Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

WP2.P – BRIDGE Teaching Guide for the Educational Use of the Digital Museum

Turning social challenges into learning opportunities

PURPOSE AND GUIDELINES FOR USE

This template provides guidance on the development of the BRIDGE Teaching Guides linked to the seven Level A Social Challenges. Each guide will draw on the Good Practices and resources of the Digital Museum to design activities aimed primarily at Higher Education, which can be adapted to other educational and social contexts.

PRESENTATION OF THE CHALLENGE

Brief description of the challenge

Challenge A.7 concerns how the digital ecosystem shapes the way people find information, form opinions and take part in public life. The Transnational Report on Social Challenges ranks it among the fully transnational Level A challenges: it appears in all six partner countries, Spain, Portugal, Greece, Italy, Poland and Germany. Interviewees repeatedly describe social networks as amplifiers of disinformation, polarisation and hate speech and point to a lack of critical skills to deal with them. Artificial Intelligence adds new questions of transparency, bias and interpretation. The report sees universities as places where critical thinking, media literacy and democratic citizenship in digital contexts must be built. BRIDGE responds by helping learners understand these mechanisms, recognise disinformation and hate speech and develop responses that strengthen a critical digital citizenship based on human rights. (923 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Educational relevance of the challenge

Many students get their news through social media, search engines and, increasingly, AI chatbots. Knowing how to use these tools is not the same as understanding them. Media literacy in higher education therefore has to go beyond checking single posts. Learners need to understand who decides what becomes visible, why emotional and polarising content travels further, and how biased data and ranking can make some groups invisible or present them as a threat. This understanding protects the capacity for independent judgement on which democratic participation depends. It also shows that disinformation and hate speech draw on existing prejudice and inequality. Universities educate future teachers, journalists, social workers, administrators and developers who will shape digital environments themselves. When they learn to verify sources, analyse the effects of platforms and AI, and respond to hate speech with arguments rather than silence, they contribute to an inclusive public sphere and to a citizenry committed to human rights and democratic values. (1,061 characters including spaces)

GENERAL INFORMATION

BRIDGE Challenge	*A.7. Digital ecosystem, disinformation and the need for media literacy and critical thinking.*
Lead partner	*University of Bayreuth (Germany)*
SDGs	*SDG 4. Quality education* *SDG 16. Peace, justice and strong institutions*
Target audience	*Primarily university students of all disciplines, in particular teacher education, media and communication studies, social sciences, education, law and computer science, and the teaching staff who work with them. The activities can be adapted to vocational training, adult education and non-formal youth work.*
BRIDGE competencies (see Annex I)	*C7.1. Knowledge of the fundamental concepts of media literacy and digital citizenship.* *C7.2. Understanding the impact of the digital ecosystem.*

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

	C7.3. Identifying disinformation and hate speech in digital environments. *C7.4. Proposing actions to promote critical digital citizenship.*
Approximate total duration	*Approximately 12 hours (six activities of 2 hours each).*

The activities can be carried out independently or as a pathway. Taken in sequence, they lead from key concepts and the role of AI (Activity 1) to the influence of platforms on opinion (Activity 2), to recognising disinformation (Activity 3) and hate speech that distorts history (Activity 4), to the critical reading of images (Activity 5) and finally to the design of learners' own actions for critical digital citizenship (Activity 6).

ORGANISATION OF THE ACTIVITIES

Activity	**Resource**
Activity 1. Who is speaking? Key concepts of media literacy in the age of AI	Good Practices: AI.D – Artificial Intelligence and the Shaping of Democracy (Germany); Ethical AI: Educate and Innovate (Costa Rica, Spain, Peru, Italy)
Activity 2. Why am I seeing this? How platforms shape opinion	Good Practices: Critical Thinking and Media Literacy, CT&ML (Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Poland, Romania); PROMIS – Promoting Social Inclusion Skills in a Post-Truth World (Romania and partners)
Activity 3. Leave the page: lateral reading against disinformation	Good Practices: Unfake your Social Media, UnfakeSoMe (Germany, France, Austria); Pantallas Amigas (Spain)
Activity 4. Distorted memory: history, hate speech and counter-speech online	Good Practices: CEMORY – Central European Memory of the Holocaust (Poland, Czech Republic); Pantallas Amigas, "Internet Tolerance" campaign (Spain)
Activity 5. What the picture does not say	Documentary photography: ten photographs for Challenge A7 in the BRIDGE Digital Museum
Activity 6. Play it forward: design an action for critical digital citizenship	Free activity: design task modelled on the UnfakeSoMe Digital Toolkit and the Cibermanagers peer-education programme (Pantallas Amigas)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

The six activities can be carried out independently, although it is recommended that, taken together, they form a pathway progressing from an understanding of the challenge towards analysis, reflection and the proposal of educational or social responses.

Where relevant, some of the activities may include a comparison of Good practices or responses developed in different national contexts.

Activity No. 1

1. Name of the activity

Who is speaking? Key concepts of media literacy in the age of AI

2. Brief description

This activity introduces the core concepts of Challenge A7 through the Good Practice AI.D – Artificial Intelligence and the Shaping of Democracy, led by Leibniz Universität Hannover with partners in Austria and Belgium. Students first take a position on statements about AI using the AI.D Me & AI barometer. In small groups they then test a generative AI tool with prepared prompts in the style of the AI.D Mega Prompts exercises and record what the answers claim, what can be verified and where they are one-sided. With concept cards they name what they observed: misinformation, disinformation, hallucination, algorithmic bias. A short version of the AI.Dialogue role-play leads to conditions for the responsible use of AI, which groups compare with the four-component AI literacy model of the Good Practice Ethical AI (awareness, capability, knowledge of functioning, critical thinking). The activity lays the conceptual basis for the pathway. (946 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education. Adaptable to Advanced Vocational Training.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for teacher education, media and communication studies, social sciences, education, law and computer science.
- Recommended number of participants: 15–30

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- Approximate age range, if applicable: 18 years and over

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☒ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☒ C7.2
☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☐ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☐ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Selected competences: C7.1. Knowledge of the fundamental concepts of media literacy and digital citizenship. C7.2. Understanding the impact of the digital ecosystem.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Define the main concepts of media literacy and digital citizenship, including disinformation, AI hallucination and algorithmic bias.
- Distinguish between accurate information, misinformation and disinformation in examples of AI-generated content.
- Explain how training data and the framing of a request influence what a generative AI tool produces.
- Formulate conditions for the responsible use of AI tools and relate them to an institutional AI literacy model.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☒ Good practice
☐ Podcast
☒ Video
☐ Other:
_____

☒ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Documentary photograph
☐ Infographic

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable:

- AI.D – Artificial Intelligence and the Shaping of Democracy, BRIDGE Digital Museum, https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=MTEz. Associated resources: Me & AI positions barometer, Mega Prompts exercises, AI.Dialogue manual, videos on AI hallucinations, https://www.democracy-ai.eu/en/materials
- Ethical AI: Educate and Innovate, BRIDGE Digital Museum: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=NTQ=. Associated resource: EthicalAI Regulatory Framework, https://www.ethicalaiucr.info/Regulatory_Framework.php

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Access to the BRIDGE Digital Museum; one generative AI tool approved by the institution for teaching; one device per group; printed or digital concept cards; a collaborative board or flip chart; an online poll tool if the barometer is run online.

