1. BASIC INFORMATION

Course	Approaching Inclusive Education using Tangible Digital Storytelling
Program	INCLUDED 2019-22, Erasmus+, Teacher Training Course
School	European University of Madrid, School of Biomedical Sciences
Year	2019-20
ECTS	6 (75 h)
Credit type	Permanent teacher training
Language(s)	English, Spanish, Italian
Delivery mode	Blended (Online + Campus based)
Training period	03/28/2020 - 05/28/2020
Coordinating professor	Giuseppe Iandolo

2. PRESENTATION

Inclusive childhood education supported by multimedia and digital storytelling, or **INCLUDED Project,** is a training and action-research project promoted by the **European Commission** (Erasmus+, 2019/2022).

The project aims to develop **procedures** and **collaborative activities** in the classroom, for the inclusion of students with difficulties in the **Primary School** (6-10 years), through Tangible Digital Storytelling tools (T-DST). The promoters of the project are institutions from three European countries: **Spain** (European University of Madrid, A LA PAR Foundation), **Italy** (Comprehensive Institute 3, Modena, Computer Learning, Università di Trento) and **Finland** (Rovastinkankaan Koulu).

The INCLUDED project is aimed at 1) **Primary school teachers**, who can participate in the training on collaborative practices with Tangible Digital Storytelling (T/DST) and, with expert researchers, in experimental educational activities; 2) **Primary school students (6-10 years)**, who can participate in inclusive educational practices of Tangible Digital Storytelling (T/DST), supported by their teachers and researchers. The **INCLUDED project offers to teachers a free training course about collaborative digital storytelling** and access to all project tools for their use in the classroom.

The INCLUDED training course for teachers is developed by professionals from Spain, Finland, and Italy, ensuring appropriate quality standards, **seeking the inclusion of students with difficulties or special educational needs** using technology, storytelling, and collaborative paradigms.

The INCLUDED training course for teachers **is aimed to** underline the **cooperative learning and storytelling methodologies** in the classroom for students' cognitive and social development, the impact offered by technology for inclusion, traditional/digital and tangible/non-tangible storytelling procedures.

It will deepen the concept of inclusion, by reaching a motivating definition of it, identifying patterns and attitudes necessary to promote educational inclusion in the school. Moreover, in a face-to-face session, participants will learn to manage the digital i-theater, a powerful tangible digital tool to promote educational inclusion and that offers students several resources for storytelling.

The INCLUDED training course for teachers raises a total of **75 hours of training**, distributed in **three blocks**:

1. **Block 1 - Pedagogical premises: T/DST approach for inclusion.** The first block, theoretical, is available online for free in the INCLUDED website through registration (https:///includedeurope.eu). It's aimed to understand the pedagogical premises that support storytelling and collaborative methodology.
2. **Block 2. - Using i-theatre for collaborative tangible digital storytelling.** The second block, practical, is carried out through an activity of co-design of educational environments and a face-to-face workshop organized by the INCLUDED team. It's aimed to manage technological and traditional tools, creating inclusive and collaborative educational activities.
3. **Block 3 - Co-design of collaborative digital storytelling in the school (Problem-Based Activity - PBA).** The third block, practical for participants, consists of developing an educational project using tangible digital storytelling. It's aimed to draw cooperative storytelling scenarios in the classroom for the inclusion of students with and without difficulties or special education needs.

3. COMPETENCIES AND LEARNING OUTCOMES

The learning outcomes and competencies indicated below are based on the descriptors defining levels in the **European Qualifications Framework (EQF)**.[1] **Level 6** has been chosen as linked to the first cycle, developed by the Joint Quality Initiative as part of the **Bologna Process**.

Core Competencies:

- C1. Students should be able to demonstrate knowledge and understanding about traditional and digital storytelling, collaborative and cooperative learning, promoting students' inclusion and preventing group exclusion processes in school environments.
- C2. Students should be able to apply their knowledge to their work in a professional way and should possess the competencies that are usually demonstrated when preparing and defending arguments and resolving problems in their area of study.
- C3. Students should be able to gather and interpret relevant data in their area of study to make judgments that involve considering important social, scientific or ethical issues.
- C4. Students should be able to transmit information, ideas, problems, and solutions to both specialized and non-specialized audiences.
- C5. Students should have developed the learning skills necessary to undertake further studies with a high degree of autonomy.
- C6. Knowing the functions, characteristics, and limitations of different theoretical models of traditional and digital storytelling, collaborative and cooperative learning, students' inclusion and group exclusion prevention in school environments.

