Journal of Inclusive Methodology and Technology in Learning and Teaching
ISSN 2785-5104
Anno 6 n. 4 (2026)

EDIZIONI UNIVERSITARIE ROMANE
editoria scientifica dal 1952

Magritte's Threshold: Promoting Agency and Reflexivity in Universal Design for Learning 3.0

Emanuela Macera [1]

1 emanuela.macera@unipegaso.it

Abstract: In the contemporary post-digital era, educational practices risk progressively delegating sensemaking to automated artificial intelligence systems, resulting in a passive learner posture, definable as the 'algorithmic Self.' To counter this alienation, this theoretical-design paper proposes a heuristic hybridisation between the new Universal Design for Learning 3.0 Guidelines (CAST, 2024), which focus on promoting learner agency and equity, and Gert Biesta's pedagogy of subjectification. Adopting René Magritte's painting The Human Condition as a metaphor for the mediation operated by interfaces, the 'Synesthetic Didactic Cycle' is outlined: a methodological architecture articulated in the recursive phases of Meta-Inquiry, Meta-Action, and Meta-Synthesis, applied to the multimodal authentic task 'My Human Condition' for upper secondary school. The proposal integrates the construct of meta-reflective aisthesis with the hypothesis of 'aesthetic accessibility,' understood as care for the learning environment (chora), aimed at fostering affective regulation and mitigating extraneous cognitive load. Situated in the first phase (Conceptual Design) of Design-Based Research (McKenney & Reeves, 2018), the paper discusses the conditions for the didactic sustainability of the proposal and explicates an operational protocol for classroom experimentation and empirical documentation through the adaptation of the Agency for Learning Questionnaire (Code, 2020) and the use of docimological rubrics with high inter-rater agreement ($\kappa \geq 0.80$).

Keywords: Agency; Universal Design for Learning 3.0; Reflexivity.

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction: The Onlife Infosphere and the Alienation of the Subject

Contemporary pedagogical reflection increasingly confronts an educational system immersed in the infosphere and its Onlife dimension (Floridi, 2015), where the boundaries between physical, analogue, and digital spaces overlap inextricably. In this ecosystemic complexity, the learning environment ceases to be a neutral container and becomes an effective device for mediating cognitive, emotional, and relational processes. Faced with the widespread dissemination of generative artificial intelligence and autonomous computational systems, educational practice nevertheless risks incurring an unprecedented form of semantic alienation derived from the surrender of agency: the illusion of delegating uniquely human functions, such as deep comprehension, meaning attribution, and sustained attention, to technological apparatuses (Floridi, 2020). When the digitalisation of teaching is reduced to metric measurement, procedural tracking, and path standardisation, learners risk developing an 'algorithmic Self.' The 'algorithmic Self' describes a student's passive posture, adapting to technological inputs and automated feedback without conscious critical or emotional mediation, trading autonomy of judgment and affective self-regulation for the reassuring efficiency of computational procedures.

In the current scientific debate, positions on the impact of emerging technologies on learning processes have emerged, sometimes diverging. On the one hand, technosolutionist perspectives hypothesise that algorithmic personalisation and automated assessment can optimise student performance, guaranteeing individualised adaptive learning paths on a large scale. On the other hand, critical pedagogical research highlights how excessive reliance on automated systems risks depriving the school experience of its relational and community dimension, impoverishing students' ability to inhabit complexity, error, and uncertainty. A similar tension appears in inclusive education: for a long time, strategies to increase engagement and accessibility were limited to extrinsic gamification expedients or purely instrumental, compensatory adaptations. Conversely, Universal Design for Learning 3.0 (CAST, 2024) proposes an ethical and cultural paradigm shift, inviting educators to see the learner not as a cognitive receptacle to be aligned with performance parameters, but as an existential, unique, and irreplaceable subject.

To overcome the sterile polarisation between uncritical techno-enthusiasm and defensive techno-scepticism, this work proposes a design framework oriented toward promoting personal flourishing and reflexive autonomy, understood as 'the flourishing of existing' (Mortari, 2015, p. 45). This contribution is theoretical-design in nature and constitutes the first exploratory and ideational phase (Phase 1: Exploration and Conceptual Design) within the methodological framework of Design-Based Research (McKenney & Reeves, 2018). Building on this framing, the paper asks: How can the Universal Design for Learning 3.0 Guidelines be translated into concrete, inclusive classroom architectures through meta-reflective devices and authentic multimodal tasks to promote learner agency and de-automate the use of digital interfaces?

