FACULDADE DE ARQUITETURA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

# FICHA DE UNIDADE CURRICULAR

**Unidade Curricular**

202499215 - Propostas Inovadoras para Ambientes Exteriores de Ensino/Aprendizagem

**Tipo**

Optativa

| Ano lectivo | Curso | Ciclo de estudos | Créditos |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2024/25 | Mestrado Design Comunicação<br>Mestrado Design Produto<br>MI Interiores<br>Mestrado Design Moda<br>MI Arquitetura - Esp.Arq<br>MI Arquitetura - Esp.Urb | 2º | 3.00 ECTS |

| Idiomas | Periodicidade | Pré requisitos | Ano Curricular / Semestre |
|---|---|---|---|
| Português | semestral | | |

**Área Disciplinar**

Tecnologias da Arquitetura, Urbanismo e Design

**Horas de contacto (semanais)**

| Teóricas | Práticas | Teórico práticas | Laboratoriais | Seminários | Tutoriais | Outras | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 |

**Total Horas da UC (Semestrais)**

| Total Horas de Contacto | Horas totais de Trabalho |
|---|---|
| 28.00 | 75.00 |

**Docente responsável (nome / carga lectiva semanal)**

Jorge Manuel Tavares Ribeiro

**Outros Docentes (nome / carga lectiva semanal)**

Susana Maria Gouveia Rosado 1.00 horas
Jorge Manuel Tavares Ribeiro 1.00 horas

**Objetivos de aprendizagem (conhecimentos, aptidões e competências a desenvolver pelos**

**estudantes)**

*Sensibilizar a consciência dos alunos para as vantagens do ensino/aprendizagem de crianças e jovens no exterior;*

*Desenvolver elementos e artefactos científicos, tecnológicos e artísticos para os ambientes exteriores de escolas e jardins que contribuam para a aprendizagem das crianças e jovens;*

*Aplicar os elementos desenvolvidos a cada caso particular em termos de organização espacial e contextualização sociológica e do lugar, segurança estrutural, materialidade, conforto e segurança dos utilizadores.*

**Conteúdos Programáticos / Programa**

*APRESENTAÇÃO*

*Programa, Bibliografia e Avaliação*

*1. PROPOSTAS INOVADORAS DE ELEMENTOS E ARTEFACTOS*

*1.1. Sistematização de ideias*

*1.2. Concretização de ideias*

*1.3. Discussão das propostas no local de intervenção selecionado*

**Demonstração da coerência dos conteúdos programáticos com os objectivos de aprendizagem da unidade curricular**

*O aluno devera? desenvolver uma capacidade de recolha, análise e síntese da informação necessária para concretizar os elementos e artefactos científicos, tecnológicos e artísticos adequados aos ambientes exteriores de ensino/aprendizagem e às faixas etárias.*

*A aprendizagem dos conteúdos programáticos vai proporcionar ao aluno o desenvolvimento de soft skills como organização espacial, capacidade de comunicação das suas ideias fundamentadas, liderança, resolução de problemas/desafios, trabalho em equipa e até mesmo ética no trabalho.*

*Os docentes acompanham o trabalho desenvolvido de forma a otimizar os resultados esperados, transmitindo a importância de levantar novas e desafiantes questões que estimulem o gosto pelo conhecimento e a investigação.*

**Metodologias de ensino (avaliação incluída)**

*São constituídas equipas de trabalho que vão abordar o desafio proposto de acordo com o curso (4 elementos). Cada grupo terá de apresentar uma proposta inovadora de elementos e artefactos para um ambiente exterior de ensino/aprendizagem de crianças e jovens, a entregar até 3 dias úteis antes da data de avaliação. O trabalho desenvolvido será apresentado aos docentes da UC na modalidade AC ou ao júri designado pelo Conselho Pedagógico nas modalidades 1CE e 2CE), seguido da discussão do mesmo*

