Euroconnect

Strengthening Civic Competences and EU Democratic Life

Framework for Training and Education

Deliverable D3.A1

Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci ETS

Co-funded by the European Union

Deliverable information

Grant Agreement No.	
Project acronym	EuroConnect
Project title	Strengthening Civic Competences and EU Democratic Life
Project timeframe and duration	24 months
WP	WP 3 Expanding the Foundations of Civic Competence Education
Task	1
Deliverable	D3A1
Status	Complete
Version number	1.0
Deliverable responsible	Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci ETS
Dissemination level	

Project coordinator

Name	
Organization	University of Tartu
Email	Thomas.luke.pritchard@ut.ee
Postal address:	Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies, Lossi 36, 51003 Tartu, ESTONIA

Version history

Version	Date	Author	Description
1	30/01/2026	Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci ETS	First draft
2	30/05/2026	Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci ETS & University of Tartu	Final version

Author list

Name	Organization
Melisa Bucur	Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci ETS
Alar Kilp	Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies, University of Tartu

Summary of the Project

EuroConnect is an Erasmus+ cooperation project coordinated by the Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies at the University of Tartu, which runs until October 2027 and focuses on strengthening civic competences and participation in EU democratic life among young people. The consortium (University of Tartu, University of Göttingen, University of Siena, and CSC "Danilo Dolci") develops and tests transnational learning formats – online student debates, school workshops, teacher training activities, and a project-based university course – linking EU-level issues to local realities and curricula.

The best practices, the feedback and the results of the activities will be recorded and transformed in a toolkit, providing a set of concrete actions and guidelines, which can be implemented in the future practices of civic competence education. The project aims to generate both direct impact on students' civic skills and robust evidence and tools (guidelines, toolkit, recommendations) to help European education systems integrate civic competence development more systematically.

Key results of this project will be the improved knowledge of civic competences among students, as well as an enhancement of their own civic competences. There will also be the formulation of updated practical methods in civic competence education to achieve this enhancement. Additionally, teachers working on civic competence education will be able to facilitate more engaging experiences for students working on civic competences and students will find their educational experience improved.

Table of Contents

Deliverable information....1
Project coordinator....2
Version history....2
Author list....3
Summary of the Project....4
Table of Contents....5
List of abbreviations....6
Introduction....7
The Framework for Training and Education....8
Principles and methodological foundations....10
Non-formal education (NFE)....12
Engaged and transformative pedagogy....14
Reciprocal maieutic approach (RMA)....16
Topics and Activities....19
Embodied civic and democratic knowledge – EU focus....20
Social responsibility, community engagement and participation....26
Critical thinking....34
Annexes....44
Self-assessment questionnaires....44
Reporting template....54
Evidence collection checklist....55

List of abbreviations

Acronym	Description
WP3	Work Package 3 – Expanding the Foundations of Civic Competence Education
NFE	Non-Formal Education
RMA	Reciprocal Maieutic Approach

Introduction

Across Europe, democratic backsliding, rising polarisation, and a growing distance between citizens and EU institutions have renewed attention to the role of education in fostering civic engagement and strengthening young people's connection to the European Union – not only as a set of institutions but as a lived space of participation. Traditional civic education has often focused on transmitting knowledge about rights, institutions, and procedures. While valuable, this approach may leave a gap between what students know and what they are able to do as active citizens. Many young people learn what democracy is, but have fewer opportunities to practise how to deliberate, manage disagreement, or critically address contemporary issues. To address this distance, civic competences need to be developed not only as knowledge but as skills, attitudes, and values that are actively exercised. This calls for innovative, hands-on practices that complement traditional civic education – moving from reception to embodied, participatory, and reflective learning. The Framework for Training and Education wants to respond to this challenge by providing implementers with methodologies and guidelines designed to make civic competences actionable across different European contexts.

A definition of civic competences

Civic competences refer to the knowledge, skills, attitudes, and values that enable individuals to participate fully in public life, fostering active and responsible citizenship. These competences include understanding societal and political processes, human rights, democratic values, and the ability to engage in activities that promote community well-being. The development of civic competences helps individuals contribute to democratic societies, ensuring they can advocate for themselves and others within the political and social structures of their communities.

The Framework for Training and Education

The Framework for Training and Education seeks to provide guidelines and methodologies and to test them for the implementation of effective and innovative civic education workshops in secondary schools, with a focus on developing civic competences.

