

## Monitor report 2

### GOLD project

Programme: Lifelong Learning Programme Leonardo  
Action: Leonardo da Vinci Transfer of innovation  
Project title: Goldilocks-based learning Overcomes Learning Disabilities (GOLD)

Enid Reichrath  
toetsen meten & weten - external evaluator  
January 2014

<http://www.gold-leonardo.eu>

## Contents

Introduction	2
1 GOLD project and SlimStampen	2
2 Monitoring the project	3
3 WP 1 Management and coordination consortium	3
4 WP 4 Test phase	4
5 WP 5 Evaluation and adjustments	7
5.1 Research questions	8
5.2 Deliverables WP 5	9
5.3 Feedback	10
6 WP 6 Dissemination	12
7 What's next	14

## Introduction

This second monitor report describes the state of art of the GOLD project for each of the six work packages (see Deliverable 1: Consensus document). GOLD is a project financed by the Leonardo Life Long Learning program. The goal of the project is to test the application SlimStampen on effectiveness on the population students with disabilities in three different countries. The context of the project and an explanation of SlimStampen have been described in the first monitor report. This information is included in this second monitor report too in chapter one.

This second monitor report continues where the first report has ended. It describes the work done between June 2013 and January 2014 and gives input on the needed remaining work for the last months of the project (January-April 2014).

Chapter two contains a short description of what has been done to obtain all relevant information for monitoring the actions in the GOLD project. In chapters three to six the process and outcomes of work packages 1, 4, 5 and 6 are described including the state of art on the related deliverables. These deliverables are marked with 'D' and the number corresponding with the list in the consensus document (the consensus document is D1, this monitor report is D18).

Work packages 2 and 3 are not included in this report, since these work packages were finished in June 2013, before the test phase (WP 4) started and were included in monitor report 1. This second monitor report will conclude with chapter seven in which the actions for the last months of the project are mentioned.

## 1 GOLD project and SlimStampen

In project GOLD the project partners want to test if students with special educational needs (e.g. learning disabilities like autism or acquired brain injury) can benefit from an individual tailor-made learning method called 'SlimStampen'. The three test locations are ReaCollege Groningen in The Netherlands, Orchardville Society in Ireland and CRPG in Portugal. The University of Groningen (RUG) is project partner too and supports these three partners in the testing. RUG is the owner of SlimStampen. ReaCollege (location Nijmegen) in The Netherlands is project coordinator and toetsen meten & weten, also in The Netherlands is external evaluator (subcontractor).

SlimStampen is a method that is used as a tool to help students to learn facts, words, topography, etc. It is based on scientific models and formulas that take into account the individual knowledge the student already obtained and the way each individual remembers facts. This makes studying more efficient, more effective and more encouraging. The method is already scientifically tested in mainstream education with good results: 1) higher grades, 2) more efficient/faster learning because it supports students on an individual basis, 3) much more motivated students because it supports students on their individual level: Not too easy and not too difficult and with tangible results.

The main goal of project GOLD is to come to an evidence based tool that helps students with special educational needs to learn more efficient and to remember more. At the end of the project we will have the following results:

- Materials of one curriculum for each partner are placed in the SlimStampen application
- Three groups of students have worked with SlimStampen
- Dissemination of the results of the test in writing and in a conference about the effectiveness of SlimStampen on this population students

Apart from measuring the learning gains by a final test, the learner's motivation to learn is assessed too by administering a questionnaire and/ or by an interview with the learners.

The project consortium has four partners. Three of them are specialized in educating people with (learning) disabilities, with the aim to get a job on the open labour market and/or participating (more) independent in society. These partners are the test locations mentioned earlier in this chapter in The Netherlands, Ireland and Portugal. The fourth partner is the University of Groningen. The University developed and tested SlimStampen, which became an evidence-based tool.

SlimStampen will be tested in three sites throughout Europe. The test group will consist of people with special educational needs that could profit from this new way to process learning topics. When they finish the program, students will get an officially recognized certificate. At every test location the participants have a different type of disability. So in this project for these three types of populations SlimStampen will be tested.

## 2 Monitoring the project

In order to keep track of all actions in the project and to monitor both the process and contents in the relevant work packages, the external evaluator (author of this report) kept in contact with all project partners at a regular basis.