2. The 'Who' and UDL 3.0: The Turn towards Learner Agency and Subjectification

The update of the Universal Design for Learning Guidelines to Version 3.0 (CAST, 2024) marks a paradigmatic evolution: the framework redefines its epistemological goal, moving beyond the historical notion of the 'expert learner' in favour of the systematic promotion of Learner Agency. In UDL 3.0, agency is defined as the learner's capacity to act with intentionality, critical awareness, and selfdetermination within their educational journey, valuing the inextricable intersection among learning, personal identities, sociocultural contexts, and equity imperatives (Sasanelli et al., 2025).

On the level of pedagogical elaboration, this paper proposes an original heuristic hybridisation of the CAST framework: grafting onto the three core principles of the framework (the Why, the What, and the How of learning, rooted in affective, recognition, and strategic neural networks) the philosophical category of the 'Who'. To safeguard philological rigour, it must be clear that the 'Who' is not a formal fourth axis codified by the CAST Guidelines, but rather an interpretative reading key formulated here based on Gert Biesta's theory of subjectification. As Biesta (2006, p. 53) and Bandura (2006) highlight, education cannot be reduced to mere functional qualification (the 'What' of knowledge acquisition or executive skills) or uncritical socialisation; it must be the space in which the subject emerges in their unrepeatable uniqueness. While UDL's neural networks map learner functioning from a neurofunctional perspective, the imperative of the 'Who' introduces an ethical and existential dimension: the student emerges as an autonomous, responsible subject capable of resisting algorithmic homogenization and inhabiting the infosphere as a conscious citizen (Biesta, 2022, p. 28).

2.1 The Pedagogy of Meta-Perception and the Construct of Meta-Reflective Aisthesis

To operationally translate this subjectifying demand, we propose the construct of meta-reflective aisthesis. It describes the learner's ability to consciously monitor their cognitive, affective, and sensory experiences during interaction with the environment and digital devices, bridging the gap between bodily perception (aisthesis) and classical metacognition (Flavell, 1979). The construct's theoretical foundation rests on Kant's (2004) analysis of the insolubility of the link between sensitive grounding and intellect, as well as on cognitive neuroscience's demonstration of the overcoming of Cartesian dualism (Damasio, 1994). Meta-reflective aisthesis is structured across three analytical and observable dimensions:

1. Metacognitive Awareness: Active monitoring of cognitive strategies and logical deconstruction processes, wherein operational error loses its punitive connotation and assumes the value of a fundamental heuristic feedback for restructuring mental models;

2. Meta-Emotional Awareness: The ability to recognise, verbalise, and regulate affective and emotional states (such as performance anxiety or epistemic wonder), an essential condition for learner self-regulation and resilience (Zimmerman, 2000);

3. Meta-Ethical Awareness: A critical and deontological posture guiding the student in analysing the socio-technical implications of algorithms and AI, preserving the autonomy of moral judgment in the face of automated machine responses.

Orchestrating this inclusive framework hinges on the teacher's role as a reflective mentor, one who provides adaptive scaffolding and serves as a maieutic facilitator during collective debriefing sessions.

2.2 From Instrumental Accessibility to Aesthetic Accessibility as Care for the Chora

School inclusion in multimodal contexts requires moving beyond a purely bureaucratic or compensatory approach, which risks pigeonholing students under diagnostic labels through visually cluttered or fragmented instructional materials. Therefore, we formulate the pedagogical hypothesis of 'aesthetic accessibility': a design perspective in which spatial order, clean typographical layout compliant with WCAG 2.2 guidelines (W3C, 2023), and compositional harmony act as facilitators of classroom wellbeing.

In learning psychology, John Sweller's Cognitive Load Theory (2011) formally links reducing extraneous cognitive load to mitigating the split-attention effect and eliminating procedural redundancies. Here, we hypothesise that aesthetic harmony converges with emotional design principles in multimedia learning (Um et al., 2012; Mayer, 2014; Plass & Kalyuga, 2019): perceptual balance and visual pleasantness are not ornamental accessories but affective precursors that induce positive emotional states. These states, in turn, increase working memory resources allocated to generative processing and mitigate extraneous cognitive load. The classroom is thus re-signified as a chora—borrowing the Platonic concept of a welcoming matrix and formative 'custodial space' (Bertolini, 1988, p. 112), capable of sheltering learners from the informational scatter typical of the contemporary digital ecology.

