

Create After Class: choosing a medium and reaching a real place to make

The strongest case is for informed access to existing making opportunities. The retained research offers reasons to study intentional revision and authorship, but does not establish that a cross-medium hub improves creativity, confidence or learning.

Research by Education Angel Group. Last substantive review: September 19, 2026.

Education Angel Group is developing Create After Class and has an interest in the proposed product. This review does not establish its effectiveness.

Prepared by Education Angel Group (EAG), with AI-assisted research and drafting. Research date: September 19, 2026. EAG is developing Create After Class and has an interest in its success. This is a source-led rationale and proposed evaluation, not an independent assessment of a working service.

1. Proposition, audience and the decision at stake

Create After Class is EAG's proposed cross-medium creative hub. Its locked tagline is "Make posters, games, music, stories, and whatever comes next." The specific responsibility behind that broad invitation is helping a student choose a project type, understand where making happens, reach a real destination and return safely. A destination may be another EAG tool or an external service. Create does not acquire that tool's editor, storage, export capabilities or permissions by linking to it. EAG product authority, A0

The immediate audience is a student with an idea but an unsettled medium or destination. A student who already knows the appropriate tool may need only a direct link. Parents and school adults need enough information to permit, adapt or decline a route. A destination operator needs a clear account of what the hub promises on its behalf. These jobs can conflict: reducing a child's reading burden must not erase information an adult needs to make a sound decision.

Overview. The strongest case is for informed access to existing making opportunities. The retained research offers reasons to study intentional revision and authorship, but does not establish that a cross-medium hub improves creativity, confidence or learning. Existing tools already provide substantial creation capabilities. Create earns a role only if its additional step helps people select an appropriate destination and understand its boundaries better than simpler alternatives.

The first proposed journey is therefore a medium choice, an accurate destination description, entry and return. A completed drawing or song would be a destination outcome. It would not by itself prove that Create helped, saved the work or had permission to receive it. Snack's Tube retains its separate multimedia-

studio role. Runstr supplies required identity where applicable, without granting access to another tool's drafts or automatically receiving creative outputs. These are product boundaries, not empirical findings or verified implementation claims. [A0]

2. Research questions and what would answer them

The review centers on five questions:

1. When does choosing among media create enough difficulty to justify a dedicated hub?
2. What does research on making and remixing suggest, and where does transfer to routing stop?
3. Which existing alternatives already satisfy the student's job?
4. What must a student and adult understand before entering, transferring work or sharing?
5. What evidence would justify continuing, simplifying or withdrawing the proposed route?

A helpful answer to the first question requires observed decision problems. It could be a student repeatedly choosing a tool that cannot produce the intended output, or an adult abandoning an activity because the destination's requirements are unclear. Neither pattern has been measured for Create. Counting available creative products would not establish demand for another directory.

For the second question, evidence must follow the actual mechanism. A study of programming projects concerns activity inside a programming environment. A hub intervenes earlier, when a student selects a destination, and later, when the student tries to return. Connecting these events into a learning claim requires evidence at each link. This report treats that connection as an EAG hypothesis.

For the remaining questions, first-party documentation can identify candidate differences, but a working journey needs device testing, current destination review and comprehension evidence. The evidence base here is strongest on those differences and weakest on comparative child navigation. No optimal number of choices, improvement percentage or universal age threshold is established.

3. Need and context: medium choice is also a choice of constraints

A student's intended artifact does not always map neatly onto a medium. A story could be written, drawn, animated or performed. A poster could be a finished image or a starting point for a game. Create's proposed contribution is to help the student recognize a feasible next action without forcing every idea into one editor. This is a product rationale, not a measured account of how students currently choose.

Consider an illustrative student who wants to explain a science topic through a short story. The student may care about drawing, narration, audience and where work can be kept. A route labeled only "stories" could conceal whether the destination supports text, sound or animation. A route labeled only with a product name

assumes prior knowledge. A more informative choice would connect an intended action to a destination's actual capabilities, while leaving room to change direction.

The practical context also includes the device and the setting. Installed software may be usable on a prepared school computer but unavailable on a borrowed phone. Sound may be unsuitable in a quiet classroom. A task that can be started anonymously may still encounter registration or sharing requirements later. These are plausible conditions to investigate, not prevalence estimates. The report has no Arkansas-specific inventory of devices, blocked sites, adult permissions or preferred media.

The hub could also introduce its own obstacles. A student might mistake EAG presentation for a guarantee about an external provider. Another might spend more time selecting than making. An adult may already maintain a small, suitable set of links. The need should therefore be expressed as a testable problem of selection and destination understanding, not a presumed shortage of creative software.