Cross-Curricular Competencies:

- CC1: Autonomous learning. An ability that allows the person to choose the most effective learning strategies and tools and to apply independently the acquired knowledge.
- CC2: Information management. Ability to search, select, analyze and integrate information from different sources.
- CC3: Planning and time management. Ability to establish objectives and choose the means to achieve those objectives effectively using time and resources.

- CC4: Critical thinking. Ability to analyze an idea, phenomenon or situation from different perspectives and adopt a personal approach, built rigorously and objectively, and not from the intuition.
- CC5: Decision making. Ability to choose between alternatives and existing ways to effectively solve different situations or problems.
- CC6: Teamwork. Ability to integrate and collaborate actively with other people, areas and / or organizations to achieve common goals.
- CC7: Use of information and communication technologies (ICT). Ability to effectively use information and communication technologies as a tool for searching, processing, and storage of information, as well as for the development of communication skills.

Specific Competencies:

- S1: Being able to set the goals of collaboration, storytelling and inclusive activities in the classroom, proposing and negotiating the goals with care recipients and other parties concerned.
- S2: Being able to plan and conduct storytelling collaborative activities (traditional and digital), promoting students' inclusion and preventing group exclusion in the classroom.
- S3: Being able to describe and measure social, personal and group variables to promote inclusion and cooperative learning.
- S4: Being able to identify differences, problems, and needs.
- S5: Knowing how to analyze the context in which individual behaviors, group and organizational processes occur.
- S6: Knowing how to give precise and appropriate feedback to students and families.
- S7: Being able to prepare verbal and written cooperative storytelling projects.

Learning outcomes

1. **LO1 (Knowledge).** The student will acquire advanced knowledge about theories and principles of traditional and digital storytelling, collaborative and cooperative learning in school environments, aimed at the inclusion of students with and without difficulties or special education needs.
2. **LO2 (Skills).** The student will develop **advanced skills to set up collaborative storytelling scenarios (traditional & digital), promoting inclusion and prevention of group exclusion in school environments.**
3. **LO3 (Responsibility & Autonomy**). The student will develop skills to manage educational activities based on group cooperation and **storytelling (traditional & digital), aimed at inclusion and prevention of group exclusion**, taking responsibility for decision-making and development of students and groups.

The following table shows the relationship between the competencies developed during the course and the learning outcomes pursued:

Competencies	Learning outcomes
C1, C6, CC2, S3, S4, S6	**LO1 (Knowledge).** The student will acquire advanced knowledge about theories and principles of traditional and digital storytelling, collaborative and cooperative learning in school environments, aimed at the inclusion of students with and without difficulties or special education needs.

C3, C4, CC3, CC4, CC5, CC6, CC7, S2, S7	**LO2 (Skills).** The student will develop advanced skills to set up collaborative storytelling scenarios (traditional & digital), promoting inclusion and prevention of group exclusion in school environments.
C2, C5, CC1, S1, S5	**LO3 (Responsibility & Autonomy).** The student will develop skills to manage educational activities based on group cooperation and storytelling (traditional & digital), aimed at inclusion and prevention of group exclusion, taking responsibility for decision-making and development of students and groups.

4. CONTENT

Block 1 - Pedagogical premises: T/DST approach for inclusion.

1. Historical context: storytelling, collaborative and cooperative learning.
2. Stories, scripts, scenes, and characters: creativity and script-based storytelling.
3. The development of narrative competencies.
4. Experiences of school applications of traditional and digital collaborative storytelling.
5. Education and technology.
6. Tangible and non-tangible tools for digital storytelling.
7. Inclusive processes in educational contexts.
8. Coding class dynamics in T-DST practice: observation and report of collaborative storytelling activities.

Block 2. - Using i-theatre for collaborative tangible digital storytelling.