Within this epistemological frame, René Magritte's painting The Human Condition (1933), in which a painted canvas on an easel overlaps the external landscape visible

through the window with millimetre precision, serves as a heuristic metaphor for the Onlife 'threshold.' The digital screen interposes itself precisely like Magritte's canvas, merging representation with physical reality. Educating at the threshold means deautomating students' optical and cognitive consumption, enabling them to decipher the device's frame and reclaim their bodily and relational presence.

3. The Synesthetic Didactic Cycle and the Authentic Task: 'Magritte's Threshold'

To implement the outlined principles, the model structures the 'Synesthetic Didactic Cycle.' At the outset, it is important to clarify that the term synesthetic is used here in an explicitly metaphorical, pedagogical-didactic sense, indicating the intentional integration of heterogeneous sensory codes (visual, auditory, haptic) with conceptual elaboration, rather than referring to clinical conditions. The cycle is articulated across three recursive stages:

1. Meta-Inquiry (Hermeneutic Pause): Reflexive suspension of immediate reactivity. Faced with Magritte's artwork and digital interfaces, the class deconstructs visual mediation. This is followed by a paired sensorimotor experiment (lasting two minutes) comparing live intersubjective interaction with vision mediated by a smartphone camera. A crucial inclusive adaptation: to ensure full accessibility for all students, the exercise optionally allows students to focus their observation on hand movement, posture, or caring gestures, avoiding mandatory direct eye contact. Learners document the experience in a reflective logbook.

2. Meta-Action (Intentional Agency): In small heterogeneous cooperative groups (3– 4 students), learners design and execute an authentic task, creating a visual composition that reproduces Magritte's doubling through a gesture of genuine care and relationship. The group negotiates choices and drafts a critical caption (maximum 100 words) explicating their theoretical thesis;

3. Meta-Synthesis (Community of Meaning Inquiry): Exhibition of student works in a classroom display on an interactive whiteboard and discussion in circle time. Technical and execution challenges are re-signified as heuristic windows for understanding the intrinsic limits of technological media, supported by self-assessment rubrics.

3.1 Design of the Authentic Task 'My Human Condition'

The application of the Synesthetic Didactic Cycle is operationalised in the authentic task titled 'My Human Condition: Embodied Resonance between Screen and Reality' (Gallese, in press; Damasio, 1994). Below are the operational specifications and ethical precautions of the task:

- • Target Audience and Age Group: Final-year students of upper secondary school (grade 13, aged 17–19 years);
- • Subjects and Curricular Links: Philosophy and Civic Education, with interdisciplinary links to Art History and Human Sciences;
- • Schedule and Timeline: 3 weeks (6 in-person hours divided into three 2-hour sessions, supplemented by asynchronous cooperative work);
- • Inclusive Scaffolding and Differentiated Channels: In adherence to UDL 3.0 principles, submission allows equivalent alternative modes mediated by classroom choice boards (Tomlinson, 2014): for students with visual impairments or visuo-

spatial processing deficits, the photographic product can be replaced by a binaural soundscape (doubling real classroom sounds with recorded tracks) or a tactile relief model;

- • Ethical-Deontological Protocol and GDPR Data Protection: The activity strictly respects Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR). Prior written informed consent and image release forms are collected from parents/guardians (and adult students). Photographs remain strictly confined to classroom devices and the school's secure archive, with an absolute ban on external or social media dissemination; • Ministerial Regulations on Device Use in Schools: The use of personal devices (BYOD) is strictly limited to laboratory filming and co-writing phases under direct teacher guidance, in compliance with Ministerial Circular MIM prot. no. 107190 of Dec 19, 2022 and Ministerial Circular MIM prot. no. 5274 of July 11, 2024 (which forbids improper personal use while validating legitimate educational and inclusive laboratory uses).

3.2 UDL 3.0 Inclusive Design Matrix

Table 1 outlines the synthetic design matrix developed from the Universal Design for Learning 3.0 framework (CAST, 2024), associating operational guidelines with inclusive scaffolds and target soft skills across the phases of the Synesthetic Didactic Cycle:

UDL 3.0 Guideline	**Inclusive Aesthetic-Didactic Scaffolding**	**Target Soft Skills**
Engagement (Guidelines 7-9: Welcoming Identities, Effort and Persistence, Emotional Capacity)	Existential authentic tasks; minimisation of threats (7.4); heterogeneous teams with complementary roles; hermeneutic pause and reflective logbook; free choice of observation focus.	Epistemic curiosity, relational empathy, emotional self-regulation, cooperation.
Representation (Guidelines 1-3: Perception, Language and Symbols, Building Knowledge)	Aesthetic accessibility compliant with WCAG 2.2; coordinated multimodal stimuli (Magritte's canvas, philosophical texts); bilingual visual graphic organisers.	Visual attention management, visual literacy, conceptual synthesis, analogical transfer.
Action and Expression (Guidelines 4-6: Interaction, Expression, Strategy Development)	Flexibility in expression channels via choice boards (photography, soundscape, or tactile installation); protected co-writing platforms; roadmaps and descriptive rubrics.	Expressive creativity, multiliteracy, strategic planning, monitoring.

