



Co-funded by
the European Union



EuroCivic Lab

**Strengthening European Identity
and Citizenship through
SDGs, Social Activism and
Living Labs Methodology in
School Education**

WP4

Complementary Resources – Module 6

The EuroCivic Lab project: Strengthening European Identity and Citizenship through SDGs, Social Activism and Living Lab methodology in School Education

2024-1-HU01-KA220-SCH-000251467

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are however those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the Erasmus+ National Agency. Neither the European Union nor the administering body can be held responsible for them.

Creative Commons License



CC BY-NC 4.0

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

This license requires that reusers give credit to the creator. It allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, for noncommercial purposes only.

Project Partners



universität
wien



Authors	Project Partner
	Torbali

Project Partners



Title	Case Study: The Silent Library Corner
Type	Case study (written scenario with reflective questions)
Short description	A short written case study that walks through one complete Living Lab cycle inside a school library, using borrowed beanbags and a hand-written sign as the prototype. It shows students that a credible pilot needs a small honest test and a way to measure what happens, not a budget or a perfect plan. The story The school library is almost empty every lunch break, even though students often complain there is ‘nowhere quiet to sit’. Instead of guessing why, a group of students treats the library like a Living Lab: their school itself becomes the laboratory, and the ‘experiment’ is a real space that real classmates use every day. Discover: over one week, the team watches when and how the library is used, and asks 20 classmates a simple question: “Why don't you come here at lunch?” The answers cluster around three things — the lighting feels harsh, the chairs are uncomfortable, and nobody is sure quiet reading is actually allowed during lunch. Prototype: rather than requesting a full renovation, the team builds the smallest possible test. They borrow two beanbags and a few cushions from home, bring in two small plants, and make a hand-written sign: ‘Quiet Corner — Lunch Reading Welcome’. Pilot: for two weeks, the corner is open every lunch break. The team keeps a simple daily tally of how many students use it. Reflect: usage grows from 2–3 students in the first days to over 15 by the end of the second week. Some students say they didn't realise reading during lunch was allowed until they saw the sign. The team reports back to the librarian and school administration with their tally sheet — real evidence, not just an opinion — and the beanbag corner becomes a permanent fixture the following term. The case shows a core idea from Module 6: you don't need a perfect plan or a big budget to start. You need a small, honest test, and a way to measure what happens. Reflective questions

Project Partners



universität
wien



	1. Why did the team choose to observe and interview classmates before building anything? 2. What made the beanbag corner a 'prototype' rather than a finished solution? 3. The team measured success with a simple daily tally. What are the strengths and limits of this kind of evidence? 4. Think of another underused space in your own school. What would a two-week, low-cost pilot look like there?
Learning objectives	• Apply the Discover → Prototype → Pilot → Reflect → Repeat cycle to a real school-life example. • Understand why a 'prototype' should be small, cheap, and quick to test. • Recognise the value of simple evidence (a tally, a short survey) in making the case for a permanent change.
Format/Source link (if external)	
Recommended use	Read the case study aloud or in pairs, then work through the reflective questions in small groups (4–5 students) before a short whole-class discussion. Allow 30–40 minutes total. Can be used as a warm-up before the module's assessment exercises, or as a stand-alone Living Lab lesson.

Project Partners



universität
wien



Title	Case Study: Water Fountains That Work
Type	Case study (written scenario with reflective questions)
Short description	A short written case study about a Living Lab team investigating unused drinking fountains and discovering that the barrier is trust and appearance as much as plumbing. It teaches students to separate what a problem is from how a problem is perceived, and to test the cheap hypothesis first. The story Three of the school's five drinking-fountain taps have been unreliable for months — sometimes dripping weakly, sometimes not working at all — and most students have simply stopped using them, carrying bottled water instead. Discover: a Living Lab team maps all five fountains, testing water pressure at different times of day and asking students at each fountain, “Do you use this one? Why or why not?” They discover the problem isn't just mechanical — two fountains are also seen as ‘dirty-looking’ even though the water is safe, because of mineral staining around the tap. Prototype: the team proposes two small, testable fixes: a laminated ‘this fountain is safe to drink from’ sign with a QR code linking to the school's latest water-quality check, and a request to the caretaker to clean the visible staining on two fountains — a low-cost, high-visibility change. Pilot: over two weeks, the team counts how many students use each fountain before and after the sign and cleaning. Reflect: usage of the two ‘fixed’ fountains roughly doubles, even though the water itself hadn't changed — only its visible cleanliness and the trust signal from the sign. The team writes a short note to the school administration recommending the same treatment for the remaining fountains, and suggesting fewer single-use plastic bottles are needed as a result. Reflective questions 1. Why did ‘cleaning the appearance’ matter as much as the mechanical repair? 2. What does this case teach about the difference between what a problem is and how a problem is perceived?