8. Prerequisites

No prior knowledge of AI or media theory is required. Students watch a short AI.D video on AI hallucinations before the session. The teacher checks in advance that the chosen AI tool can be used without personal accounts or personal data, and prepares the barometer statements, the concept cards and three prompts on a current topic. (333 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. Where do I stand? – 15 minutes

The teacher reads four statements, for example: "An AI chatbot is a reliable source for current news." "AI is neutral because it is a machine." "I would notice if a text was written by AI." Students position themselves along a line in the room (Me & AI barometer). Two or three students at different points explain their position. The teacher notes the distribution without correcting it.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Phase 2. Testing the machine – 35 minutes

Groups of 4–5 receive three prompts in the style of the AI.D Mega Prompts exercises: a question on a current news event, a request to describe a social group or profession, and one question asked twice with different framing (for example "Why is X dangerous?" and "Is X dangerous?"). Each group runs the prompts, repeats at least one, and records in a table what the answer claims, what can be verified, what is missing or one-sided, and how confident the tone is. The teacher can refer to the EBU/BBC study (2025) cited by AI.D, in which 45 per cent of AI answers on current news had significant problems.

Phase 3. Naming what we saw – 30 minutes

Groups receive concept cards with short definitions and assign each observation to one or more concepts. They add one concept that did not appear in their test and describe where it could appear, for example hate speech or polarisation. In plenary the teacher clarifies three distinctions: misinformation and disinformation (intention), hallucination and bias (error or pattern), and personal choice and algorithmic ranking (who decides what we see).

Phase 4. AI.Dialogue, short version – 25 minutes

Three groups take the AI.D positions anxious, sceptical and optimistic and discuss: "Under what conditions should students use AI tools to inform themselves about political or social issues?" After three minutes per position and an open exchange, the groups leave their roles and agree on three conditions. They check which of the four components of the Ethical AI literacy model their conditions cover.

Phase 5. Back to the barometer – 15 minutes

Two statements from Phase 1 are repeated. Students who moved explain why. Each student completes a reflection card: "A concept I can now explain in my own words is … / Next time I use an AI tool for information, I will check …"

Total duration: 120 minutes. (2,313 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity follows the AI.D approach of treating AI as a social and political question. It starts from students' own assumptions and from direct experience with a generative AI tool, and only then introduces the concepts. Testing prompts makes errors and bias concrete, so that terms such as hallucination or disinformation are linked to examples the groups have produced themselves. Cooperative work on the concept cards turns these observations into a shared vocabulary. The

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

AI.Dialogue role-play asks students to argue from a position that may not be their own and moves the discussion from the technology to responsible use; the Ethical AI model links this to the institutional level. The repeated barometer and the reflection card show whether and how positions have changed. (123 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☒ Introductory presentation	☒ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☐ Case study	☒ Problem-solving
☒ Role-play / Simulation	☒ Analysis of good practice	☐ Analysis of photographs
☐ Photovoice	☒ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☒ Oral presentations
☐ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: Me & AI positions barometer; testing and documenting AI outputs

12. Final product or evidence

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☐ Oral presentation
☐ Podcast
☐ Mural
☐ Recorded debate
☐ Portfolio
☒ Concept map
☒ Other: observation table of AI outputs
☐ Infographic
☐ Video
☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Solved case study
☒ Brief reflection
☐ Proposal for improvement

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☐ Solving a case study	☒ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☐ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work
☐ Questionnaire or short test	☐ Analysis of a good practice	☐ Portfolio
☐ Other: _____		

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Observation table: records specific problems in the AI outputs (errors, omissions, bias, unwarranted certainty) and supports each with a quotation or example from the answer.
- Concept assignment: uses the concepts accurately, in particular the difference between misinformation and disinformation and between hallucination and bias.
- AI.Dialogue: argues the assigned position with reasons and formulates conditions for responsible use that cover at least two components of the Ethical AI model.
- Individual reflection: explains one concept correctly in the student's own words and names a concrete verification step.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

Online, the barometer can run as a live poll or on a shared slider board, and groups test prompts in breakout rooms with a shared table. In vocational training and adult education, prompts can refer to everyday topics such as health or consumer information. With secondary school students, the teacher runs the AI tool on screen instead of giving students access, which also avoids age and account restrictions. Concept cards should be available in plain language and, where possible, in the

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

languages of the group. Materials are shared in advance in formats compatible with screen readers, videos are shown with subtitles, and students who cannot stand or move can take part in the barometer with cards or a digital poll. If no AI tool can be used, the teacher prepares printed outputs from earlier tests. (806 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Test the prompts yourself shortly before the session: AI tools change, and an answer that was wrong last month may now be correct. Keep a few saved examples as a fallback. Students should not enter personal data or information about other people into the tool. Avoid presenting AI as either a threat or a solution; the aim is informed judgement. A common difficulty is that students treat every error as disinformation. Ask: "Did anyone intend to mislead?" and "Who could benefit from this error?" Prompts on social groups can produce stereotyped or offensive outputs. Announce this, discuss the output as an object of analysis, and do not ask students to relate it to themselves. In the AI.Dialogue, make clear that the positions are roles. As an extension, groups can compare their conditions with the rules for AI use at their own institution. (846 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity builds the basic vocabulary of Challenge A7 by testing a generative AI tool and naming what goes wrong. Students learn to distinguish misinformation, disinformation and bias and to see how data and framing shape content that looks neutral. This responds to the report's finding that AI adds questions of transparency, bias and interpretation to the digital ecosystem, and prepares students to take part in decisions on the responsible use of AI. (A7) (463 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Activity No. 2

