



Website

www.inthrace.unitbv.ro



Civil engagement, integration and better management of the national intangible heritage to raise awareness of European common values - EU context, perspectives and active citizenship

GUIDEBOOK FOR COACHES



Co-funded by
the European Union



Foreword

The InThrace Project (2023-1-RO01-KA220-HED-000156121) is an Erasmus+ KA220-HED Cooperation Partnerships in Higher Education project. The six partners are responsible for all materials produced in this project. The project's *Guidebook for coaches* supports coaches in effectively using the learning materials, the Training pack, and the platform by outlining learning objectives, explaining how to use each component, presenting the learning path, and providing clear guidelines for delivering courses that combine theoretical and practical content from the Handbook and Manual.

Funded by the European Union. Views and opinions expressed are, however, those of the author(s) only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the ANPCDEFP. Neither the European Union nor the ANPCDEFP can be held responsible for them.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	3
THE INTRACE CONCEPT.....	4
ORGANIZATIONAL ASPECTS OF THE COACHING PROCESS	8
PREPARATION OF COACHING.....	8
THE SESSION	8
SESSION CLOSING	9
COACHING PLAN.....	10
COACHING PLAN FOR CHAPTERS - MODELS	14
<i>COACHING PLAN Chapter 4.....</i>	<i>14</i>
<i>COACHING PLAN Chapter 7.....</i>	<i>18</i>
DIDACTIC MATERIALS AND TOOLS	22
FRAMEWORKS COMPARED.....	23
HOW-TO (SCRIPTS & STEPS)	24
SELECTING A METHODOLOGY (DECISION TREE – PLAIN TEXT).....	25
OPERATIONALIZING SDT & GROWTH MINDSET	32
MICRO-INTERACTIONS THAT BOOST ENGAGEMENT.....	32
SESSION ARCHITECTURE & RUN-OF-SHOW	34
INTERACTIVE METHODS & TOOLS (EXAMPLES)	35
MOTIVATION & PERSISTENCE BEYOND THE SESSION	37
EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK	41

Introduction

The general objective of the InThrace project is to enhance and enrich the competences of university academia to facilitate the interpretation, preservation, integration and sustainable management of the national and common EU intangible heritage in urban and suburban environments and in the social life of the local community. Secondly, to foster civic engagement, to raise awareness of the national and EU identity and to facilitate better understanding of the common EU values, principles and concept of shared future.

In order to achieve this goal, the project aims firstly, to enhance the competencies of university academia to develop, teach and apply models for the interpretation, preservation and better integration of intangible heritage in the urban landscape and in the social calendar. Secondly, to develop and exchange good practices to expand tourism experience through integration of intangible heritage in the touristic offer. Thirdly, to promote an open society where the intangible heritage is a base for the creation of an inclusive, sustainable and representative EU with diverse cultures united in one common family.

The Guidebook on the InThrace concept should assist the coaches in training on the interpretation, preservation, integration and sustainable management of the national and common EU intangible heritage. The Guidebook shall also foster civic engagement and raise awareness on the national and EU identity in the context of European values. All these activities should aim at preserving cultural identity, fostering tolerance, and respecting diversity through the lens of intangible heritage.

Work on the different parts of the Guidebook shall be distributed among the partners based on their professional expertise and competencies. Each result will have its leader responsible for its structure, style and language coherence.

The InThrace concept

The InThrace project - **Civil engagement, integration, and better management of intangible national heritage to raise awareness of common European values – EU context, perspectives, and active citizenship** is funded by the Erasmus+ program, action KA220-HED - Cooperation partnerships in higher education (project no. 2023-1-RO01-KA220-HED-000156121). The implementation runs from 2023 to 2026, coordinated by Transilvania University of Braşov (Romania), together with partners from the University of Warsaw (Poland), the University of West Attica (Greece), the University of Zagreb (Croatia), the University of the Azores (Portugal), and the Pax Rhodopica Foundation (Bulgaria).

The InThrace concept is based on the idea that intangible cultural heritage is not just a legacy of the past, but a living, fragile and constantly recreated phenomenon. UNESCO emphasizes that the value of this heritage is not found in objects, but in human knowledge and creativity, which give meaning to collective identity and social continuity. In the context of globalization and rapid change, intangible heritage becomes a barometer of identity, an instrument of cohesion, and a catalyst for civic engagement. ICH is an essential means of strengthening active citizenship and intercultural dialogue, and based on the data collected, our methodological framework confirmed that its integration into the university curriculum is considered essential.

The individual and group interviews with experts conducted at the beginning of the project to consolidate the Methodological Frame confirmed the high importance of ICH for the academic environment, but also drew attention to the lack of dedicated courses in the universities of the experts interviewed. These interviews also revealed that there is an acute need for digital tools, applied examples, and methodological guidelines. Focus groups showed that among the major priorities are: clarifying the definitions and role of intangible heritage, highlighting its value for identity and cohesion, integrating it into tourism and creative industries, but also into public policies. In addition, the need to involve students in participatory processes, enabling them to become actors in the preservation and reinterpretation of heritage, was emphasized.

Based on the opinions of experts, we have identified several problems in integrating the subject of intangible heritage into the university curriculum.

Firstly, there is a disparity between universities in terms of including intangible heritage in their study programs. Some institutions offer dedicated courses, but many do not have such disciplines or treat them only marginally. This lack leads to insufficient training of teachers and students in the field of conservation and valorisation of living heritage. The project responds by developing a Training Pack and a Model for the interpretation, integration and management of ICH, which will provide theoretical and practical resources for both professors and researchers.

It has also been found that, although some lecturers integrate heritage elements into their research and courses, there are difficulties and limitations related to the lack of resources, the stigmatization of ethnological approaches as “outdated”, and difficulties in adapting to the content of more rigid courses. To address these issues, InThrace proposes digital textbooks, case studies, and best practices to make ICH more accessible and relevant to various disciplines.

Another major issue is the perception of young people, who often consider intangible heritage outdated or irrelevant to their current lives. In addition, globalization and uncontrolled tourism risk turning living traditions into mere spectacles, losing their authenticity and community meaning. The project addresses these challenges by integrating heritage into social events and community calendars, through a large-scale promotional campaign and the use of interactive digital tools (online platforms, augmented reality, digital archives) designed to engage young people and the general public in an attractive and participatory way.

At the same time, it has been observed that the lack of clear legislation and financial resources is an obstacle to the preservation and transmission of intangible heritage. InThrace addresses this issue by providing guidance on legislation, funding, and resource mobilization, as well as by training local and academic actors in the development and implementation of sustainable strategies.

In addition, the integration of intangible heritage into the process of strengthening European identity is often fragmented, and national differences can generate tensions or even political misuse of traditions. The project aims to promote a common European vision based on cultural diversity, intercultural dialogue, and mutual respect by creating a European resource platform and including living heritage in the civic and educational dimension of communities.

The project’s results are designed to provide both theoretical foundations and practical tools for the integration of ICH in education, community life, and urban development. A central output is the **Training Package**, which brings together complementary instruments: the **Handbook** and the **Manual**, and the **Model for Interpretation, Integration & Management of ICH**.

The Handbook for the Integration of Intangible Heritage provides the theoretical and practical framework necessary for understanding and integrating ICH into urban, educational, and community environments. It includes strategies for sustainable cultural and tourism development, chapters dedicated to legislation, heritage typologies, tourism value, management and conservation, digital promotion, and the role of heritage in strengthening European identity.

The Intangible Heritage Manual complements the Handbook with applied resources: case studies, multimedia examples, and practical guides for documenting, conserving, and valorizing traditions, rituals, and crafts. It provides professionals and communities with concrete tools to turn theory into practice.

The Model for Interpretation, Integration, and Management of ICH proposes an applicable framework for universities and other interested stakeholders offering methodologies for integrating heritage into community life, social events, and public policies. It includes applications that generate solutions for citizen engagement, the use of new digital technologies, impact assessment, and the identification of resources for sustainability.