It is designed as a supportive tool for civic education implementers who wish to experiment with different methodologies in the field, with the aim of creating stronger links between theoretical learning and practical application, ultimately fostering active citizenship.

More specifically, the development of the current document responds to three interrelated needs:

1. Develop and strengthen civic competences among secondary school students, thereby enhancing their connection to and participation in the EU's democratic life;
2. Implement innovative, hands-on methodologies that offer practical, real-life applications;
3. Ensure methodologies are adaptable and applicable across different European contexts.

To meet these objectives, the Framework is organized into the following sections:

1. **Principles and methodological foundations**: a description of the principles and methodologies guiding the workshops, their relevance in this context, their characteristics, and accompanying guidelines for their use as approaches in civic education lessons.
2. **Topics and activities**: a description of the main topics selected for the workshops. These topics were chosen in response to gaps in civic education in secondary schools that were considered particularly important, as identified in consultation with the University of Tartu. Moreover, examples will be given of practical activities that can be carried out within each topic.
3. **Annexes**: these include self-assessment questionnaires and a reporting template that will close the loop by allowing implementers to document and

evaluate the implementation of the workshops, identifying potential needs of further activities to strengthen the impact.

The Framework and the results of its application will first be discussed in a collaborative exchange among the project partners and students training to become teachers from the University of Göttingen. This process will facilitate transnational knowledge exchange and further promote reflection on the needs and solutions for more effective civic education across Europe.

The results of this work will feed into a final Toolkit, providing comprehensive insights collected throughout the project's activities.

Principles and methodological foundations

The Framework for Training and Education is grounded in three complementary approaches: **non-formal education, engaged pedagogy, and the Reciprocal Maieutic Approach**. These frameworks inform the design of workshops that place participants at the centre, using dialogue, participatory exercises, and collaborative problem-solving to explore civic issues.

Civic issues can be defined as public matters that affect communities at multiple levels – such as in school, local, national, and European Union contexts – entailing collective decision-making or power relations and relating to democratic values, rights, or responsibilities.

Each methodology contributes specific tools to engaging with civic issues: Non-formal Education (NFE) offers flexible activities to develop transversal skills; engaged pedagogy positions participants as active and co-responsible shapers of the learning process; and the Reciprocal Maieutic Approach (RMA) structures shared understanding through collective inquiry. Activities are structured to apply these principles directly, enabling participants to explore civic issues and relate concepts to their own experiences through hands-on exercises, in line with the objectives of the work package.

The added value

Traditional civic education often focuses on transmitting knowledge, so that while students learn what democracy is, they rarely practice how to deliberate, manage disagreement, or engage critically with different perspectives. The result is a gap between knowing and doing, that the workshops in WP3 address by introducing different methodologies aimed at fostering the active practice of democratic skills.

Non-formal education (NFE) places peer learning and active participation at its core, and connects the learning processes to real-life scenarios. Moreover, it supports the development of key transversal competences for civic education, including critical thinking, problem-solving, teamwork, and effective communication.

Engaged pedagogy understands learning as a holistic process that involves the whole person – including experiences, emotions, and embodiment – thus moving civic education beyond a purely intellectual exercise. It also foregrounds questions of voice and power, as well as the capacity to remain in dialogue despite disagreement, fostering communication across differences. At the same time, it emphasises co-responsibility: learners and educators share responsibility for shaping the learning environment. In this sense, pedagogy itself becomes a transformative practice embedded in everyday life.

The Reciprocal Maieutic Approach (RMA) conceives knowledge as something co-constructed through the exchange of experiences and collective inquiry. In practice, this means that the facilitator does not guide the group toward a predetermined outcome, but supports a process in which all contributions are examined, questioned, and deepened collectively.

Together, these three methodologies shift civic education from transmission to practice, from abstraction to embodiment, and from competition to collaboration. The added value is not in new facts about democracy, but in the lived experience of democratic skills.

Non-formal education (NFE)

NFE refers to an intentional and flexible learning process that places the learner at the centre. While formal education is often structured around predefined curricula, standardised pathways, and the transmission of subject-based knowledge, NFE is composed of a wide range of educational activities where adaptability is prioritized. This means that content, methods, and learning environments can be adjusted to participants' different learning styles, needs, and realities. In this way, learning can better respond to the diversity of learners and their contexts, making it more inclusive and accessible.