Block 3 - Co-design of collaborative digital storytelling in the school. Problem-Based Activity - PBA.

5. TEACHING-LEARNING METHODOLOGIES

The types of teaching-learning methodologies used are indicated below:

- Lecture
- Debates & participation
- Autonomous work
- Tutorials
- Practice Exercises & Role playing
- Group activities and Problem Based Activity
- Campus based workshop

6. LEARNING ACTIVITIES

Listed below are the types of learning activities and the number of hours the student will spend on each one:

Blended mode (Online + Campus based)

Learning activity	Number of hours	% Campus based	% Online
Online Lecture	5	0%	100%
Course content reading	12	0%	100%
Online Tutorials	3	0%	100%
Debates	5	50%	50%
Practice Exercises	4	50%	50%
Role playing	4	0%	100%
Autonomous work	25	0%	100%
Problem solving	10	50%	50%
Campus based workshop	5	100%	0%
Evaluation	2	100%	0%
TOTAL	**75 h**		

7. ASSESSMENT

Listed below are the assessment systems used and the weight each one carries towards the final course grade:

Assessment system	Weight
Activity 1 (Active Methodologies): Online lectures, course content reading, debates. *[Online attendance, minimum 50% of attendance].*	15%
Activity 2 (Active Methodologies): Problem Based Activity (PBA). *[Co-design of collaborative digital storytelling in the school. Problem-Based Activity - PBA].*	15%
Activity 3 (Active Methodologies): Campus based workshop. *[Attendance and participation to the workshop].*	20%
Activity 4 (Final Objective Test): Final objective assessment. *[Number of correct answers in multiple answers and evaluation of form and content in open questions].*	50%

When you access the course on the *Campus Virtual*, you'll find a description of the assessment activities you must complete, as well as the delivery deadline and assessment procedure for each one.

7.1. First exam period

To pass the course in the first exam period, you must obtain a final course grade of at least 5 out of 10 (weighted average), both in the active methodologies section and in the final objective test, as detailed below:

A. ACTIVE METHODOLOGIES (5 out of 10)
   1. Activity 1 (15%)
   2. Activity 2 (15%)
   3. Activity 3 (20%)

B. FINAL OBJECTIVE TEST (5 out of 10)
   1. Activity 4 - Final Exam (50%)

The date of the final objective test (exam) will be established according to the calendar of objective tests of the European University, confirmed in class with the teacher of the subject.

To pass this course, the final grade must be equal or greater than 5 in all compulsory activities.

- Each student will be required to submit compulsory activities. The activities will be facilitated as the subject progresses. Some of them will be done throughout the class and will be delivered at the end of this. To obtain the points corresponding to this section it is essential to deliver the mandatory activities by the indicated date. The delay in the delivery of a paper/ activity can result in a penalty or the failure of the activity.
- Each mandatory activity would be graded from 0-10. A grade of 5 is necessary in order to compute the activity into the final grade. Otherwise the student will be considered suspended in the ordinary call and will be qualified with a 4 in the subject.
- The active methodologies that refer to the analysis of cases and resolution of problems, suspended or not presented will be evaluated in the second exam period.
- Spelling mistakes will be considered both in the practices and in the knowledge tests. More than three spelling mistakes will mean not qualifying the practice and / or question.
- It is expected that students will be the sole authors of their assignments. If students plagiarize their work or cheat on the exam, they will obtain a grade of 0 and be subject to disciplinary punishment.

A grade of 5 is necessary in order to compute the exam into the final grade, meaning that a grade of 5 is a necessary but not enough condition to pass this subject. Final objective test (exam) would-be multiple-choice question and open questions.

7.2. Second exam period

To pass the second exam period, you must achieve a minimum score of 5 out of 10 points both in the active methodologies section and in the final evaluation test.

- Each compulsory activity or the exam in which the student has not reached the minimum requirement (5) will need to be evaluated in Second Exam Period. Activities that can´t be repeated will be evaluated through an objective test (theoretical or practical) in the second exam period.
- Each part of the final objective test in which the student has not reached the minimum requirement (5) will need to be evaluated in the second exam period.

The date of the exam in the second exam period will be established according to the exam schedule of the European University, confirmed by the teacher of the subject.