A useful initial inquiry would ask students to describe an intended output before seeing the hub. The research team could then observe whether the person needs medium guidance, destination guidance, permission information or no assistance. Those are different problems. Their relative frequency would inform whether Create should emphasize project examples, concise route descriptions or a small set of direct destinations.

4. Existing alternatives and the gap Create would have to earn

Figure 1

Existing routes have different conditions

Music experiments

Chrome Music Lab

FAQ describes account-free browser use. Runtime and output fidelity untested.

Drawing software

Tux Paint

Manual describes export and exit controls. Installation and version matter.

Programming stories and games

Scratch

Service terms identify capabilities and registration conditions. No destination approval follows.

First-party descriptions, checked September 19, 2026. Different jobs and entry conditions, not a quality ranking.

Existing routes have different conditions

First-party descriptions, checked September 19, 2026. Different jobs and entry conditions, not a quality ranking.

- S3
 - S4
 - S6
-

These equivalents accompany the reader figures. Source IDs refer to the report references. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Figure 1. Existing routes have different conditions

First-party descriptions, checked September 19, 2026. Different jobs and entry conditions, not a quality ranking.

Music experiments: Chrome Music Lab. FAQ describes account-free browser use. Runtime and output fidelity untested.

Drawing software: Tux Paint. Manual describes export and exit controls. Installation and version matter.

Programming stories and games: Scratch. Service terms identify capabilities and registration conditions. No destination approval follows.

Sources: S3, S4, S6.

Figure 1. Official descriptions document distinct candidate routes, not a ranking or integration approval. Runtime use, accessibility, export fidelity and safe return have not been tested. Text and data alternative.

Chrome Music Lab's FAQ describes account-free browser experiments and Song Maker for creating and sharing songs. The extracted page also showed unsupported-browser text and template placeholders. Its documented offering is a meaningful music alternative, but the retrieval does not prove successful operation on a student's device. Account-free access should not be interpreted as an assurance that no data is collected. Chrome Music Lab, S3

Tux Paint's manual documents picture export, a slideshow/GIF path and prompts around unsaved exit. This is a concrete drawing alternative with an installed-software journey. Those documented operations are not tested output-fidelity results. The manual's version-specific notes also make it important to identify the actual installed version before describing available behavior. Tux Paint manual, S4

Scratch's service terms describe a visual programming service covering stories, games and animation, with registration for certain features. That makes it a relevant programming alternative, not an automatically approved destination. Current terms must be considered separately from the historical community studied in the research below. Scratch service terms, S6

These alternatives challenge any claim that Create must build a universal editor. They also show why a single promise such as "make and save anything" would be misleading. Different jobs imply different devices, operations and conditions. A comparison should help a person decide whether a route fits the intended task, rather than convert those differences into an invented creativity score.

A teacher's existing list of approved links is the most direct comparator for the hub. It can be concise, familiar and locally appropriate. A direct destination link removes a selection step for a student who already knows the medium. Paper and pencil can support an early sketch without requiring a digital destination at all. These are credible alternatives to test; this review does not establish their comparative performance.

Create's proposed gap is an explanation between an idea and a suitable next place to work, especially when that next place changes by medium. If the same benefit can be achieved through clearer labels on a short link list, that simpler result should count as a successful research finding. If users want detailed instruction inside a chosen editor, the problem belongs to the destination or a separately scoped teaching activity. It should not be relabeled as a routing problem to justify expanding the hub.

5. Evidence, counterevidence and the limits of transfer

Figure 2

Making evidence does not establish routing benefit

Dasgupta et al. 2016

Programming indicators

Historical Scratch association; code presence is an imperfect understanding measure.

Hill et al. 2010

Responses to reuse

Positive reactions and plagiarism concerns coexist; comments are selective.

Create research gap

A different intervention

Neither study tests a medium chooser, destination comprehension or safe return.

Historical observational studies in one community. Publication years differ from observation periods; no causal Create effect.

Making evidence does not establish routing benefit

Historical observational studies in one community. Publication years differ from observation periods; no causal Create effect.

- S1
- S2

Figure 2. Making evidence does not establish routing benefit

Historical observational studies in one community. Publication years differ from observation periods; no causal Create effect.

Dasgupta et al. 2016: Programming indicators. Historical Scratch association; code presence is an imperfect understanding measure.

Hill et al. 2010: Responses to reuse. Positive reactions and plagiarism concerns coexist; comments are selective.