In addition, NFE goes beyond the acquisition of subject-based knowledge and places transversal skills – critical thinking, problem-solving, entrepreneurship, effective communication, teamwork – at its core. These competences are developed through active participation in learning processes rather than through passive reception of information. NFE thus creates learning spaces that encourage peer learning and value every participant's contribution, engaging cognitive, as well as emotional and experiential dimensions of learning.

For all these reasons, NFE is particularly well suited to addressing civic and social topics, which benefit from participatory and critical learning approaches, where learners are directly engaged in reflecting, exchanging perspectives, and actively contributing to the learning process.

More practically, applying NFE approaches to civic education in school means making a series of concrete methodological choices that change how learning happens in everyday classroom practice. In practical terms, this can mean:

- Starting from real and current civic issues, preferably connected to students' local context or to topics they encounter in their daily lives, and using these issues as learning triggers rather than as examples at the end of a theoretical explanation.
- Designing activities that require active participation – such as debates, simulations, case studies, or collaborative problem-solving tasks – where students are asked to negotiate and make decisions, instead of passively receiving information.

- Allocating time for structured reflection, both individually and collectively, to help students make sense of what they experienced during the activity and explicitly connect it to their lives.
- Working in a peer learning setting and treating difference and controversy as core learning resources, thus encouraging students to learn from one another and respect multiple viewpoints.
- Linking civic learning to action, even in small and realistic ways, for example through awareness campaigns, school-based projects, or interactions with local community actors, so that civic competences are practiced and not only discussed.
- Adopting a facilitative teaching role, where the educator guides the process, asks questions, and supports reflection, while progressively giving students responsibility for their learning and collective outcomes.

Engaged and transformative pedagogy

Engaged pedagogy refers to an educational approach and teaching practice grounded in the idea that learning is a holistic, relational process. Complementary to NFE, knowledge is not seen as fixed or transmitted from teacher to student, but as co-constructed through dialogue and critical questioning, starting from learners' lived experiences. This approach emphasizes the connection between theory and practice, recognizing that learning is never neutral but inherently political, with the potential to inspire personal and social transformation.

A key aspect of this approach is the full engagement of learners – not only their minds, but also their experiences and emotions – which are integral to understanding and meaning-making (hooks, 1994). In hooks' engaged pedagogy, emotions are not separate from cognition; attending to feelings such as curiosity, frustration, hope, and care enables authentic engagement, and supports the development of critical consciousness and ethical action.

In this framework, the educator moves from a position of authority to one of guidance. Rather than simply delivering content, educators facilitate discussions, introduce concepts, and help structure the learning process. Learners, in turn, share responsibility for shaping both the process and the outcomes of learning, actively contributing their perspectives, questioning assumptions, and connecting theoretical ideas to their lived experiences (hooks, 1994). Learning is therefore not something that is delivered, but something that is collectively produced through participation. This shift challenges hierarchical teaching models without abandoning structure or rigour; instead, it reframes rigour as the capacity to engage critically and ethically with complex issues.

This framework is particularly well-suited to civic education because it aligns the learning process with the goals of active citizenship. By integrating learners' experiences, reflections, and emotions, it allows them to relate abstract civic concepts – such as democracy, equity, or social responsibility – to their own communities and daily lives. This approach encourages learners to critically examine social structures, question assumptions, and consider the consequences of civic actions, rather than simply memorizing rules or theories.

Applying engaged pedagogy in civic education thus means designing learning experiences that involve learners fully – intellectually, emotionally, and experientially – and treat their lived experiences as foundational to learning. In practical terms, this looks like:

- Valuing and integrating learners' personal and community experiences as legitimate and critical starting points for exploring civic themes, rather than anecdotal contributions.
- Encouraging emotional engagement alongside cognitive understanding, recognizing that feelings and values deeply influence how students relate to social and civic issues.
- Shifting the educator's role from content deliverer to learning facilitator and guide, supporting students in structuring their inquiry and reflection without imposing fixed answers.
- Promoting collective responsibility for learning, where students actively co-create knowledge, shape the learning process, and take ownership of outcomes through participation and reflection.
- Fostering a critical, reflective, and ethical attitude towards complex civic issues by engaging students in examining power relations, social inequalities, and the consequences of civic actions.