Table 1. UDL 3.0 Inclusive Design Matrix and Synesthetic Didactic Cycle Phases.

4. Classroom Didactic Devices for Cognitive De-automation

Rather than treating the digital environment as a neutral space or mere distraction, we propose configuring the classroom as an inquiry context where technology is rendered opaque so its mediated structure can be critically analysed. Teachers must interrupt students' automated consumption driven by fast-thinking dynamics and introduce dedicated moments of hermeneutic pause. Operationally, the Magrittian threshold metaphor translates into specific classroom devices:

- • The 'Visual Threshold' Technique (I See – I Think – I Suspect): Re-elaborating Harvard Project Zero's See–Think–Wonder routine (Ritchhart, Church, & Morrison, 2011), when faced with a digital stimulus (AI-generated image, video, or social media interface), the teacher introduces a tripartite grid: 1. What I see:

objective description of visual elements; 2. What I think: explicit emotional and interpretative initial reaction; 3. What I suspect: identification of the medium's boundary, what the screen frames and what it deliberately leaves out of frame, reproducing the dynamic of Magritte's canvas.

- • The Perceptual Contrast Experiment: Alternating direct observation of a live face or body gesture with its mediation through a smartphone screen, guiding students to verbalise which micro-sensory and empathetic details change across the digital lens, developing critical awareness of medium boundaries without demonising technology.

4.1 Orienting Meaning in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Guidelines for a Critical Use of Algorithms

To prevent generative AI adoption from degenerating into an uncritical delegation of comprehension, students use algorithms not as automatic task-solvers, but as dialectical interlocutors to debate with, aligned with the DigComp 2.2 framework competencies. The teacher guides the class through two specific strategies:

1. Socratic Dialogue with the Artificial Agent: Students formulate a guided instruction (critical prompting) asking the machine to challenge their initial thesis, prompting the algorithm to act as a sceptical cross-examiner identifying three biases or logical fallacies in their position;

2. The 'Data Traffic Light' for AI Validation: Transposing Assessment for Learning traffic-light strategies (Black & Wiliam, 1998; Wiliam, 2011) into algorithmic literacy, students apply a three-level metacognitive colour code to LLM-generated text: Green for facts verified against accredited primary sources; Yellow for ambiguous or unsubstantiated claims requiring investigation; Red for model hallucinations or semantic fallacies. Thus, the learner remains responsible for truth attribution.

4.2 Aesthetic Accessibility and Care for the Classroom Chora: Operational Recommendations for Teachers

School inclusion derives tangible benefits from shifting from a compensatorybureaucratic logic to one grounded in aesthetic accessibility and care for the classroom chora. Teachers can operate according to the following practical guidelines:

- a) Material Design Standards (Mitigating Extraneous Load): Essential spatial organisation with ample white space to foster attentional focus; adoption of highlegibility fonts with 1.5 line spacing and high visual contrast compliant with WCAG 2.2; breaking instructions into micro-visual sequences accompanied by graphic organisers;
- b) Differentiated Submission Channels: Guaranteed through choice boards aligned with UDL 3.0 Multiple Means of Action and Expression: Option A (Visual-Textual: photo and critical caption), Option B (Audio-Narrative: 2-minute binaural soundscape podcast with transcript), Option C (Graphic-Tactile: relief concept map or plastic installation);
- c) Facilitating Circle Time Debriefings: The teacher assumes the maieutic posture of a reflective mentor, orienting reflection with process-questions: 'Which interpretative choice proved most complex in your team? At what moment did you feel the screen was conditioning your perception?'

5. Discussion, Didactic Sustainability, and Design-Based Research (DBR) Protocol

Engaging with the latest frontiers of media technology requires evaluating the proposal's relevance in light of emerging agentic artificial intelligence. Unlike reactive generative systems, agentic AI models can plan multi-step action sequences, make choices, and execute complex workflows with minimal human oversight. This transition shifts education's centre of gravity from performance to pedagogical ontology: automation invades the very faculty of decision-making.