Create research gap: A different intervention. Neither study tests a medium chooser, destination comprehension or safe return.

Sources: S1, S2.

Figure 2. Historical observational Scratch studies illuminate activity inside one community. Neither estimates a Create routing effect or contemporary attitudes. Text and data alternative.

Dasgupta, Hale, Monroy-Hernandez and Hill's 2016 study analyzed historical Scratch projects from 2007-2012. Within-user analyses associated remixing with a broader programming-block repertoire and exposure to concepts with later use. The authors explicitly note that they lack exogenous variation needed for causal inference. Code appearing in a project may not demonstrate understanding; robustness checks cannot eliminate that measurement problem. The study also concerns one community and does not test a cross-medium chooser. Dasgupta et al., S1

For EAG, the useful research question is whether a destination lets a maker explain an intentional change. That is a proposed evaluation choice, not a conclusion that all remixing is educational. A student who reaches a tool and makes a deliberate revision might have received useful help, but the routing layer still needs comparison with a direct-link route. More projects, more blocks or more time alone should not become Create's definition of creative growth.

Hill, Monroy-Hernandez and Olson's 2010 study examined responses to remixing in the 2007-2008 Scratch community. Positive responses and plagiarism concerns coexisted despite permissive norms and licenses. Comments were selectively observed and categories could overlap; silence cannot establish satisfaction or consent. Their controlled analysis did not find a significant association between prior remixing and fewer accusations. The 2015 manuscript deposit date should not be mistaken for the publication or observation year. Hill et al., S2

This counterevidence matters because a creative invitation can conceal different expectations about authorship. The proposed EAG response is to make audience and intended reuse understandable before any separately approved transfer or sharing action. It is not to assume that a short explanation will solve disagreement, or that Create should build a community to reproduce the setting of the studies. A student may legitimately prefer private work.

The two papers should not be averaged into “remixing works” or “remixing harms.” They examine different outcomes. One concerns indicators of programming learning; the other concerns reactions to reuse. A person can learn through an activity and still dislike how their work is reused. That possibility is a reason to evaluate both the student’s intended outcome and the consequences of a destination choice.

The largest evidence gap remains the hub itself. No retained original study tests whether medium-based routing improves destination selection, return, creative self-efficacy or sustained making for Create’s audience. Positive making evidence cannot repair that gap. The proportionate response is a bounded comparison of the proposed routing journey, not a claim of demonstrated educational effectiveness.

6. Proposed mechanism: orientation, informed departure and recoverable return

Figure 3

A route preserves intent and permission boundaries

Conceptual only. Every link is proposed.

Informed departure

1. Choose intended medium
↓ proposed link
2. Understand named destination and conditions
↓ proposed link
3. Enter only the permitted route

Unknown: whether the explanation improves selection over plain links.

Recoverable return

1. Complete, cancel or encounter failure
↓ proposed link
2. Return to the chosen medium
↓ proposed link
3. Retry, change direction or leave

Return never proves saving, transfer or publication.

EAG conceptual model, not an implemented or evaluated flow. Destination ownership and any data transfer need separate verification.

A route preserves intent and permission boundaries

EAG conceptual model, not an implemented or evaluated flow. Destination ownership and any data transfer need separate verification.

- A0. EAG product definition

Figure 3. A route preserves intent and permission boundaries

EAG conceptual model, not an implemented or evaluated flow. Destination ownership and any data transfer need separate verification.

Informed departure. Choose intended medium → Understand named destination and conditions → Enter only the permitted route. Unknown: whether the explanation improves selection over plain links.

Recoverable return. Complete, cancel or encounter failure → Return to the chosen medium → Retry, change direction or leave. Return never proves saving, transfer or publication.

Sources: A0.

Figure 3. EAG conceptual mechanism. Each step is proposed and requires destination-specific evidence. Return does not imply that work was saved, received or published. Text and data alternative.

The proposed mechanism begins with an intended creative action. A student chooses a medium or project type, then learns what the destination actually supports and who operates it. Before departure, the student receives the information needed for that route: whether an account or adult decision is required, whether anything is transferred, what audience is involved and how to get back. An ordinary navigation link and a handoff carrying media are materially different actions.

The initial hypothesis is that this sequence reduces mistaken expectations while preserving the student's ability to choose. Its success condition is an appropriate, understood route. It is not a completed artifact, a public post or engagement with a particular provider. Declining an unsuitable destination can be a successful outcome if the student understands why and can choose another path.