InThrace Training Package – Main Outputs		
Tool	Focus	Key Content
Handbook on Integration of Intangible Heritage	Strategies & concepts	Concepts, legislation, typologies, management, promotion, EU integration
Manual on Intangible Heritage	Case studies & digital resources	Case studies, multimedia, practical guides, community projects
Model for Interpretation, Integration, and Management of ICH	Framework for interpretation, integration & management	Methodologies, community involvement, public policies, digitalisation, sustainability
		
InThrace Platform & e-Library	Courses integrating all approaches	Integrating all above

In addition, the project is developing a platform with courses based on the training package and an accessible e-library containing theoretical materials, case studies, and multimedia resources.

Thus, the role of trainers is central, as the project brings no added value if it is not used and its ideas are not passed on to younger generations (students). Trainers are not just transmitters of information, but mediators between knowledge and the community. The resources created must be transformed into learning experiences that cultivate respect for diversity, stimulate creativity, develop critical thinking, and encourage civic engagement.

The coaching process within the InThrace project has as its central priority the development of the capacity of academic staff to understand, interpret, and integrate intangible cultural heritage into their educational and research activities. The goal is to transform academics into agents of change who can convey the importance of living heritage to students and communities.

The table below outlines some of the objectives of the coaching process through the project's results:

Coaching Process Priorities	Description
Strengthening theoretical knowledge about ICH	Coaching should provide a solid foundation on the concepts, typologies, and role of intangible heritage in national and European cultural identity. Emphasis is placed on understanding its dynamic dimensions, social and economic value, and connection to European integration processes.
Development of practical and methodological skills	The priority is for participants to acquire tools for documenting, preserving, and promoting ICH: ethnographic research methods, use of digital archives, application of case studies, and integration of practical experiences into teaching and research activities.
Integrating heritage into the curriculum and community events	Coaching will support teachers in developing lesson plans, projects, and extracurricular activities that make intangible heritage part of university and community life (festivals, exhibitions, cultural calendars).
Promoting the use of digital tools	A major priority is training in the use of online platforms, digital archives, augmented reality, and other technologies to make ICH attractive and accessible to students and young people.
Addressing ethical and legislative dimensions	Coaching should provide guidance on compliance with ethical principles (consent, fair representation, avoidance of cultural exploitation) and knowledge of the European and national legislative framework.
Stimulating creativity and critical thinking	Through coaching, participants are encouraged to adopt innovative teaching methods (project-based learning, simulations, gamification) and to develop a critical mindset towards the risks of globalization and excessive commercialization of heritage.
Developing skills for resource mobilization	The coaching process aims to equip participants with knowledge on identifying funding sources, developing projects, and collaborating with authorities, NGOs, and local communities to ensure the sustainability of actions.
Strengthening the intercultural dimension and European dialogue	Coaching will help teachers and students understand heritage not only as a local or national element, but as part of a common European mosaic, where diversity is valued and used as a glue to strengthen European identity.

Organizational aspects of the coaching process

Preparation of Coaching

The Coach needs to prepare a sound background knowledge on the group participants that will allow for the better adaptation within the emerging group. Particularly, the coach should understand the participants by identifying their motivations and expectations. In the context of the explored approaches to ICH the coach can prepare a pre-session form including questions exploring participants attitudes, understanding of ICH, level of stereotypical perception and knowledge of historical, geographic and cultural contexts.

The Coach needs to secure appropriate conditions for coaching, taking into consideration the group size and the planned activities, so that the atmosphere is appropriate. The premises need to be also equipped with the appropriate IT tools, needed for the conduct of the coaching session(s).

The Coach needs to take into consideration the length of the planned coaching and to consider its start and end point in order to best exploit the participants concentration and ability to focus during the activities. With regard to the ICH organizers should consider appropriate and enriching venues that deliver direct or indirect associations with the discussed topics.

ICH sessions feature two essential components: learning and reflecting. Hence, the learning part should contain easy-to-apprehend and attractively presented information on the discussed topic that delivers a solid background for the reflecting part. The reflecting part aims to encourage curiosity, comparative and critical reflections, extracting deposits of own knowledge in search of understanding for the history and logic of ICH.

The Session

Whereas the session's aim and priorities are identified by the organizers, the process needs to start with an ice-breaking session, building a connection and the conduct of a brief Q&A aiming to identify the level of awareness of the subject by the participants. The next step is a review of the actions to be taken and reference to basic necessary information. Importantly, the participants need to be led by a clear, specific, and participant-driven objective for the current session to maintain focus. The use of the prepared educational materials, including videos, interviews and reading materials delivers the needed substantial content and food for thought for the deliberative part.

Following the InThrace logic, the purpose of the coaching sessions is not solely to replicate and refer to the existing ICH knowledge and examples, but to deliver content for wider reflections on social, economic, political and cultural implications related to the existence and endurance of ICH. During the deliberative part of the session, numerous thoughts can appear and the moderator can use a "parking lot" to acknowledge important but off-topic issues for future sessions. Once recognizing the achievement of the goals set, the session can move to its completion.

Session closing

The final phase of the session is devoted to the assessment, feedback and feedforward activities. The moderator can reach out for formal (in the form of assessment cards) or informal (oral) feedback from the participants. Based on the discussion and its conclusions, the moderator can deliver further recommendations for exploration or development of the discussed topics.

With regard to the ICH the participants should be encouraged to reach for comparative research and analysis in terms of finding similarities, connections and relations that reveal the system of interactions that creates the fabric of European distinctiveness, embedded in shared philosophy, interactions and legacy.

Coaching plan

Within this part, several coaching templates will be provided that encompass a comprehensive, exciting, and engaging training and educational path. The program aims to help coaches obtaining practical examples how to approach, use and operate with InTrace materials that have been created such as

- the Handbook on Integration of Intangible Heritage,
- the Model for Interpretation, Integration and Management,
- the Manual on Intangible Heritage,
- Videos and
- Interviews related to the Manual and the Handbook.

The coaching plan will answer the question of how to prepare a coaching plan and will contain the following points:

- Preliminary requirements
- Audience specifics (socio-cultural, personal, professional, conflict resolution and problem-solving competencies)
- technical provisions of the coaching
- thematic content of the training module

With regard to **preliminary requirements**, each coach needs to identify the minimum prerequisites for a person to attend the modules. These can be associated with the level of study, previous courses undertaken, competence in English language etc. Table 1 illustrates an example of preliminary requirements.

Table 1: Indicative requirements

Preliminary requirements can include the following

Describe any requirements or limitations that need to be established in advance for the successful application of this training.

Example:

The trainees should have a theoretical knowledge of the specific lesson unit before they undertake this section.

With regard to **audience specifics** (socio-cultural, personal, professional, conflict resolution and problem-solving competencies), the coach can specify and define that the trainees need to have a team work spirit since participants can be asked to work on case studies based on the material created.

We provide an example in order for the coach to understand the significance of competences: A trainee reads individually Chapter 7 from the Handbook that is titled Marketing and methods of promoting ICH. Personal competences are needed and thus, these can be defined by the coach. Then, trainees can be asked to work in teams and create videos, advertising campaigns etc for which they need to develop team work and problem-solving competencies. These are audience specifics on which trainees can be assessed and the coach can define. Figure 1 from the Model presents indicative competencies.

Figure 1: Indicative Monitoring and Assessment Activities and Criteria as Described in the Model

Components	Monitoring Activities	Examples
Knowledge (K)	- Assess whether students understood main concepts and whether they can apply them in case studies.	- Case studies for the implementation of an advertising campaign.
Emotional Impact (E)	- Evaluate to which level students are engaged with the communities from where they choose to work the case studies.	-Development of real case studies from students' homeland.
Intellectual Connection (I)	-Solutions students propose for the promotion of ICH.	- Videos created by students in relation to the case study.

Evaluation Criteria	Focus Areas	Methods
Relevance	Did the case studies students choose to align with marketing and communication campaigns for the promotion of ICH?	- Social media campaigns created by students to promote the ICH of the case study they choose.