Project Partners


	- How did the team use evidence (usage counts) rather than opinion to support their recommendation? - Where else in your school might a 'trust' problem, not just a technical one, be stopping people from using something that already works?
Learning objectives	- Distinguish between a technical problem (broken plumbing) and a trust or perception problem (a fountain that looks unsafe). - Practise designing a low-cost, testable intervention rather than jumping straight to an expensive fix. - Link a small school-level pilot to a global goal (SDG 6, and indirectly SDG 12 on reducing single-use plastic).
Format/Source link (if external)	
Recommended use	Read the case study aloud or in pairs, then work through the reflective questions in small groups (4–5 students) before a short whole-class discussion. Allow 30–40 minutes total. Can be used as a warm-up before the module's assessment exercises, or as a stand-alone Living Lab lesson.

Project Partners



universität
wien



Title	Case Study: The Recycling Station Redesign
Type	Case study (written scenario with reflective questions)
Short description	A short written case study in which students test two competing bin-label designs against a control bin and measure contamination rates over ten school days. It is the module's clearest illustration of comparative testing and of the principle that failure is data, not defeat. The story The school installed recycling bins last year, but a quick check by a group of students shows that nearly 40% of what's inside the 'paper' bin is actually food wrappers, plastic bottles, and general rubbish. Simply telling students to 'recycle properly' hasn't worked. Discover: the team interviews classmates at the bins and finds most people aren't ignoring the rules on purpose — the text-only labels ('Paper', 'Plastic') are easy to miss in a rush between classes. Prototype: the team designs two alternative label styles — one with large, simple icons and colour-coding, and one that keeps text but adds a large arrow pointing to the correct bin — and tests them on different bins. Pilot: over ten school days, the team checks bin contents each morning and records the contamination rate for each label style, plus a 'no change' control bin for comparison. Reflect: the icon-and-colour labels cut contamination roughly in half compared to the control bin; the arrow-only labels help a little, but less. The team reports the results to the school's sustainability committee with a simple table of before/after numbers, and recommends rolling out the icon design school-wide. Reflective questions 1. Why did the team test two different label designs instead of just picking the one they personally liked best? 2. What was the purpose of keeping a 'no change' control bin? 3. How is this case an example of 'failure is data, not defeat' — a key Living Lab idea?

Project Partners



	4. If the icon labels hadn't worked either, what would the Living Lab cycle suggest doing next?
Learning objectives	• Understand why testing two different solutions (not just implementing one guess) produces stronger evidence. • Practise collecting and comparing simple quantitative data (contamination rates) to evaluate an intervention. • Connect the pilot to SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production) and to Living Lab principles of iteration and evidence.
Format/Source link (if external)	
Recommended use	Read the case study aloud or in pairs, then work through the reflective questions in small groups (4–5 students) before a short whole-class discussion. Allow 30–40 minutes total. Can be used as a warm-up before the module's assessment exercises, or as a stand-alone Living Lab lesson.

Project Partners



universität
wien



Title	ENoLL — What Is a Living Lab?
Type	Multimedia resource (online reference page)
Short description	About this resource The European Network of Living Labs (ENoLL) is the world's largest network of Living Labs and the sector's certification body. Its 'Who We Are' page explains Living Labs as real-life, user-centred innovation ecosystems built on co-creation, exploration, experimentation, and evaluation — giving students a genuine European reference point for the methodology they are practising in their own school-based projects. Classroom activity Before reading: ask students to predict, in one sentence, what the resource will be about based on its title. After reading: students complete a short 'One thing I learned / one question I still have' exit ticket, then share in pairs. Reflection prompts • What is the single most surprising fact or idea from this resource? • How does it connect to something in your own school or town? • What would you tell a friend who has 3 minutes to understand this topic?
Learning objectives	• Understand that the Living Lab approach used in this module is part of a real, active European innovation movement, not a classroom invention. • Identify ENoLL's four core Living Lab activities: co-creation, exploration, experimentation, and evaluation. • Compare ENoLL's professional definition with the students' own school-based Living Lab projects.
Format/Source link (if external)	Source: Who We Are — European Network of Living Labs (ENoLL) https://enoll.org/who-we-are/
Recommended use	Use for teacher background reading, or read the page together and ask students to match ENoLL's four activities (co-creation,

Project Partners



universität
wien



exploration, experimentation, evaluation) to the steps of their own class project.

Project Partners



**universität
wien**



Title	eTwinning — European School Education Platform
Type	Multimedia resource (online platform / web page)
Short description	About this resource eTwinning is the European Commission's community for schools, now part of the European School Education Platform, connecting more than 233,000 schools across 40+ countries in joint, project-based learning. It gives students a real, accessible next step for taking their Living Lab work beyond their own school and into collaboration with peers across Europe. Classroom activity Before reading: ask students to predict, in one sentence, what the resource will be about based on its title. After reading: students complete a short 'One thing I learned / one question I still have' exit ticket, then share in pairs. Reflection prompts • What is the single most surprising fact or idea from this resource? • How does it connect to something in your own school or town? • What would you tell a friend who has 3 minutes to understand this topic?
Learning objectives	• Discover a real platform for running future collaborative Living Lab projects with schools in other European countries. • Understand project-based, cross-border collaboration as a concrete expression of shared European identity. • Identify one Living Lab idea from this module that could become an eTwinning project.
Format/Source link (if external)	Source: European School Education Platform (eTwinning) https://school-education.ec.europa.eu/en
Recommended use	Introduce toward the end of the module: after students complete their own Living Lab pilot, ask them to sketch (in one paragraph) how the same project could be adapted into a joint eTwinning project with a partner school abroad.