Return deserves explicit treatment. Completion, cancellation, denial and interruption should all leave a recognizable way back to the selected medium. A resumed route must not repeat a transfer or publish work. If the destination has changed or withdrawn the relevant capability, the hub should not preserve a stale promise merely to keep its navigation looking complete. These requirements follow the current product authority; no existing implementation is verified here. [A0]

W3C Technique G201 advises warning users visually and through assistive technology when normal activation opens a new tab or window. It explains that such changes can disorient users and alter the expected Back behavior. The technique is advisory, not independently a mandatory WCAG success criterion. It supports a specific orientation check, not proof that the whole journey is accessible. W3C, S7

A key design question is whether the student can distinguish three statements: “I can return to Create,” “my destination kept my work,” and “Create has my work.” They describe different events. The proposed evaluation should test them separately. Smooth navigation cannot compensate for a false expectation about persistence or audience.

7. Design concepts worth investigating

The first concept is an action-led chooser. Instead of requiring a student to know a product name, it would describe a recognizable making job and a small number of relevant destinations. “Whatever comes next” should leave room for emerging formats without presenting unavailable modes as ready. No source establishes the right number of choices, so the research should compare understandable coverage and decision burden rather than impose a fashionable grid size.

The second concept is a concise destination explanation. Its purpose would be to answer what happens next, not to reproduce a provider's entire documentation. The student-facing information could identify where making occurs, what the route opens and whether a separate decision is needed. An adult-facing explanation could provide the dated provider source and unresolved conditions. The layers should agree; simpler language must not change the underlying claim.

The third concept is a return path that preserves intent. A student returning from music after a failed attempt should be able to recognize the previous choice and try another route without implying that any song was saved. A failure state should say what is known. It should avoid announcing completion based only on navigation away and back.

The fourth concept is a genuine no-fit outcome. If no approved destination supports the intended project or device, the hub should allow exit, a different medium or an appropriate offline start. An empty or unavailable route is more honest than a nominal destination that fails at the next step. This is particularly important while the first destination and transfer permissions remain unsettled.

These are research concepts, not screens, selected interaction designs or implementation instructions. The report does not establish an editor, template library, upload path, game engine, AI generation feature or showcase. Any later authoring capability would need its own specification and evidence. The role of research here is to make the smallest routing proposition testable before broadening it.

8. Risks, equity and the work imposed on others

Rights deserve more precision than a generic “you own your work” label. Scratch's January 22, 2026 service terms separate user rights from licenses granted by posting, including provider uses involving AI-model training. That text is a current due-diligence input, not proof that a particular AI feature operates or legal clearance for integration. It should not be replaced with historical licensing assumptions from the research papers. [S6]

Tux Paint's November 18, 2023 privacy policy draws another important distinction: specified official apps have no networking functionality, while its website describes logging, analytics, advertising cookies and optional gallery submissions. Unofficial builds are outside that app claim. A route must therefore identify the relevant surface and release, rather than attribute a provider-wide privacy property.

Tux Paint privacy policy, S5

EAG's inference is that destination trust has to be maintained, not merely asserted when a link is first added. Someone must notice changed availability, materially revised terms, inaccessible entry or misleading export claims. That work has a cost even if the hub stores no artifacts. A growing catalog could create more review burden than user benefit. A narrow first set makes it possible to learn that burden before breadth becomes an expectation.

Equity questions should focus on successful participation under real conditions. A readable hub does not make a downstream drawing interaction accessible. An available school device does not establish permission to install an app. A shared home device may change whether work can be kept privately. The study should include the intended language, keyboard, assistive-technology and device contexts without claiming that this source review measured their distribution.

Adult involvement also has a cost. If every choice requires a teacher to interpret a lengthy permission note, the hub may shift effort rather than reduce it. Evaluation should record requests for help, reasons for intervention and whether the adult can resolve them. It should also respect a student's decision to stop. Finishing a route through pressure or repeated adult takeover would be weak evidence of creative agency.

Private-by-default work and separate approval for public sharing remain canonical boundaries. Shared identity does not grant access to sibling drafts, justify automatic publication, establish reward eligibility or authorize institutional use of an artifact. A future showcase would be a different product question involving audience, moderation, retention and takedown. It cannot be smuggled into a routing pilot as a convenient measure of completion. [A0]

9. Evaluation and criteria that could change the proposition

A first evaluation should compare the proposed hub with a clear ordinary link list, and with a direct destination link when the task already specifies a medium. Keep the destination and creative task comparable so that a superior editor is not mistaken for a superior chooser. This is a proposed study, not a completed experiment or an approved recruitment protocol.

