

International Colloquium Plan

The European Commission's support for the production of this publication does not constitute an endorsement of the contents, which reflect the views only of the authors, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

Date: 13/02/2026

Duration: 3 hours + 1 hour for the break

09:00 – 13:00 CET (10:00 – 14:00 Finnish time)

Purpose

1. Dissemination: teams present educational game prototypes.
2. Course evaluation: focus groups with each country team (students + staff) to assess course design, support, learning outcomes, and collaboration.
3. Cross-country learning: identify transferable good practices and improvement points for the sustainability phase.

Participants

- Student teams from each partner country (game designers/pedagogy students) -
- Course tutors/mentors
- Consortium staff
- External guests
- Registration form for everyone:
https://docs.google.com/forms/d/e/1FAIpQLSd7CN3lginZNtUdWaN2D_kePUUhbyV8yuWzSy676F7vKnrFwA/viewform?usp=header

Format: hybrid (in-person host + online access), to maximise participation and reduce barriers.



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future

Expected outputs and what has to be collected

1. Game-related outputs (per team)

A 5 min video OR a 5 min. narrated presentation of the game + one-page Game Brief (only applies to tabletop games) (learning goals, target group, mechanics, inclusivity features, required materials/tech - as part of the print & play resources - a shortened version of it as support) - no longer than one page.

The presentation framework for the students is [here](#).

Google drive space where students upload their presentations:

https://drive.google.com/drive/folders/1RIOs_TcInFBCy38Zn99WPhkTaY9VHCJb

2. Post-event deliverables (consortium)

Colloquium report: results, game highlights, cross-country themes, course improvement actions

Agenda

Introduction

09:00 - 09:15 - Welcome address by the project coordinator

09:15 - 09:45 Keynote address 1

Kryštof Klestil (Mad Cookies Studio) - This talk zooms in on the mythical processes through which games are published. It's about how self-publishing works and, alternatively, what benefits a publisher can bring to the table. What the two paths offer, and what to look out for. The talk is intended for anyone who wants to find out more about publishing options and how they pan out in the long term.

09:50 -10:20 Keynote address 2

Juraj Horňák (Lebo Mäďved) - Case Study of a Successful Slovak Tabletop Games Company This lecture introduces a Slovak tabletop games company with a focus on board game design. It broadly explores how visual style, mechanics, and user experience shape tabletop games. The talk is intended for anyone interested in game design and creative processes.

10:30 - 10:40 Instructions for focus groups + logistics

Focus groups (course evaluation)



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future

10:45 - 11:15 Focus groups (parallel sessions)

One focus group per country team cohort (or per course cohort type), run in parallel breakout rooms.

11:15 - 11:45 Presentations

11:45 - 11:55 Vote rules

11:55 - 12:25 Break & vote time

12:30 - 12:45 Presentation of the winners

12:45 - 13:00 End of the 1st Colloquium

Focus Group Mission

Help us “level up” the course. Your feedback will directly shape the next edition, so please be honest and specific. There are no “wrong” answers - we want the real experience (the good, the messy, and the helpful).

Team setup (who does what)

Each group has:

- **Moderator** - keeps the discussion moving and makes sure everyone speaks.
- **Note-taker** - writes down key points and strong quotes (no names).

These roles are assigned by us at the start, but you may swap roles during the session if your group wants to.

- **Mentor** - one person per group is available only to support if needed (e.g., clarify a question, help the group stay on track).
The discussion and decisions are yours.

Final “deliverables”

By the end of the focus group, your group should be ready to share:

1. **3 strengths** (what worked best)
2. **3 pain points** (what was hardest / didn't work)
3. **3 quick wins** (small changes we can do fast)



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future

- 4. **3 structural changes** (bigger changes for next semester)
- 5. **2 anonymised quotes** that capture the main themes
(e.g., "A student said: '...' - no names.)

Core questions (must-do)

1) What worked well (Strengths)

What were the 3 best things about the course?

(Examples: activities, materials, pacing, teamwork, feedback, teacher support.)

Which 1-2 moments helped you most to turn your idea into a playable prototype?

Why?

(Pick real moments: a task, a workshop, a feedback point, a template, a deadline, etc.)

2) What was difficult (Pain points)

What were the 3 hardest or most frustrating parts?

(Examples: concept, tools/tech, time, teamwork, feedback, instructions, assessment.)

When did you feel stuck - and what exactly caused it?

(Try to be precise: what was unclear, missing, too fast, too hard, or poorly timed?)

3) What changes do you want?

Quick wins (easy changes):

If we could change 3 small things next week, what should they be?

(Examples: clearer instructions, templates, more examples, more playtesting time, better grouping.)

Structural changes (bigger redesign):

If we could change 3 bigger things for next semester, what should they be?

(Examples: new sequence of topics, more pedagogy before tools, more mentoring, different assessment, more milestones.)

Bonus questions (use if you have time)

Balance check: Did the course feel more about...how to teach with games OR how to build games?

Was the balance right? What would you adjust?

Support: What support helped most (teacher, mentor, peers, resources)? What support was missing?



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future

Barriers: What barriers did you face (time, tech, skills, institutional limits)? What would make the process easier?

Teamwork: How well did your team collaboration work overall?

Misunderstandings: Where did confusion happen (terms, roles, expectations)? What would prevent it?

Inclusivity/accessibility: Did you do anything to make your game accessible/inclusive? What?

Challenges: What was hard about accessibility/inclusivity? What checklist/examples would help?

Feedback: What feedback helped your game improve the most (peer/jury/teacher)? Why?

Assessment focus: What should assessment reward in this course? (Fun/engagement, learning value, playability, clarity of rules, inclusivity, prototype quality.)

Real-life use: Could you use these methods in your future school/university/workplace? Why or why not?

Quote collecting (easy rule)

During discussion, the note-taker should capture 2 strong sentences (anonymised), for example:

- “A student said: ‘I finally understood the design process when...’”
- “A student said: ‘The hardest part was... because...’”

Framework to organise your notes

Strengths (3)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future



Pain points (3)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Quick wins (3)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Structural changes (3)

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

2 anonymised quotes

Quote 1:

Quote 2:

Practical logistics and accessibility checklist

- Language: English (communicative level expected in the post-course seminar context).
- Time zones: schedule a core window + recordings for asynchronous viewing/analysis

What the consortium should produce after the colloquium

Course evaluation synthesis: themes mapped to: training/support gaps; barriers/feasibility; pedagogy-tool balance; collaboration protocols; assessment and feedback mechanisms; inclusivity & cultural sensitivity

Action plan for iteration: what changes before Round 2.



Funded by
the European Union



Learn to Play
for the Future