

SugarLabs deployments survey analysis

Version 1.1: Add replies from 3 more deployments.

Introduction

With the objective of get more information about deployments to help us evaluate alternatives for future developments at SugarLabs, the SLOBs run a survey at the beginning of 2015.

The questions were send by email, and we received 15 replies, with information about 21 deployments (some respondents are involved in more than one deployment). Then the first conclusion is that we need improve our communication with the deployments, but the results are representative enough. In particular, we couldn't communicate with some of the biggest deployments.

The questions we send were:



- Describe the actual population using Sugar in your deployment (number of people, public/private schools, ages, etc.)
- Projections for the next year(s): number of schools (teachers & students), platform (hw&sw)
- What type of communication do you have with SugarLabs?
- What is the level of satisfaction with the use of Sugar and activities in your deployment.
- What are the main issues you find in the use of Sugar and Activities in your deployment.
- Are other options of hardware/software in use in your deployment right now?
- What are your plans to the future one/two years, with respect to the use of Sugar?
- Would you pay for support or services? What type of work would be needed by you?

Summary of the replies:


Describe the actual population using Sugar in your deployment (number of people, public/private schools, ages, etc.)

In the 21 deployments who replied the survey, there are a total of 519K students.

The results are very diverse, we have deployments from 1 school to hundred participating in the survey:



Range of age



Projections for the next year(s): number of schools (teachers & students), platform (hardware & software)

1 deployment plan add 50000 laptops.

4 deployments plan add between 1000 and 5000 machines this year.

3 deployments plan add between 100 and 150 machines.

2 deployments plan test a few number of tablets with Sugarizer.

One deployment plan introduce 7000 tablets with Android, and one deployment research develop his own device basing the software in Android.

The other deployments do not have changes scheduled.

What type of communication do you have with SugarLabs?

From 14 replies to this question:

6 said they don't have any communication with SugarLabs.

2 said they have communication with particular members of the community

5 have contact using the mailing list (even when one of them said contact is limited, but is in IAEP list)

Only one of the respondents said he is part of SugarLabs. Other two would like to increment the participation.

One of the respondents manifest one member in his group was lost because of their request were not acknowledged by the Sugar community, after make a effort to participate on OLPC SF event.

We can see here we need find a way to make people in the deployments feel part of SugarLabs, be clear about our communication channels, and the events that we organize.

What is the level of satisfaction with the use of Sugar and activities in your deployment.

From 14 replies, 12 qualify the level of satisfaction as good or high in different terms (“users and teachers use activities a lot”, “users are excited”, “Sugar provides a very elegant way of getting users started”, “users pickup very quickly with very little formal training”) . One of them notes that Sugar is the only platform their users known, and other said they have planed do a analysis of the use of Sugar this year.

Two respondents express frustration when something does not work or with difficult integration of applications not developed for Sugar and optimized for the XO hardware. Two wuld like more regional activities or more advanced activities.

What are the main issues you find in the use of Sugar and Activities in your deployment.

From 13 respondents, 2 said don't have issues.

The other manifest the following issues:

- Activities than do not work in newer Sugar versions.
- Not clear way to communicate with SugarLabs. Lack of a single point of contact to get help.
- Teachers struggle to link the activities to the curriculum and required learning outcomes.
- Poor support of newer Sugar versions in XO-1. In particular problems with Browse activity.
- Not be able to install Sugar in other computers (like teachers desktop computers).
- Issues running video streaming on the XO with resources like IIAB and Khan Academy
- Problems to run a school server.
- Performance regressions from XO-1.5 to XO-1.75
- Little use of Journal or collaboration as key characteristics of Sugar, even when the use of the activities is well valued.
- Localization issues.

Are other options of hardware/software in use in your deployment right now?

From 13 respondents to this question, 7 don't have other options of hardware or software in use.

The options available to the other are:

- Classmate devices running Sugar.
- Edubuntu (software)
- Android (in development)
- School servers.
- Gnome desktop for older students.

What are your plans to the future one/two years, with respect to the use of Sugar?

From 15 respondents:

9 plan continue use Sugar.

4 express concerns about the future availability of XO devices, and as a consequence are looking at cheap Android tablets, with Sugarizer or content provided by servers.

1 is investing in develop a new device and plan use Android .

1 is exploring use a local Linux distribution.

Would you pay for support or services? What type of work would be needed by you?

From 14 respondents to this question:

8 can't afford or are not interested in pay for support or services, but 2 of them are already paying for development needed locally.

4 didn't needed it yet, but would pay if they need customization beyond the local expertise. One of them proposed modify the Sugar activities to allow run them in the Gnome desktop too.

One off the biggest deployments explain they are not interested in pay to SugarLabs for services given that they already are big OLPC clients.