8. SCHEDULE

This table shows the delivery deadline for each assessable activity in the course:

Assessable activities	Deadline
Activity 1 (Active Methodologies): Online lectures, course content reading, debates. *[Online attendance, minimum 50% of attendance].*	March – May 2020
Activity 2 (Active Methodologies): Problem Based Activity (PBA). *[Co-design of collaborative digital storytelling in the school. Problem-Based Activity - PBA].*	May
Activity 3 (Active Methodologies): Campus based workshop. *[Attendance and participation to the workshop].*	Abril
Activity 4 (Final Objective Test): Final objective assessment. *[Number of correct answers in multiple answers and evaluation of form and content in open questions].*	May

This schedule may be subject to changes for logistical reasons relating to the activities. The student will be notified of any change as and when appropriate.

9. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Applebee, A. N. (1978). *The child's concept of story: ages two to seventeen*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Banks J. (2012). Storytelling to access social context and advance health equity research. *Preventive Medicine*, 55: 394–397.
- Barrett, H. (2006). Researching and evaluating digital storytelling as a deep learning tool. *Technology and teacher education annual*,1, p.647-654.
- Baumer, S., Ferholt, B., & Lecusay, R. (2005). Promoting narrative competence through adult-child joint pretense: lessons from the Scandinavian educational practice of playworld. *Cognitive Development*, 20(4), 576-590.
- Bornstein, M. H., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S (1995). *The Bears Family: cognitive coding handbook.* Unpublished manual. Bethesda, EE.UU.: National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, Child and Family Research Unit.
- Botvin, G. J., & Sutton-Smith, B. (1977). The development of structural comlexity in children's fantasy narratives. *Developmental Psychology*, 13 (4), 377-388.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss. (Vol 1. attachment).* Nueva York: Basic Books, 1982.

- Bruner, J. (1985). Vygotsky: an historical and conceptual perspective. En J. Wertsch (Ed.) *Culture, communication, and cognition: Vygotskian perspectives* (pp. 21-34). Londres: Cambridge University Press.
- Bruner, J. (1991). The narrative construction of reality. *Critical Inquiry*, 18, 1-21.
- Burmark, L. (2004). Visual Presentations that Prompt, Flash & Transform. *Media and Methods*, 40(6), 4–5.
- Cao X., Lindley S.E., Helmes J., Sellen A. (2010). Telling the whole story: anticipation, inspiration and reputation in a field deployment of TellTable. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work* (pp. 251-260). ACM.
- Costa, C. E., Mayora, O., & Gabrielli, S. (2011). I-Theatre: developing narratives skills in kindergarten children. In *2nd CHI workshop on UI technologies and their impact on educational pedagogy*.
- de Rosnay, M., & Hughes, C. (2006). Conversation and theory-of-mind: do children talk their way to socio-cognitive understanding? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 24, 7–37.
- Di Blas N., Paolini P., Sabiescu A. (2010). Collective digital storytelling at school as a whole-class interaction. *Proceedings of the 9th international Conference on interaction Design and Children*. IDC '10. ACM, New York, NY, pp. 11-19.
- Di Blas, N. & Boretti, B. (2009). Interactive storytelling in pre-school: a case-study. En *Proceedings of IDC 2009, ACM*, NY (2009), pp. 44-51.
- Di Fuccio, R., & Mastroberti, S. (2018). Tangible user interfaces for multisensory storytelling at school: a study of acceptability. *Qwerty-Open and Interdisciplinary Journal of Technology, Culture and Education*, 13(1).
- Dorner, R., Grimm, P., & Abawi, D. (2002). Synergies between interactive training simulations and digital storytelling: a component-based framework. *Computers & Graphics*, 26, 45–55.
- Druin A. (1999). *The design of children's technology*. Moran Kaufmann Publishers.
- Druin A., Solomon C. (1996). *Designing multimedia environments for children*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Eisenberg, M., Buechley, L. & Elumeze, N. (2004). Computation and construction kits: toward the next generation of tangible building media for children. *Proceedings of Cognition and Exploratory Learning in the Digital Age* (CELDA), Lisbon, Portugal, 2004.
- Erikson, E. (1950). *Infancia y sociedad*. Buenos Aires: Horme-Paidós, 1983.
- Erikson, E., Erikson, J. M. (1987). El ciclo vital completado. Barcelona: Ediciones Paidós Ibérica, 2000.
- Esposito, G., Venuti, P., Iandolo, G., de Falco, S., Wei, C., Bornstein, M.H., & Gabrieli, G. (2018). Microgenesis of typical storytelling. *Early Child Development and Care*, DOI: 10.1080/03004430.2018.1554653
- Faver C. y Alanis E. (2012). Fostering empathy through stories: a pilot program for special needs adoptive families. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 34: 660–665.
- Ferreira, V. S., Slevc, L. R., & Rogers, E. S. (2005). How do speakers avoid ambiguous linguistic expressions? *Cognition*, 96, 253-284.
- German, T. P., & Leslie, A. M. (2001). Children's inferences from knowing to pretending and believing. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 19, 59–83.
- Hakkarainen, P. (2004). Narrative learning in the fifth dimension. Outlines. *Critical Practice Studies*, 6(1), 5-20.
- Heo, M. (2009). Digital storytelling: an empirical study of the impact of digital storytelling on pre-service teachers' self-efficacy and dispositions towards educational technology. *Educational Multimedia and Hypermedia*, 18(4), 405–428.