Effectiveness	To what extent did students apply the theoretical concepts in the real cases with the appropriate methods?	- Continuous assessment on the steps followed to finalise the case study of the promotional plan for ICH.
Sustainability	Are the proposed suggestions on promotion activities sustainable for the real-world ICH case study that students choose to present?	- Real world cases with photos and videos and or posters created by students related to specific communities and their heritage traditions.
Impact	Do students' suggestions promote innovative ways of promoting ICH of an area under study?	- Students evaluate the projects of other teams. -Feedback from questionnaires collected on what needs to be further done

With regard to **technical provisions** of the coaching, the coach may require specific programs that the trainee can use. For example, the use of Canva in order for videos and interviews that trainees will create to have a homogeneous format. In addition, the trainee may work on quizzes to show how well s/he comprehended the theoretical part. Each module from the Handbook has indicative quizzes with right and wrong answers in the form of multiple choice.

Table 2 presents indicative technical provisions

Table 2: Indicative technical provisions

<p>Describe the educational tools and media used by the specific course, such as tools and media from a Learning Management System (Moodle, eClass) or other online tools (e.g., Padlet), repositories, or any physical media like 3D models.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>Moodle tools:</p> <p>Activity assignment</p> <p>Quiz, Forum, book</p>
--

Regarding the **thematic content** of the training module, coaches have access to different materials that can be used in the modules. Each chapter prepared in the Handbook that has different thematics (for example, chapter 7 Marketing and methods of promoting ICH) is divided in 3-4 modules that are directly related to the chapter of the handbook. This is the theoretical part. Then, coaches can connect and interrelate these modules with cases presented from the manual in addition to videos and interviews that relate with the handbook. Table 3 presents indicative ways for the coach to provide his/her content and Table 4 presents chapter's 7 structure.

Table 3: Indicative thematic content

Categorise your course in terms of the level of study it is intended for and its type. For example: Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Laboratory, Exercise, Seminar, Lifelong Program, Video tutorial, etc.

COACHING PLAN FOR CHAPTERS - MODELS

COACHING PLAN Chapter 4		
Training (Course)	Module	Heritage, Tourism, and Society
Thematic (Section)	content	Understanding Heritage in the Tourism Context & Tourism Impacts on Culture, Economy, and Society
Duration		2 sessions × 90 minutes
Framework Of methods		Blended Modern Classroom Education Method (in-person lecture & discussion with synchronous online participation; supplemented with asynchronous readings and activities)
	Aim and Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To introduce students to definitions and typologies of heritage (tangible/intangible, movable/immovable). - To critically assess the cultural, economic, and social impacts of tourism on heritage. - To discuss challenges of heritage commodification and strategies for sustainable practices.

<p>Abstract</p>	<p>This module explores how heritage functions within tourism frameworks. It introduces key concepts of heritage typology, examines its role as identity and historical legacy, and highlights the double-edged effects of commodification. Case studies such as Venice, Machu Picchu, Kumrovec, and Rovinj illustrate opportunities and risks of heritage tourism. Students engage with participatory approaches, policy debates, and sustainable practices that balance tourism development with cultural safeguarding.</p> <p>Heritage, Tourism, Identity, Commodification, Sustainability</p>
<p>Key words</p> <p>Learning Outcomes</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Distinguish between tangible/intangible, movable/immovable heritage. - Explain how heritage tourism shapes cultural identity and community development. - Evaluate the economic potential and social tensions of mass tourism. - Propose sustainable models of heritage tourism based on case studies.
<p>Preliminary requirements</p> <p>Describe any requirements or limitations that need to be established in advance for the successful application of this training.</p> <p>Example:</p>	<p>Basic knowledge of cultural heritage and introductory tourism studies.</p>

<p>The trainees should have a theoretical knowledge of the specific lesson unit before they undertake this section.</p>	
<p>Technical provisions of the coaching</p> <p>(Educational Tools & Means)</p> <p>Describe the educational tools and media used by the specific course, such as tools and media from a Learning Management System (Moodle, eClass) or other online tools (e.g., Padlet), repositories, or any physical media like 3D models.</p> <p>Example:</p> <p>Moodle tools:</p> <p>Activity assignment</p> <p>Quiz, Forum, book</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - LMS (Moodle/eClass) with uploaded readings and quizzes - Multimedia presentations (slides, video clips on UNESCO sites) - Interactive mapping tools (Padlet or Miro boards for community mapping exercises)

<p>Course Description</p> <p>Categorise your course in terms of the level of study it is intended for and its type. For example: Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Laboratory, Exercise, Seminar, Lifelong Program, Video tutorial, etc.</p>	<p>Graduate / Seminar with blended learning elements.</p>
<p>Basic Flow – Phases</p> <p>Describe the basic flow and phases of your training session</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Introduction & Concepts (definitions, typologies, UNESCO frameworks). 2. Tourism Impacts (positive & negative; case studies of Venice, Machu Picchu). 3. Group Activity (mapping local heritage values and risks). 4. Discussion (balancing identity, tourism, and sustainability). 5. Conclusion & Reflection (key lessons, link to policy frameworks).

COACHING PLAN Chapter 7

Description	<p>Module 7 emphasises the importance of marketing concepts in promoting intangible values. Cultural management applies marketing principles based on the four Ps: product, place, promotion, and price. It also highlights digital tools that can be utilised for recognising and preserving the ICH. The module further stresses essential ethical considerations related to people’s cultural artefacts, especially within the context of AI technologies. Risks include data misuse, cultural biases, and potential exclusion from digital advancement. Main marketing concerns should centre on respecting inclusivity and the rights and cultures of indigenous peoples and knowledge systems.</p>	
Learning objectives	<p>By the end of this module, learners will be able to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify the importance of promoting, preserving and protecting the intangible heritage of diverse cultures and settings 2. Apply the marketing methodologies that refer to the four Ps (product, place, promotion, price) on various ICH settings and cases 3. Analyse how technology and digital tools can become an asset or a risk with regards to the protection and preservation of ICH 4. Propose a synthesis of technological tools, knowledge and methodologies to be applied on a scenario in which testimonials of ICH need to be safeguarded, protected and transmitted to future generations 	
No. hours	[180 minutes]	
Lessons	Lesson Title	Duration
	Lesson 1. Marketing Theory concepts	[45 minutes]
	Lesson 2. Digital Tools	[45 minutes]
	Lesson 3. Ethical considerations	[45 minutes]

	Lesson 4. Application of theory to a real-world case study scenario	[45 minutes]
--	---	--------------

Table 4 below summarises the above detailed coaching plan that can be used as a template for coaches.

COACHING PLAN	
Training Module (Course)	
Thematic content (Section)	
Duration	
Framework of methods	<p>Describe the framework of your course—choose from the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Modern Classroom Teaching Method: In-person trainees meet at a shared location and time, experiencing the same combination of personal teaching experiences. • Modern Online Education Method: Live mandatory online sessions at set times (fully online application) • Asynchronous Online Education Method: Fully online delivery without compulsory live sessions (asynchronous study of material) • Blended Online Education Method: Fully online application with both mandatory live sessions at set times and asynchronous study of material. • Blended Modern Classroom Education Method: In-person trainees meet

	<p>simultaneously in a shared place and time and experience the same combination of in-person teaching experiences alongside online trainees who are connected synchronously via live streaming technology</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hybrid Education Method: a combination of in-person teaching with online content delivered synchronously or asynchronously.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Aim and Objectives 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Abstract 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Key words 	
Learning Outcomes	

Preliminary requirements

Describe any requirements or limitations that need to be established in advance for the successful application of this training.

Example:

The trainees should have a theoretical knowledge of the specific lesson unit before they undertake this section.

Technical provisions of the coaching

(Educational Tools & Means)

Describe the educational tools and media used by the specific course, such as tools and media from a Learning Management System (Moodle, eClass) or other online tools (e.g., Padlet), repositories, or any physical media like 3D models.

Example:

Moodle tools:

Activity assignment

Quiz, Forum, book

<p>Course Description</p> <p>Categorise your course in terms of the level of study it is intended for and its type. For example: Undergraduate, Postgraduate, Laboratory, Exercise, Seminar, Lifelong Program, Video tutorial, etc.</p>	
<p>Basic Flow – Phases</p> <p>Describe the basic flow and phases of your training session</p>	

The diagram below presents the basic flow – phases of the training session, integrating the essential elements (Preliminary requirements, Audience specifics, technical provisions of the coaching, thematic content of the training module).