Reciprocal maieutic approach (RMA)

The RMA is a pedagogical approach developed within the work of sociologist, nonviolent activist and educator Danilo Dolci. It arises from the conviction that learning, education and social change cannot be separated from the active participation of the people directly involved. Historically, Dolci applied this approach in Sicily, creating spaces with local communities to address social issues such as poverty, illiteracy, and lack of basic services, leading to tangible results. For instance, in the town of Partinico, these collaborative efforts contributed to the construction of schools and better water and sanitation infrastructure, illustrating how collective inquiry and participatory problem-solving can produce transformative changes.

The approach takes its name from the Socratic concept of maieutics, understood as the art of bringing to light the potential already present in individuals; however, unlike classical maieutics, which is monodirectional, Dolci's approach is explicitly reciprocal. Learning does not occur through guidance by an authority figure, but unfolds through a shared process in which participants support one another in expressing their experiences and intuitions, in critically engaging with concrete problems and collaboratively developing possible solutions.

Danilo Dolci places particular emphasis on the careful and intentional use of language. Rather than being a neutral tool for conveying information, language is a relational and exploratory medium. Participants use language to ask questions, share experiences and interact with each other's ideas. In this way, language becomes a dynamic mechanism for co-constructing knowledge, requiring continual clarification and negotiation to achieve a shared understanding. This highlights the difference between real communication and transmission. Unlike transmission, where a sender delivers predefined content to passive receivers, communication is a bidirectional, participatory process that requires participants to listen, respond, and refine their understanding together. Another important distinction underlying Danilo Dolci's educational approach is that between power and domination. Power is conceived positively as the capacity to act, create, and participate, while domination refers to relationships that condition or control others through economic, political, or social means.

In practice, the Reciprocal Maieutic Approach is implemented through maieutic laboratories: structured, dialogical settings designed to activate a process of collective inquiry. Participants, seated in a circle, are invited to reflect on a shared question rooted in a concrete situation that needs addressing. Each participant contributes by expressing their own understanding, listening to others and responding or asking questions about what emerges from the group. This allows knowledge to develop through reciprocal interaction rather than individual statements.

Rather than explaining, evaluating or guiding participants towards specific conclusions, the role of the facilitator is to safeguard the maieutic process by ensuring equal speaking opportunities, sustaining attentive listening and helping the group to remain focused on the shared inquiry. No answers are validated as correct or incorrect; instead, the emphasis is placed on making meanings explicit and progressively clarifying points of agreement, as well as potential solutions and responses to the presented problem, planning a potential intervention to solve the issue, if necessary.

The Reciprocal Maieutic Approach is particularly suitable for civic education as it is grounded in the same practices that civic competences require: dialogue, shared responsibility, critical examination of social issues. Civic education does not aim only at knowledge of institutions or rules, but at developing the ability to take part in democratic processes. The RMA addresses this aim by engaging learners in practising these competences through the learning process itself, rather than learning about them in abstract terms. It is worth emphasising that the RMA can function as either a specific methodology developed through maieutic laboratories, as described above, or as a general educational approach that informs daily teaching practice. Last but not least, the Reciprocal Maieutic Approach is meant to be also as an approach to life and relations with the others, not only at laboratory/workshop level: it trains people to welcome the complexity of others' perspectives and views, encouraging to find a shared vision and solutions to the main challenges a community faces.

In particular, applying the RMA in civic education involves:

- Facilitating reciprocal dialogue, where each student contributes experiences, and intuitions, and listens actively to others, helping the group to develop shared understanding rather than providing predetermined answers.
- Using maieutic questions that provoke reflection, curiosity, and critical thinking. The aim is to generate doubt, inquiry, and collaborative exploration of civic issues.

- Organizing learning through participatory circles or “laboratories,” where participants sit together, speak in turn, and engage in collective observation and analysis of real-life problems or community challenges, as well as in the shared formulation of possible solutions.
- Separating authority from facilitation, so that the educator does not impose solutions or interpretations, but supports the process by ensuring participation, reciprocity, and the synthesis of emerging ideas.
- Connecting discussion to lived experience and community realities, allowing learners to link civic concepts such as democratic participation and equity to concrete situations they encounter in their communities.
- Encouraging collective responsibility and reflection, where students share ownership of both the learning process and outcomes.

Topics and Activities

The Framework for Training and Education organizes learning around three core areas: Embodied civic and democratic knowledge (with an EU focus); Social responsibility, community engagement and participation; and critical thinking.