- Horton, W. S., & Keysar, B. (2006). When do speakers take into account common ground and perspective on domanins of referential interpretation. *Journal of Memory and Lenguage*, 49, 43-61.
- Hudson, J. A., & Shapiro, L. R. (1991). From knowing to telling; the development of children's scripts, stories and personal narratives. En A. McCabe & C. Peterson (Eds.), *Developing narrative structure* (pp.89-136). Hillsdale, Nueva Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Iandolo G. (2011). *El desarrollo de las competencias narrativas, forma, cohesión y equilibrio de contenido a través del Test Proyectivo de la Familia de los Osos*. Tesis Doctoral. Universidad Autónoma de Madrid pp. 173-193.
- Iandolo, G., Esposito, G., & Venuti P. (2012b). The Bears Family Projective test: Evaluating stories of children with emotional difficulties. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 114,3, 883-902.
- Iandolo, G., Esposito, G., & Venuti, P. (2012a). Cohesión, micro-organización, estructura narrativa y competencias verbales entre tres y once años: el desarrollo narrativo formal. *Estudios de Psicología*, 34(2), 141-160.
- Johnson D. (2012). Transportation into a story increases empathy, prosocial behavior, and perceptual bias toward fearful expressions. Personality and Individual. *Differences*,52; 150–155.
- Johnson, R. T., & Johnson, D. W. (1986). Action research: cooperative learning in the science classroom. *Science and Children*, 24, 31-32.
- Kajder, S. y Swenson, J. (2004) Digital Images in the Language arts Classroom. *Learning and Leading with Technology*. 31(8).
- Khandelwal, M. & Mazalek, A. (2007).Teaching table: a tangible mentor for pre-K math education. Proceedings of the *First International Conference on Tangible and Embedded Interaction* (TEI '07), ACM, New York, NY, 2007, pp.191-194.
- Lindqvist, G. (1996). The aesthetics of play. A didactic study of play and culture in preschools. *Early years*, 17(1), 6-11.
- Lits, M. (2012). Quel futur pour le recit mediatique?. *Questions de communication*, 21.
- Lowenthal, P. R. y Dunlap, J. C. (2010). From pixel on a screen to real person in your students' lives: Establishing social presence using digital storytelling. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 13(1-2), 70-72.
- McKeough, A. (1997). Narrative knowledge and its development: toward an integrative framework. *Issues in Education: Contributions form Educational Psychology*, 2, 146-155.
- McKeough, A., & Genereux, R. (2003). Transformation in narrative thought during adolescence: the structure and content of story compositions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95 (3), 537-552.
- Nading, A. S., & Sedivy, J. C. (2002). Evidence of perspective-taking constrains in children's on line reference resolution. *Psychological Science*, 13, 329-336.
- Neale, H., & Nichols, S. (2001). Theme-based content analysis: a flexible method for virtual environment evaluation. *International journal of human-computer studies*, 55(2), 167-189.
- Nelson K. (1996). *The emergence of the mediated mind*. Nueva York: Cambridge University Press.
- Nelson, K. (1989). *Narratives from the crib*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.
- Nicolopoulou, A., Cortina, K. S., Ilgaz, H., Cates, C. B., & de Sá, A. B. (2015). Using a narrative-and play-based activity to promote low-income preschoolers' oral language, emergent literacy, and social competence. *Early childhood research quarterly*, 31, 147-162.
- Nicolopoulou, A., Mcdowell, J., & Brockmeyer, C. (2006). Narrative Play and Emergent Literacy: Storytelling and Story-Acting Meet Journal Writing. En Golinkoff & Hirsh-Pasek (Eds.) Play = *Learning: How Play Motivates and Enhances Children s Cognitive ' and Social-Emotional Growth*. Oxford University Press.