*perante o júri na data de avaliação. A proposta submetida será o suporte da apresentação oral (duração máxima de 10 minutos) e da discussão (duração máxima de 15 minutos dividida em partes iguais entre o júri e os elementos do grupo). Em concordância com o RAAE, durante a discussão haverá lugar para a avaliação individual dos membros do grupo, através de questões dirigidas a cada elemento.*

*Os critérios de avaliação para apuramento da nota final da UC são: adequação da proposta (50%); apresentação oral (20%) e discussão (30%).*

**Demonstração da coerência das metodologias de ensino com os objectivos de aprendizagem da unidade curricular**

*Os trabalhos de grupo fomentam a aprendizagem em contexto similar ao contexto profissional futuro. A discussão individual permite que o aluno seja avaliado individualmente e demonstre o grau de cumprimento dos objetivos da UC.*

**Bibliografia Principal**


*Ebbeck, M.; Yim, H.Y.B.; Warrier, S. 2019. Early childhood teachers' views and teaching practices in outdoor play with young children in Singapore. Early Childhood Education Journal, 47:265–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-00924-2*

*Fielding, R. 2006. Best practice in action: six essential elements that define educational facility design. CEFPI (Council of Educational Facility Planners International) Planner, Association for Learning Environments: Scottsdale, AZ, USA*

*Harris, R; Bilton, H. 2019. Learning about the past: exploring the opportunities and challenges of using an outdoor learning approach. Cambridge Journal of Education, 49(1): 69-91, doi: 10.1080/0305764X.2018.1442416*

*Higgins, P.; Nicol, R. 2002. Outdoor education: authentic learning in the context of landscapes, vol. 2. An international collaboration project supported by the European Union, Comenius Action 2.1, European In-Service Training Courses: Kisa, Sweden*

*Lackney, J.A. 2000. Thirty-three educational design principles for schools & community learning centers. http://faculty-legacy.arch.tamu.edu/rjohnson/courses/StudioF05/33SchoolDesignPrinciples.pdf (consultado abril 2022)*

*Learning Policy Institute and Turnaround for Children. 2021. Design principles for schools: putting the science of learning and development into action. https://turnaround.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/23124616/SoLD_Design_Principles_REPORT.pdf (consultado junho 2022)*

*Mäkelä, T.; Leinonen, T. 2021. Design framework and principles for learning environment co-design: synthesis from literature and three empirical studies. Buildings 11(12), 581. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11120581*

*Østern, T.P.; Gjølme, E.G. 2015. Outdoor education as aesthetic pedagogical design in nature space understood as thirdspace. Sport and Art, 3(1):1–10. doi: 10.13189/saj.2015.030101*

*Reis, G.; Scott, J. (Eds.). 2018. International perspectives on the theory and practice of environmental education: a reader. Environmental Discourses in Science Education, 3. Springer International Publishing AG*

**Bibliografia Complementar**

*Aleixo, S. 2019. Change and adaptation. Historic school buildings and the impact of conservation on cultural significance. In Alexandra Alegre, Teresa Heitor, Maria Bacharel, Ana Fernandes (coord.), Educational Architecture - Education, Heritage, Challenges Conference Proceedings (p. 59-77), Instituto Superior Técnico*

*Angelidou, M. 2015. Smart cities: A conjuncture of four forces. Cities, 47:95–106*

*Campbell, C.; Robottom, I. 2004. Environmental education: appropriate vehicle for science education? Teaching Science, 50(2):18-23*

*Dudek-Klimiuk, J.; Warzecha, B. 2021. Intelligent urban planning and ecological urbanscape - solutions for sustainable urban development. Case study of Wolfsburg. Sustainability, 13(9), 4903. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094903*

*Glithero, L. 2018. Educating for student agency: Perspectives from young eco-civic leaders in Canada. In G. Reis, J. Scott (eds.), International Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Environmental Education: A Reader (p. 71-83). Environmental Discourses in Science Education 3. Springer International Publishing AG*

