



HAL
open science

Scaffolding pedagogical planning and design of learning activities: an on-line dedicated tool

Rosa Maria Bottino, Michela Ott, Mauro Tavella

► To cite this version:

Rosa Maria Bottino, Michela Ott, Mauro Tavella. Scaffolding pedagogical planning and design of learning activities: an on-line dedicated tool. *International Journal of Knowledge Society Research (IJKSR)*, 2011, 2 (1), pp.84-97. 10.4018/jksr.2011010107. hal-00908888

HAL Id: hal-00908888

<https://telearn.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00908888>

Submitted on 25 Nov 2013

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Scaffolding pedagogical planning and design of learning activities: an on-line dedicated tool

Rosa Maria Bottino, Michela Ott, Mauro Tavella

Istituto Tecnologie Didattiche – CNR
Via De Marini, 6, Genoa ITALY
{bottino, ott, [tavella](mailto:tavella@itd.cnr.it)}@itd.cnr.it

Abstract.

This paper focuses on pedagogical planning and illustrates the on-line system IAMEL aimed at supporting teachers in the process of designing, structuring and planning educational activities for their students. Pedagogical planning is meant as the description, at different level of granularity, of the playing out of a learning situation or a unit of learning aimed at the acquisition of a precise body of knowledge through the specification of roles, activities, educational theories and methods. The use of ICT-based pedagogical planners has a particularly important role since it: 1) has a maieutic function in that it helps teachers to express his/her didactical ideas, finalize approaches and educational methods 2) serves as a mean for sharing practices among teachers and communities of teachers and 3) is a useful basis to foster “a posteriori” reflections on the planned educational experiences once implemented in real school settings.

Keywords: Technology Enhanced Learning, Pedagogical Planning, Net –Technologies, Learning Innovation, Formal Education.

INTRODUCTION

The integration of ICT into ordinary classroom activities is nowadays considered a necessity in the education policies of most of countries, and its positive effects have been showed by a number of research projects carried out in a variety of contexts and age levels. The first effort made by many Governments in this direction was the considerable budget invested for equipping schools with hardware and software tools. However, this effort proved to be insufficient and the high expectations put on ICT as vehicles to promote change in education remained unfulfilled at the level of wide school practice (Venezky & Davis, 2002; European Commission, 2004).

Many reasons can be examined for the limited impact of wide ICT use in schools for the purpose of teaching/learning, from those related to the traditional resistance of the school systems to change to reasons more deeply related to the fact that technology has often been introduced as an addition to an existing, unchanged classroom setting (De Corte, 1996; Grasha & Yangarber-Hicks, 2000).

For the purpose of this paper, we focus on the teachers and on the difficulties they encounter in reconsidering and revising their pedagogical practice for accommodating a proper and not sporadic ICT use. Often, teachers are induced to look at software tools for education on the basis of very general, ill-defined expectations, and this approach can result in a lack of

understanding on the theoretical frameworks, pedagogical practice and conditions under which the educational use of such tools could be meaningful and productive.

This means that the work towards technological innovation should be developed together with pedagogical innovation. As the matter of fact, from one hand, the use of new tools results in a little pedagogical gain if novel educational strategies and the activities in which teachers and students are involved in are not carefully re-considered and planned. On the other hand, pedagogical innovation should be based on the opportunities offered by technological advances and on the critical examination of how such advances change substantially, in a direct or indirect way, the needs, the modalities and the content themselves of teaching and learning activities.

In this context, a particular relevant role is played by the activity of pedagogical planning seen as the description, at different level of granularity, of the playing out of a learning situation or a unit of learning aimed at the acquisition of a precise body of knowledge through the specification of roles and activities.

When considering the integration of ICT in school practice, pedagogical planning assumes a particularly important role since it helps not only the single teacher to express his/her didactical objectives and approaches but also it serves as a mean for sharing practices among teachers and communities of teachers and can also serve as a basis for reasoning on the encountered difficulties and problems faced. The integration of new technologies in class practice, requires teachers to increasingly take into account a variety of different elements (e.g. changing of roles, timing, contents, etc.), in an effort to ensure that these form part of a coherent, manageable whole that responds effectively to learners' needs (Jonassen, 1997) and that consents the full attainment of the intended educational objectives. For this reason, teachers should be supported in the setting-up of pedagogical plans which describe not only an educational itinerary but also help them to reflect and make explicit their pedagogical aims, choices and approaches.