Figure 2: Basic Flow – Phases

we have the figure in the word doc we could not embed

Source: Own authors

Didactic materials and tools

These guidelines established coaching models with InTHRACE’s Interpretation = $(K + E) \times I$ principle (Knowledge + Emotional Impact, multiplied by Intellectual Connection) to sustain culturally grounded outcomes. Through embedding the $K \times E \times I$ model into coaching methodologies, we align knowledge, emotion, and intellectual connection with concrete didactic materials that make practice immediate.

But the overall approach also considers the other three components: GROW, OSCAR, and CLEAR. In GROW, K arises from options informed by governance (guide sheets/“inventory template,” consent checklist, and policy map), while E is activated through community narratives captured and developed in lightning demos or case clinics; I is consolidated with criteria and reflection using the $K \times E \times I$ journal, the quality rubric, and a commitment scale at

the close (OSCAR-style). In CLEAR, E is ensured by safe listening and co-created participation rules, operationalized through the session micro-contract, plain-language guide, and feedback ladder for respectful validation; I results from co-contracting (visible norms on a board - Miro/Excalidraw or flipchart) that anchors interpretations and decisions. In OSCAR, K rests on baseline data (1–10 scales, a recorded starting line in a simple form), and I materialize in scaling and review through the Action Planning Canvas, evidence logs (consented artifacts), quick polls, and retrospective cycles. Thus, each methodological step is directly linked to tools and supports - such as fillable templates, collaboration boards, UDL checklists, rubrics, reflection journals, and low-tech alternatives - that ensure K (rigor), E (meaning), and I (critical thinking) occur in a visible, inclusive, and measurable manner.

Frameworks compared

The following matrix provides a quick, side-by-side comparison of three widely used coaching models - GROW, CLEAR, and OSCAR - so you can select the approach that suits your teaching process more efficiently. Read across each row to see the purpose, when to use, step-by-step flow, and sample coach/participant prompts, plus typical pitfalls and variations for 1:1 vs. group delivery.

Use it in planning to match the model to your scenario (for instance, sensitive topics → CLEAR; time-bound outcomes → GROW; progress tracking → OSCAR), and during sessions to keep your facilitation focused.

The matrix also nudges you to embed K×E×I - grounding options in Knowledge, surfacing Emotion through stories and safe listening, and strengthening Intellectual connection with criteria, scaling, and reflection. Treat it as a living reference: start with one model, blend elements as needs evolve, and always pair with inclusive practices (UDL checks, plain language, multimodal tools, among others).

Table 1 - Coaching Frameworks briefly

Frame work	Purpose	Best When	Step-by-Step Flow	Coach Prompts	Participant Prompts	Pitfalls	1:1 vs Group Variations
GROW	Goal-oriented progress	Clear aims; limited time	Goal → Reality → Options → Will	“What outcome matters to your community?”	“Given our constraints, which option honors	Jumping to options, weak commitment	In group, co-create a shared goal; assign sub-

					consent?"		goals per role
--	--	--	--	--	-----------	--	----------------

CLEAR	Relationships & ethical	Sensitive topics, community dynamics	Contract → Listen → Explore → Action → Review	"What agreement ensure safe participation?"	"What concerns do we need to name before acting?"	Vague contracting; skipping review	In a group, co-contract norms; use listening rounds
--------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------	---	---	---	------------------------------------	---

OSCAR	Outcomes + scaling	Tracking progress over time	Outcomes → Situations → Choices → Actions → Review	"How will we know we're at 7/10?"	"What small action lifts us one step?"	Over-scoring; no baseline	In a group, visible scale poll; pair on micro-actions
--------------	--------------------	-----------------------------	--	-----------------------------------	--	---------------------------	---

Embed KxEI: in **GROW** (K=options informed by governance; E=community narratives; I=criteria & reflection), **CLEAR** (E=safe listening; I=co-contract), **OSCAR** (K=baseline data; I=scaling & review).

How-To (scripts & steps)

This section turns the frameworks into actionable steps you can implement immediately. For each stage - contracting (CLEAR), goal setting (GROW/OSCAR), reality scan, options design, commitment, and review - you'll get concise scripts, timing cues, and sample prompts for both 1:1 and group formats. Each step links to the suggested didactic tools (for instance, micro-contract card, consent checklist, KxEI journal, action-planning canvas, and scaling polls) and includes inclusive elements (plain language, UDL checks, and multimodal options). Use the scripts verbatim when starting, then adapt the tone and depth to the context - especially for sensitive topics. Begin with CLEAR's safety contract; time-bound outcomes lean on GROW; multi-week progress uses OSCAR's scaling and review.

- **Contracting (CLEAR):** "We will use first-person statements, name limits, and pause on any item that risks breaching consent."

- **Goal setting (GROW/OSCAR):** “By week 4, produce a community-approved 1-page ICH inventory entry + audio snippet.”
- **Reality scan:** “What policies/registries matter for this element?” (link to national registers; EU context; national context).
- **Options:** “What low-tech + digital paths exist? (audio, photo, sketch, map).”
- **Will/Action:** “Who does what by Friday; what evidence goes into the shared archive?”
- **Review:** “What did we learn about governance or consent we must document?”

With these scripts and steps, start simple, run the plan, and iterate visibly. Anchor every move in K×E×I (rigor, meaning, critical thinking), uphold safety and consent through CLEAR style contracting, and convert intentions into action with GROW/OSCAR commitments and scaling. Always try to capture light evidence as you go, such as rubrics, quick polls, and artifact snapshots, among others. Keep low-tech backups ready and note one improvement to test next time. When the context shifts, such as stakeholders, constraints, or sensitivity, return to the decision cues, remix the students' tasks, and recontract. The goal isn't perfect delivery; it's reliable, inclusive progress you can prove and improve.

Selecting a methodology (Decision Tree – plain text)

This plain-text decision tree is a quick diagnostic tool to help you match the coaching approach to the real situation at hand. Start by scanning for sensitivity (identity, power, consent) to decide if you need a brief CLEAR contract first. If the outcome is time-bound with a concrete deliverable, steer toward the GROW model. If you need to track progress over several weeks, use OSCAR with scaling and regular reviews. Many sessions incorporate mixed approaches: CLEAR for safety, GROW for focus, and OSCAR to sustain momentum. At each branch, apply K×E×I - ground choices in Knowledge, invite Emotion through story and respectful listening, and sharpen Intellectual connection with criteria, scaling, and reflection.

1. **Is the topic sensitive or identity-laden?** → **CLEAR** first (contract & safety).
2. **Is the outcome time-bound with a clear deliverable?** → **GROW** for focus.
3. **Do you need visible progress over weeks?** → **OSCAR** with scaling & reviews.
4. **Mixed needs?** → Start **CLEAR** (5–8 min), then **GROW/OSCAR** for planning & tracking.

Use the decision tree as a compass. Begin where the context demands, often with a brief CLEAR contract, then move into GROW to focus action, and OSCAR to sustain momentum and evidence progress. Keep K×E×I in view at every branch: ground choices in Knowledge, honor Emotion through safe listening and community narratives, and strengthen Intellectual connection with explicit criteria, scaling, and reflection. If conditions change (stakeholders, sensitivity, time), revisit the tree, remix your prompts, and re-contract. The win is not picking a “perfect” model - it's making inclusive, ethical progress you can show and improve.

Below is a practical walkthrough that applies the **Decision Tree (Selecting a Methodology)** to **Chapter 6 – Module 6** scenarios (Fado case; four 60-minute lessons). Each mini-case illustrates the branch points (sensitivity, time-bound deliverables, and multi-week tracking), the chosen framework(s), and the precise moves, prompts, and artifacts aligned with the lesson plans.