These topics were first selected to directly address the project's objectives of strengthening students' civic competences and connection to EU democratic life through hands-on, experiential learning.

Secondly, these choices address specific gaps identified in the participating countries, such as limited participation in democratic activities and underdeveloped skills in applying civic knowledge to real-world contexts.

The selection and structuring of these topics are also informed by key European competence frameworks, in particular the Council of Europe's Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture and the European Union's Key Competences for Lifelong Learning. These frameworks provide a shared conceptual reference for civic competence as an integrated combination of knowledge, skills, values, and attitudes, and emphasise the need for education that practically builds the ability to act and think critically in civic contexts.

By combining the three aforementioned criteria – project objectives, needs analysis and EU framework alignment – the Framework provides a basis for workshops that are both practically oriented and strategically relevant, thereby enabling students to translate civic knowledge and values into concrete, participatory action.

Embodied civic and democratic knowledge – EU focus

Civic and democratic knowledge refers to the understanding of democratic principles and processes that enable individuals to participate in public life. In the European educational context, this knowledge is closely linked to active citizenship – understood not only as voting, but as sustained engagement with public issues and community life.

From this perspective, fostering active citizenship requires that learners develop an understanding of the structures, values and dynamics that shape democratic societies. The Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture (RFCDC) does in fact underline that democratic culture is not only a matter of institutions and legal frameworks; it is a living system sustained by shared practices and values.

However, a general gap can be identified in the passage from what one knows to democratic action. Civic knowledge often remains something confined to an intellectual zone of reception and abstraction. Learners may acquire information about rights, institutions and procedures, but struggle to connect these concepts to their lived experiences and to their own capacity for action. Moving from abstract knowledge to embodied experience means creating conditions in which learners can recognize democratic values and dynamics in their own experiences, give them personal meaning, explore and question them, see how they appear in practice, and from this process be prompted towards action.

Activity: Embodying EU Values

This activity moves EU values from abstract principles to embodied experiences. Inspired by Augusto Boal's Image Theatre, participants work in small groups to represent – through silent, frozen images made with their own bodies – a chosen EU value, a challenge that threatens it, and a possible civic action to address that challenge. By making the body an active part of the process, the activity transforms what often sounds abstract into something concrete, felt, and personally relevant.

Through collective creation, observation, and dialogue, participants deepen their understanding of how values are lived, violated, and defended in everyday situations, and explore together what it means to put democratic values into practice.

DURATION: 45 minutes – 1 h | **PARTICIPANTS**: 15–18 yrs |**GROUP SIZE**: any

MATERIALS: flipchart or whiteboard, chairs, space for movement and group work

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Identify key fundamental EU values and experience them through embodied representation, while developing non-verbal communication skills and collaborative meaning-making through group image creation.
- Connect EU values to real-life situations and everyday contexts.
- Explore and reflect on ways of putting democratic values into practice through individual and collective civic actions, and participate in guided reflection and dialogue on how values are lived, challenged, and defended in society.

INSTRUCTIONS

Step 1**:** Exploring EU values (20 min)

- Divide participants into six small groups and assign one EU value (human dignity, freedom, democracy, equality, rule of law, respect for human rights) to each group.
- Ask each group to discuss and define what their assigned value means in their own words.
- Each group briefly presents its interpretation in plenary.
- Support a short collective discussion to clarify and align understanding of the values, and then list them on a flipchart.
- Reorganize participants into an even number of groups divided into two complementary orientations (Group A and Group B groups) for the following activity.

Step 2: First scene: challenges (8 minutes)

- Ask each group A to choose an EU value and create a “sculpture” or “frozen image” representing a challenge to it, drawing on their own knowledge or real-life experiences. They can use their bodies and any simple materials or objects available (scarves, pens, notebooks, etc.) to build their scene.

- Groups B observe the image and briefly discuss what the challenge represents and how it relates to the value.

Step 3: Second scene: the action (8 min)

- Groups B act as “sculptors”: starting from Group A’s challenge image, they physically transform it into a new frozen image representing a possible civic action or response to address the challenge.