Current research in the field of pedagogical planning mainly focuses on defining which instruments and methods better serve the scope since a wide number of different tools and different approaches are adopted to assist teachers "in the thought processes involved in selecting appropriate methods, tools, student activities and assessments to suit the required learning objectives" (Bailey et Al., 2006).

ICT-based environments and tools aimed at supporting and backing the process of pedagogical planning are widely considered extremely useful resources and recently, a number of significant attempts to use ICT to describe and share pedagogical ideas have been carried out (Dalziel et Al., 2006; Earp & Pozzi, 2006). The availability of such ICT-based tools has given strong impulse to the formalisation of pedagogical plans and this fact, on the one hand, increases the possibility of sharing and re-using pedagogical ideas/methods, on the other, makes the process of pedagogical planning conceptually simpler and offers the possibility of better managing complexity.

This paper aims at giving a contribution to this research field by presenting an on line environment devoted to pedagogical planning. This environment was designed and implemented in the framework of the research project IAMEL, supported by the Italian Ministry of Education and Research under the PRIN 2007 (Research Projects of National Interest) programme, the main aim of which was that of supporting the teaching/learning of mathematics by enhancing the potential of e-learning platforms at these ends. In this project pedagogical planning was broadly felt as a key aspect and a specific ICT-based tool was produced, following previous experiences (Bottino et Al. 2008) carried out by the authors, who were partners of the consortium.

In the following, we first discuss the relations of our work with the broad field of learning design, then an overall description of the IAMEL system is provided and its main features are illustrated by focusing on key innovative aspects. Finally, some considerations on its concrete use by teachers are reported. (qualche indicazione sugli sviluppi successivi? – vedi Macerata?).

Learning design & Pedagogical planning

When approaching the area of pedagogical planning, the broad area of learning design was surveyed and the main existing approaches were considered.

Although learning design is intended in a variety of manners in the literature, one general unifying characteristic is the presence of an artefact as a focal point of the design process. This artefact can be defined as “a description of the playing out of a learning situation or a unit of learning aimed at the acquisition of a precise body of knowledge through the specification of roles and activities, as well as knowledge handling resources, tools, services and results associated with the implementation of the activities” (Pernin & Lejeune, 2006).

Definitions of this kind are sufficiently broad to accommodate a wide range of interpretations and approaches. Indeed researchers in the field adopt a variety of terms to denote such artefacts (learning design, learning scenario, pedagogical plans, didactical scenario, etc.), which differ greatly as far as both the nature of the meaning invested in them and, consequently, in the design and in the implementation of artefacts implemented to express them (Bottino et Al., 2010).

In our work we focused on pedagogical planning with the specific aim to provide teachers with a tool to support them in the process of ideating, structuring and planning educational activities for their classes. Such tool has to provide teachers with a mean to make explicit not only the educational activities to be carried out but also the pedagogical rationale underlying their design choices. According to this approach, in our work the term pedagogical plan means not only the description of a learning situation planned by the teachers but also the reflection on and the explicitation of critical pedagogical and contextual aspects entailed in the design and enactment of a planned learning activity.

In recent years, modelling languages have been studied and implemented with the aim to formalize, in a machine-readable manner, educational activities and, in particular, units of learning, by making explicit the relations between actors, activities, resources, tools and services involved in them. IMS LD [12](XXX), the most widely adopted of these languages, appears to act as a way of standardising them. New artefacts aimed at implementing this specification are beginning to appear and will eventually give rise to new teaching and learning design practices.

However, “the knowledge of the learning designer himself is not captured by the IMS-LD Learning Design, which only represents the result” (Koper, 2006). Consequently, approaches based on the adoption of specific design languages such as IMS-LD were considered to be unsuitable for the specific objectives of the IAMEL project.

The focus on production and management of machine-interpretable design artefacts is also a characteristic of the LAMS system (Dalziel, 2003). LAMS is an integrated system that seeks to support rapid, “teacher-friendly” generation, customisation and running of learning sequences (Philip & Dalziel, 2004). Nevertheless, LAMS too is not primarily intended to support critical pedagogical and contextual reflection. LAMS sequences, and those generated with IMS-LD based tools, can generally be classified as “runnable” design artefacts, as opposed to “inspirational” ones, to use the distinction adopted by (Falconer et Al, 2007). Inspirational designs tend to be more educator - than learner-oriented, and, as such, are closer to the

pedagogical plan concept we aim to in the IAMEL project, where we defend the idea of providing teachers with means to build high-level models rather than proposing them a modelling language to prepare ready-to-use lesson plans.