Table 2 - Selector Table - Chapter 6 Scenarios → Framework Path

Scenario (from Chapter 6)	Key Decision Tree Branch	Framework Path	Why this path	Core Outputs
L1 ICH Evidence Sprint on Fado basics	Low sensitivity; time-bound draft	GROW	Clear 20–25' deliverable (markers on a map)	6–8 ICH markers; 150-word notes; map pins; peer shares
L2 Power–Interest Role-Play (Fado Charter)	High sensitivity (power, consent)	CLEAR → GROW	Contract for safety first, then plan clauses, and next steps	Micro-contract; 8–10 charter clauses; owners for revisions
L3 Theory of Change Canvas	Medium sensitivity; multi-week progress	GROW → OSCAR	Set outcomes, then scale/review across weeks	ToC canvas; 6+ indicators; baseline & 1–10 progress scale
L4 Risk-to-Safeguard Lab	High sensitivity (commodification, filming)	CLEAR → OSCAR	Safety & norms first; track mitigation KPIs over time	Safeguard pack; 5 risks→5 safeguards; KPI dashboard sketch

Below is **the class plan for the four Chapter 6 classes, using the Fado case from Chapter 6 as a case study**. Each plan is ready to run, including concrete tools, low-tech fallbacks, accessibility, privacy, and evidence capture. Timings assume a 60-minute session.

Class 1 - ICH Evidence Sprint (Mapping Fado Markers)

Objective (outcome by the end of class)

- Teams produce **6–8 ICH markers** (150-word notes + map pins) with basic consent recorded.

Core ICT stack

- Data capture: Google Forms → Google Sheets
- Visualization: Google My Maps (or ArcGIS Online)
- Whiteboard: Excalidraw or Miro (low bandwidth mode)
- File store: Shared Drive/OneDrive with folder permissions
- Accessibility: Live captions (Zoom/Meet) + auto-transcript

Run-of-show (60')

1. (5') Kick-off & micro-contract (privacy, consent). Quick poll (Slido/Zoom) to confirm agreement.
2. (8') Demo: sample marker (K×E×I) on shared board; show Form fields.
3. (20') Teamwork: each team submits markers via **Form** (fields: Location, 150-word description, Tags, Consent tick boxes).
4. (12') Map build: import Form responses from Sheets → **My Maps**; teams place/adjust pins; add one supporting quote/image per pin with source.
5. (10') Gallery Walk: screen-share the map; 1-minute per team; quick emoji reactions in chat.
6. (5') Evidence snapshot: export CSV + map link; micro-survey (3 items) on relevance & clarity.

Assessment & evidence

- Sheet of markers (completeness & quality rubric 1–4).
- My Maps layer (pins ≥6 per team).
- Micro-survey results (reaction level).

Accessibility & inclusion

- Provide **text-only** template (DOC/PDF) mirroring the Form.
- Alt-text for images; high-contrast board backgrounds; keyboard navigation.

Plan B (no/low tech)

- Printed map + sticky notes; capture with phone photo → upload later.
- Offline DOC template; coach enters data into Sheets after class.

Class 2 - Power–Interest Role-Play (Fado Experience Charter)

Objective

- Draft **8–10 charter clauses** (consent, recording etiquette, capacity, benefit-sharing) with roles acknowledged and priorities voted.

Core ICT stack

- Whiteboard: Miro/Excalidraw (columns per stakeholder)
- Voting: Slido/Zoom Polls (ranked or multi-selected)
- Co-editing: Google Docs/OnlyOffice with *Suggesting* mode
- Records: Version history + PDF export

Run-of-show (60')

1. (5') CLEAR micro-contract slide; 1-question poll "Do you agree to the norms?" (Yes/Not yet - ask).
2. (10') Role set-up on whiteboard: columns = Singer, House Owner, Museum, Tour Operator, City; participants add needs/concerns as sticky notes.
3. (20') Clause drafting in **shared Doc** (one per clause; sentence stem provided). Assign a "clause owner" (initials).
4. (10') **Poll** to prioritise top 8–10 clauses; display results; discuss any red-flag tensions.
5. (10') Final tidy-up in Doc (*Suggesting*), add *Enforcement* field per clause.
6. (5') Export v0.9 to PDF; assign owners for v1.0 before next class.

Assessment & evidence

- Doc with track changes, poll report, stakeholder board screenshot.
- Quality rubric (clarity, enforceability, FPIC present, stakeholder balance).

Accessibility & inclusion

- Provide plain-language clauses; bilingual glossary if needed.
- Offer "chat-only" contributions for low-audio contexts.

Plan B

- Paper clause cards and dot stickers for voting; scan with your phone; the coach compiles the Document post-class.

Class 3 - Theory of Change (Indicators & Benefits)

Objective

- Build a **ToC canvas** with **≥6 indicators**, owners, baselines, and a first 1–10 OSCAR scale entry.

Core ICT stack

- Database: Notion or Airtable (tables: Outcomes, Indicators, Owners)
- Dashboard: Looker Studio/Metabase (reads from Sheets/CSV)
- Tasking: Trello/Planner with due dates and "Definition of Done"

- Scale capture: Quick Google Form (indicator, date, rating 1–10)

Run-of-show (60')

1. (7') Show ToC template (screen share) + one worked example.
2. (18') Breakouts populate Notion/Airtable: Inputs → Activities → Outputs → Outcomes → Impact; add **Indicator name, unit, owner, frequency**.
3. (10') **Baseline capture** via Form (1–10) for two priority indicators per team.
4. (15') Auto-refresh **dashboard** to display baselines; discuss “target deltas” and measurement cadence.
5. (10') Create **Trello cards** for the next two actions per indicator (owner, due date, evidence link).

Assessment & evidence

- ToC database entries (exportable CSV).
- Form responses (baseline).
- Dashboard screenshot: task board with assigned owners.

Accessibility & inclusion

- Provide ToC in DOC table format; ensure all links are keyboard accessible.
- Use readable fonts and color-blind-safe KPI highlights.

Plan B

- Paper ToC canvas; manual tally chart for baselines; coach enters digitally after class.

Class 4 - Risk → Safeguard Lab (KPIs & Implementation)

Objective

- Produce a **Safeguard Pack**: 5 priority risks each mapped to 1 safeguard, 1 KPI, threshold, and review date; set up a light incident feedback loop.

Core ICT stack

- QR feedback: Google Form (3-item “signal” survey) with QR codes for physical spaces
- KPI Sheet: Conditional formatting (red/amber/green thresholds)
- Monthly report: Auto-generated PDF from Looker Studio/Sheets
- Repository: Structured folders (Year/Month/Safeguards)

Run-of-show (60')

1. (5') CLEAR reminder: non-blaming stance; community agency as north star.

2. (15') Teams fill **Risk→Safeguard** table in a shared Sheet (columns: Risk | Safeguard | KPI | Threshold | Owner | Review Date).
3. (10') Generate **QR codes** for the micro-feedback Form (e.g., "Respect the silence" signage); paste into a shared slide.
4. (15') KPI Sheet: set conditional formatting and small sparkline trends; agree data collection cadence.
5. (10') Auto-report: build a simple Looker Studio page reading the Sheet; export a sample PDF; set a calendar reminder for monthly review.
6. (5') Closure: each team states one KPI that most protects agency and why.

Assessment & evidence

- Completed Safeguard Sheet; QR Form link & sample scans; sample PDF report.
- Rubric (completeness, measurability, relevance to safeguarding).

Accessibility & inclusion

- Provide printable feedback slips (if no smartphones); allow voice notes submitted later.
- Ensure QR posters have large fonts and high contrast.

Plan B

- Manual incident tally on paper; monthly phone survey; later digitization.

Cross-class ICT governance (applies to all)

Privacy & consent

- Forms include explicit checkboxes (audio, image, public sharing); default sharing = restricted.
- Pseudonymize participant names (initials); store only necessary data; apply a Creative Commons license where appropriate (e.g., CC BY-NC).

Accessibility

- Captions enabled; transcripts shared; PDFs are text-based and screen-reader friendly; all images carry alt-text.

Data hygiene & backups

- Weekly export CSV/PDF of key artifacts (Forms, Sheets, Docs, Dashboards).
- One owner per artifact; folder naming convention: YYYY-MM_ClassX_Artifact.

Light automation

- Form → Sheet triggers “thanks” email with next steps.
- Monthly scheduled email with dashboard snapshot to stakeholders.

Forms to use

A) Marker (Class 1) – Form field list

- Location/Neighbourhood; 150-word description; Tags (instrument/space/etiquette/...); Quote (optional); Image link (optional); Consent: audio [Y/N], image [Y/N], public sharing [Y/N].

B) Clause stem (Class 2)

- “To protect [practice/people], [stakeholder] agrees to [action/limit]. Enforcement: [how/when/by whom].”

