



Co-funded by
the European Union



GenerationInfinity

**The Generation Infinity Project:
Enhancing digital skills,
competencies and safety
in European older adults and seniors!**

WP2 – M2

Appendix and Worksheets



 **Bluechain**



Project Partners

The Generation Infinity Project (2024-1-BG01-KA220-ADU-000248972) 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 European Education and Culture Executive Agency (EACEA). Neither the European Union nor EACEA can be held responsible for them.

Author	Project Partner
Fabrizio Rosini	Fondazione Università adulti/anziani
Silvia De Mori	Fondazione Università adulti/anziani

Creative Commons License



CC BY-NC 4.0

Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International

This license requires that reusers give credit to the creator. It allows reusers to distribute, remix, adapt, and build upon the material in any medium or format, for noncommercial purposes only.



Project Partners



Table of Contents

Section 1

Checklist for an Age-Friendly Analysis of a Digital Service	3
1. Objective	3
2. Information about the digital service	3
3. Checklist	3

Section 2 Teaching scenarios

1. Table of scenarios to be discussed in class	7
--	---

Section 3 Worksheet: Analysing a digital service from an age-friendly perspective

1. Objective	9
2. Instruction for participants	9
3. Suggested Timing	9
4. Worksheet	9

Section 4 Worksheet: Trainer's Self-Reflection

1. Objective	13
2. Essential session data	13
3. Worksheet	13

Section 5 Worksheet for the module final evaluation

1. Objective	17
2. Evaluation data	17
3. Evaluation criteria and trainer's worksheet	17
4. Worksheet for participants	20



Project Partners



1. Checklist for an Age-Friendly Analysis of a Digital Service

1. Objective

This factsheet allows you to quickly assess whether a digital service is accessible, understandable, and usable by older people, with particular attention to clarity, autonomy, dignity, and user support.

2. Information about the digital service

- Service analysed:
- Organization/company:
- Date:
- Evaluator:
- Service Category:
- Senior reference user:

3. Check list

1. Visual readability

- The text is easily readable.
- The font size is adequate.
- The contrast between text and background is sufficient.
- The essential information emerges clearly.
- Icons, colours and symbols are consistent and understandable.

2. Clarity of language

- The language is simple, direct and non-technical.



Project Partners

- The instructions are short and logically arranged.
- The operational steps are clearly explained.
- There are no unexplained specialist terms.
- The content does not require any unstated implicit knowledge.

3. Navigation and orientation

- The path to follow is immediately clear.
- The user always understands which stage he is in.
- The main buttons are clearly visible.
- It is possible to go back without difficulty.
- The overall structure reduces the risk of loss.

4. Error handling

- Errors are prevented whenever possible.
- The error messages are clear and helpful.
- The system tells you how to correct the error.
- You can easily recover from a wrong action.
- The user is not penalized for small formal errors.

5. Cognitive load and times

- The service does not require too many consecutive passes.
- The completion or response times are reasonable.
- There are no too fast deadlines.
- The information is distributed gradually.



Project Partners

- The user can proceed calmly.

6. Autonomy of the elderly user

- The service allows for autonomous use.
- The instructions allow you to proceed without constant help.
- The path is clear even for those with limited digital skills.
- Simple alternatives are provided in case of difficulties.
- The service does not presuppose any unspecified skills.

7. Respect and inclusion

- The language is not paternalistic.
- The service does not blame the user.
- There are no age stereotypes.
- Communication values dignity and autonomy.
- The overall approach is inclusive and non-infantilizing.

8. Support and assistance

- It's easy to find a support channel.
- There are clear contacts to ask for help.
- Accessible FAQs, guides, or instructions are available.
- There are alternative ways for those who encounter difficulties.
- Support can be achieved without complex paths.