In the following, an overall description of the IAMEL system is provided and its main features are illustrated by focusing on key innovative aspects.

THE RESEARCH CONTEXT: THE IAMEL PROJECT

This research was conducted in the framework of the research project IAMEL, supported by the Italian Ministry of Education and Research under the PRIN 2007 (Research Projects of National Interest) programme, the main aim of which was that of supporting the teaching/learning of mathematics by enhancing the potential of e-learning platforms at these ends.

In this project pedagogical planning was broadly felt as a key aspect and a specific ICT-based tool was produced, following previous experiences (Earp & Pozzi, 2006) carried out by the authors, who were partners of the consortium.

METHODOLOGY: THE IAMEL SYSTEM AND THE RELATED APPROACH TO PEDAGOGICAL PLANNING

The IAMEL system was designed and implemented with the main aim of allowing the production and sharing of structured pedagogical plans; although it was conceived and created to address the needs of researchers and teachers working in the field of mathematics, it can be considered fully content and subject-independent. It is grounded on a well-defined but open structure and foresees a detailed description of learning activities.

Structuring pedagogical plans

Fig. 1 shows the main screen of an exemplary pedagogical plan, called PLAN X, that gives a global idea of the overall structure and contents of the IAMEL Pedagogical Plans.

The main upper part of the screen contains some basic data (description, authors, target population...) aimed at providing key information about the plan; the map at the bottom of the screen shows, instead, the sequence of the different activities to be carried out. Each activity is then further described in detail in a separate section where its relevant functional aspects are highlighted.

Fig 1 Main screenshot of an exemplary IAMEL Pedagogical Plan





Fig 2 Map of the activities (flow: obligatory-optional-obligatory-optional)



Key information provided in the upper part of the screen (Fig.1) mainly aim at providing a general overview of the plan by giving a basic idea of its features, constraints and overall feasibility.

On the top of the screen, after the title of the plan and the references of the authors, a very basic description of the plan is provided encompassing the educational area (discipline), the subject matter and the definition of the target population addressed (school level, age range, further specific and detailed features such as disability, learning difficulties etc...);

The underneath ribbon gives further general detail on the plan at hand by means of seven small tabs that can be expanded by clicking on them, thus providing access to a text box containing detailed information about:

The underpinning *idea* or, in other words, the main reasons why the author(s) has chosen to implement such an educational plan, the need for it, its importance and value in the educational context.

The *prerequisites* (cognitive, physical, related to specific knowledge and know how etc..) demanded to the students in order to perform the required activities.

The *goals* to be achieved by the learner population (curricular, content-epistemological, cognitive, social-affective, instrumental goals).

The content addressed, in terms of specific issues, subjects, topics, matters...

The *working plan* or, rather, the overall organization underpinning the plan enactment. This section is meant to indicate how to manage the overall process and to cover details about setting, duration and process documentation.

The theoretical *framework* that has informed the process of the plan design.

The methods, parameters and specific tools adopted to carry out the *evaluation* of the envisaged activities.

At the core of the pedagogical plans: the learning activities

The core of the whole plan are, nevertheless, the activities to be carried out; as shown in Fig. 1, the map containing the flow of the activities appears in the main screen shot of the plan.

As to the type of the activities, the IAMEL system distinguishes among “mandatory/obligatory activities”, namely those that are considered necessary to fulfill the intended educational objectives and “optional activities” or activities that are not to be carried out by all students in a classroom or discretionary activities non essential to the learning/teaching scope.

Fig 2 shows an exemplary simple map of activities. The represented sequence is composed by obligatory activities (squares) and optional activities (rhombuses). The actual flow is linear and sequential: an initial obligatory activity is followed by an optional one, subsequently the third activity is again obligatory while the last one is, once more, optional.

IAMEL, nevertheless, allows the building up of very complex and articulated plans where the sequence of the activities can be far more variegated and diversified. For instance, as shown in

Fig 3 Map of the activities: “two routes” and “three routes” flow





Fig. 3, it offers the possibility of setting up “two routes” (Fig.3, left part) or even “three routes” paths (Fig.3, right part), where the user can autonomously choose among different alternatives. As an example, the flow represented in the left part of Fig.3 envisages that after performing the

Fig 4 Map of the activities including random – order activities




mandatory “Activity1” and before performing the mandatory “Activity5” the users have the possibility to follow the upper route (where only one optional activity is foreseen) or to follow the lower route where one mandatory activity and an optional one (to be performed in a linear sequence) are foreseen.