C) Indicator record (Class 3)

- Indicator | Unit | Owner | Frequency | Baseline (1–10) | Target (1–10) | Next review date | Evidence link

D) Risk→Safeguard row (Class 4)

- Risk | Safeguard | KPI | Threshold (R/A/G) | Owner | Data source | Review date | Notes

Mini checklists

ICT Accessibility (each class)

- Captions on; transcript saved
- High-contrast visuals; alt-text present
- Keyboard-friendly links and forms
- Low-bandwidth alternative provided

ICT Evidence & Follow-through

- Artifact exported (CSV/PDF/map link)
- Rubric applied & logged
- Owner + due date assigned
- Next review meeting scheduled

One-line rationale

Embedding ICT at each step makes **CLEAR** visible (digital norms & consent), **GROW** shippable (fillable templates, polls, boards), and **OSCAR** measurable (scales, dashboards, scheduled reviews) - while keeping privacy, accessibility, and low-tech fallbacks front and center.

Operationalizing SDT & Growth Mindset

This section translates motivation theory into practical coaching strategies. We anchor Self-Determination Theory (SDT) by designing sessions that protect autonomy (meaningful choices of task, role, or medium), build competence (clear success criteria, small wins, timely feedback), and strengthen relatedness (trust, peer support, and community recognition). In parallel, we cultivate a growth mindset by normalizing productive struggle, using “not yet” language, and treating errors as data for iteration. You’ll find simple levers - choice boards, scaffolded templates, peer-coaching triads, error-analysis rounds, and brief reflection prompts - that fit 1:1, group, and hybrid formats. Each lever ties back to our K×E×I lens: rigorous Knowledge, meaningful Emotion, and deliberate Intellectual connection. Use these moves to elevate engagement without adding complexity, so participants leave each session feeling that they have chosen this, they can do this, and they belong here.

- **Autonomy:** choice of ICH element/medium; optional roles (researcher, interviewer, editor).
- **Competence:** scaffolded templates; quick wins (example, 150-word inventory note).
- **Relatedness:** peer triads; community co-review; acknowledgement rituals.
- **Growth mindset scripts:** “We’re not there yet. What one prompt improves our consent note?”

Bring it home by closing each session with a quick check against SDT and growth-mindset cues:

- Did we offer real choice (autonomy), enable a visible win (competence), and foster connection (relatedness)?
- Did we frame effort and errors as steps toward “not yet → next”?

Capture one concrete improvement (for instance, simplify criteria, add a peer triad, shorten feedback loops) and schedule the smallest possible practice rep before the next session. Keep K×E×I in view, considering pair rigorous Knowledge with meaningful Emotion and deliberate Intellectual reflection, and log evidence (micro-surveys, rubrics, brief reflections), so motivation isn’t a slogan, it’s a measured habit.

Micro-interactions that boost engagement

Small, well-timed moves can significantly alter the entire dynamic of a session. Micro-interactions, such as 30- to 180-second check-ins, think-pair-share bursts, emoji or quick-poll pulses, reflective pauses, and peer-feedback ladders, not only create rhythm but also raise

psychological safety and keep attention cycling between input and action. They're low-cost and inclusive. Check the examples of micro-interaction:

- **90-second check-ins** (“One word: how’s your energy?”)
- **Think-Pair-Share** on an ethical dilemma.
- **Reflective pauses** (60 seconds of silent writing → 2-minute debrief).
- **Peer feedback ladders:** Clarify → Value → Concerns → Suggestions.

Over time, these small moves compound - resulting in higher participation, clearer artifacts, and a group that expects to think, contribute, and make progress together. Inclusive design & accessibility (UDL checks)

Make every activity usable from the start by the broadest range of participants, in different languages, with varying bandwidth, devices, and sensory/cognitive profiles, without special requests.

- **Plain language, multimodal options** (audio/photo/text); **cognitive load** (chunking; 20-minute blocks); **captioned media; keyboard-only paths; color-contrast friendly docs; scaffolded instructions.**
- **UDL mini check:** “Multiple means of *engagement, representation, and action/expression* included?”
- Aligns with InTHRACE’s emphasis on community empowerment, technology, and governance fit for purpose.

Use the following matrix to determine the level of adaptation to carry out:

Table 3 - Participant Profiles → Adaptations

Profile	Facilitation Tactics
Novice	Concrete examples: model one artifact end-to-end; pair with an advanced peer.
Intermediate	Choice of tools: mini crits focused on depth & accuracy.
Advanced	Lead a fishbowl; mentor novices; evidence standards.
Introvert	Silent ideation → written chat → voluntary voice.
Extrovert	Time-boxed rounds; assign “summarizer” role.

Remote/Hybrid Clear audio, captioning, asynchronous boards, and shared templates.

Multilingual Glossaries, visuals, bilingual prompts, and pair translation buddies.

Neurodiverse Predictable agenda; written + visual instructions; sensory breaks; alternative demonstration modes.

Session Architecture & Run-of-Show

This section turns design into action, minute by minute. You'll find ready-to-use blueprints for 60- and 90-minute sessions, as well as four-session dynamics, each with clear objectives, materials, coach scripts, engagement touchpoints (including check-ins, pair work, and debriefs), and light assessment moments. Every run-of-show weaves K×E×I (Knowledge, Emotion, Intellectual connection) with CLEAR for safety and norms, GROW for focus and deliverables, and OSCAR for visible progress. Built-in Plan B options cover tech failure, low participation, and time overruns, with low-tech equivalents and UDL-minded accessibility so you can facilitate with confidence today.

60-Minute Session Blueprint

- **Objectives:** apply K×E×I to a selected ICH element; produce a 150-word draft + consent checklist.
- **Agenda:**
 1. Welcome & contract (CLEAR micro-contract) – 6'
 2. Mini-input: K×E×I with example – 8'
 3. Breakouts: draft inventory snippet (template) – 20'
 4. Peer feedback ladder – 12'
 5. Commitments (OSCAR scaling) – 8'
 6. Close & async task – 6'
- **Materials:** inventory template; consent checklist; timer; captions.
- **Coach script (samples):**
 - "Contract: confidential, consent-first, community-owned artifacts."
 - "Recall: Interpretation = (K + E) × I. Name your K (facts), your E (story), and how you'll prompt I (questions/links)."
- **Assessment moments:** peer ladder notes; scale self-rating (1–10).

90-Minute Session Blueprint

- Adds **live ethics scenario** (10') and **tool demo** (whiteboard/poll) (10'), plus a **mini retrospective** (5').
- "Plan B" inserts: offline worksheets if whiteboard fails; SMS backchannel if VC fails.

Four-Session Dynamics (bi-weekly)

1. **Discover & Contract** (CLEAR + K×E×I primer).
2. **Document & Design** (GROW planning; artifact v1).
3. **Debate & Decide** (ethics fishbowl; governance mapping).
4. **Deliver & Review** (OSCAR review; publish to shared archive with community sign-off).

Contingencies

- **Tech failure:** switch to phone audio; share static PDFs; capture via chat.
- **Low participation:** assign rotating roles; use 1-2-4-All; micro-choices.
- **Time overruns:** parking lot; slip one item to the async forum.
- **Challenging dynamics:** invoke contract; structured turn-taking; private check-ins.

After each session, close with three key steps: reconfirm the contract (what worked, what needs adjustment), log light evidence (e.g., rubric slice, 1–10 scale, artifact snapshot), and outline the next step with the owner and the date. If the context shifts, reopen the blueprint, simplify, and reestablish the micro-rhythms (brief reflective pauses and peer feedback) that keep energy high. The goal isn't strict scripting, but rather a reliable rhythm, inclusion, and results: use CLEAR for safety, GROW for action, OSCAR for continuity - always guided by K×E×I and UDL.

Interactive Methods & Tools (Examples)

This section is your toolbox for high-impact facilitation. Each method - case study, role plays, Socratic sprints, fishbowl, lightning demos, commitment contracts, action-planning canvases, peer-coaching triads, error analysis, and retrospective circles - comes with a clear purpose, setup, step-by-step facilitation, sample coach/participant prompts, expected artifacts, timing, virtual/in-person adaptations, debrief questions, and success metrics. All activities are designed to be UDL-friendly (multiple ways to engage, access, and respond), privacy-aware (with explicit consent options), and ICT-enabled (utilizing whiteboards, forms, polls, and dashboards), with low-tech equivalents (including paper templates, dot votes, and flipcharts). Each method lists purpose, setup, steps, prompts, artifacts, timing, virtual/in-person options, debrief, and success metrics. Low-tech equivalents are provided.