9. Evaluation outcome

- Overall age-friendly service: ☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No



- Main strengths:
- Main critical issues:
- Priority improvements:
- Final remarks:

Operational summary

- Suitable for seniors: ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Partially
- Requires language review: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Requires flow simplification: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Requires more human support: ☐ Yes ☐ No
- Requires visual accessibility interventions: ☐ Yes ☐ No



Project Partners



2. Teaching scenarios

Table of scenarios to be discussed in class

Case	Synthetic scenario	Main barriers to observe	Possible effects on the elderly person	Discussion tracks in the classroom
1. Access to the online medical report	Maria, 74, receives a text message asking her to download a medical report from a healthcare portal, but encounters confusing access, complex authentication, and incomprehensible technical messages. After several attempts, she gives up and asks her daughter for help.	Confusing login path; difficult authentication ; technical language; lack of step-by-step guidance.	Frustration; giving up; dependence on others; loss of trust.	Where is the barrier: within the user or within the system? What simplifications would make the service more age-friendly?
2. Booking an appointment	Giovanni, 69, tries to book a specialist appointment online; the portal requires a lot of information, multiple screens, and quick confirmations; after an error, some of the data already entered is lost.	High cognitive load; long flow; tight deadlines; low error tolerance.	Stress; feeling of ineffectiveness; risk of abandoning the procedure.	What design elements increase the difficulty? How can we transform this case into a training activity?
3. Banking app and	Lucia, 78, tries to make a bank	Sudden change in	Anxiety; mistrust;	When does security



Project Partners

security	transfer using a banking app; the system requires an additional authentication process she's never used before, and the steps appear different than in the past.	flow; unclear instructions; security-related overload.	persistent delegation to family members; reduced autonomy.	protect and when does it exclude? How can we explain complex procedures without infantilizing them ?
4. Digital municipal services	Antonio, 72, needs to apply for a municipal service; the form is online only, the language is bureaucratic, and there's no immediate support contact.	Digital by default; administrative language; lack of alternative channels; low-visibility support.	Disorientation; renunciation; exclusion from access rights to services.	What alternatives should be considered? How can institutional language lead to exclusion?
5. Digital Literacy Course	During a class, the trainer says, "It's simple, just do it this way." A 76-year-old participant feels inadequate, stops asking questions, and falls behind.	Paternalistic language; implicit pressure on pace; failure to manage differences within the group.	Embarrassment ; silence; fear of making mistakes; lowered self-efficacy.	What are the signs of a non-inclusive teaching approach? How can we reframe the trainer's language?
6. Transport booking portal	Sandro, 80, uses a portal to book local transportation; the page features small print, poor contrast, confusing icons, and requires recalling data from previous screens.	accessibility; memory load; poor orientation; lack of summary.	Fatigue; errors; abandonment of tasks; loss of autonomy.	What changes would improve visual and cognitive accessibility? How can we approach the case in an age-friendly way?

Project Partners



7. Continuous family assistance	Anna, 75, always asks her son to use digital services for her and has stopped trying on her own, convinced she isn't good at it.	Dependence on external support; low self-efficacy; repeated experience of substitution.	Reduction of autonomy; preventive renunciation; internalization of incapacity.	When does help become a substitute? How can we foster trust and progressive autonomy?
8. Unclear error message	During an online application, the message "Invalid Operation" appears without explanation; the participant doesn't understand what to correct and aborts the procedure.	Inadequate feedback; lack of corrective guidance; non-user-oriented language.	Frustration; blockage; abandonment of service.	What characteristics should a good error message have? Why might a technical detail lead to exclusion?

Section 3 Worksheet: Analysing a digital service from an age-friendly perspective

1. Objective

The activity helps participants to recognise the barriers that can make a digital service inaccessible to older people, to evaluate their practical and emotional effects and to propose improvements consistent with an anti- ageist and inclusive approach, in line with the themes of Module 2.

2. Instructions for participants

1. Read one of the scenarios assigned by the trainer.
2. Identify the main barriers present in the case.
3. Discuss what effects these barriers may have on the older person.
4. Propose at least three concrete improvements, related to service or communication.
5. Give a summary of the work done to the plenary session.