As a further opportunity the map also encompasses the possibility of defining a set of activities to be carried out in a random, not strictly sequential order. Fig.4 shows represents a situation where after performing the mandatory “Activity1” and before performing the mandatory “Activity5” the users have to carry out two obligatory activities (“Activity 3” and “Activity 4”) and possibly an optional one (“Activity2”) but the order of these activities, therefore represented in a “cloud”, is not established *a priori*.

As a consequence of these facilities, the IAMEL maps can represent a huge number of different links /relations among the entailed activities, as it is shown in Fig.5.

In order to allow full comprehension and, possibly, reusability and modifications/adaptations, each activity of the plan is further described in details in a separate section, where its relevant aspects are highlighted. A full description of the activity at hand is provided, together with its

Fig 5 Three different activity maps instantiating different possible learning paths



main learning objectives and the needed prerequisites. The tools and resources needed (or even suggested) to perform the activity are described and, possibly, made available, linked or provided for downloading; detailed information about the educational method adopted is given as well with a specific focus on the evaluation methods, tools and measures to be used. An accurate description of the teaching methodology, the work organization, the teaching/learning strategy adopted, the overall time required etc...is also provided and, in addition, all relevant documents and reports are available in the “Documentation” section.

Relevant features of the system

The IAMEL system was designed to be an environment providing different kinds of users with different facilities; it is actually based on advanced database technologies and exploits the potential of a powered graphical interface; it also allows customized access by the users and was designed and implemented in accordance with the “Design for All” (Klironomos et al, 2004) principles.

The system is endowed with a number of significant features that contribute to make it a widely usable and accessible tool, namely:

Data-Base Facilities

IAMEL is powered by PHP and based on a MySQL database whose structure is the result of the common work of the researchers involved in the project.

Increased flexibility and augmented search facilities are some of the key added values provided by the fact that the pedagogical plans are in a database compatible format. The fields of the database can be filled both with text and XHTML code; XHTML is required if the author needs to implement simple editing features, to insert images, to add links to documents in the repository and to external sites (in the system guide a few examples of the use of XHTML code are available, and some specific tags are suggested). When the use of XHTML code is required, some specific and very simple rules have been defined in order to maintain a homogeneous layout (e.g.: it’s forbidden to use the tag FONT)

The system also offers easy access to external material. The uploading of external resources (software as well as articles or working sheet) is, in fact, accepted; in particular it is possible to upload a wide amount of resources directly from a special repository which is part of the system itself.

Multi-Environment Features

The IAMEL system encompasses two different environments: the “authoring environment” and “viewing environment”.

They are oriented to fulfil the different needs of two different types of users: readers and authors. The formers can only view the existing published plans, while the others can both create new plans and edit/modify existing plans. Readers have limited access permissions (and are therefore only admitted to use the “viewing environment”) while authors, through a rigorous authentication procedure, have access to both the environments (Petrides et al, 2008).

In addition, while the readers can only access the “published” plans (those plans that the authors have decided to share with others) those users that are authenticated as authors, can view all the plans they themselves have created, and can both create new plans and make adjustments and amendments to existing plans (yet to those that have already been “published”). What’s more, the authors are allowed to directly shift from the “viewing environment” to the “authoring environment” and vice versa, thus getting an immediate feedback of their actions (new content

/ changes).

The fact that IAMEL allows direct and immediate “commuting” between the authoring and the viewing environment, thus *de facto* functioning as a multi-environment system, represents a relevant novelty with respect to other systems where the environments are not directly linked one to the other (Benigno et al, 2006).

Graphical Interface Assistance

The system includes a graphical interface which greatly enhances the system usability. Thanks to this feature the users, as shown in Fig.6, in a few steps can modify the map of the activities of a plan (flow of the activities) and, as mentioned above, immediately after they also have the possibility to visualize the new map.

Fig 6 in the left part shows the starting situation where the map comprises four activities in the sequence *obligatory-optional-obligatory-optional*; the central part shows the authoring environment where the second optional activity (Activity 2) is moved upwards (the move is underlined by the black arrow); in the right part of the figure the result of the move are shown; actually following the performed changes, “Activity 2” is placed at the first place of the sequence and the order of the activity has been changed into *optional- obligatory-obligatory-optional*.