1. Name of the activity

Why am I seeing this? How platforms shape opinion

2. Brief description

This activity examines how social media, search engines and recommendation systems influence what people see and believe. It combines two Good Practices from higher education. Critical Thinking and Media Literacy (CT&ML), an Erasmus+ partnership of institutions in Bulgaria, Germany, Greece, Poland and Romania, provides an open online course and a Teacher's Manual on media bias, manipulation and disinformation. PROMIS, coordinated by Babeş-Bolyai University in a consortium from six countries, shows in its BUILD curriculum how social media represent marginalised groups through polarised and stigmatising frames and how echo chambers reward confirmation bias. Working with a prepared sample feed rather than their own accounts, students rank posts by likely reach and by reliability, trace which groups become visible and how, and compare the two practices' answers to the problem. (885 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education. Adaptable to Advanced Vocational Training and adult education.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for media and communication studies, social sciences, psychology, education and computer science.
- Recommended number of participants: 15–30
- Approximate age range, if applicable: 18 years and over

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☐ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☒ C7.2
☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☐ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☐ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Selected competences: C7.2. Understanding the impact of the digital ecosystem.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Explain how ranking by engagement can increase the visibility of emotional or polarising content.
- Analyse a sample feed for signs of media bias, emotional framing and missing perspectives.
- Identify how social groups are framed in a feed and what consequences such frames can have for social cohesion.
- Compare how two Good Practices from different countries prepare students to understand the digital ecosystem.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☒ Good practice
☒ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Podcast
☐ Documentary photograph

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable:

- Critical Thinking and Media Literacy (CT&ML), BRIDGE Digital Museum: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=NTY=. Associated resources: CT&ML Teacher's Manual, https://ctml.eu/sites/default/files/Teachers-Manual.pdf; CT&ML online course and Open Virtual Platform, https://learn.ctml.eu/
- PROMIS – Promoting Social Inclusion Skills in a Post-Truth World, BRIDGE Digital Museum: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=NTM=. Associated resources: PROMIS BUILD Curriculum and eBUILD gamified platform, https://course.promis.education

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Access to the BRIDGE Digital Museum; a sample feed of 12–15 posts on one controversial topic, prepared by the teacher as screenshots with personal data removed; analysis grid; sticky notes or a collaborative board.

8. Prerequisites

Activity 1 is recommended but not required. Students explore the CT&ML online course for about 20 minutes before the session, focusing on the units on media bias. The teacher prepares the sample feed on a topic that is debated in the group's country, removes names and faces of private persons, and adapts the analysis grid from the CT&ML Teacher's Manual. (356 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. Who chose my feed? – 15 minutes

Students note three posts they saw on social media today and answer two questions: Why did I see this? Who decided? In plenary, the teacher collects answers on the board and groups them into own choices, contacts, platform decisions and advertising.

Phase 2. Reach or reliability? – 35 minutes

Groups of 4–5 receive the sample feed. They first rank the posts by how much reach they expect them to get, then by how reliable they are, using the analysis grid: source, evidence, emotional language, engagement cues, missing perspectives. They compare the two rankings and mark the posts where reach and reliability diverge most.

Phase 3. Who becomes visible, and how? – 30 minutes

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

The teacher briefly presents the PROMIS finding that marginalised groups are often shown on social media through polarised and stigmatising frames, and that echo chambers reward confirmation bias. Groups return to the feed, identify which social groups appear, how they are framed and who is absent, and discuss what the frames could do to intergroup relations if they were the only posts a person saw.

Phase 4. Two answers from two practices – 25 minutes

Half of the groups examine CT&ML in the Digital Museum (online course, Teacher's Manual), the other half PROMIS (BUILD curriculum, gamified platform). Each group notes the problem the practice addresses, its main method and one idea they could use in their own studies. Pairs of groups from both sides exchange results.

Phase 5. From mechanism to consequence – 15 minutes

In plenary the class builds a chain on the board: mechanism (for example ranking by engagement), effect on the feed, consequence for opinion and for social cohesion. Each student writes one sentence explaining a mechanism in their own words.

Total duration: 120 minutes. (1,807 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity starts from students' everyday experience and moves step by step to structural explanations. Double ranking makes visible, without technical knowledge, that reach and reliability follow different logics. The analysis grid adapted from the CT&ML Teacher's Manual gives the analysis a shared structure. The PROMIS perspective adds the question of who is represented and how, linking the digital ecosystem to discrimination and exclusion. The comparison of two Good Practices from different countries shows that the problem is shared and that higher education can respond in different ways. A prepared feed protects students' privacy and ensures that all groups work on comparable material. (103 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☒ Introductory presentation	☒ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☒ Case study	☐ Problem-solving
☐ Role-play / Simulation	☒ Analysis of good practice	☐ Analysis of photographs

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

☐ Photovoice	☐ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☒ Oral presentations
☐ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: double ranking of a sample feed

12. Final product or evidence

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☐ Oral presentation	☐ Infographic
☐ Podcast	☐ Video
☐ Mural	☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Recorded debate	☐ Solved case study
☐ Portfolio	☒ Brief reflection
☒ Concept map	☐ Proposal for improvement
☒ Other: completed analysis grid with double ranking	

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☒ Solving a case study	☐ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☐ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

☐ Questionnaire or short test ☒ Analysis of a good practice ☐ Portfolio

☐ Other: _____

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Analysis grid: justifies each ranking with specific features of the posts (source, evidence, language, engagement cues).
- Framing analysis: identifies at least two social groups, describes how they are framed and names who is missing.
- Comparison of practices: states the problem, method and one transferable idea of the Good Practice accurately.
- Individual sentence: explains one mechanism of the digital ecosystem and its possible consequence correctly.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

Online, the sample feed can be shared as a slide deck and ranked on a collaborative board; groups work in breakout rooms. In vocational training, the feed can deal with a topic from the students' occupational field. With secondary school students, the number of posts can be reduced to eight and the grid simplified to three questions. The feed should include image descriptions and readable font sizes, and screenshots should be provided as accessible documents for screen reader users. Students can work in the language they are most comfortable with; the teacher checks in advance which language versions of the CT&ML course are available. Students who do not use social media take part fully, since the activity relies on the prepared feed. (744 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Choose a topic that is debated but not directly about the personal identity of students in the room. Remove names, faces and profile pictures of private persons from the screenshots. Posts containing stereotypes should be analysed as material, not repeated or ridiculed; say this at the start. A common difficulty is that students blame individual users only. Ask: "What would the platform gain if this post spread?" and "What would change if the feed were sorted by date?" Some students will say they are not influenced by their feed. Invite them to compare their own ranking with the group's rather than to