- Nilsen E. S.,& Graham S. A. (2009). The relations between children's communicative perspective-taking and executive functioning. *Cognitive Psychology*, 58, 220-249.
- Normann, A. (2011). *Digital storytelling in second language learning*. Norwegian University of Science and Technology. Faculty of Social Sciences and Technology Management. Programme for Teacher Education.
- O'Malley, C. (1992). Designing computer systems to support peer learning. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 7(4), 339-352, 1992.
- O'Malley, C. (1995). *Computer supported collaborative learning*, Springer-Verlag.
- Ohler J. (2008). *Digital storytelling in the classroom: new media pathways to literacy, learning, and creativity*. Corwin Pr, Thousand Oaks, CA.
- Papadopoulou, S. y Ioannis, S. (2010). The emergence of digital storytelling and multimedia technology in improving greek language teaching and learning: challenges versus limitations. *Sino-US English Teaching*, 7(4).
- Pasupathi, M., & Hoyt, T. (2009). The development of narrative identity in late adolescence and emergent adulthood: the continued importance of listeners. *Developmental Psychology*, 45 (2), 558-574.
- Paull, C. N. (2002). *Self-perceptions and social connections: empowerment through digital storytelling in adult education*. Dissertation Abstracts International.
- Piaget, J. (1955). *The Child's construction of reality*. Londres: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Piaget, J. (1959). *Judgment and reasoning in the child*. Paterson, Nueva Jersey: Littlefield, Adam & Co.
- Pontecorvo C. (1991). Narrazione e pensiero discorsivo nell'infanzia. En M. Ammaniti & D. Stern, *Rappresentazioni e narrazioni* (pp. 141-158). Bari: Laterza.
- Porter, B. (2004). *Digitales: the art of telling digital stories*. Bernajean Porter.
- Resnick, M., Martin, F., Berg, R., Borovoy, R., Colella, V., Kramer, K. & Silverman, B. (1998). Digital manipulatives: new toys to think with. *SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, Los Angeles, CA, pp. 281-287.
- Robin, B. R. (2008). Digital Storytelling: a powerful technology tool for the 21st Century classroom. *Theory into practice*, 47 (3), 220-4.
- Robin, B., & Pierson, M. (2005). A multilevel approach to using digital storytelling in the classroom. En C. Crawford et al. (Eds.), *Proceedings of Society for Information Technology & Teacher Education International Conference* (pp. 708-716). Chesapeake, VA: AACE.
- Rogoff, B. (1990). *Apprenticeship in thinking: cognitive development in social context*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Salpeter, J. (2005). Telling Tales with technology. *Technology and Learning*, 25(7):18-24
- Shaffer, D. R. (2000). *Social and personality development* (4th Edition). Trad Cast. C. del Barrio Martínez, Desarrollo social y de la personalidad (4ª edición). Madrid: Thomson Spain, 2002.
- Slavin, R. E. (1989). Research on cooperative learning: an international perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 33(4), 231-243.
- Stacey, G. y Hardy, P. (2011). Challenging the shock of reality through digital storytelling. *Nurse Education in Practice*, 11(2), 159-164.
- Standley, M. (2003). Digital Storytelling: using new technology and the power of stories to help our students learn and teach. *Cable in the Classroom*, 1618.
- Stock, O., & Zancanaro, M. (Eds.). (2007). *PEACH-Intelligent interfaces for museum visits*. Springer Science & Business Media.