The following actions have taken place and provided all needed information and the input for this second monitor report:

- Frequent email contact with the project coordinator
- Frequent email contact with the project partners
- Telephone conversations with the project partners
- Studying minutes of the project meeting of November 2013
- Studying PowerPoint presentations held at the meeting in November 2013
- Summarizing state of art of the test phase for each of the three test locations and formulating remaining questions
- Meeting with the project coordinator, face to face

All information was put into a working document, a table that is clustered by the work packages. This document has been and will be updated monthly by the external evaluator and the version of 6<sup>th</sup> of January 2014 is the basis for this monitor report.

## 3 WP 1 Management and coordination consortium

The first work package is about the project management and coordination (REACollege Nijmegen/ Pluryn) and all tasks that come with this. WP 1 will run throughout the whole project. There are no deliverables that have to be finished between June 2013 and January 2014. The consensus document (D1) and Project website (D13) have been completed in the first half year of 2013, as described in the first monitor report (D17, this is also a deliverable of WP 1). This second monitor report (D18) has been completed on time and is the last deliverable of WP 1.

Apart from the deliverables in this work package the project coordinator is responsible for running the project in time, making sure that all project partners fulfill their role the best way possible and taking care of the finances and other practical issues in the project. He prepares international meetings, together with the hosting country/ project partner and is chair of these meetings. Making notes and informing all partners on necessary details is included. In November 2013 there has been a project meeting in Belfast, Ireland. The agenda, relevant documents and minutes have been communicated to all partners in time.

## 4 WP 4 Test phase

Since all three test locations decided to start the first tests with SlimStampen in June 2013 already (instead of August conform the project plan), WP 2 and WP 3 are finished at the beginning of June 2013. In June, WP 4 started being the test phase at the three locations. The test phase ended in January 2014.

Deliverables WP 4:

- Draft report first results tests: effect on learning and motivation (D8)

This report on the results is planned to be finished by the beginning of February 2014 and is written by the University of Groningen. This report possibly has a little delay as the planning is January 2014, but since ReaCollege is still running test sessions it is understandable.

One of the project goals is to measure the participants' motivation for using SlimStampen. This was done by a short questionnaire, possibly combined with an interview. All project partners are asked to use this questionnaire at the end of each test session.

Down below for all three test locations is described how the testing proceeded. If there were changes on the test outlines and conditions (WP 2), this is mentioned too. The changes made were decided upon after a first (pilot) test session and with consultation of the University of Groningen. The aim was to improve the test sessions in order to get the best possible results.

### 1. Test phase ReaCollege Groningen The Netherlands

In total ReaCollege has over 200 items inserted into the program of SS, so 10 clusters of 20 items are ready to be used for testing SS. Multiple choice items are added too. ReaCollege thinks multiple choice is not really suitable for their students, since participants at the end of the course take a multiple choice-test as an exam, but it is possible to test it as well.

#### *1st session*

In June 2013 ReaCollege started the first test session as described in the first monitor report, but with minor changes. There were 37 instead of 32 participants divided in three groups: 2 groups/classes located in Groningen (SS) and one located in Leeuwarden (FC). All participants studied ICT commands (ITIL) concerning one topic with the SlimStampen learning method and another topic (powershell) with the flashcard method. This is called a 'within subject research design'. The item lists consisted of 20 commands/ items each. In the end the students studied in more than three learning sessions with SS or FC and for some participants the sessions were quite a bit longer than 15 minutes. A final exam for each study list served as learning outcome measure. Unfortunately this test session turned out to be irrelevant, because the University of Groningen made a mistake in creating the exam which makes comparing outcomes impossible.

The participants answered the motivation questionnaire online. But since something went wrong technically, the University of Groningen never received the answers.

### *2nd session*

ReaCollege executed a second test session in summer 2013, using several different modules (20 items each) in 3 groups of the same participants as before (2 locations Groningen - SS and one location Leeuwarden - FC). This test session is not to be used for testing the impact of SS on the learning outcomes, since there has not been controlled for which learning method (SS or FC) was used by the students during the course. Unfortunately this cannot be reconstructed. The students could switch between SS and FC. See also chapter five (WP 5).