3. Suggested Timing

- Case reading: 5 minutes.
- Discussion in pairs or small groups: 10-15 minutes.
- Plenary feedback: 5 minutes per group.

4. Worksheet

Assigned Case/Scenario:

1. What digital barriers emerge in this case?



Project Partners

2. What practical or emotional effects might the elderly person experience?

3. The difficulty depends mainly on:

- ☐ User skills
- ☐ Complexity of the task
- ☐ Service design
- ☐ Language used
- ☐ Lack of support
- ☐ Combination of multiple factors

4. What improvements would you propose to make the service more age-friendly?

5. What considerations should a trainer take when working on this case?

6. What key message emerges from the case in terms of digital inclusion?



Project Partners



Variant for the trainer

For a more structured presentation, the trainer can ask each group to present their case study in four steps: problem description, identification of barriers, impact on the individual, and proposed improvements. This approach is consistent with the module's objectives, which include recognizing digital exclusion, critically analysing systems, and the use of anti-aging teaching strategies.



Project Partners



Section 4 Worksheet: Trainer's self-reflection

This worksheet supports trainers in reflecting on and improving their teaching practices related to digital ageism and senior inclusion.

1. Objective

The worksheet helps the trainer analyse a training session in a concise yet structured way, identifying strengths, weaknesses, and potential improvements related to language, methodology, accessibility, difficulty management, and promoting autonomy, in line with the module's objectives.

2. Essential session data

- Session Title:
- Date:
- Duration:
- Number of participants:
- Main topic covered:
- Activities carried out:

3. Worksheet

1. Clarity of objectives and contents

- Were the session objectives clear and understandable to participants?
- Was the content consistent with the level of the group?
- Were the most important concepts understood or did areas of confusion emerge?

2. Language and posture of the trainer



Project Partners

- Was the language used respectful, inclusive, and non-paternalistic, as required by the form?
- Were expressions used that reinforced dignity, autonomy, and trust?
- At what points might the tone, pace, or explanations have been too rapid, simplifying, or directive?

3. Participation and involvement

- Did the participants actively participate in the session?
- Who participated the least and for what possible reasons?
- Did the activities foster discussion, reflection, and critical awareness?

4. Management of the difficulties that have emerged

- What difficulties emerged during the session?
- Did the difficulties appear to stem mainly from the participants' skills, the complexity of the task, the language, materials, or design of the service being analysed, according to the approach proposed in the module?
- How were these difficulties addressed?
- Did the trainer's response foster autonomy or risk the participant's replacement?

5. Accessibility of materials and activities

- Were the materials used readable, clear, and appropriate for a senior audience?
- Were the instructions clear and well-paced?
- Did the proposed activities reduce or increase the cognitive load of the participants?
- Would it be helpful to modify examples, screenshots, timelines, or media?



Project Partners

6. Learning and observable results

- Did participants demonstrate a better recognition of forms of digital exclusion?
- Were they able to connect the observed problems to the service design, language, or system organization, as required by the module objectives?
- What concrete signs of learning have emerged?

7. Educational climate and dignity

- Was the classroom climate respectful and safe for asking questions and making mistakes?
- Have there been signs of embarrassment, withdrawal, anxiety, or self-depreciation?
- How did the session leadership support dignity, participation, and a sense of efficacy?

8. Improving the next session

- Which activity worked best and should be continued?
- Which part of the session requires review?
- What concrete changes will be introduced in the next edition?
- What materials or examples would be useful to prepare or substitute?

Trainer's final summary

Main strength of the session:

Main criticality observed:



Priority improvement action:

Short version for quick post-session use

- What worked well today?
- Where did difficulties or resistance emerge?
- Was the language truly inclusive and non-paternalistic?
- Did I encourage autonomy or did I intervene too much?
- What concrete changes will I make in the next session?

Final note

This outline can be used at the end of each session or collected as a tool for continuous improvement, in line with the module's recommendation to use participant reactions, errors, questions, and observation of practice to refine examples, pacing, materials, and future explanatory strategies.