Before navigation, ask the participant to state the intended output. After the destination explanation, ask where making will happen, whether work leaves Create, who can receive or see it, and how to return. Observe entry and recovery after a realistic cancellation or unavailable route. Record correct understanding, wrong-destination choices, help required and unresolved errors. Time can describe effort, but faster departure with worse comprehension is not a benefit.

A delayed check would ask whether the participant can resume the intended route and distinguish a kept artifact from a remembered navigation choice. Any artifact inspection would require appropriate permission and a separately approved destination capability. The initial study can test the route without collecting children's creative work. Do not introduce sensitive content collection just because it might produce a more vivid report.

The product should continue only if there is a recognizable advantage for the intended users that exceeds the extra step and maintenance burden. Exact quantitative thresholds, sample size and analysis should be agreed before collecting comparative data, based on a meaningful difference and feasible recruitment. This review provides no defensible numerical cutoff to substitute for those decisions.

The proposition should simplify if a short link list performs as well, if most students already know their tool, or if destination information overwhelms rather than informs. It should narrow if benefit occurs only for a particular medium or audience. It should stop routing to a destination when the promised path is unavailable, a material permission condition remains unresolved or return behavior causes unsafe repetition. Those are proposed decision criteria, not observed failures.

Only after the route demonstrates value should a later study examine making outcomes. A student explaining a revision, transferring a learned practice or reporting greater confidence would each require its own measure and comparison. The report's recommendation is to establish whether Create helps someone reach and understand a making opportunity before claiming that it improves what happens inside that opportunity.

10. Methods, limitations, references and corrections

This is a focused review for an EAG product decision. It is not a systematic review, a meta-analysis or a representative account of students' needs. Original manuscripts, official provider documentation and the W3C technique were reopened on September 19, 2026. Sources were selected for relevance to making, authorship, destination differences and orientation; favorable findings were not treated as a requirement for inclusion.

The retained empirical evidence is historical and concentrated in Scratch. No local interviews, product-use observations or comparative trials were performed. No provider was installed or integrated, no child account was created, and no save, export, accessibility or end-to-end return test was conducted. The Chrome Music Lab extraction limitation is retained.

The source dates matter. The remix-response paper was published in 2010 and deposited as a manuscript in 2015. Current provider terms are separate evidence from the services described in historical studies. The inspected originals did not establish a correction affecting the summarized findings, but a comprehensive correction or retraction search was not performed. No absence-of-correction guarantee is claimed. Any later change to destination terms or observed behavior should trigger revision of the corresponding route description and this report's current-provider comparison.

References. All external sources below were accessed September 19, 2026. Source findings, EAG interpretation and proposed evaluation are distinguished in the body.

Reference
A0. Education Angel Group, Create After Class product definition, reviewed September 19, 2026 for this report. Defines intended scope, not implementation or effectiveness.
S1. Dasgupta, S., Hale, W., Monroy-Hernandez, A., and Hill, B. M. (2016). Remixing as a Pathway to Computational Thinking. CSCW 2016 author manuscript. Data and Measures, Results, Limitations and Discussion.
S2. Hill, B. M., Monroy-Hernandez, A., and Olson, K. R. (2010). Responses to remixing on a social media sharing website. ICWSM 2010, manuscript deposited 2015. Study 1 Procedure/Results, Study 2 and Conclusions.
S3. Chrome Music Lab. Official experiments and FAQ , undated. Song Maker, account and device questions; runtime extraction incomplete.
S4. Tux Paint. Official README , living manual with version-specific notes. Open, Save, Slides and Quit.
S5. Tux Paint. Privacy Policy , updated November 18, 2023. Website sections B2-B5 and official-app section E.
S6. Scratch. Terms of Service , updated January 22, 2026. Sections 1-3 and 7-9. Service terms, distinct from Foundation-site terms; documentation review is not legal advice or clearance.
S7. W3C. Technique G201: Giving users advanced warning when opening a new window , updated May 18, 2026. Description, advisory note and Tests.

Figure text and data alternatives

Complete semantic alternatives accompany each figure in this reader and its text download. Source IDs refer to the references in this report. A0 identifies EAG's product definition reviewed for the original report, not an external study or proof of availability. Other source IDs resolve to this report's reference and access record.

Corrections and entity context

Readers identifying an error can contact EAG with the section, disputed statement and supporting source. Create After Class provides the public entity context, not an external citation for EAG's product claims.