*Hemmings, P. 2007. Renegotiating the primary school: Children's emotional geographies of sport, exercise and active play. Children's Geographies, 5:353–371*

*Lee, R.; Lane S.; Tang, A.; Leung, C.; Kwok, S.; Louie, L.; Browne, G.; Chan, S. 2020. Effects of an unstructured free play and mindfulness intervention on wellbeing in kindergarten students. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 17(15), 5382. doi:10.3390/ijerph17155382*

FACULDADE DE ARQUITETURA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

# CURRICULAR UNIT FORM

**Curricular Unit Name**

202499215 - Innovative Proposals for Outdoor Teaching/Learning Environments

**Type**

Elective

| Academic year | Degree | Cycle of studies | Unit credits |
|---|---|---|---|
| 2024/25 | Master Communication Design<br>Master Product Design<br>IM Interiors<br>Master Fashion Design<br>IM Architecture - Spec.Arch<br>IM Architecture - Spec.Urb | 2 | 3.00 ECTS |

| Lecture language | Periodicity | Prerequisites | Year of study/ Semester |
|---|---|---|---|
| Portuguese | semester | | |

**Scientific area**

Technologies of Architecture, Urbanism and Design

**Contact hours (weekly)**

| Tehoretical | Practical | Theoretical-practicals | Laboratory | Seminars | Tutorial | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 |

**Total CU hours (semester)**

| Total Contact Hours | Total workload |
|---|---|
| 28.00 | 75.00 |

**Responsible teacher (name /weekly teaching load)**

Jorge Manuel Tavares Ribeiro

**Other teaching staff (name /weekly teaching load)**

| | |
|---|---|
| Susana Maria Gouveia Rosado | 1.00 horas |
| Jorge Manuel Tavares Ribeiro | 1.00 horas |

**Learning objectives (knowledge, skills and competences to be developed by students)**

*Raise students' awareness of the advantages of teaching/learning for children and young people outdoors;*

*Develop scientific, technological and artistic elements and artifacts for outdoor environments in schools and gardens that contribute to the learning of children and young people;*

*Apply the principles to each particular case in terms of spatial organization and sociological and place contextualization, structural safety, materiality, comfort, and safety of users*

**Syllabus**

*PRESENTATION*

*Program, Bibliography, and Assessment*

1. *INNOVATIVE PROPOSALS OF ELEMENTS AND ARTIFACTS*
    - *1.1. Systematization of ideas*
    - *1.2. Implementation of ideas*
    - *1.3. Discussion of proposals at the selected intervention location*

**Demonstration of the syllabus coherence with the curricular unit´s learning objectives**

*Students must develop the ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize the information necessary to plan outdoor educational spaces.*

*Learning the syllabus will give the student soft skills such as spatial organization, communicating their well-founded ideas, leadership, problem/challenge resolution, teamwork, and even work ethics.*

*Teachers monitor the work carried out to optimize the expected results, conveying the importance of raising new and challenging questions that stimulate a taste for knowledge and research.*

**Teaching methodologies (including evaluation)**

*Workgroups will address the proposed challenge according to the course (4 elements). Each group will have to present a plan for an innovative proposal of elements and artifacts for an outdoor teaching/learning environment intended for children and young people, to be delivered up to 3 working days before the assessment date. The work developed will be presented to CU teachers in the CA modality or to the jury designated by the Pedagogical Council in the 1EC and 2EC modalities), followed by its discussion before the jury on the evaluation date. The submitted proposal will support the oral presentation (maximum duration of 10 minutes) and the discussion (maximum duration of 15 minutes divided into equal parts between the jury and the group members).*

*Following the RAAE, during the discussion, there will be room for individual assessment of group members, through questions addressed to each element.*

*The evaluation criteria for determining the final CU grade are: adequacy of the plan (50%); oral presentation (20%) and discussion (30%).*