**Project Partners**

Section 5 Worksheet for the module final evaluation

1. Objective

The chart allows the trainer to evaluate in an essential but structured way the learning outcomes of the participants at the end of the module, balancing conceptual understanding, analytical skills, professional sensitivity and orientation towards anti-ageist practices, as indicated in the section dedicated to the evaluation of the module.

2. Evaluation data

- Participant Name:
- Date:
- Title of the final session / activity:
- Evaluator:
- Type of test:

☐ Oral discussion ☐ Case analysis ☐ Practical exercise ☐ Written reflection

3. Evaluation criteria and trainer's worksheet

Criterion	Initial level	Basic level	Good level	Advanced level
1. Understanding key concepts	It partially or confusedly recognizes the concepts of digital ageism, digital divide, and inclusion.	Identify main concepts but with limited or imprecise examples.	Understands and explains key concepts correctly with relevant examples.	Connects concepts with clarity, precision, and the ability to apply them to different contexts.
2. Recognizing barriers in	Struggles to identify	It acknowledges	Appropriately identifies	Accurately analyse visual,

Project Partners



digital services	barriers or tends to blame the problem solely on the user.	some obvious barriers, but the analysis remains incomplete.	barriers of access, language, design, or process.	cognitive, organizational, and systemic barriers, clearly distinguishing them.
3. Ability to critically read the system	It does not distinguish between individual limitations and systemic obstacles.	Begin to recognize that the system can produce exclusion.	Can explain why a difficulty may arise from service design or process organization.	It offers a comprehensive, non-blaming, and well-argued critical reading of the dynamics of exclusion.
4. Sensitivity to the language and dignity of the elderly person	Uses inaccurate or sometimes stereotyped language.	It shows general attention to respect, but with formulations that are not always consistent.	Use respectful, non-paternalistic, and autonomy-oriented language.	Demonstrates full awareness of the value of dignity, self-determination, and inclusion in training practice.
5. Proposal for solutions or improvements	It proposes generic or impractical solutions.	It suggests simple improvements, but they are not always consistent with the problem.	Makes relevant, realistic proposals aimed at making the service or teaching more inclusive.	Develops clear, concrete, and well-reasoned solutions, with a strong focus on accessibility and autonomy.
6. Application of an anti-ageist teaching approach	He struggles to translate concepts into educational practice.	It captures some aspects of inclusive teaching but still in a partial way.	Demonstrates the ability to set up respectful, gradual, and non-substitutive training interventions.	It confidently integrates methodology, language and management of difficulties in a fully anti-ageist perspective.
7. Final	The	The reflection	The reflection	The reflection is

Project Partners



professional reflection	reflection is very general or descriptive.	identifies some useful aspects but without going into depth.	highlights learnings, critical issues and possible improvements.	lucid, critical, and oriented toward the concrete improvement of training practice.
--------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Synthetic level attribution

- ☐ Initial level
- ☐ Basic level
- ☐ Good level
- ☐ Advanced level

Evaluator's observations

Participant's strengths:

Aspects to consolidate:

Operational suggestion for improvement:

Final outcome



Project Partners



- Overall result:

☐ Adequate ☐ Partially adequate ☐ To be strengthened

- The participant demonstrates the ability to recognize digital exclusion in services aimed at seniors:

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

- The participant demonstrates the ability to propose inclusive training responses:

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

- The participant demonstrates attention to language, dignity and autonomy:

☐ Yes ☐ Partially ☐ No

4. Worksheet for participants

For a very brief final evaluation, the trainer can use the following four essential indicators, consistent with the objectives of the module:

Essential indicator	Yes	Partially	No
Recognizes a situation of digital ageism or digital exclusion	☐	☐	☐
He can explain why the problem is not just the user's fault.	☐	☐	☐
Proposes at least one age-friendly or inclusive improvement	☐	☐	☐
Use respectful, non-paternalistic, and autonomy-oriented language	☐	☐	☐