1. Live Case Study (ICH Dilemma)

- **Purpose:** unlock progress on a real ICH documentation/consent challenge.
- **Setup:** 1 case-owner; 4–6 discussants; timer.
- **Steps (20'):** 2' case; 8' clarifying Qs; 6' recommendations; 4' owner reflections.

- **Prompts:** Coach “What’s the real constraint - policy, time, or consent?”; Participants “What small test respects community ownership?”
- **Artifact:** decision log + next action.
- **Metrics:** owner moves from $\leq 4/10$ to $\geq 6/10$ confidence (OSCAR scale).
- **Low-tech:** paper cards + pen.

2. Role Play: Consent & Representation

- **Purpose:** rehearse respectful interviewing; mitigate bias.
- **Steps:** pair A interviewer, B community custodian; swap; observe.
- **Prompts:** “What benefits/risks do you perceive?”
- **Success:** both articulate consent terms in plain language; note red lines.

3. Socratic Questioning Sprint

- **Purpose:** deepen I (intellectual connection).
- **Cycle:** 3 rounds of “Why?”, “What evidence?”, “Who else is affected?”
- **Artifact:** refined research question.

4. Fishbowl: Policy & Governance

- **Purpose:** surface multi-stakeholder views on registers, funding, and governance.
- **Steps:** 3 in inner circle debate; outer circle captures insights; rotate.
- **Metrics:** ≥ 3 governance implications identified.

5. Lightning Demos (Storytelling)

- **Purpose:** showcase three ways to convey E (audio, photo, mini story).
- **Artifact:** demo board + links; later used in teaching modules.

6. Commitment Contracts

- **Purpose:** create public accountability to deliver artifacts.
- **Tooling:** simple form with date, deliverable, witness/peer.

7. Action Planning Canvas

- **Purpose:** plan for the next 2 weeks (who/what/when/evidence).
- **Metric:** completion rate; KQI: % with community sign-off.

8. Peer Coaching Triads

- **Purpose:** increase relatedness & feedback density.
- **Structure:** coach ↔ coachee ↔ observer rotation; 15' cycles.

9. Error Analysis (ICH Inventory Drafts)

- **Purpose:** normalize and learn from errors (e.g., missing consent lines).
- **Output:** checklist of common pitfalls & how to fix.

10. Retrospective Circle

- **Purpose:** inspect & adapt the coaching process.
- **Prompts:** “Start/Stop/Continue”; “What did we learn about community empowerment?”

Treat these methods as modular building blocks: pick the lightest tool that achieves the outcome, add one inclusive adaptation, and define the smallest piece of evidence you'll capture. If energy levels drop, switch to a micro-interaction (such as a 90-second reset or quick poll); if complexity creeps in, revert to the low-tech version and continue moving forward. Close every activity with a short debrief (What worked? What changes next time?) and a named commitment. Over time, your records - rubric slices, 1–10 scales, artifact snapshots - will show which tools deliver the strongest engagement and transfer. Mix, match, and adapt, but stay anchored in CLEAR (safety), GROW (action), OSCAR (momentum), and K×E×I so every method leads to inclusive, ethical progress you can prove.

Several digital tools can be adopted. Please use the ones available at your university or at the e-library of InTHRACE. Some examples are:

- **Breakouts:** built-in VC rooms; Zoom, Team, Jitsi,...
- **Whiteboarding:** Miro/Excalidraw; low-tech: A3 paper.
- **Polling:** Slido/Zoom polls; low-tech: sticky dots.
- **Reflection:** Padlet/Google Docs; low-tech: index cards.
- **Habit tracking:** simple spreadsheet; personal journals.

Motivation & Persistence Beyond the Session

Learning only matters if it translates into practice. This section turns “insight” into “uptake” through a simple learning-to-doing system: spaced practice (short, repeatable reps), nudges (timed prompts and checklists), reflection journals (K×E×I notes in minutes), peer

accountability (triads and micro-reviews), manager/supervisor alignment (clear expectations and evidence), and habit scaffolds (definition of done, cues, and rewards). You'll get a 30/60/90-day Implementation Ladder, ready-to-send message scripts, and lightweight tracking (1–10 scales, rubric slices, artifact snapshots). Everything is SDT-aligned [choice (autonomy), visible wins (competence), and social glue (relatedness)] with UDL-friendly, and ICT-enabled with low-tech fallbacks so progress remains inclusive, ethical, and measurable.

Learning-to-Doing Transfer Plan

- **Spaced practice:** 15-minute weekly reps (consent script; plain-language abstracts).
- **Inter-session nudges:** calendar pings with one reflective Q (“What changed in your community conversation this week?”).
- **Reflection journals:** K/E/I sections + evidence snippet.
- **Peer accountability:** triad check-ins; publish “done list,” not just “to-do.”
- **Manager/supervisor alignment:** brief with objectives and artifacts; set expectations for applied outputs in teaching.
- **Habit formation:** tie actions to existing routines (e.g., post-class 10-minute upload to archive).

Implementation Ladder (30/60/90) – Checklist

- **First session:** contract; set 1 outcome; create shared folder; schedule triads.
- **30 days:** 1 artifact published with consent; peer review completed.
- **60 days:** module/pilot delivered; governance reflections logged.
- **90 days:** case story compiled; community feedback integrated; plan next cohort.

Measurement & Evidence of Impact

Aligned with InTHRACE’s “Monitoring & Evaluation” component and program outputs, we have created the following tables to facilitate self-assessment.

Table 4 - Matrix 2 – Measurement Levels & Instruments

Level	Outcomes	Indicators	Instruments	Cadence
Reaction	Satisfaction, perceived relevance	Session ratings; open comments	3-item survey	micro- Every session
Learning	K×E×I application; ethics	Rubric artifacts	scores on Coaching quality & transfer rubrics	At key milestones

Behavior	Teaching changes; community practice	# redesigned sessions; # community sign-offs	Observation protocol; review	30/60/90 days
Results	Partnerships; safeguarding	ICH # documented elements; policy links	Program dashboard; studies	Quarterly case studies

Table 5 - Measurement Matrix – Activities → Metrics

Activity	Metric	Data Source
Case study	Confidence lift; next action clarity	OSCAR scale; action log
Role play	Consent quality	Rubric; observer notes
Lightning demos	Reuse in class	Lesson plans; LMS artifacts
Fishbowl	Governance insights	Board capture; reflection notes
Action canvas	On-time delivery	Version history; check-ins

Rubrics (extracts)

- **Coaching quality rubric:** Contracting; question quality; inclusivity moves; time stewardship (1–4 scale).
- **Participation rubric:** Preparation; contribution; listening; follow-through (1–4).
- **Transfer-of-learning rubric:** Artefact completeness; consent quality; community alignment; evidence of use (1–4).

Survey items (examples)

- “Today’s session helped me apply KxExI to a real ICH element.” (1–5)

- “I can state our consent boundaries in plain language.” (1–5)

Observation protocol (coach/peer)

- Pre-brief (goals), live notes (prompts used, airtime), post-brief (two strengths, one improvement).

Risk Management & Ethics

The section reflects InTHRACE's emphasis on governance, stewardship, and ethical safeguards that must always be considered.

- **Confidentiality & boundaries:** store only necessary data; de-identification when sharing; community controls dissemination.
- **Psychological safety:** co-create norms; allow opt-out; offer alternate tasks.
- **Conflicts of interest:** disclosed affiliations (e.g., festival organizers).
- **Escalation:** define contacts for data breaches, participant distress, or cultural disputes.
- **Sensitive topics protocol:** STOP (Signal → Time-out → Options → Plan); consult cultural custodians; pause publication.
- **Mandatory reporting contexts:** follow institutional law/policy; document decisions.