Again, the participants answered the motivation questionnaire online. But the same thing went wrong technically, so the University of Groningen didn't receive the answers.

### *3rd session*

In autumn 2013 a third test session took place. This session actually consists of several small test sessions of 2 to 3 weeks each. This is set up in cooperation with RUG to make sure the usability for testing the effectiveness of SS. New lists but also lists that have been used in sessions 1 or 2 will be used. There are 71 such lists in total for ReaCollege - ICT course. There were 37 participants (7 at location Leeuwarden and 30 in Groningen). This third test session is expected to give a huge amount of useful data.

Of the tested lists with 20-30 items each<sup>1</sup>, pairs were constructed with the exact same items by RUG. In the one half of the pair the items of the list can be studied with SS and in the other half of the pair the items of the list can be studied with FC. Students don't know whether they are using FC or SS. So each list can only be studied with either Flashcard or SlimStampen. Participants were divided randomly into two groups and studied either in the order SS - FC -SS - FC...etc. or FC - SS -FC -SS - etc.. So every student used both methods for an equal number of lists; and every list was learned as many times by using SS and FC.

There were daily learning sessions, at the same time of day, for about 15 minutes. After 2 to 3 weeks the students took a 'final test', answering the exact same items, as they had to do in the learning sessions. The results were made available to the University of Groningen immediately. The university provided ReaCollege with the 'test forms' for each list (the pairs and final tests). By doing so ReaCollege could determine theirselves when to administer the learning sessions and the final tests (so that there was no "overlearning" and the students didn't become demotivated).

After a small test session (2-3 weeks), a new topic was addressed in the same way for another 2-3 weeks, by using another pair of list/ module. Also lists with multiple choice answering options were tested during this third testing phase. For ReaCollege this will not be their first choice in the end, but testing it is very much possible, so why not including this. Up till November 2013 (Belfast meeting) three of the smaller test sessions have taken place. They had 13, 14 and 15 participants respectively (42). Nineteen used SS and 23 used FC. In the time between October and January about 15 to 20 small test sessions took place. At this moment the exact number of small tests and participants is not yet known since the test sessions in this third episode are still running.

ReaCollege used the motivation questionnaire in this third testing period. But since the answers are not useable (it is impossible to detect to what method, SS or FC, the answers of the participants are

---

<sup>1</sup> In these sessions the number of items per list varied -not every list fitted 20 items precisely.

referring to because they filled the form out anonymously), the University of Groningen will provide a new motivation form so that the participants can be asked again. They will do so until the current

testing sessions of REA college are done or at least until students had time to acquaint themselves more with the different study methods. Then the participants will be asked directly which method (SS or FC) one is better.

## 2. Test phase Orchardville Society Ireland

In June 2013 the first test session took place with seven participants. Three people unsubscribed from the course at short notice unfortunately. As there are only a few questions in the first unit of the course, OS decided that the students will only start learning with SS or FC in the second week. Classes took place on a weekly basis with a computer session at the end of each class. The students then completed 2 SlimStampen-sessions before the next teaching session; the learning time during a lesson was 5 minutes in week 2 and 10 minutes in week 3 and 4. In week 5 students took a test.

The second test session has been in August 2013, following the same setup as the first test session. Eight participants were included. The third test session took place in September 2013. Ten participants were included. The last and fourth test sessions was held in October 2013. There were eleven participants. In the end, 18 participants used SS and also 18 used FC.

The first two sessions were held within OS; session 3 and 4 took place in a school for special education. After all four test sessions the participants were asked to fill out the motivation questionnaire. These were sent in to the University of Groningen.

## 3. Test phase CRPG Portugal

### *Computer course*

Halfway June 2013 CRPG started testing the computer course. There was one test session in June 2013 which ended in July. The University of Groningen accompanied the last and final class/meeting of the computer course on the site. The second test session for the computers course started in October 2013 and ended in November 2013.

In the first computer course participants used SS/FC for 15 minutes in every class/meeting. Except for the second meeting where they used it for 45 minutes. Four students used SS and four used FC. There have been 13 meetings in this course. Participants took the final exam on the computer, with the same questions as they answered using SlimStampen.

In the second computer course there were 9 participants: 5 used SS and 4 used FC. There were 12 meetings in which the participants worked with SlimStampen for 15 minutes at the end of each meeting.

