FACULDADE DE ARQUITETURA
UNIVERSIDADE DE LISBOA

FICHA DE UNIDADE CURRICULAR

Unidade Curricular

202599221 - Propostas de espaços pedagógicos outdoor

Tipo

Optativa

Ano lectivo	Curso	Ciclo de estudos	Créditos
2025/26	MI Arquitetura	2º	3.00 ECTS

Idiomas	Periodicidade	Pré requisitos	Ano Curricular / Semestre
Português ,Inglês	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)

Susana Maria Gouveia Rosado

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 e sua defesa sustentada em dados recolhidos e anaisados anteriormente

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.

Metodologias de ensino (avaliação incluída)

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.

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

202599221 - Proposals for outdoor educational spaces

Type

Elective

Academic year	Degree	Cycle of studies	Unit credits
2025/26	IM Architecture	2	3.00 ECTS

Lecture language	Periodicity	Prerequisites	Year of study/ Semester
Portuguese ,English	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)

Susana Maria Gouveia Rosado

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 and learning for children and young people in outdoor environments;
Develop scientific, technological, and artistic elements and artifacts for outdoor spaces in schools and gardens that contribute to the learning of children and young people;
Apply the developed elements to each specific case in terms of spatial organization and

sociological and local context, structural safety, materiality, comfort, and user safety.

Syllabus

PRESENTATION
Program, Bibliography, and Assessment

INNOVATIVE PROPOSALS FOR ELEMENTS AND ARTIFACTS
1.1. Systematization of ideas and their defense supported by previously collected an analysed data
1.2. Implementation of ideas
1.3. Discussion of the proposals at the selected intervention site

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

The student should develop the ability to collect, analyze, and synthesize the information necessary to create scientific, technological, and artistic elements and artifacts suitable for outdoor teaching/learning environments and the appropriate age groups.
The learning of the program contents will enable the student to develop soft skills such as spatial organization, the ability to communicate their well-founded ideas, leadership, problem/challenge solving, teamwork, and even work ethics.

Teaching methodologies (including evaluation)

The professors monitor the work carried out in order to optimize the expected results, emphasizing the importance of raising new and challenging questions that stimulate an interest in knowledge and research.

Work teams are formed according to the course (4 members each) to address the proposed challenge. Each group must present an innovative proposal of elements and artifacts for an outdoor teaching/learning environment for children and young people, to be submitted up to 3 working days before the assessment date. The work will be presented to the course instructors in the AC format, or to a jury designated by the Pedagogical Council for the 1CE and 2CE formats, followed by a discussion with the jury on the assessment date. The submitted proposal will serve as the basis for the oral presentation (maximum duration: 10 minutes) and the discussion (maximum duration: 15 minutes, divided equally between the jury and the group members). In accordance with the RAAE, during the discussion, there will be an opportunity for individual evaluation of group members, with questions directed to each participant.

The criteria for the final grade in the course unit are: proposal adequacy (50%), oral presentation (20%), and discussion (30%).

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

Group work promotes learning in a context similar to the students' future professional environment. The individual discussion allows each student to be assessed individually and to demonstrate the degree to which they have achieved the objectives of the course unit.

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*