Cultural & Modal Adaptations

One size doesn't fit all cultures, time zones, languages, and delivery modes. This section shows how to adapt coaching for cross-cultural teams, multilingual cohorts, and remote/hybrid/in-person settings without losing clarity or inclusion. You'll receive patterns for time zone-friendly scheduling and asynchronous options (pre-briefs, reflection prompts, forum replies), guidance on creating plain-language and bilingual artifacts, and tips for localizing cases while maintaining shared standards. We anchor safety with CLEAR (co-contract norms and consent), execute outcomes with GROW (time-boxed deliverables), and maintain momentum with OSCAR (scaling and periodic reviews). Throughout, keep K×E×I in view - ground choices in Knowledge of local context and policy, honor Emotion through community narratives and respectful listening, and build Intellectual connection with transparent criteria and reflection. All tactics are UDL-minded and ICT-enabled with low-tech fallbacks.

- **Cross-cultural teams:** avoid homogenizing “Europeanness”; foreground local registers and national legislation impact; promote participatory selection of what becomes “heritage.”
- **Multilingual cohorts:** bilingual glossaries; visuals; peer translators.
- **Remote vs hybrid vs in-person:** ensure equal voice (chat + mic); mirror board content to PDF; optional asynchronous submissions.

- **Time zone-friendly patterns:** rotate session times; asynchronous prep (5–7 days); office hours.
- **Async options:** pre-reads from **Handbook, Model, Manual**; forum reflections; voice notes; artifact uploads.

These guidelines operationalize the Handbook’s governance/ethics, the Model’s K×E×I architecture, and the Guidebook plan for coaches and coaching plans, ensuring that educators can run inclusive, evidence-based coaching that advances ICH interpretation, integration, and management across EU contexts.

Evaluation and feedback

Evaluation and feedback ensure that InThrace coaching remains rigorous, meaningful, and transferable to teaching and community practice. Trainers are encouraged to run evaluation as a continuous cycle across three moments:

1. Before the course (diagnostic): establish participants’ baseline knowledge, prior experience with ICH, digital readiness, and expectations.
2. During the course (formative): monitor engagement and learning-in-action, adjust pacing and methods, and provide feedforward.
3. After the course (summative + transfer): verify competence development and document how learning is applied in teaching/research or community settings (30/60/90-day follow-up when possible).

An approach to diagnostic parameters and indicators is listed below and the trainers have the opportunity to select the lightest set that provides credible evidence for the course format (single workshop vs. multi-session module).

Competence area (linked to coaching priorities)	Diagnostic parameter (baseline)	Observable indicators (during/after)	Evidence / instruments	Scoring suggestion
---	---------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------	--------------------

1) Theoretical understanding of ICH & EU context	Key concepts, typologies, UNESCO logic, links to European values; awareness of national/EU frameworks	Explains concepts accurately; makes explicit links between local ICH and European identity/common values; uses correct terminology	Short baseline quiz; concept map; 3–5 minute oral check; reflection journal (K section)	Rubric 1–4 (accuracy/clarity) or OSCAR 1–10 confidence scale
2) Methodological skills for documentation & interpretation (K×E×I)	Familiarity with field methods, inventory templates, and the (K+E)×I interpretation logic	Produces an inventory note with sources; includes community narrative (E) and reflective questions/criteria (I); avoids stereotyping	Artifact review (inventory snippet, case study); peer feedback ladder; observation notes	Rubric 1–4 per K/E/I; require minimum threshold on ethics/consent
3) Curriculum integration & session design	Experience designing learning outcomes, activities, and assessments; comfort with blended/hybrid delivery	Creates a module plan with outcomes, activities, UDL adaptations, and assessment moments; aligns tasks with Handbook/Manual/Model resources	Coaching plan template; lesson plan portfolio; micro-teaching observation	Rubric 1–4 (alignment, feasibility, inclusion)
4) Digital tools & media literacy for ICH	Ability to use LMS, repositories, simple creation tools (audio/video), and data hygiene practices	Uses appropriate tools; provides low-tech fallback; produces accessible materials (captions/alt-text);	Tool checklist; LMS activity logs; artifact metadata; accessibility check	Checklist (met/not met) + rubric 1–4 (quality)

		organizes artifacts in shared folders		
5) Ethics, consent, and governance	Understanding of consent, representation, community ownership, risk management, and data protection	Applies CLEAR contracting; documents consent; recognizes sensitive topics; pauses/adjusts when risks emerge; can justify decisions	Consent checklist; scenario role-play; decision log; incident/issue log	Pass/needs work on non-negotiables + rubric 1–4 (safeguarding)
6) Critical thinking, creativity, and problem solving	Comfort with analysis, debate, and designing solutions (e.g., tourism pressures, commodification risks)	Proposes realistic safeguards and sustainable actions; uses criteria; evaluates trade-offs; iterates based on feedback	Case clinic outputs; Theory of Change canvas; risk→safeguard table	Rubric 1–4 (reasoning, feasibility, sustainability)
7) Intercultural collaboration & civic engagement	Prior experience collaborating with diverse groups and involving communities/stakeholders	Demonstrates respectful dialogue; integrates multiple stakeholder perspectives; promotes inclusive participation and civic engagement	Peer/observer notes; group products; community co-review (when feasible)	Rubric 1–4 (inclusion, collaboration)
8) Resource mobilization & sustainability	Awareness of funding, partnerships, and maintenance of initiatives	Identifies partners/funding routes; plans responsibilities and review cadence;	Action planning canvas; stakeholder map; follow-up	Checklist + rubric 1–4 (sustainability planning)

		defines indicators for continuity	plan (30/60/90)	
--	--	-----------------------------------	-----------------	--

Feedback collection should be planned from the start and framed as part of the learning contract (CLEAR): feedback is respectful, specific, and used to improve future sessions. Trainers must be sure of making anonymity available for sensitive issues (e.g., power dynamics, inclusion, or ethical dilemmas).

A list of feedback points and tools that can be used includes:

1. End-of-session micro-survey (2–3 minutes): 2–3 items on relevance, clarity, and ability to apply + 1 open question (“What should we keep/change next time?”).
2. Mid-course pulse (for multi-session courses): short anonymous check on pace, inclusion/UDL, tool usability, and consent/safety climate.
3. End-of-course evaluation: satisfaction + perceived learning + self-rated competence change (pre/post) + most useful resource (Handbook/Manual/Model/platform).
4. Transfer check (30/60/90 days, optional but recommended): brief questionnaire or interview on what participants have implemented (e.g., redesigned lesson, community collaboration, documented ICH element, use of digital tool).

To close the loop, trainers should record one improvement decision after each course (OSCAR ‘Review’):

1. What evidence suggests a change is needed? (micro-survey + rubric results + observation notes).
2. What is the smallest change with the highest impact? (e.g., add a worked example, simplify instructions, strengthen the consent script, add a low-tech fallback, or increase peer feedback time).
3. Who owns the change and by when? (action log; update the coaching plan template accordingly).

Course format	Minimum recommended evidence	Decision cue (what to do next)
Single session / workshop (≤ 3 hours)	Baseline quick check (poll or 5-item quiz) + one assessed artifact (rubric) + end micro-survey	Revise the next delivery based on top 2 issues; keep the artifact rubric constant for comparability
Short course (2–4 sessions)	Pre/post self-assessment (OSCAR scale) + portfolio of 2–3 artifacts + mid-pulse + end evaluation	Use results to adjust pacing/tools; add one additional UDL adaptation if inclusion scores are low
Module / semester course	Rubric-based portfolio + observation protocol (peer/coach) + ToC/indicator tracking + 30/60/90 follow-up sample	Report outcomes at Reaction/Learning/Behavior levels; decide whether to update learning outcomes or assessment strategy
Sensitive/community-embedded topics	CLEAR contract evidence (micro-contract + consent log) + reflective journal prompts + anonymous feedback channel	If safety/consent indicators drop below threshold, pause publication and re-contract before proceeding

Further readings



Website

www.inthrace.unitbv.ro



Co-funded by
the European Union

2023-1-RO01-KA220-HED-00015612



INTHRACE

Civil engagement, integration and better management of the national intangible heritage to raise awareness of European common values – EU context, perspectives and active citizenship



Website

www.inthrace.unitbv.ro