All participants were asked to fill out the motivation questionnaire. This was made accessible through internet:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1VCY7fTzS1tPTwSSlzdB2RHFAi1wypgdmfgCBxVHzwN8/viewform>

### *Legislation*

Both test sessions of the Legislation course started in July 2013 and ended in September 2013. The University of Groningen accompanied the beginning of the first class in the first test sessions of the legislation course on site. In both the legislation courses there turned out to be 17 participants (9 used SS and 8 used FC). The legislation sessions each take 3 hours totally, 2h30m of work with

approximately 30 minutes of pause. Both Legislation courses contained of 8 classes/ meetings. Participants took the final exam on the computer, with the same questions as they answered using SlimStampen. The participants in each meeting worked 15 minutes with SS/FC, then had a break and then another 15 minutes with SS/FC.

All participants were asked to fill out the motivation questionnaire. This was made accessible through internet:

<https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1VCY7fTzS1tPTwSSlzdB2RHFAi1wypgdmfgCBxVHzwN8/viewform>

## Overall

All together up till November 2013 (Belfast meeting), 112 students participated in testing SS. Fifty-four participants used SS and 58 used FC. Please look at table 1 for further details. ReaCollege 1, 2 and 3 refer to three of the smaller test sessions held in the third test period/episode (October-November 2013) in The Netherlands. The first and second test sessions in The Netherlands unfortunately did not deliver suitable data to include in this study. Please also see chapter 5 for an explanation.

There are (many) more data available, but the exact numbers are not known yet and therefore cannot be included in table 1 below. ReaCollege continued testing in November 2013 and still is running sessions. At least about 15-20 more ReaCollege-sessions have been performed.

Table 1: number of participants per test session

Group	SlimStampen	FlashCard	Total
CRPG 1 Computer	4	4	8
CRPG 2 Computer	4	5	9
CRPG 3 + 4 Legislation	9	8	17
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>34</i>
OS 1	4	3	7
OS 2	4	4	8
OS 3	4	6	10
OS 4	6	5	11
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>18</i>	<i>36</i>
ReaCollege 1	5	8	13
ReaCollege 2	8	6	14
ReaCollege 3	6	9	15
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>19</i>	<i>23</i>	<i>42</i>
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>54</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>112</b>

## 5 WP 5 Evaluation and adjustments

Workpackage 5 starts in August 2013 and ends in March 2014. The aim of this WP is to evaluate the use of SS following the test phase and to suggest improvements and adjustments in the way SS is implemented in the curricula of the three partners.

## 5.1 Research questions

The following three questions are essential:

1. Is SlimStampen helpful for students with learning disabilities?
2. Is SlimStampen suitable for multiple choice questions?
3. Is computer-learning (especially SlimStampen) fun?

These questions are going to be answered by the University of Groningen, after studying the data that come out of testing SS. They will write a report about it (D8 and D9).

Based on the first results the University of Groningen comes to the following first conclusions:

- SlimStampen is not better than the flashcard method for students with learning disabilities.
- SlimStampen is not better than the flashcard method for multiple choice questions.
- Students like to use the computer for their studies.
- It is not known yet whether students have more fun in studying while using SlimStampen or Flashcard.

But a few study limitations have to be taken into account: 1) the groups sizes were small; 2) there was large variability within and between the groups of participants; 3) there was large variability in the question items within lists but also between lists. The circumstances between test locations but also within one test location varied.

For example in Portugal:

University of Groningen: *'Testing is going well in Portugal, but it will be difficult to make strong conclusions about our hypothesis. The sample size of the first course is very small. Many students did not attend all the classes. Some have prior experience with a computer; some have no experience at all. And the type and degree of brain injury (all have brain lesions) varies widely.'*

Another limitation was found at ReaCollege. The setup of the first and second test sessions were not optimal and therefore the data could not be used unfortunately. In the first test session there were (too) many test sessions in which the students used SS and FC. So the time for learning was quite long. Because of this, there is a so called 'ceiling effect'. Performances will be high on the final exams regardless of the learning method (SS or FC).

The second test session at ReaCollege unfortunately is not to be used for testing the impact of SS on the learning outcomes, since there has not been controlled for which learning method (SS or FC) was used by the students during the course. This test session has not been useless though, since it does give information on the satisfaction of students with SS.