Building on Bateson's levels of learning model (1972) and Baldacci's curricular theory (2006), the threshold model acts as a 'heuristic brake': it operates on protolearning (comprehension of digital content) but, crucially, on deutero-learning (the acquisition of reflexive mental habits). This draws a clear demarcation between the algorithm's

operational-functional agency (procedural optimisation and computational efficiency) and the student's existential-reflective learner agency (questioning meaning, moral foundations, and human responsibility).

5.1 Enabling Factors, Didactic Sustainability, and Transferability Conditions

The model centred on 'Magritte's threshold' is characterised by application flexibility and calibrated situational adequacy: it is not a prescriptive device but an operational framework designed to integrate into ordinary classroom dynamics, valuing teachers' design autonomy. The effectiveness and continuity of the intervention rest on three pedagogical and organisational conditions:

- a) Instrumental Sustainability and Low-Tech Adaptation (BYOD): The proposal does not require complex digital infrastructure or specialised labs. Guided adoption of students' personal devices (BYOD) leverages existing technologies, minimising organisational and financial impacts on schools. In low-connectivity contexts, the model operates effectively via low-tech solutions (local school archives, paper montages, physical frames);
- b) Promoting Teacher Professionalism and Reflective Processes: Serving as a reflective mentor does not require advanced IT skills, but willingness to preside over educational relationships, guide dialogic exchange, and support classroom discussion. Short departmental planning sessions (2–3 hours) can consolidate shared formative assessment practices;
- c) Curricular Coherence and Interdisciplinary Convergence: The proposal seamlessly embeds into Civic Education (digital citizenship and technology ethics), Philosophy (perception and subject-world relation), Art History (visual language decoding and Surrealism), and Language Arts (argumentative writing).

5.2 Operational Protocol for Classroom Experimentation and Empirical Documentation (DBR Phase 2)

To foster model transferability and enable other research teams or school communities to replicate the experience, the empirical implementation of Phase 2 of Design-Based Research (McKenney & Reeves, 2018) is structured into a four-step sequential pathway:

	[PHASE A: Entry Survey] ⟶ [PHASE B: Classroom Intervention] ⟶ [PHASE C:	
	Docimological Evaluation] ⟶ [PHASE D:	

	Post-Test Survey]	
	• AFLQ Pre-test (15') | • Experimental vs Control (6h) | • Blind Cross-Rater ($\kappa \geq 0.80$)	
	| • Post-test and ANCOVA	

Phase A: Preliminary Survey and Ethical-Organizational Protocols. Prior to the start of classroom activities (estimated time: 1 hour), the protocol requires two concurrent operations: 1. Data protection and consent: acquisition and filing in the school records of consent forms and data processing notices compliant with Regulation (EU) 2016/679 (GDPR); 2. Baseline agency assessment: administration to students (in both experimental and control classes) of the Agency for Learning Questionnaire (AFLQ) validated by Jillianne Code (2020), in online or paper format. The instrument requires approximately 15 minutes to complete and measures four socio-cognitive dimensions on a 5-point Likert scale: Intentionality, Forethought/Motivation, Self-Regulation, and Self-Efficacy. Sample item: "When I use digital tools in my studies, I consciously choose the steps to follow rather than merely accepting the answers provided by the system" (scale from 1 = Strongly disagree to 5 = Strongly agree).

Phase B: Comparative Classroom Intervention (3 weeks, 6 total hours). The experimentation unfolds over three weeks articulated in biweekly two-hour modules:

- • In the experimental group (Synesthetic Didactic Cycle): during Week 1 (Meta- Inquiry – 2 hours), the teacher projects René Magritte's painting The Human Condition. The class performs the "Visual Threshold" routine (I See – I Think – I Suspect), describing what is seen on the canvas, explicating initial thoughts regarding the coincidence between painting and landscape, and questioning what is plausible to suspect regarding the frame's selections. A two-minute paired perceptual experiment follows: two students observe each other directly, and subsequently, a smartphone camera is interposed between them. If a learner expresses discomfort with prolonged eye contact (such as students with social anxiety or on the autism spectrum), the teacher immediately provides an operational alternative: observing hand gestures or writing movements on the desk, recording how two-dimensional filming alters the perception of the gesture. This is followed by 10 minutes of individual reflective logbook entry. During Week 2 (Meta- Action – 2 hours), cooperative teams (3–4 students) design and create the 'Onlife Threshold' photograph. One or two peers enact a real relational situation (e.g., a conversation or sharing a book), one student holds up a phone screen displaying a similar but decontextualised image, and another takes the overall shot, framing the device's border. For students with visual or sensory impairments, the choice board lets them record a 60-second soundscape pairing real classroom sounds with synthesised audio tracks. The group jointly drafts a critical caption of 80–100 words. During Week 3 (Meta- Synthesis – 2 hours), the class projects the products on the interactive whiteboard for debriefing. The class queries a generative AI model to interpret one image, applies the Data Traffic Light (green for congruent inferences, yellow for generalisations, and red for errors or hallucinations), and completes the self-evaluation rubric (Table A.5).
- • In the control group (standard instruction): during the same 6 total hours, students address identical content (digital citizenship, interface impact, and Magritte's work) through traditional laboratory methodologies: interactive lectures