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

argue. As an extension, students can compare the recommendations they get on a neutral search with those of a classmate and document the differences. (758 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity addresses the role of the digital ecosystem as an amplifier of polarisation described in the Transnational Report. Students analyse how ranking by engagement and stigmatising frames shape what people see about social groups, and how this can affect social cohesion and democratic deliberation. Comparing two Good Practices shows how higher education in different countries can respond. (A7) (403 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Activity No. 3

1. Name of the activity

Leave the page: lateral reading against disinformation

2. Brief description

This activity trains the practical recognition of disinformation and manipulated content. It uses the Good Practice Unfake your Social Media (UnfakeSoMe), coordinated by Impact Grid e.V. in Berlin with partners in France and Austria. Its open Digital Toolkit contains more than 14 online and offline games with verification checklists and follows a play-reflect-apply cycle. Its central method is lateral reading: instead of studying a page closely, one leaves it and checks what other sources say about it. Students play a game from the toolkit, then apply lateral reading to real posts and document their verification. A second Good Practice, the Spanish initiative Pantallas Amigas, contributes its campaign "Information Disorder", which helps students name the manipulation techniques they have found. The activity ends with a personal verification routine. (861 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education. Adaptable to Advanced Vocational Training, secondary education and non-formal youth work.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for teacher education, journalism, media and communication studies and social work.
- Recommended number of participants: 12–30
- Approximate age range, if applicable: 16 years and over

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☒ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☐ C7.2
☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☒ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☐ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Selected competences: C7.3. Identifying disinformation and hate speech in digital environments. C7.1. Knowledge of the fundamental concepts of media literacy and digital citizenship.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Identify disinformation, clickbait and manipulated images in examples from different platforms.
- Apply lateral reading and a verification checklist to assess the credibility of a post.
- Name common manipulation techniques and explain why content that triggers fear or indignation spreads quickly.
- Formulate a personal verification routine of three to five steps.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☒ Good practice
☐ Podcast
☒ Video
☒ Other: educational game
☒ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Documentary photograph
☐ Infographic

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable:

- Unfake your Social Media (UnfakeSoMe), BRIDGE Digital Museum, https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=MTE0. Associated resources: UnfakeSoMe Digital Toolkit with game manuals and verification checklists, https://unfakesocial.eu/
- Pantallas Amigas, BRIDGE Digital Museum: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=OTI=. Associated resource:

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

"Information Disorder" educational campaign, https://www.pantallasamigas.net/campanas-y-recursos-para-la-sensibilizacion-social-y-la-comunicacion/

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Access to the BRIDGE Digital Museum; printed game materials from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit; one device with internet access per pair; three to four current posts prepared by the teacher (at least one accurate); verification log template.

8. Prerequisites

No prior knowledge is needed; Activity 1 helps with the terms. The teacher selects and prints one game from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit, for example Real or Fake? or Memearazzi, and prepares three to four current posts, at least one of them accurate. Students bring a device with internet access; pairs can share one. (312 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. First message wins? – 10 minutes

The teacher shows a striking post for 30 seconds. Students vote: true, false or unsure, and say how confident they are. The result is not discussed yet.

Phase 2. Play – 30 minutes

Groups play a game from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit, following its manual, for example Real or Fake? or Memearazzi, which train the recognition of bias, clickbait and manipulated content. After the game each group notes which clues helped them and which misled them (reflect step of the play-reflect-apply cycle).

Phase 3. Leave the page – 40 minutes

The teacher demonstrates lateral reading in five minutes: before reading a post closely, open new tabs and find out who is behind the source, what others say about the claim, and where an image first appeared. Pairs then check the prepared posts, including the one from Phase 1, using the toolkit's verification checklist. For each post they record in the log: the claim, the steps taken, the sources consulted, their verdict and how certain they are.

Phase 4. Naming the techniques – 25 minutes

Groups look at the Pantallas Amigas campaign "Information Disorder" in the Digital Museum and list the manipulation techniques it describes. They match them with what they found in Phases 2 and 3

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

and discuss why fear and indignation make people share before they check. The Phase 1 post is resolved.

Phase 5. Apply – 15 minutes

Each student writes a personal verification routine of three to five steps for their own use and one situation in which they will apply it. Two or three routines are shared.

Total duration: 120 minutes. (1,584 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity follows the play-reflect-apply cycle of UnfakeSoMe. A game lowers the threshold and lets students experience how quickly they judge; reflection turns this into explicit clues; lateral reading on real posts transfers the skill to everyday use. Lateral reading replaces the question "Does this look credible?" with "What do others say about this source?" and counters the "first message wins" reflex that UnfakeSoMe describes. The Pantallas Amigas campaign offers a second national perspective and a vocabulary for manipulation techniques. The verification log makes the process visible and assessable, not only the verdict. The personal routine anchors the result in students' own media use. (104 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☒ Introductory presentation	☒ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☒ Case study	☒ Problem-solving
☐ Role-play / Simulation	☒ Analysis of good practice	☐ Analysis of photographs
☐ Photovoice	☐ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☐ Oral presentations
☒ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: lateral reading with a verification log

12. Final product or evidence

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☐ Oral presentation	☐ Infographic
☐ Podcast	☐ Video
☐ Mural	☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Recorded debate	☒ Solved case study
☐ Portfolio	☒ Brief reflection
☐ Concept map	☐ Proposal for improvement
☒ Other: verification log; personal verification routine	

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☒ Solving a case study	☐ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☐ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work
☐ Questionnaire or short test	☐ Analysis of a good practice	☐ Portfolio
☐ Other: _____		

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Verification log: documents at least two independent sources per post and draws a verdict that follows from them.
- Lateral reading: checks the source and the origin of images before judging the content.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- Techniques: names at least two manipulation techniques and links each to a concrete example.
- Personal routine: contains concrete, feasible steps that reflect lateral reading.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