University of Groningen: *'from the data we have so far we cannot conclude anything. Basically it looks like both methods, SS and FC, are equally good or bad. If anything, SlimStampen users seem to fare a bit worse than flashcard users. So in a way it really isn't surprising that we didn't find a statistically significant effect in this data. That doesn't mean that it is useless though. We can use this information to make further predictions and guide future study designs in this learning setting. Plus with the ongoing data acquisition at REA college there is still hope for getting some more conclusive results.'*

The University of Groningen mentions the following possible solutions for these limitations:

- Statistically separate MC and essay questions

- Statistically take into account question length
- Combine groups of participants (e.g. all first aid courses) to increase sample size
- Collect more data (at ReaCollege this is done in multiple sessions in the third test session which has been set up differently, as described in chapter 4)

They mention some future directions too:

- Assess whether learning satisfaction is greater for SS compared to FC
- Do thorough statistical analysis on final data sets
- Ongoing data acquisition at Rea college

University of Groningen: *'In a way the original hypothesis about whether SlimStampen will benefit more than flashcard was shifted a bit into the background, because simply using the computer program seemed to have a rather huge positive impact. In addition to that it is nice to see how experiences and methods between international groups are exchanged completely unrelated to the SlimStampen system.'*

Other circumstances that troubled the testing at ReaCollege were the following:

- Sometimes the wrong test is chosen by the participants
- Students logged in with the wrong ID
- Students are often distracted and busy with other actions on the internet
- Students experience less or more motivation to continue to work with the program based on their score results

These circumstances troubled testing at CRPG:

- Many absences caused by students' health condition: illness or therapy
- Low literacy skills of students
- Low vision of a student
- Students with very low or none knowledge about computers and severely affected knowledge retention

Motivation measurement in Portugal

The feedback from students on using SS (or FC) is very positive (on a likert scale from 1 - 4 with 1 being best and 4 being worst, all feedback was either 1 or 2). The written comments are also very positive and show that this way of learning is beneficial for the students and gives them a sense of empowerment. It was also commented that the questions were too easy by some. This is reflected in the results with 3 students scoring perfectly or almost perfectly. For the others the level of difficulty seems appropriate.

## 5.2 Deliverables WP 5

In WP 5 these two deliverables are planned:

- February 2014: version 2 of the curricula in SS (D10)
- March 2014: final report on the results (D9)

*Version 2 curricula in SS*

The University of Groningen has made necessary adaptations in SS for all three partners during the test phase (D10). There are not going to be any further adjustments to the SlimStampen website. So this deliverable has been completed before February 2014.

### *Final report on the results*

By the beginning of February 2014 University of Groningen will deliver a draft report on the results of the testing (D8). The final report on the results, also written by the University of Groningen, is expected in March 2014 (D9). This report will be accessible to a large audience. It will highlight the positive experiences that were made and lessons learned during the project. At the same time it is going to sound very 'sciency' and relate our findings to the general scientific literature. It includes the learning experience from this project. Possibly this report or this publication is combined so that it will be used for dissemination too (D16 in WP 6).

## 5.3 Feedback

The three test locations have shared their experiences on using SS and FC in the test phase. Their feedback, both positive and critical is listed below.

### ReaCollege

There are limitations in applying SlimStampen in the IT-program

- Students found a number of 'bugs' in the SS program. These were communicated with the university and most of them have been corrected in the last months. Some examples:
  - When starting typing the answer in SS, the rest of the answer automatically appears. Then students could easily recognize the correct answer. You don't know if they actually knew the whole answer themselves.
  - Hitting the backspace button led to ending the SS session immediately.
  - Of questions with a lot of text just a part of the text was displayed.
- SS is a good method for learning facts and is well usable in the ICT courses of ReaCollege.