Step 4: Debriefing (20 min)

Participants return to a large circle for a facilitated reflection in two parts:

Part 1 – Group comparison and exchange

Facilitate a guided discussion between Group A and Group B (working on the same image sequence). The discussion explores:

- whether the action proposed by Group B matches the challenge shown by Group A
- whether the two groups interpreted the challenge in the same way or differently
- whether Group A would have proposed a different response
- whether Group A was surprised by how their image was transformed
- whether the transformation suggested new ideas or perspectives

Part 2 – reflection on process and methodology

Lead a broader reflection on the activity and its aims. Guiding questions might include:

- *How did working through body images change the way you understood the topic?*
- *What did this method help you express or notice that words alone might not?*
- *Did this activity help explore EU values in a more concrete way?*
- *What made you choose that "scene" to represent? Did it bring to mind situations you have lived or witnessed?*
- *How could you put into practice what you explored in your daily life?*

Optional closing activity – collective action mapping

- As an alternative or additional closing activity, participants can collectively develop a simple action plan to support and promote the EU values discussed during the activity.
- This can be represented visually on a flipchart (e.g. ideas, actions, commitments, or strategies).

FACILITATION TIPS

Before you start

- Prepare all materials and ensure an open space where participants can move freely.
- Explain that the activity is based on collective learning, where everyone's contribution is essential. For this reason, it is important to co-create a safe environment together where everyone can participate, for example by agreeing on basic rules such as no judgement.

Adapting the activity

Less time: You can skip the initial group definition of EU values and move this part to the final reflection, where values are collectively discussed. However, ensure that reflection is still included, as it is a crucial part of the learning process.

Inexperienced or less engaged groups: Slow down the process and explicitly connect the activity to participants' real-life experiences and interests. Adapt the level of dialogue and embodiment depending on the group: sometimes deeper discussion is needed, sometimes it is more effective to keep a stronger focus on the physical and theatrical dimension.

Large groups: Reduce plenary presentations and clearly manage time by stating available time and reminding participants to stay within it to complete the activity. Prioritise observation and shared reflection over long presentations.

What to do if...

Participants don't know what to do: Help them connect the task to their own experiences and everyday life. Invite them to start from simple, concrete life scenes, as in a "living picture", expressing emotions and real actions rather than abstract

ideas. If needed, give a very simple, non-restrictive example (e.g. a situation of exclusion or inclusion at school, or a moment of cooperation or conflict), so that creativity is supported but not limited.

Images are unclear for others: Encourage interpretation first, explicitly explaining that this is part of the activity: meaning is co-constructed through different perspectives.

Stereotypes or simplified ideas appear: Avoid correcting directly. Instead, use guiding questions such as:

- "Why do you think that?"
- "What exactly is happening in this image?"
- "Can we imagine another perspective?"

Your role as facilitator

Your role is not to explain EU values or provide correct answers. Instead, you:

- help participants express and develop their own ideas and definitions
- ask open questions that stimulate reflection
- support dialogue between different perspectives
- ensure equal participation and, if necessary, explicitly invite to pay attention to possible imbalances in participation
- connect the images to real-life actions, emotions and experiences
- Avoid correcting interpretations or imposing meanings. When referring to EU values, use formulations such as: "At the EU these values are defined as" rather than presenting them as universal or fixed definitions.

Additional resources

Grant, D. (2017). Feeling for meaning: The making and understanding of image theatre. Research in Drama Education: The Journal of Applied Theatre and Performance. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1080/13569783.2017.1286977

Jääskeläinen, P., Woods, P., & Oganisjana, K. (2025). The importance of the aesthetic-embodied dimension in learning for democracy. AECED.

https://aeced.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/PP2-The-Importance-of-the-Aesthetic-Embodied-Dimension-in-Learning-for-Democracy-3-6.pdf

Phillips, D. P. (2014). Embodied civic education: The corporeality of a civil body politic. Journal of Pedagogy, *5*(1), 90–114. https://doi.org/10.2478/jped-2014-0005

Social responsibility, community engagement and participation

Social responsibility, community engagement, and participation refer to learners' ability to act responsibly and constructively in collective contexts, applying civic knowledge to understand issues and take actions that generate meaningful social impact. This is the domain of practical citizenship, where knowledge and democratic values are transformed into concrete participation.

According to the Council Recommendation on Key Competences for Lifelong Learning (2018), meaningful participation requires awareness of social, political, and legal systems as well as the ability to engage with others in civic activities, contribute to community life, and take responsibility for collective choices. Achieving this requires developing competences that enable students to critically recognize shared concerns, negotiate differing perspectives, make joint decisions, and reflect on the consequences of their actions.