The UnfakeSoMe games are designed to be low-tech and can be played offline, which helps where devices or connectivity are limited. Online, groups play the online games of the toolkit and verify posts in breakout rooms with a shared log. With secondary school students and in youth work, the posts should come from platforms they use and the verification can be done by the teacher on screen. Toolkit materials are available in English, German and French; Pantallas Amigas materials are mainly in Spanish. Provide the log as an accessible digital form, describe images orally, and allow students with visual impairments to work with text-based claims. (650 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Check shortly before the session that the posts are still online and that your own verdicts still hold. Include at least one accurate post, so that students do not learn to distrust everything. Lateral reading needs practice: demonstrate it live, including dead ends. A common difficulty is that students look for a single authority and stop there; ask them to find a second independent source. Avoid posts that target groups present in the room or that contain hate speech; Activity 4 deals with this separately. If students are unsure, "unsure" is an acceptable verdict when it is justified. As an extension, groups can verify a post their fellow students suggest and present the result in a short video or a Memearazzi-style counter-meme. (741 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity develops critical thinking and media literacy through the analysis of digital content and practical strategies to detect disinformation. It responds to the lack of critical skills identified in all partner countries in the Transnational Report by giving students a verification routine they can apply every day. (A7) (329 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Activity No. 4

1. Name of the activity

Distorted memory: history, hate speech and counter-speech online

2. Brief description

This activity connects the recognition of hate speech with its historical roots. It is based on the Good Practice CEMORY – Central European Memory of the Holocaust, coordinated by the Jagiellonian University with partners in Poland and the Czech Republic. CEMORY uses Holocaust memory as a framework for analysing current antisemitism, racism, xenophobia, Islamophobia and populist narratives, and gives space to perspectives long marginalised in remembrance, such as those of Roma, Muslims, LGBTQ+ persons and people with disabilities. Students work with a CEMORY podcast episode or expert seminar and then analyse prepared online examples in which history is distorted or trivialised to target groups today. The Spanish Good Practice Pantallas Amigas adds its campaign "Internet Tolerance" on preventing hate speech. Groups end by drafting and testing a counter-speech response. (880 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education. Adaptable to Advanced Vocational Training and adult education.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for history, teacher education, political science, social work, law and media studies.
- Recommended number of participants: 12–25
- Approximate age range, if applicable: 18 years and over

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☐ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☐ C7.2

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☒ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☒ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Selected competences: C7.3. Identifying disinformation and hate speech in digital environments. C7.4. Proposing actions to promote critical digital citizenship.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Identify hate speech and distortions of history in online content.
- Explain how historical distortion is used to legitimise discrimination against groups today.
- Analyse the possible consequences of such content for the groups concerned, for social cohesion and for human rights.
- Design a counter-speech response to a case of online hate speech and justify its approach.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☒ Good practice
☒ Podcast
☒ Video
☐ Other:
_____

☒ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Documentary photograph
☐ Infographic

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable:

- CEMORY – Central European Memory of the Holocaust in a Multicultural and Multidimensional Perspective, Good Practice from Poland, to be published in the BRIDGE Digital Museum. Associated resources: CEMORY podcasts and recorded expert seminars, https://cemory.project.uj.edu.pl/

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- Pantallas Amigas, BRIDGE Digital Museum: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=OTI=. Associated resource: "Internet Tolerance" campaign, https://www.pantallasamigas.net/ciberconvivencia/

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Access to the BRIDGE Digital Museum; audio playback; a case set of four to six anonymised online examples prepared by the teacher (screenshots with hateful terms partly masked); counter-speech planning sheet.

8. Prerequisites

Activity 3 is recommended. Students listen to a CEMORY podcast episode chosen by the teacher before the session. The teacher prepares the case set, removes names and faces, masks slurs, and informs students in advance that the session deals with hate speech and the Holocaust. A short agreement on respectful discussion is useful. (330 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. Framing the session – 15 minutes

The teacher explains the aim and the ground rules: examples are analysed, not repeated; anyone may step out. Students share one idea from the CEMORY episode about whose experiences are missing from public memory. The teacher links this to the question of the session: how is history used online against groups today?

Phase 2. Reading the cases – 35 minutes

Groups of 3–4 receive two cases each. For each case they answer: Who is targeted? Which historical event is referred to, and how is it changed (denied, trivialised, inverted, used as a comparison)? What does the content want the reader to feel or do? Is it hate speech, disinformation, or both? They mark their answers on a shared grid.

Phase 3. Consequences – 20 minutes

In plenary, groups present one case. The class discusses the effects on the targeted group, on people who read without reacting, and on trust in historical knowledge. The teacher relates this to the CEMORY view that historical processes of exclusion continue to shape current discrimination.

Phase 4. Answering back – 35 minutes

Groups look at the Pantallas Amigas campaign "Internet Tolerance" and note which responses it proposes. They then choose one case and draft a counter-speech response: whom it addresses (the

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

author, the targeted group, the silent readers), which facts or sources it uses, its tone. Groups swap drafts and test them against three questions: Is it accurate? Does it avoid repeating the hateful message? Does it support the targeted group? They revise their draft.

Phase 5. Reflection – 15 minutes

Each student writes down one sign by which they will recognise historical distortion online and one option for acting when they see it, including reporting or supporting the person targeted.

Total duration: 120 minutes. (1,803 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity links historical learning with media literacy. CEMORY's multidirectional approach to memory gives students a framework for seeing how narratives about the past are used against groups in the present. Working with prepared cases protects participants and allows structured analysis instead of spontaneous reaction. The analysis grid separates target, historical reference, technique and intended effect, which helps students distinguish hate speech from disinformation and see where they overlap. The Pantallas Amigas campaign offers a second national perspective and practical responses. Drafting and peer-testing counter-speech turns analysis into action and makes students aware that responses can also cause harm if poorly designed. (102 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☒ Introductory presentation	☒ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☒ Case study	☒ Problem-solving
☐ Role-play / Simulation	☒ Analysis of good practice	☐ Analysis of photographs
☐ Photovoice	☒ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☒ Oral presentations
☐ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: listening to a podcast; peer review of counter-speech drafts

12. Final product or evidence

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☐ Oral presentation	☐ Infographic
☐ Podcast	☐ Video
☐ Mural	☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Recorded debate	☒ Solved case study
☐ Portfolio	☒ Brief reflection
☐ Concept map	☒ Proposal for improvement
☐ Other: _____	

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☒ Solving a case study	☒ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☐ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work
☐ Questionnaire or short test	☒ Analysis of a good practice	☐ Portfolio
☐ Other: _____		