with standard presentations, guided web research, and group PowerPoint paper preparation, without the use of meta-reflective devices, the threshold experiment, or the Data Traffic Light.

Phase C: Docimological Evaluation and Inter-Rater Reliability Verification At the conclusion of the unit, to ensure procedural rigour and limit subjective bias:

1. Final products (image and critical text) and logbooks from the experimental group are collected in coded and anonymised form;

2. Independent evaluation: two teachers (the lead teacher and an internal observer or special education teacher) examine the materials applying the Meta-Reflective Aisthesis Docimological Rubric (Table A.4) and assign a score from 1 to 4 to each dimension.

3. Calculation of inter-rater agreement: the degree of consensus between scores assigned by the two observers is measured using Cohen's kappa coefficient. A value of $\kappa \geq 0.80$ indicates high agreement, suggesting the rubric descriptors are clear and discriminating enough to guide consistent judgments across observers.

Phase D: Final Survey and Comparative Analysis (Post-Test) At the end of the instructional unit (time: approximately 30 minutes), the second AFLQ survey is administered to both experimental and control groups. Data analysis includes: a comparative quantitative analysis of mean score changes between pre-test and post-test across both groups (using paired-samples parametric tests or analysis of covariance ANCOVA), hypothesising statistically significant positive gains ($p < .05$) in Intentionality, Self-Regulation, and Self-Efficacy in favour of the group that experienced the meta-reflective cycle; and a descriptive qualitative integration of texts and logbooks to examine whether and to what extent signs of progressive critical distancing from interface automation and greater awareness of decision-making intentionality emerge. This protocol aims to provide school communities and researchers with an operational framework, adaptable to specific context features and oriented toward controlled documentation of learner agency development processes.

6. Conclusions

The theoretical and methodological pathway outlined in this paper shows that the challenge of education in the era of computational automation can be resolved neither by nostalgically avoiding technology nor by uncritically submitting to its flows. Magritte's threshold metaphor shows that human freedom plays out precisely at the suture point between digital representation and lived experience. By combining the Universal Design for Learning 3.0 framework with Gert Biesta's subjectification imperative and wellgrounded care for aesthetic accessibility, education gains the tools to deactivate the passivity of the 'algorithmic Self,' restoring learners' joy of intentionality, the density of bodily presence, and the fullness of existential agency.

References

Baldacci, M. (2006). Ripensare il curricolo: Continuità, discontinuità, competenze. Carocci.

Bandura, A. (2006). Toward a psychology of human agency. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 1(2), 164–181. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1745-6916.2006.00011.x

Bateson, G. (1972). Steps to an ecology of mind. Chandler Publishing Company.

Bertolini, P. (1988). L'esistere pedagogico: Ragioni e limiti di una pedagogia come scienza fenomenologicamente fondata. La Nuova Italia.

Biesta, G. (2006). Beyond learning: Democratic education for a human future. Paradigm Publishers.

Biesta, G. (2022). World-centred education: A view for the present. Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003098331

Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice, 5(1), 7–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/0969595980050102

CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning guidelines version 3.0. https://udlguidelines.cast.org

Code, J. (2020). Agency for learning: Intention, motivation, self-efficacy and self-regulation. Frontiers in Education, 5, Article

19. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2020.00019

Damasio, A. (1994). Descartes' error: Emotion, reason, and the human brain. G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Flavell, J. H. (1979). Metacognition and cognitive monitoring: A new area of cognitive-developmental inquiry. American Psychologist, 34(10), 906–911. https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.34.10.906

Floridi, L. (2015). The Onlife manifesto: Being human in a hyperconnected era. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3- 319-04093-6

Floridi, L. (2020). Pensare l'infosfera: La filosofia come design concettuale. Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Gallese, V. Il Sé digitale: Neuroscienze della risonanza corporea nell'infosfera. Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Kant, I. (2004). Critica della ragione pura (P. Chiodi, trad.). Bompiani. (Original work published 1781)

Magritte, R. (1933). La condition humaine (Oil on canvas). National Gallery of Art, Washington, DC, United States.