Fig 6 modification facilities for the activity map

Of course, by acting on the map by means of the graphical interface not only the map changes but the whole activity (including its detailed description) is moved to the new position.

Customization Features

The system comprises a number of features allowing a high degree of customization and personalization. This aspect is particularly important to sustain and improve the software accessibility by persons with special needs.

For instance the viewing of the main screenshot of each plan can be fully customized by reducing and/or enlarging the content to meet the needs of low vision users. This is of course only one of the available customization features: the system is equipped with; the architecture of the entire system is, in fact, fully compliant with the required accessibility standard (use of validated XHTML and CSS) and meets the requirements of the Italian law in force (law 4/2004

or Stanca Act¹).

The system also allows that the author works in a random, not sequential way by filling in the data base fields in the order he/she prefers, by acting on the map structure and on the data base fields in a relatively independent way.

MAIN RESULTS

Pedagogical plans and wider learning scenarios of different levels of granularity and scope can be designed, modelled and retrieved by means of the IAMEL tool: e.g. scenarios modelling the specific articulation of a learning activity, scenarios modelling a set of learning activities, scenarios modelling the orchestration of different learning activities or sets of activities, etc.

The first results of the in-field experimentations of the IAMEL system, carried out in the framework of the research project, suggest that pedagogical planning, which is actually a traditional practice for educators, when it is mediated by new technologies and in particular by net-technologies, acquires new potentialities for the propagation of innovation among teachers. The success of tools of such kind depends not only on their ergonomic quality but also on the appropriateness of underlying concepts of users practice and representation. IAMEL has been designed by taking into account pre-existing practices but it is also a flexible system that can be adapted to users' specific needs. In detail it proved to :

To provide a flexible model where it is possible to make explicit and to structure not only the concrete activities to be carried out but also the theoretical and pedagogical assumptions that have motivated the setting up of such activities.

To offer the possibility to provide descriptions at different levels of granularity and scope.

To support the teacher in gaining greater awareness on the pedagogical rationale underlying his/her own design choices making explicit relevant pedagogical issues at play.

To foster the sharing among teachers of pedagogical reasoning and knowledge connected with concrete activities and itineraries thus, fostering, at different degrees of abstraction, its reuse.

To support the integration of ICT tools in school practice through the development of plans where crucial issues related with its integration in practice are explicitly addressed.

To provide a model which is content and subject-independent.

CONCLUSIONS

Main objective of the research carried out in the framework of the IAMEL project was to provide a conceptual model for pedagogical planning able to represent both teaching and learning processes to be enacted in concrete classroom settings and also able to make explicit the underpinning motivations and choices.

The approach adopted to build up the IAMEL system differs from the standard approach adopted for instance by the IMS-LD main stream movement (Koper, 2006); IAMEL, in fact, defends the idea of providing teachers with means to build high-level models rather than offering a ready-to-use modelling language (this point of view signs a distinctive perspective in the learning scenario research stream).

The research line on Pedagogical planning appears productive and opens perspectives related to the introduction of intention-based modelling and seems crucial, in particular, in TEL research since is strictly linked with the idea that the design of new technological tools is always

¹ Italian Law 4/2004 Provisions to support the access to Information Technologies for the disabled http://www.pubbliaccesso.gov.it/normative/law_20040109_n4.htm

to be complemented with the design of specifically designed pedagogical plans to specify how those tools are to be integrated in the teaching and learning processes.

The IAMEL system, from one hand, offers a more systematic approach to the design of pedagogical plans, an activity often suffering of a low degree of formalization, and, on the other hand, it also supports the preading of new educational ideas and methods by allowing the "reuse" of previously developed plans.

We see that the pedagogical plan approach can contribute to give a potential answer to the complexity and intricacy of the issues inherent to "educational design". We also hope that it can also allow making further steps in the direction of concretely building a shared "knowledge culture" (Bakry, & Alfantookh, 2010).

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research has been funded by the Italian Ministry of Education and Research (MIUR), within the PRIN 2007 (Research Projects of National Interests) programme, under the grant 2007H75ZXT_002. Project: "e-learning platforms and the personalization of mathematics teaching and learning activities in high schools and at the beginning of graduate courses" – Unit: "Supporting the collaborative design of pilot pedagogical plans through the implementation of an on-line computational system".