Project Partners



universität
wien



Title	Collaborative Project: Better Break Time — A School Living Lab
Type	Collaborative project suggestion (full Living Lab cycle, 3–4 weeks)
Short description	Project overview Teams select one specific, observable problem related to break time — queueing, noise, boredom, safety, or access to shared equipment (footballs, board games, seating) — and run a complete Living Lab cycle over three to four weeks. The emphasis is on evidence and iteration, not on getting the ‘perfect’ idea on the first try — matching the module's key idea that a Living Lab treats an unsuccessful first attempt as new data, not as failure. Step-by-step instructions 1. Discover: observe break time for 2–3 days and interview at least 10 classmates about the chosen problem. 2. Define one simple metric you will track (e.g. number of students queueing after 5 minutes, number of noise complaints, number of students using the equipment). 3. Prototype: design the smallest possible test of your idea (a new queue system, a quiet zone, a sign-out sheet for equipment). 4. Pilot: run the prototype for one to two weeks, tracking your chosen metric daily. 5. Reflect: compare the ‘before’ and ‘after’ numbers as a team. Decide what worked, what didn't, and why. 6. Repeat or recommend: either run a second, improved pilot, or prepare a short evidence-based recommendation for school leadership. Suggested team roles • Data lead — designs the metric and keeps the daily tracking sheet. • Prototype builder — designs and sets up the small test. • Interviewer — collects classmate feedback before and during the pilot. • Reporter — prepares the final recommendation and presents it. Deliverable

Project Partners



	A one-page 'Living Lab report' with the problem statement, the metric used, a simple before/after chart or table, and a clear recommendation — presented in a 5-minute pitch to school administration or the student council. Reflection prompts 1. Did your first prototype work as expected? What did you learn from what didn't go to plan? 2. How did having a specific metric change the way your team discussed 'success'? 3. Which part of the Living Lab cycle was hardest to do well: discovering, prototyping, or reflecting? Why? 4. If your school had unlimited time and budget, what would the 'next round' of this pilot look like?
Learning objectives	• Independently run all five stages of the Living Lab cycle: discover, prototype, pilot, reflect, repeat. • Practise defining a simple, honest metric to judge whether a change actually worked. • Present evidence-based recommendations to a real audience (school administration or the student council).
Format/Source link (if external)	
Recommended use	Best run over three to four weeks alongside regular lessons. Group size: 3–5 students. Teachers should agree the chosen problem area with school administration before piloting any physical change.

Project Partners



Title	Collaborative Project: Living Lab Partners — School Meets Neighbourhood
Type	Collaborative project suggestion (community co-creation, 3–4 weeks)
Short description	Project overview Unlike the in-school pilots in this module, this project deliberately involves people outside the school — reflecting the Living Lab idea that the strongest solutions are co-created with the people who actually use a space, not designed for them from a distance. Teams identify one small, realistic public-space issue near the school (a bus stop without shade, a neglected corner of a park, an unclear pedestrian crossing) and reach out — with teacher support — to one real local partner who could help. Step-by-step instructions 1. With your teacher's help, identify one realistic local partner (e.g. the local municipality office, a neighbourhood association, a local NGO) and one small, specific public-space issue. 2. Discover: interview at least 8–10 people who actually use the space (not just classmates) about what they need. 3. Prototype: co-design one small, low-cost improvement with input from the partner (e.g. a temporary shade cover, a painted crossing marker, a small seating area using recycled materials). 4. Pilot: with permission, test the small improvement for an agreed period and gather feedback from users. 5. Reflect: as a team and with the partner, discuss what worked and what the next step could be (e.g. a permanent version, a follow-up request to the municipality). 6. Share: present the project — including the partner's role — to the class and, if possible, to the partner organisation itself. Suggested team roles • Partnership lead — manages contact and communication with the outside partner (with teacher supervision). • Field researcher — conducts interviews with space users.

Project Partners



universität
wien



	• Designer/builder — helps design and set up the small prototype. • Presenter — prepares the final joint presentation. Deliverable A short joint project summary (with photos, if possible) co-signed by the student team and the external partner, plus a 5-minute class presentation describing the co-creation process and outcome. Reflection prompts 1. How did involving a real outside partner change the project, compared to a purely in-school pilot? 2. What did the people who actually use the space want that your team hadn't originally thought of? 3. Which European value (solidarity, participation, sustainability) did this project reflect most strongly, and how? 4. What would it take to turn this pilot into something permanent?
Learning objectives	• Practise co-creating a solution with a real external stakeholder, not only with classmates. • Apply the discover–prototype–pilot–reflect cycle to a public, shared space rather than a purely school-internal one. • Connect the project explicitly to at least one SDG (e.g. SDG 11 Sustainable Cities and Communities) and one European value (e.g. participation, solidarity).
Format/Source link (if external)	
Recommended use	Best run over three to four weeks. Group size: 3–5 students. Teachers should make first contact with any outside partner and confirm consent before students engage directly.

Project Partners



universität
wien