Mayer, R. E. (2014). Incorporating motivation and emotion into cognitive theory of multimedia learning. In R. E. Mayer (Ed.), The Cambridge handbook of multimedia learning (pp. 719–740). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139547369.035

McKenney, S., & Reeves, T. C. (2018). Conducting educational design research (2nd ed.). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315105642

Ministero dell'Istruzione e del Merito. (2022). Circolare ministeriale prot. n. 107190 del 19 dicembre 2022: Indicazioni sull'utilizzo dei telefoni cellulari e di analoghi dispositivi elettronici nelle classi.

Ministero dell'Istruzione e del Merito. (2024). Circolare ministeriale prot. n. 5274 dell'11 luglio 2024: Disposizioni in merito all'uso degli smartphone e del registro elettronico nel primo ciclo di istruzione e linee guida per la secondaria. As a supplement to, and partial supersession of, Circular 5274/2024 for upper secondary school, the Ministry issued further national guidelines in 2025 extending the ban on smartphone use during lesson hours to upper secondary schools as well, starting with the 2025/2026 school year. The measure prohibits personal smartphone use during lesson hours, even for educational purposes, except with specific, reasoned authorisation from the teacher within planned educational activities (e.g., educational apps, guided research).

Mortari, L. (2015). Filosofia della cura. Raffaello Cortina Editore.

Plass, J. L., & Kalyuga, S. (2019). Four ways of considering emotion in cognitive load theory. Educational Psychology Review, 31(2), 339–359. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-019-09473-5

Ritchhart, R., Church, M., & Morrison, K. (2011). Making thinking visible: How to promote engagement, understanding, and independence for all learners. Jossey-Bass.

Sasanelli, M., Di Fuccio, R., & Baldassarre, V. (2025). Universal Design for Learning 3.0: Framework evolutivo per l'equità e l'agency nei contesti ibridi. Journal of Inclusive Methodology and Technology in Learning and Teaching, 5(1), 15–32.

Sweller, J. (2011). Cognitive load theory. In J. P. Mestre & B. H. Ross (Eds.), The psychology of learning and motivation: Cognition in education (Vol. 55, pp. 37–76). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-387691- 1.00002-8

Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.

Um, E. R., Plass, J. L., Hayward, E. O., & Homer, B. D. (2012). Emotional design in multimedia learning. Journal of Educational Psychology, 104(2), 485–498. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0026609

W3C. (2023). Web content accessibility guidelines (WCAG) 2.2 (W3C Recommendation). https://www.w3.org/TR/WCAG22/

Wiliam, D. (2011). Embedded formative assessment. Solution Tree Press.

Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attaining self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. R. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation (pp. 13–39). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978- 012109890-2/50031-7

Appendix A: Methodological, Design, and Docimological Apparatus Classroom matrices and assessment rubrics for the authentic task 'Magritte's Threshold' (heuristic interpretation adapted from CAST, 2024).

Table A.1. Multiple Means of Engagement (The 'Why' of Learning in UDL 3.0)

UDL 3.0 Guideline	Inclusive and Aesthetic Scaffolding	Target Soft Skills
Guideline 7: Welcoming Interests and Identities	Co-construction of team cooperation rules; optimisation of autonomous choice (7.1: full freedom in selecting caring gestures); preventative accessibility in Phase 1 (optional eye contact or posture/hands focus).	Relational empathy, interpersonal openness, emotional co-regulation.
Guideline 8: Sustaining Effort and Persistence	Authentic existential challenge based on class-	Cooperative teamwork, constructive conflict

	room relational experience (Onlife doubling); positive interdependence via defined cooperative roles (models, photographer, editor).	management, decision autonomy.
Guideline 9: Emotional Capacity (Self-Regulation)	Integration of hermeneutic pause and logbook journaling; minimising threats and distractions (7.4: valuing technical error as a heuristic research resource).	Affective self-regulation, operational resilience, metacognitive self- assessment.

Table A.2. Multiple Means of Representation (The 'What' of Learning in UDL 3.0)

UDL 3.0 Guideline	Inclusive and Aesthetic Scaffolding	Target Soft Skills
Guideline 1: Perception	Aesthetic accessibility: visual structure free from cognitive overload; WCAG 2.2- compliant contrast and high-legibility fonts.	Manage visual attention, organise information, and support visual literacy.
Guideline 2: Language and Symbols	Coordinated multimodal stimuli (Magritte's canvas, concept maps, selected philosophical texts); authentic representation of cultural plurality.	Hermeneutic decoding, intercultural communication, semantic accuracy.
Guideline 3: Building Knowledge (Comprehension)	Integrate graphic knowledge organisers and bilingual guide sheets to support cognitive transfer between artwork and daily use of digital tools.	Deconstructive critical thinking, conceptual synthesis, analogical transfer capacity.

