the partner organization
- Presentation about the TECLO project
- Explanation of the objectives of the day
- Presentation of the MOOC: approach, interface and structure (videos and exercises
- Presentation of the 7 learning units
- Coffee break
- Individual/group work (analysis of the MOOC: 3 learning objects to be tested, contents and exercises)
- Brainstorming (discussion about first impression related to the MOOC and units contents. What can be validated? Is there anything to add?)

At the end of the day, all the participants were asked to fill in an evaluation questionnaire, in order to gather data useful to understand strengths and weaknesses of the TECLO MOOC.

The results of all the questionnaires are summarised in the following paragraph.

3. RESULTS - STRENGTHS

Among the Strengths of the Course, users identified the good flow of the information, from general to specific, and the clear structure of the course units. The content was considered clear and able to give a good overview about all the topics the course deals with. Also, users appreciated the good balance between text and images on the screen, the friendly user interface, easy and intuitive to use and the aesthetic look and feel both of the interface and of the course itself.

4. RESULTS – WEAKNESSES

Users also identified some Weaknesses in this first testing phase. One was that the course content was too basic and not enough interactive. They also noticed that sometimes the text on the screen was the same spoken by the audio and that they would have preferred the presence of a real- life presenter. Some users complained about the absence of further readings and references, but, as the partners explained to them, those materials were not subject for the testing so they were not implemented.

The collateral scope of the testing was also to find bugs and technical issues that, after the reporting, were fixed.

5. WHAT CAN BE DONE

In order to put remedy to the weaknesses addressed by the users during the Learning Labs, all partners will discuss the results of the Learning Labs during the next meeting so to find a proper solution all together.

6. ANNEXES

All the National Learning Labs reports:

1. P1 – Italy: REPORT TECLO Learning Lab ITALY.pdf
2. P2 – Belgium: Report TECLO_MOOC validation_P2.pdf
3. P4 – Spain: TECLO_Report of Learning Lab-Partner 04 AEI TEXTILS.pdf
4. P6 – Greece: Comments from Piraeus MOOC learning lab.pdf
5. P10 – Romania: TECLO_Report of Learning Lab Partner 10 ASITEX.pdf
6. P11 – Slovenia: TECLO_Report of Learning Lab-13_5_2016_SL.pdf
7. P12 – Poland: National_Report_Poland_TECLO_MOOC_FRP
8. P13 – France: Report Teclo learning lab Fr.pdf