- Thousand, J., Villa, A., & Nevin, A. (1994). *Creativity and collaborative learning*. Baltimore, Maryland: Brookes Press.
- Totten, S., Sills, T., Digby, A., & Russ, P. (1991). *Cooperative learning: a guide to research*. Nueva York: Garland.
- Trabasso, T., & Stein, N. L. (1997). Narrating, representing, and remembering event sequences. En P. W. van den Broek, P. J. Bauer & T.Bourg (Eds.), *Developmental spans in event comprehension and representation: bridging fictional and actual events* (pp. 237–270). Mahwah , Nueva Jersey : Erlbaum.
- Ullmer B., Ishii, H. (2001). Emerging Frameworks for Tangible User Interfaces. En Carroll, J. (ed.) *Human-computer interaction in the new millennium*. Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA, pp. 579-601.
- Unnsteinsdóttir K. (2012). The influence of sand-play and imaginative storytelling on children's learning and emotional-behavioral development in an Icelandic primary school. *The Arts in Psychotherapy*, 39: 328–333.
- Vermette, P., Harper, L. J., & DeMillo, M. (2004). Cooperative and collaborative learning with 4-8 year olds: how does research support teachers' practice? *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 31(2), 130-134.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1930/1931/1933). *Mind in society*. Cambridge, Massachussets: Harvard University Press, 1978.
- Wellman, H. M., Cross, D., & Watson, J. (2001). Meta-analysis of theory-of-mind development: the truth about false belief. *Child Development*, 72, 655–684.
- Wood, D., & O'Malley, C. (1996). Collaborative learning between peers: an overview. *Educational Psychology in Practice*, 11(4), 4-9.
- Zancanaro, M., Pianesi, F., Stock, O., Venuti, P., Cappelletti, A., Iandolo, G., Prete, M., & Rossi, F. (2007). Children in the museum: an environment for collaborative story telling. En Stock, O. & Zancanaro, M., eds, *PEACH – Intelligent Interfaces for Museum Visits, Cognitive Technologies*. Springer, Berlin.

10. DIVERSITY MANAGEMENT UNIT

Curricular adaptations and adjustments for students with specific learning support needs, in order to guarantee equal opportunities, will be overseen by the Diversity Management Unit (UAD: Unidad de Atención a la Diversidad).

It is compulsory for this Unit to issue a curricular adaptation/adjustment report, and therefore students with specific learning support needs should contact the Unit at unidad.diversidad@universidadeuropea.es at the beginning of each semester.

11. HOW TO COMMUNICATE WITH YOUR PROFESSOR

Whenever you have a question about the content or activities, don't forget to post it to your course forum so that your classmates can read it.

You might not be the only one with the same question!

If you have a question that you only want to ask your professor, you can send him/her a private message from the Campus Virtual. And if you need to discuss something in more detail, you can arrange an advisory session with your professor.

It's a good idea to check the course forum on a regular basis and read the messages posted by your classmates and professors, as this can be another way to learn.

12. DESCRIPTION OF EVALUATION ACTIVITIES

Activity 1 (Active Methodologies) - Online lectures, course content reading, debates:

- Attend to the online masterclasses, study course content and participate (minimum 50% to access the objective test in ordinary call).
- Participate in debates and make the reports requested by the teacher.

Activity 2 (Active Methodologies) - Problem Based Activity (PBA, Co-design of collaborative digital storytelling in the school):

- Write the group report asked by the teacher following his/her instructions. Both the form and the content of the report will be evaluated, as well as the group collaboration, according to the criteria detailed below established for the written works of the subject.

Activity 3 (Active Methodologies) - Campus based workshop:

- Attend to the Campus based workshop.
- Participate in debates and make the group report requested by the teacher.

Activity 4. Final objective test:

- Answer multiple-choice questions and/or open questions following the exam instructions.
- In the case of open questions, its form and content will be evaluated according to the criteria detailed below established for the written works of the subject.