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Case analysis: identifies the targeted group, the historical reference and the distortion technique accurately.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- Distinction: explains whether a case is hate speech, disinformation or both, with reasons.
- Consequences: describes effects on the targeted group and on social cohesion with reference to human rights.
- Counter-speech: is factually accurate, does not reproduce the hateful message and names its intended audience.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

In secondary education the cases should be milder and the historical context introduced more fully; the focus can be on recognising trivialisation. In adult and community education, cases can come from local debates. Online, cases are shared in a protected space rather than as open links, and drafts are written in shared documents. Provide a transcript or, where none is available, a written summary of the podcast for students who are deaf or hard of hearing or less confident in the language. Offer an alternative task, such as analysing a counter-speech campaign only, for students who may be personally affected. Cases should be available as accessible text descriptions, not only as screenshots. (702 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Prepare yourself on the historical facts behind each case and have reliable sources ready, for example from memorial institutions. Never show unmasked slurs or hate symbols without a clear analytical purpose. Be aware that participants may belong to targeted groups; do not ask anyone to speak for a group. If a participant reproduces discriminatory statements, name the statement, not the person, and return to the analysis grid. A common difficulty is treating comparisons with the Holocaust as always the same; discuss what a comparison does in each case. Counter-speech is not the only option: reporting, supporting the targeted person and not sharing are also valid. As an extension, students can listen to further CEMORY episodes on minority perspectives and present one to the group. (790 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity addresses the digital amplification of hate speech and the vulnerability of groups targeted by it, identified for A7 in the Transnational Report. Students learn to recognise how distorted history is used to legitimise discrimination online and develop counter-speech as a concrete action for critical digital citizenship. (A7) (339 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Activity No. 5

1. Name of the activity

What the picture does not say

2. Brief description

The activity uses the ten documentary photographs of Challenge A7 in the BRIDGE Digital Museum. The images show everyday scenes of the digital ecosystem: two passengers seeing the same event in two different feeds, a grandmother holding an AI-generated flood image in front of her dry town square, a student alone with hostile comments while others walk past. Students first look at the images without titles or descriptions and separate what they observe, what they interpret and what they assume. They then read the museum descriptions and compare. All images were generated with AI for the BRIDGE project and are labelled as such, which becomes part of the lesson: groups discuss how they can tell, why labelling matters and write two captions for one image, one accurate and one misleading, to see how context changes meaning when images are shared. (853 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education and Advanced Vocational Training.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for media and communication studies, journalism, art and design, teacher education and social sciences.
- Recommended number of participants: 15–30
- Approximate age range, if applicable: 16 years and over

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☐ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☒ C7.2
☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☒ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☐ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Selected competences: C7.2. Understanding the impact of the digital ecosystem. C7.3. Identifying disinformation and hate speech in digital environments.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Distinguish between what an image shows, how it can be interpreted and what is assumed without evidence.
- Explain how captions and context change the meaning of an image when it is shared online.
- Identify signs that an image may be AI-generated and explain why labelling matters.
- Relate the scenes in the photographs to mechanisms of the digital ecosystem discussed in earlier activities.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☐ Good practice
☐ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Podcast
☒ Documentary photograph

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

☐ Video ☐ Infographic

☐ Other:

_____

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable: Documentary photographs for Challenge A7, BRIDGE Digital Museum, https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_photography.php

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Access to the BRIDGE Digital Museum; projector or printed copies of the ten photographs without titles; observation sheet with three columns (observe, interpret, assume); caption cards.

8. Prerequisites

No prior knowledge is required. The activity works best after Activities 2 and 3. The teacher prints or projects the photographs without titles and descriptions and prepares the observation sheet. Students should know beforehand that the images were generated with AI for the project. (284 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. Silent gallery – 20 minutes

The ten photographs are displayed without titles. Students walk around in silence and choose one image that catches their attention. On the observation sheet they write what they see, what they think it means and what they assume without evidence.

Phase 2. Reading the image – 30 minutes

Students who chose the same or similar images form groups. They compare their sheets, discuss where interpretations differ and why, and agree on a working title. Each group identifies which mechanism of the digital ecosystem the scene shows, for example personalised feeds, attention to outrage or AI-generated content.

Phase 3. What the museum says – 20 minutes

Groups read the museum description of their image and compare it with their own interpretation. They note what they missed, what they read into the image and what the description adds. In plenary, two or three groups share the biggest difference.

Phase 4. Two captions – 35 minutes

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Each group writes two captions for its image: one accurate, one misleading but plausible, for example by adding a false place, date or cause. Groups exchange captions; the others guess which is misleading and explain how. The class then discusses how they could tell the images were generated, which clues were reliable and which were not, and why the Source line of each photograph matters.

Phase 5. Reflection – 15 minutes

Each student writes a short reflection: Which image changed my view of my own media use, and what will I check before sharing an image?

Total duration: 120 minutes. (1,549 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity uses visual analysis to slow down the fast reading typical of social media. Separating observation, interpretation and assumption makes students aware of how quickly they fill gaps with prior beliefs. Comparing their reading with the museum descriptions shows that images need context and that context can be supplied or falsified. Writing an accurate and a misleading caption lets students experience from the inside how disinformation with images works. Because the photographs are AI-generated and labelled, the activity also addresses synthetic media directly and links the pathway's discussion of AI to visual evidence. (94 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☐ Introductory presentation	☒ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☐ Case study	☐ Problem-solving
☐ Role-play / Simulation	☐ Analysis of good practice	☒ Analysis of photographs
☐ Photovoice	☐ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☒ Oral presentations
☐ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: silent gallery; caption writing

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

12. Final product or evidence

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☐ Oral presentation	☐ Infographic
☐ Podcast	☐ Video
☐ Mural	☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Recorded debate	☐ Solved case study
☐ Portfolio	☒ Brief reflection
☐ Concept map	☐ Proposal for improvement
☒ Other: observation sheet; pair of captions	

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☐ Solving a case study	☒ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☐ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work
☐ Questionnaire or short test	☐ Analysis of a good practice	☐ Portfolio
☐ Other: _____		

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Observation sheet: separates observation, interpretation and assumption consistently.
- Link to the challenge: names a mechanism of the digital ecosystem shown in the image and explains it correctly.
- Captions: the misleading caption is plausible, and the group explains precisely what makes it misleading.
- Reflection: names a concrete check before sharing an image.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