In practice, learners develop these competences by engaging in activities that reflect the processes of real civic participation, including deliberating, negotiating differing perspectives, and reaching collective decisions. They also get to see how their actions can produce tangible impact and make use of digital tools to carry out initiatives to engage in civic processes.

Activity: Practicing collaborative deliberation

Students experience a structured deliberation process to make a shared group decision on an imaginary but realistic civic issue. They co-construct rules for respectful dialogue, use specific roles (Timekeeper, Empathy Keeper, Recorder, Spokesperson), follow a four-phase deliberation framework, and apply the Agreement Gradient to protect minority views. The activity ends with a reflective debriefing that connects the experience to democratic citizenship. Through this process, students develop practical skills in dialogue, perspective-taking, and collective decision-making.

DURATION: 45 - 90 min | **AGE**: 15 to 18 yrs | **GROUP SIZE**: 12–25 (groups of 4–5)

MATERIALS: Flipchart or whiteboard, markers, sticky notes, worksheets.

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Distinguish collaborative deliberation from other decision-making strategies, such as debate, where positions are opposed and one side tries to win.
- Follow a structured deliberation process that includes sharing perspectives, exploring consequences, and using a 5-point agreement gradient to reach a collective decision while protecting minority views.
- Develop practical skills for equitable group work, including timekeeping, ensuring balanced participation, active listening, and documenting the group's decision.
- Reflect on the group's decision-making process, identifying how deliberation connects to democratic practice and what makes a process just and equitable.

INSTRUCTIONS:

PART 1: OPENING CIRCLE (10 min)

Step 1:

- Before introducing the activity, ask students to think about conflicts or disagreements they have experienced in situations where a group had to make a decision (in class or in their personal life). Collect some examples on a flipchart.
- Use these examples to explore what led to the disagreement and how the group tried to reach a decision. Then ask: *"What are the different ways you know a group can make a decision?"*
- Collect answers and introduce two main approaches using a flipchart with two columns: debate / majority decision and collaborative deliberation. Guide students in co-defining both approaches by asking:
    - *"What is the goal in this type of decision-making?"*
    - *"How does the process usually work?"*
    - *"What are the advantages and possible limits?"*
- Once this is done, provide a short and clear definition of both approaches to consolidate understanding, then go back to the examples of conflicts and decision-making situations collected at the beginning and ask students to classify them.

- Finally, say: 'Today, you will practise collaborative deliberation.' Divide students into groups and give them the worksheet with the scenario, the roles they will take on, the steps they will follow, and some final tips.

PART 2: GROUP DELIBERATION (20 min)

Students work in small groups to make a decision using the worksheet provided.

Start of activity

- Make sure all groups have the worksheet and understand the scenario.
- Check that roles are assigned.
- Say: “Follow the steps on the worksheet. Your Timekeeper will guide your group.”

During the activity:

- signal the start of each phase (share → discuss → decide)
- give time warnings
- circulates among groups to briefly observe progress and provide short prompts when needed.

Collaborative Deliberation - Worksheet

SCENARIOS

In your school, many teachers complain that students are distracted by their phones during lessons. Some propose a strict ban: phones must be turned off and kept in lockers during the entire school day. Others argue that phones can be useful for learning and should be integrated into lessons instead of banned. What rules should the school adopt regarding phone use?
In your town, a public square is often used by young people in the evening. Some residents have complained about noise, litter, and feeling unsafe. The local council is considering installing surveillance cameras and increasing police presence. Others argue this would limit freedom and unfairly target young people. What should be done to make the space safe and fair for everyone?

In your school, some students from minority backgrounds (ethnic, religious, or LGBTQ+) have reported feeling targeted by offensive comments, both online and in person. Some teachers believe the school should introduce stricter punishments for those responsible. Others think punishment alone is not effective and suggest focusing on education, dialogue, and awareness. What actions should the school take to address discrimination and make all students feel safe?
Your school has received limited extra funding and must choose how to use it. Some argue it should improve academic performance with learning resources, labs, and extra curricular courses. Others believe priority should be student wellbeing and mental health. Others believe that priority should be given to student wellbeing and mental health. Some support investing in the overall school environment and daily student life, for example by improving common spaces and sponsoring student-led activities. What should be the main priority for the funding?
In your school, there is an ongoing debate about homework, tests, and academic workload. Some students and teachers believe the current system is too demanding and leaves little time for rest and personal life. Others argue that reducing workload could lower exam results and hinder future opportunities. What changes should the school make regarding workload?