13. CRITERIA OF EVALUABLE ACTIVITIES

The criteria sheet for evaluation of written and collaborative activities is shown below:

	Inadequate (2-4)	A bit right (5-6)	Good enough (7-8)	Very good (9-10)
CONTENT **Convenient use of scientific concepts according to APA format**	He/she doesn't use adequate resources from the relevant scientific literature	He/she uses adequate resources of the relevant scientific literature, enumerating them in a general way, without specifying the case of analysis	He/she uses adequate resources from the relevant scientific literature deepening though an analysis of the assumptions	He/she uses adequate resources from the relevant scientific literature, makes a deep analysis case and complements them with additional information (texts not studied, international framework, ...)
FORM **Clear and adequate presentation**	The work appears careless, messy and, in general, unacceptable to deliver to a potential client	The work is presented without cover, identification of the work and the group, contents index and properly structured and ordered	Proper writing and extension are provided. Well-structured and organized work.	The work is of an adequate, correct and orderly presentation.
Teamwork	All members of the group agree that the contributions of the student have been scarce or nil.	Most of the classmates show complaints about the contributions of the student to the group	Most of the classmates show conformity about the contributions of the student to the group	All group members indicate are satisfied with the collaboration and contributions of the entire group.

NOTES

[1] **Descriptors defining levels in the European Qualifications Framework (EQF).** Recovered on line 02/01/2020 https://ec.europa.eu/ploteus/content/descriptors-page#footnote1

1. Level 1 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Basic general knowledge; **Skills**: Basic skills required to carry out simple tasks; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Work or study under direct supervision in a structured context.
2. Level 2 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Basic factual knowledge of a field of work or study; **Skills**: Basic cognitive and practical skills required to use relevant information in order to carry out tasks and to solve routine problems using simple rules and tools; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Work or study under supervision with some autonomy
3. Level 3 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Knowledge of facts, principles, processes and general concepts, in a field of work or study; **Skills**: A range of cognitive and practical skills required to accomplish tasks and solve problems by selecting and applying basic methods, tools, materials and information; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Take responsibility for completion of tasks in work or study; adapt own behaviour to circumstances in solving problems.
4. Level 4 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Factual and theoretical knowledge in broad contexts within a field of work or study; **Skills**: A range of cognitive and practical skills required to generate solutions to specific problems in a field of work or study; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Exercise self-management within the guidelines of work or study contexts that are usually predictable, but are subject to change; supervise the routine work of others, taking some responsibility for the evaluation and improvement of work or study activities.
5. Level 5 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Comprehensive, specialised, factual and theoretical knowledge within a field of work or study and an awareness of the boundaries of that knowledge; **Skills**: A comprehensive range of cognitive and practical skills required to develop creative solutions to abstract problems; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Exercise management and supervision in contexts of work or study activities where there is unpredictable change; review and develop performance of self and others.
6. Level 6 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Advanced knowledge of a field of work or study, involving a critical understanding of theories and principles; **Skills**: Advanced skills, demonstrating mastery and innovation, required to solve complex and unpredictable problems in a specialised field of work or study; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Manage complex technical or professional activities or projects, taking responsibility for decision-making in unpredictable work or study contexts; take responsibility for managing professional development of individuals and groups.
7. Level 7 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Highly specialised knowledge, some of which is at the forefront of knowledge in a field of work or study, as the basis for original thinking and/or research. Critical awareness of knowledge issues in a field and at the interface between different fields; **Skills**: Specialised problem-solving skills required in research and/or innovation in order to develop new knowledge and procedures and to integrate knowledge from different fields; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Manage and transform work or study contexts that are complex, unpredictable and require new strategic approaches; take responsibility for contributing to professional knowledge and practice and/or for reviewing the strategic performance of teams.
8. Level 8 - Learning outcomes: **Knowledge:** Knowledge at the most advanced frontier of a field of work or study and at the interface between fields; **Skills**: The most advanced and specialised skills and techniques, including synthesis and evaluation, required to solve critical problems in research and/or innovation and to extend and redefine existing knowledge or professional practice; **Responsibility and autonomy**: Demonstrate substantial authority, innovation, autonomy, scholarly and professional integrity and sustained commitment to the development of new ideas or processes at the forefront of work or study contexts including research.