REFERENCES

- Bailey, C., Zalfan, M. T., Davis, H. C., Fill, K., Conole, G., Panning for Gold: Designing Pedagogically-inspired Learning Nuggets. *Educational Technology & Society*, 9 (1), 113--122 (2006).
- Bakry, S., Alfantookh, A.: Toward Building the Knowledge Culture: Reviews and a KC-STOPE with Six Sigma View, *International Journal of Knowledge Society Research (IJKSR)* 1, 46--64 (2010)
- Benigno, V., Ott, M., Puddu, F., Tavella, M.: Netform: An online support system for teachers. In Callaos, N., Lesso, W., Sanchez, B., (Eds.): *Proceedings of the 8th World Multi-Conference on Systemics, Cybernetics and Informatics (SCI2004)*, Orlando Fl. USA: IIIS, 85—90 (2004).
- Bottino R.M., Earp J., Olimpo G., Ott M., Pozzi F., Tavella M., Supporting the design of pilot learning activities with the Pedagogical Plan Manager, Kendall M. and Samways B (eds), *Proc. IFIP, Learning to Live in the Knowledge Society*, vol.281, 37-44, 2008, Springer Sci.Business Media, N.Y., 2008
- Dalziel, J., McAndrew, P., Goodyear, P.: Patterns, designs and activities: unifying descriptions of learning structures. *International Journal of Learning Technology*, 2 (2-3) (2006).
- De Corte, E., Changing views of computer supported learning environments for the acquisition of knowledge and thinking skills. In S. Vosniadou, E. De Corte, R. Glaser & H. Mandl (eds.) *International perspectives on the designing of technology-supported learning environments*, Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 129-145 (1996)
- Earp, J., Pozzi, F., Fostering reflection in ICT-based pedagogical Planning. In Philip, R., Voerman A., Dalziel, J. (Eds): *Proceedings of the First International LAMS Conference 2006: Designing the Future of Learning*. LAMS Foundation, Sydney. 35--44 (2006).
- EC, European Commission, DG Education and Culture, Ramboll Management, *Study on Innovative Learning Environments in School Education*. Available at: http://www.elearningeuropa.info/extras/new_learning_env.pdf (2004)
- Falconer, I., Beetham, H., Oliver, R., Lockyer, L., Littlejohn, A.: *Mod4L Final Report: Representing Learning Designs*. Joint Information Systems Committee (JISC). http://mod4l.com/tiki-download_file.php?fileId=7 (2007).
- Grasha A.F., Yangarber-Hicks N. Integrating teaching styles and learning styles with instructional technology, *College Teaching*, 48, 2-10 (2000)
- Jonassen, D.H.: Certainty, Determinism, and Predictability in Theories of Instructional Design. *Lessons from Science. Educational Technology*, (37)1, 27—34 (1997).
- Klironomos, I., Antona, M., Basdekis, I., Stephanidis, C., and EDeAN Secretariat for 2005 White Paper:

- Promoting Design for All and e-Accessibility in Europe. *Universal Access in the Information Society*, 5 (1) (2006).
- Koper, R.: Current research in Learning Design. *Educational Technology & Society*, 9(1), 13--22 (2006).
- Olimpo, G., Bottino, R.M., Earp, J., Ott, M., Pozzi, F., Tavella, M. Pedagogical plans as communication oriented objects. *Computers & Education*. 55(2), 476-488 (2010).
- Pernin, J. P., Lejeune, A.: Models for the re-use of learning scenarios. <http://dspace.ou.nl/bitstream/1820/580/1/Models.pdf>. (2006).
- Pernin, J.P., Emin, V., Gueraud, V.: ISiS: An Intention-Oriented Model to Help Teachers in Learning Scenarios Design, EC-TEL 2008 Proceedings, in "Times of Convergences. Technologies Across learning Contexts", Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, 5192, 338--343 (2008).
- Petrides, L., Nguyen, L., Jimes, C., Karaglani, A., Open educational resources: inquiring into author use and reuse. *International Journal of Technology Enhanced Learning*, 1(1/2) (2008).
- Reigeluth, C.M.: A New Paradigm of ISD? *Educational Technology*, (36)3, 13--20 (1996)
- Venezky, R. L., & Davis, C. Quo vademus? The transformation of schooling in a networked world [OECD/CERI, Version 8c, March 06]. <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/48/20/2073054.pdf>. (2002).