Logo Contest Report

Smaile Project 2024-1-HR01-KA220-SCH-000254267 Dates: 01/11/2024 – 30/11/2024
Total respondents: 10

Introduction

This report provides a detailed analysis of the evaluation results for the logo contest, an activity involving students. The evaluation is based on 10 responses and covers four key areas: the quality of the results, the use of AI tools, the organization of the activity, and its pedagogical impact.

1. Results on Quality

The results on the quality of the logos were generally very positive, indicating significant success in creative output and design relevance.

- **Creativity and Originality:** The majority of respondents rated the creativity and originality of the student-designed logos very positively. 50% of the responses gave the maximum score (5), and 40% gave a score of 4. Only 10% of respondents gave a score of 3.
- **Reflection of Project Purpose:** The logos' effectiveness in reflecting the project's purpose also received high ratings. 40% of responses rated this aspect with a 5, and another 40% with a 4. However, 10% of respondents rated it with a 3 and another 10% with a 2.
- **Technical Quality:** 60% of participants considered the technical quality of the designs adequate, giving a score of 5, while 30% gave a score of 4. Only 10% of respondents assigned a score of 3.

2. Results on the Use of AI Tools

The evaluation of the use of AI tools in the creative process presents a mixed picture, with comments indicating both their usefulness and some difficulties.

- **Facilitation of the Creative Process:** 40% of respondents felt that the AI tools facilitated the students' creative process, giving a score of 4. 20% gave the

maximum rating (5), and another 20% gave a score of 3. This suggests that, while useful, the tools were not perceived as universally facilitating.

- **Understanding and Skills in Tool Use:** Students demonstrated a good understanding and ability to use the tools correctly. 50% of respondents gave a score of 5, and 40% assigned a 4. A small percentage of 10% gave a score of 3.

---

3. Results on the Organization and Dynamics of the Activity

The activity's organization was rated very positively, contributing to a smooth experience for participants.

- **Structure and Organization:** 60% of respondents considered the activity to be very well-organized and structured, rating it a 5, while 40% gave a score of 4. There were no ratings below 4.
- **Time Allotted:** Perception of the time allotted was mixed. 50% of respondents felt the time was sufficient, rating it with a 5. However, 30% gave a score of 4, and 10% each assigned a 3 and a 2, indicating that for some, the time might have been limited.
- **Promotion of Active Participation:** The activity was exceptionally successful in promoting students' active participation. 90% of participants gave it the maximum score of 5, and the remaining 10% assigned a 4.

---

4. Results on Pedagogical Impact

The pedagogical impact of the activity was very high, especially in developing creative skills and fostering interest in technology.

- **Development of Creative Skills:** The activity contributed significantly to the development of students' creative skills, with 60% of respondents giving it the maximum score and 40% a score of 4.
- **Fostering Interest:** The activity fostered an interest in technology and design in 50% of respondents, who gave it a 5, and in the other 50% who gave it a 4.
- **Meeting Educational Objectives:** The activity met the proposed educational objectives, according to 60% of respondents who rated it a 5, and 40% who rated it a 4.
- **Recommendation of the Activity:** 60% of respondents would recommend repeating this activity or a similar one in the future, giving it a 5, and the remaining 40% recommended it with a score of 4.

Improvement Comments and Strengths

The open-ended comments provide a more detailed view for improvement and highlight the most valued aspects of the activity.

- **Aspects to Improve:** Respondents suggested the need for "more devices for children to work with" and to "Use AI before to make students more efficient with it". The need for greater knowledge of different programs and platforms was also mentioned. A specific difficulty was reported with the addition of flags in the logo result, which took time to fix.
- **Most Valued Aspects: Collaboration** was the most highlighted aspect. Participants praised the collaboration "between older and younger students" and the teamwork among different groups. The use of AI tools for older students to develop their leadership skills and help younger ones was also positively valued. Other highlights included the children's motivation in using technology and the excitement of seeing the results.

Overall Conclusion

The logo contest evaluation was a success, highlighting the high pedagogical impact and the quality of the designs. The collaboration between students of different ages and the use of technology were the strongest points. While the activity was well-organized, the suggestions focus on logistics (more devices) and prior familiarity with AI tools to optimize the process. Overall, the results suggest that this activity is highly recommended for future replication.