### OS

- The time in between questions is an issue, a skip button would help
- There was a need for much individual attention given to the participants
- Spelling problems caused frustration if you typed the right answer wrong
- Some images didn't show on Flashcard sessions and timeout for sessions didn't work - but these were quickly addressed and rectified.
- Text too small
- System not intuitive enough
- Computer asked the same questions too many times
- The participants didn't like having to scroll down to click on the answer on some questions
- Not enough time to answer questions - not enough thinking time
  
- SS/ FC helped the participants to remember
- Participants liked seeing the score
- Participants enjoyed using computers

Observations of OS: *'We could see an immediate improvement in memory retention with trainees who were using both SlimStampen and flashcards compared to previous teaching of First Aid course. SlimStampen is less frustrating than Flashcard for trainees as not asked the same questions all the time, but the repetition still caused irritation and de-motivation in some students. Some trainees lost sense of independence and achievement when staff had to scribe for them due to*

*time restrictions on answering questions. We can see how the computer program could be successfully utilized in different training environments.'*

#### Recommendations of OS:

- Simplified home page for users
- All relevant text to appear in screen without having to scroll
- Larger text
- Questions not time bound
- More pictorial
- More intuitive use of mouse / keyboard

#### CRPG

- CRPG used long study lists and because of that the work was a bit dull and there was a loss of concentration
- In one group there was no time pressure in the answering of the questions; in the other group there was time pressure and that worked out positive

#### Achievements:

- The program potentiated attention, concentration and motivation
- It enabled the students' enthusiasm in learning

#### Future

Partners created an e-learning environment more than a testing environment and they appreciate the use of SlimStamopen as learning content. They would like to examine the impact of the experiences with SS on the regular (learning) programs.

The project partners are able to continue to use SS after the GOLD project has ended for the courses in which they have been using SS. ReaCollege is planning to do so, also at other locations, and also to put new material into SS. They are enthusiastic about SS and see it as supplement of their program, since for the ICT courses students need to learn a lot of facts and SS is a good method to do so. Also CRPG would like to continue to work with SS in the computer course and legislation course. Maybe other courses of CRPG would do great in SS as well. For Orchardville Society this information is not known at this point.

At least up until June 2015 this will be free of charge for the partners. The university of Groningen will prepare a kind of contract to arrange for the use of SS after GOLD has ended.

An important issue that has to be sorted out in the coming months is how the needed support for the partners in this period of time (between end of project and June 2015) will be organized and at what cost. Using SS for the partners will probably lead to (some kind of) support. For budget reasons it is unfortunately impossible for the University of Groningen to provide for this technical support. This might trouble further use. The project coordinator will talk with the partners on the possibilities to arrange for this support.

After June 2015 the application of SlimStampen will be improved and transferred into a more attractive interface, possible an App for smartphones and tablets. That is the time that SlimStampen (maybe with a different name) will be marketed and no longer will be free of charge for the project partner or anyone else.

## 6 WP 6 Dissemination

Work package 6 is aimed at informing relevant stakeholders about the GOLD project and the results through various dissemination activities. All partners have a role in this work package.

Deliverables from August 2013 to April 2014 in WP 6:

- 1 August 2013 - Dissemination plans (D11)
- 15 April 2014 - International event (D14)
- 27 April 2014 - National events (D15)
- 15 April 2014 - Publication (D16)

### Dissemination plans (D11)

In order to plan local dissemination actions, the project coordinator and external evaluator made a form 'Local dissemination plan'. The partners received it in January 2013 and should fill out this plan before August 2013. One of the partners already filled it out briefly in February 2013. This partner used this for collecting participants for the testing too. This same project partner filled out this form briefly again in August 2013 (OS). Despite several requests by the project coordinator and external evaluator no other dissemination plans have been setup before August 2013 by this or the other partners. This doesn't mean that the partners didn't do anything to organize dissemination activities. All partners have formed specific ideas on their national events. This has been discussed in the Belfast meeting, as were the other deliverables in WP 6. They choose to not use the form.