The silent gallery can take place online with a shared board on which each image has its own area. In secondary and community education, fewer images can be used and the caption task done in plenary. Provide alternative text for each photograph and describe images orally for students with visual impairments; the museum descriptions can serve as a basis. Students with reading difficulties can present their observations orally. The activity can also be used as an introduction to the pathway, with the observation sheet revisited after Activity 6. (549 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Stress at the start that the photographs are AI-generated illustrations and do not document real events; this is part of the lesson, not a disclaimer. Do not give away the museum descriptions before Phase 3. Some images touch on hate speech; introduce them with care and allow students to choose another image. A common difficulty is that students take the first interpretation as fact. Ask: "What in the picture tells you that?" Misleading captions must not target real persons or groups present in the room. As an extension, students can create their own documentary photograph of the digital ecosystem in their daily life, with consent of anyone shown, and write a museum-style description. (693 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity addresses the role of images in the digital ecosystem and in the spread of disinformation. By separating observation from interpretation and by writing accurate and misleading captions, students learn how context shapes meaning and how synthetic images can deceive. This strengthens the critical reading of visual content that Challenge A7 calls for. (A7) (368 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-ES01-KA220-HED-000359236

Activity No. 6

1. Name of the activity

Play it forward: design an action for critical digital citizenship

2. Brief description

In this closing activity students move from analysis to action. Small groups design a short action that helps a specific audience recognise disinformation or hate speech or use AI responsibly, for example first-year students, a school class, a sports club or older neighbours. The action can be a low-tech game modelled on the UnfakeSoMe Digital Toolkit, a peer workshop modelled on the Cibermanagers programme of Pantallas Amigas, in which trained young people raise awareness among their peers, or a short campaign. Each action must address a risk identified in the earlier activities and end with a reflection question. Groups test their actions with each other, give structured feedback on clarity, accuracy and respectful treatment of the groups mentioned, and explain how the action could be carried out at their university or in their community. (852 characters including spaces)

3. Target audience

- Educational level: Higher Education. Adaptable to Advanced Vocational Training and non-formal youth work.
- Qualification or subject area (if applicable): Open to all disciplines; particularly suitable for teacher education, social work, education, media studies and design.
- Recommended number of participants: 12–30
- Approximate age range, if applicable: 18 years and over

4. Competences developed

A1. Inequalities	A2 Institutional frameworks and inclusive practices	A3 Educational gaps	A4 Intercultural dialogue	A5 Discrimination	A6 Governance	A7 Digital Ecosystem
☐ C1.1	☐ C2.1	☐ C3.1	☐ C4.1	☐ C5.1	☐ C6.1	☐ C7.1
☐ C1.2	☐ C2.2	☐ C3.2	☐ C4.2	☐ C5.2	☐ C6.2	☐ C7.2
☐ C1.3	☐ C2.3	☐ C3.3	☐ C4.3	☐ C5.3	☐ C6.3	☐ C7.3
☐ C1.4	☐ C2.4	☐ C3.4	☐ C4.4	☐ C5.4	☐ C6.4	☒ C7.4
				☐ C5.5		

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Selected competences: C7.4. Proposing actions to promote critical digital citizenship.

5. Learning outcomes

By the end of the activity, students will be able to:

- Design an action that promotes media literacy and critical thinking for a specific audience.
- Justify the design of the action on the basis of the risks identified in the earlier activities.
- Assess how the action can contribute to a more responsible and democratic digital citizenship.
- Give and use structured feedback to improve an educational action.

6. Delivery method and duration

Format: ☒ Face-to-face ☒ Online ☒ Hybrid

Estimated duration of the activity: 120 minutes / 2 hours

7. Resources required. BRIDGE Museum resources used:

☒ Good practice
☐ Podcast
☐ Video
☒ Other: educational games

☒ Resources associated with Good practice
☐ Documentary photograph
☐ Infographic

Title or identification of the resource and link, if applicable:

- Unfake your Social Media (UnfakeSoMe) Digital Toolkit, https://unfakesocial.eu/
- Pantallas Amigas, Cibermanagers peer-education and mediation programme, https://www.pantallasamigas.net/apoyo-a-centros-escolares/ (Good Practice: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=OTI=)
- INCIBE – Internet Segura for Kids (IS4K), open educational resources portal, https://www.incibe.es/menores/recursos (Good Practice: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practice_view.php?id_gp=OTA=)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Materials, applications or platforms required, if applicable: Results from earlier activities (observation tables, logs, counter-speech drafts); paper, cards, markers; optional presentation or quiz tool; design canvas with the fields audience, risk, action, reflection question, resources.

8. Prerequisites

Students should have completed at least two earlier activities of the pathway. They bring their results from these activities. The teacher prepares the design canvas and a short selection of games from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit and materials from the Cibermanagers programme and the IS4K portal as models. (302 characters including spaces)

9. Activity procedure

Phase 1. What stayed with us – 15 minutes

In plenary the class collects the risks identified in the pathway, for example AI hallucinations, ranking by outrage, manipulated images, historical distortion. Students choose the risk they want to address and form groups of 3–4 around it.

Phase 2. Look at models – 15 minutes

Groups look at one or two model actions: a game from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit, the Cibermanagers peer-education approach or a resource from the IS4K portal. They note what makes the model work for its audience.

Phase 3. Design – 40 minutes

Using the design canvas, groups define their audience, the risk, the action (game, peer workshop or campaign), the steps, the materials and a reflection question for the end. They build a prototype that can be tested in ten minutes.

Phase 4. Test and feedback – 35 minutes

Two groups pair up and test each other's prototype. Testers give feedback with three questions: Is it clear what to do? Is the content accurate? Does it treat the groups it mentions with respect? Groups revise their design.

Phase 5. Pitch and reflection – 15 minutes

Each group presents its action in one minute, including where it could take place at their university or in their community. Each student writes which competence from the pathway they used most.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

Total duration: 120 minutes. (1,311 characters including spaces)

10. Methodology

The activity follows a design-based approach: students apply what they learnt by creating something for others. Choosing an audience forces them to translate concepts into accessible language and to think about the needs and situation of other people. The UnfakeSoMe games, the Cibermanagers peer-education programme and the IS4K resources serve as models from two countries, showing that effective actions can be low-tech and led by learners themselves. Peer testing with clear criteria makes feedback concrete and models the respectful, evidence-based communication that critical digital citizenship requires. The pitch links the action to the students' own institution or community. (98 words)

11. Strategies used

List all the strategies to be used during the activity

☐ Introductory presentation	☐ Individual work	☒ Cooperative work
☒ Guided discussion	☐ Case study	☒ Problem-solving
☐ Role-play / Simulation	☒ Analysis of good practice	☐ Analysis of photographs
☐ Photovoice	☐ Analysis of videos or documentaries	☐ Interviews
☐ Creation of infographics	☐ Podcast production	☒ Oral presentations
☒ Gamification	☐ Service-learning	☒ Other: design canvas and peer testing of prototypes

12. Final product or evidence

Please indicate whether the activity requires learners to produce or present a final product or evidence of learning.