**Demonstration of the coherence between the Teaching methodologies and the learning outcomes**

*Group work encourages learning in a context similar to the future professional context. Individual discussion allows the student to be assessed individually and demonstrate the degree of achievement of the CU objectives.*

**Main Bibliography**


*Ebbeck, M.; Yim, H.Y.B.; Warrier, S. 2019. Early childhood teachers' views and teaching practices in outdoor play with young children in Singapore. Early Childhood Education Journal, 47:265–273. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10643-018-00924-2*

*Fielding, R. 2006. Best practice in action: six essential elements that define educational facility design. CEFPI (Council of Educational Facility Planners International) Planner, Association for Learning Environments: Scottsdale, AZ, USA*

*Harris, R; Bilton, H. 2019. Learning about the past: exploring the opportunities and challenges of using an outdoor learning approach. Cambridge Journal of Education, 49(1): 69-91, doi: 10.1080/0305764X.2018.1442416*

*Higgins, P.; Nicol, R. 2002. Outdoor education: authentic learning in the context of landscapes, vol. 2. An international collaboration project supported by the European Union, Comenius Action 2.1, European In-Service Training Courses: Kisa, Sweden*

*Lackney, J.A. 2000. Thirty-three educational design principles for schools & community learning centers. http://faculty-legacy.arch.tamu.edu/rjohnson/courses/StudioF05/33SchoolDesignPrinciples.pdf (consultado abril 2022)*

*Learning Policy Institute and Turnaround for Children. 2021. Design principles for schools: putting the science of learning and development into action. https://turnaround.ams3.digitaloceanspaces.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/23124616/SoLD_Design_Principles_REPORT.pdf (consultado junho 2022)*

*Mäkelä, T.; Leinonen, T. 2021. Design framework and principles for learning environment co-design: synthesis from literature and three empirical studies. Buildings 11(12), 581. https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings11120581*

*Østern, T.P.; Gjølme, E.G. 2015. Outdoor education as aesthetic pedagogical design in nature space understood as thirdspace. Sport and Art, 3(1):1–10. doi: 10.13189/saj.2015.030101*

*Reis, G.; Scott, J. (Eds.). 2018. International perspectives on the theory and practice of environmental education: a reader. Environmental Discourses in Science Education, 3. Springer International Publishing AG*

**Additional Bibliography**

*Aleixo, S. 2019. Change and adaptation. Historic school buildings and the impact of conservation on cultural significance. In Alexandra Alegre, Teresa Heitor, Maria Bacharel, Ana Fernandes (coord.), Educational Architecture - Education, Heritage, Challenges Conference Proceedings (p. 59-77), Instituto Superior Técnico*

*Angelidou, M. 2015. Smart cities: A conjuncture of four forces. Cities, 47:95–106*

*Campbell, C.; Robottom, I. 2004. Environmental education: appropriate vehicle for science education? Teaching Science, 50(2):18-23*

*Dudek-Klimiuk, J.; Warzecha, B. 2021. Intelligent urban planning and ecological urbanscape - solutions for sustainable urban development. Case study of Wolfsburg. Sustainability, 13(9), 4903. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094903*

*Glithero, L. 2018. Educating for student agency: Perspectives from young eco-civic leaders in Canada. In G. Reis, J. Scott (eds.), International Perspectives on the Theory and Practice of Environmental Education: A Reader (p. 71-83). Environmental Discourses in Science Education 3. Springer International Publishing AG*

*Hemmings, P. 2007. Renegotiating the primary school: Children's emotional geographies of sport, exercise and active play. Children's Geographies, 5:353–371*

*Lee, R.; Lane S.; Tang, A.; Leung, C.; Kwok, S.; Louie, L.; Browne, G.; Chan, S. 2020. Effects of an unstructured free play and mindfulness intervention on wellbeing in kindergarten students. Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health, 17(15), 5382. doi:10.3390/ijerph17155382*