Dissemination actions are important and therefore this topic has been specifically discussed in the Belfast meeting in November 2013. The following arrangements have been made concerning dissemination actions between December 2013 and April 2014:

- The project partners agreed on sending two mails each about the progress of the project to their stakeholders (December 2013 - April 2014).
- The project partners agreed on writing and publishing two articles about the project on their websites and internal newsletters or intranet and in other magazines (for example in Leonardo newflash and EPR project news) (D16).
- The project partners CRPG, OS and ReaCollege together with University of Groningen have plans for organizing a national event, as is the assignment for all four project partners (D15). CRPG's national event will take place at the 14<sup>th</sup> March 2014, at their own site. The audience will be teachers of various schools and centers. CRPG will share their experiences and we also invite partner organizations to be present, not only as participants but also as speakers. OS is organizing a conference for their service users on the 28<sup>th</sup> March for around 200 people. University of Groningen will organize a presentation about SlimStampen at the main program of the 'Onderwijsvakdagen' in Drachten on 26<sup>th</sup> and 27<sup>th</sup> March 2014 ([www.onderwijsvakdagen.nl](http://www.onderwijsvakdagen.nl)). Since the University of Groningen has made arrangements with Noordhoff, a famous Dutch publisher on educational materials, the possibilities on a joint presentation are sorted out too. At this same event ReaCollege will demonstrate SlimStampen as it has been used at their institution at the information market. The teachers of ReaCollege will then show visitors how it works for students with (and without) disabilities at the main program. The audience at the 'Onderwijsvakdagen' are educational professionals such as teachers, trainers, lectures, school managers, etc. representing all educational levels and types of school.

- It is a possibility for project partners to join a colleague project partner at their national event since the traveling budget is adequate.
- An international dissemination event will be organized (D14). A good opportunity is the EPR annual conference (European Platform for Rehabilitation; 26 & 27 June 2014, Cologne, Germany). The project partners are enthusiastic about this idea since a lot of colleague rehabilitation institutes throughout Europe will be present. The project coordinator will contact EPR to discuss the possibilities during this Annual conference, or otherwise if it is possible to organize a session shortly before the Annual Conference. The project coordinator will sort out whether this is to be arranged and if it can be realized. If this provides sufficient possibilities, the project coordinator will write an amendment to the National Agency to extend the project period by two months and to ask whether Germany is an option for the international event since Germany is not included in this GOLD project as a partner. He will do so in the first months of 2014. If the EPR annual conference is no option the partners will examine the option to organize the final conference of project GOLD in Ireland. OS thinks that there will be sufficient partner organizations to co-organize such an event. The presentation of the GOLD results could then be a part of the content with one or two (related) other subjects.
- The project partners will write one or more non-scientific publications on the results of the project, including University of Groningen and the project coordinator (D16). Publication about the test results in a scientific journal is uncertain and undecided upon (D16). Since it is uncertain yet if the data collected in the test phase are qualified for getting reliable results (there has to be good support for or against the hypothesis), the University of Groningen is not sure about wanting to publish in a scientific journal. If the data do turn out to be qualified, then publishing is interesting. A suitable journal then has to be selected. If there won't be a publication in a scientific journal, we still have the final report, which could be published in a scientific magazine of some sort (D16).

#### **Dissemination GOLD project June 2013- January 2014**

The following dissemination activities concerning the GOLD project were performed between June 2013 and January 2014. Note that dissemination is particularly important in the months to come.

##### *Presentations*

The project partners have informed stakeholders through face-to-face meetings and presentations (CRPG, ReaCollege, OS). These dissemination actions were mainly 'internal', in ones own organization, and sometimes external. Stakeholders for example are: participants/students, colleagues (for example teachers/trainers and psychologists and also colleagues at dislocations of ones own organization), organizations similar to the project partners (in Ireland for example NOW project an Stepping Stones), and the audience at a conference (workshop given at the EUSE conference in Dublin).

##### *Announcement*

OS has mentioned the project and SlimStampen in their upcoming calendar which has been sent out in August 2013 to all or their trainees.

##### *Suppliers of educational material*

The developer/researcher of SlimStampen (University of Groningen) has made arrangements with a large Dutch publisher of schoolbooks and school materials (Noordhoff). Noordhoff bought SlimStampen and will start to sell this as one of their e-learning materials. They will rename SS, since there is other material with an almost similar name.

## 7 What's next

During the next months, from January 2014 until April 2014, the last test data of ReaCollege will be analyzed, the reports on the results will be presented and the different dissemination activities will be organized (WP 5 and WP 6) to share everything that has been learned from this project. The partners will support each other where needed.

WP 5 will be completed in March and WP 6 in April or possibly in June, if for the international dissemination event a contribution is made to the EPR conference in Germany at the end of June. At the end of April 2014, or June 2014, the GOLD project ends.