☐ The activity does not require a formal product, although brief evidence of participation or reflection may be collected.

☒ The activity requires a product or evidence of learning.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

If so, please specify which one(s):

☒ Oral presentation	☐ Infographic
☐ Podcast	☐ Video
☐ Mural	☐ Essay or written reflection
☐ Recorded debate	☐ Solved case study
☐ Portfolio	☒ Brief reflection
☐ Concept map	☒ Proposal for improvement
☒ Other: tested prototype of a game, workshop or campaign	

13. Assessment

Does the activity include assessment?

☒ Yes ☐ No (awareness-raising, reflection or non-assessed learning activity)

If you have ticked 'No', you do not need to complete the following sections.

Evidence of learning (only if the activity is assessable). Select one or more pieces of evidence that demonstrate the achievement of the activity's learning outcomes.

☒ Participation in a discussion	☐ Solving a case study	☒ Creation of a product (infographic, podcast, video, etc.)
☒ Oral presentation	☒ Individual reflection	☒ Group work
☐ Questionnaire or short test	☒ Analysis of a good practice	☐ Portfolio
☐ Other: _____		

Assessment criteria (only if the activity is assessable)

- Relevance: the action addresses a risk identified in the pathway and is suited to the chosen audience.
- Accuracy: the content of the action is factually correct and uses the concepts of the pathway correctly.
- Respect and inclusion: the action treats the groups it mentions with respect and is accessible to its audience.
- Revision: the group uses peer feedback to improve the prototype.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- Transfer: the pitch explains realistically where and how the action could be carried out.

14. Possible adaptations and accessibility measures

The activity can stand alone as a two-hour design workshop if the teacher introduces the risks in Phase 1. Online, groups design on a shared board and test prototypes in breakout rooms; digital quiz or card tools can replace paper. In vocational training, the audience can be colleagues or customers in the students' field. In service-learning settings the actions can be carried out with a real audience, for example local schools, following the Cibermanagers model. Groups should check their design for accessibility: plain language, alternative formats, no reliance on colour or sound alone. Mixed groups allow students with different strengths to contribute. (662 characters including spaces)

15. Guidance for teachers

Keep the scope small: a ten-minute prototype is enough. Some groups aim too high and never test; set a clear deadline for the prototype. Remind groups that actions on hate speech must not reproduce the hateful content. Games that mock the people who believe disinformation tend to alienate the audience; ask groups to focus on techniques, not on people. If students have little time, offer a ready-made game from the UnfakeSoMe toolkit to adapt. As an extension, the best actions can be carried out at the university, for example during introduction weeks, and documented for the Digital Museum. (595 characters including spaces)

16. Link to the BRIDGE challenge

The activity turns understanding into action: students propose and test concrete measures that strengthen media literacy and critical thinking for a specific audience. It addresses the need for cross-cutting media literacy named in the Transnational Report and shows how universities can act as places of critical digital citizenship in their communities. (A7) (360 characters including spaces)

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

An activity may focus on a single example of good practice or compare several experiences where this is appropriate to its objectives.

SUPPLEMENTARY RESOURCES

Bibliography

- Roozenbeek, Jon, & van der Linden, Sander. (2019). Fake news game confers psychological resistance against online misinformation. *Palgrave Communications, 5*, Article 65. https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-019-0279-9
- Terrón-Caro, María Teresa, Cárdenas-Rodríguez, Rocío, Bergano, Sofía, Carletti, Chiara, Chumbo, Isabel, Di Grigoli, Antonio Raimondo, Dölle, Paul, Dziwisz, Dominika, Esteban Ibáñez, Macarena, Fouskas, Theodoros, Lopes, Rui Pedro, Lyberopoulou, Lola, Mancaniello, Maria Rita, Meyer, Frank, Moreira, Benilde, Nitszke, Agnieszka, Ortega de Mora, Fabiola, Parchent, Thorsten, Pérez de Guzmán, Victoria, … Wilke, Sandy. (2026). *Transnational Report on Social Challenges*. BRIDGE. https://doi.org/10.46661/rio.20260302_1
- Wardle, Claire. (2018). The need for smarter definitions and practical, timely empirical research on information disorder. *Digital Journalism, 6*(8), 951–963. https://doi.org/10.1080/21670811.2018.1502047
- Wineburg, Sam, & McGrew, Sarah. (2019). Lateral reading and the nature of expertise: Reading less and learning more when evaluating digital information. *Teachers College Record, 121*(11), 1–40. https://doi.org/10.1177/016146811912101102

Web

- BRIDGE Digital Museum, Good Practices for Challenge A7: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_good_practices.php?ch=7
- BRIDGE Digital Museum, Educational Space: https://bridge.pixel-online.org/digital_museum_educational.php

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.

- CEMORY – Central European Memory of the Holocaust: https://cemory.project.uj.edu.pl/
- Critical Thinking and Media Literacy (CT&ML): https://ctml.eu
- INCIBE – Internet Segura for Kids (IS4K): https://www.is4k.es/
- Pantallas Amigas: https://www.pantallasamigas.net/
- PROMIS – Promoting Social Inclusion Skills in a Post-Truth World: https://promis.education
- Unfake your Social Media (UnfakeSoMe): https://unfakesocial.eu/

Regulations

- Regulation (EU) 2022/2065 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 October 2022 on a Single Market for Digital Services and amending Directive 2000/31/EC (Digital Services Act). OJ L 277, 27.10.2022, pp. 1–102. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2022/2065/oj
- Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act), in particular Article 4 (AI literacy). OJ L, 2024/1689, 12.7.2024. https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj

APPENDICES

Not applicable.

Co-funded by the European Union

The project Bridge is co-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 Servicio Español para la Internacionalización de la Educación (SEPIE). Neither the European Union nor the National Agency SEPIE can be held responsible for them.