Table A.3. Multiple Means of Action and Expression (The 'How' of Learning in UDL 3.0)

UDL 3.0 Guideline	Inclusive and Aesthetic Scaffolding	Target Soft Skills
Guideline 4: Interaction (Physical Action)	Flexibility in managing physical devices and spatial scene composition; autonomous time management during analogue-to-digital transitions.	Sensorimotor coordination, autonomous time management, operational flexibility.
Guideline 5: Expression and Communication	Differentiated expression channels via choice boards (photos, soundscapes, poems, tactile sculptures); student- managed digital exhibition on whiteboard.	Multimodal communication, expressive creativity, peer tutoring and support.
Guideline 6: Strategy Development (Executive Functions)	Weekly roadmap for teamwork planning; descriptive rubrics and logbooks for monitoring progress in itinere.	Goal setting, strategic planning, reflective monitoring.

Table A.4. Docimological Rubric of Meta-Reflective Aisthesis (Teacher Evaluation — Inter-Observer Agreement $\kappa \geq 0.80$)

Dimension / Criterion	Level 1: Initial (Guided)	Level 2: Basic (Partial)	Level 3: Autonomous (Functional)	Level 4: Advanced (Transformative)
1. Epistemological and Critical Awareness (Mastery of infosphere, Onlife, algorithmic Self)	Recognises core concepts only when prompted by direct teacher questions.	Autonomously describes basic concepts, briefly connecting them to daily digital media use.	Autonomously applies and connects theoretical concepts to own technology habits, arguing correlations.	Re-elaborates theoretical frames transdisciplinarily, linking interface critique to complex ethical scenarios.
2. Device Governance and Aesthetic Accessibility (Instrument governance and	Uses basic smartphone functions and composes a visual product following step-by-	Governs devices with partial autonomy; creates a composition meeting minimum con-	Selects expression registers and governs technology coherently, applying WCAG 2.2	Masterfully integrates multiple expression registers, harmonising aesthetic quality

visual expression)	step instructions.	trast/legibility.	accessibility standards.	with conceptual intent.
3. Self-Regulation and Metacognitive Monitoring (Logbook care and heuristic error management)	Documents only some phases; requires external support to identify/correct errors.	Compiles logbook regularly describing actions; identifies technical errors in standard tasks.	Autonomously monitors process in logbook, verbalising difficulties and resolution strategies.	Critically analyses cognitive schemas in logbook, resignifying error as a heuristic resource.
4. Democratic Participation and Cooperation (Role compliance and inclusive team climate)	Completes task only when constantly coordinated by peers; struggles with roles/timing.	Collaborates in group work, completing specific role tasks.	Actively participates, takes responsibility, and consistently supports teammates toward shared goal.	Promotes active listening and co- regulation, facilitating the integration of all individual specificities.

Table A.5. Meta-Perception Self-Evaluation Matrix (Learner Self-Assessment)

My Meta- Perception	**Level 1: I Need Guidance**	**Level 2: I Am Trying**	**Level 3: I Am Autonomous**	**Level 4: I Can Mentor**
Attention and Time Management	I easily lose focus and get distracted by screens.	I can focus only when the teacher or teammates remind me.	I consciously alternate digital production with analogue reflection pauses.	I have developed personal strategies for deep focus and help my team manage time.
Group Expression and Dialogue	I struggle to speak up and let others make all decisions.	I express my viewpoint only when asked directly.	I state my ideas clearly and propose creative solutions for the photo.	I practice active listening and ensure quieter peers feel welcome to share their ideas.
Relation to Errors and Impasses	When I face a technical/conceptual difficulty, I freeze and want to give up.	Errors cause me anxiety, but I wait for someone to show me the right solution.	I accept error as a normal stage and actively search for alternative strategies.	I view error as a valuable resource for understanding the medium's functioning and limits.
Inclusive Climate and Hospitality	I tend to work alone or ignore the team's working climate.	I participate in group activities only when assigned a rigid task.	I respect roles, listen to everyone's proposals, and accept peers' expressive diversity.	I ensure every team member feels fully welcomed, heard, and valued.