TASK

ROLE	
Timekeeper	Keep time and say when to move to the next step.
Empathy Keeper	Watch who speaks to make sure equitable participation is taking place
Recorder	Write down the main ideas and the final decision.
Spokesperson	Present the group's decision to the class.

(In groups of five, two people share the Recorder role (one writes, one checks accuracy).

STEPS (the Timekeeper keeps time)

Step	Time	Task
1. **Share**	5 min	Each person says their opinion. Don't discuss yet.
2. **Discuss**	8 min	Talk about consequences: What are the positive and negative outcomes? Who is most affected?
3. **Decide**	7 min	Use the agreement scale (see below) to reach a decision. Try to reach consensus. If you vote, the Recorder writes any minority concern.

AGREEMENT SCALE (show with fingers)

Fingers	Meaning
5	**Fully agree**
4	**Agree with small reservations**
3	**Can accept it**
2	**Uncomfortable but will not block**
1	**Strongly disagree (must explain why)**

(If anyone shows a 1 or 2, the group asks: "What would need to change for you to move to a 3?")

LANGUAGE TOOLS – Expressing perspectives and managing disagreement

When you want to...	Instead of saying...	Try saying...
Express a different view	"You're wrong."	"I see it differently. Here's why..."

State a concern	"That won't work."	"I'm worried that… What if we tried…?"
Ask for clarification	"I don't get it."	"Could you give an example of what you mean?"
Acknowledge someone's point before disagreeing	"That's not right."	"I hear what you're saying, and I also think that…"
Check understanding	"You said that already."	"Let me make sure I understood: you mean that… Is that right?"

PART 3: PLENARY AND REFLECTION (15 min)

- Each group has a maximum of 60 seconds to present the decision they took and explain how they came to it.
- Once all groups have presented, facilitate a whole-class reflection. Ask:
  - *"What was the most challenging moment in your group's decision-making process?"*
  - *"How did your group move towards a shared decision? How did compromise feel?"*
  - *"What role did the different group roles play in the process? Were they helpful?"*
  - *"Did everyone have the opportunity to contribute? What helped or made it difficult?"*
  - *"Where and why do you think this way of working could be useful or important?"*

FACILITATION TIPS

Before you start

- Prepare all materials (worksheets, flipchart, markers) and organize the space to allow small group work.

- Explain that the activity is based on collaboration and shared responsibility. Co-create a safe environment by agreeing on basic rules such as respectful listening, no interruptions, and equal participation.

During

- Emphasise that the focus is not on the final solution, but on the process of engaging with others and different perspectives to reach a shared decision and eventual compromise.
- Already during circle discussions, model and introduce simple tools that support group discussion and decision-making. For example:
    - speaking one at a time by indicating the order of intervention (e.g. showing one finger for the first speaker, two fingers for the second, etc., or writing down names in order)
    - In moments of confusion or when many speak at once, introduce a shared signal for silence: one person raises a hand with the palm open; whoever sees it immediately raises their hand as well, and this continues until everyone has noticed and all participants have their hand raised, creating silence collectively. This supports co-responsibility, makes participants active in managing the process, and reinforce collaboration.

Adapting the activity

Less time: Shorten the initial phase by asking fewer questions and moving more directly from identifying ways of making decisions to introducing the difference between debate and collaborative deliberation. If needed, provide a brief explanation instead of co-defining it. Keep the final reflection, as it is essential to connect the activity to democratic practice.

Inexperienced or less engaged groups: Keep the process flexible and adapt it to participants' needs. Link the activity to their personal experiences of decisions and conflicts, and allow more time for discussion if needed. If the activity needs to remain more conversational, you can still practice some tools directly in the whole group setting, such as: using the agreement gradient; managing turn-taking (e.g. raising fingers to indicate speaking order); assigning someone to keep track of who wants to speak, or someone else to record different or opposing positions.

Large groups: Clearly manage time by stating how long each phase and presentation will last. Remind participants to stay within the timing to ensure the activity can be completed.

What to do if...

Some participants dominate the discussion: Draw attention to group roles and use them to rebalance participation. Remind the group of the importance of hearing different perspectives.

Some participants do not contribute: Encourage groups to involve all members and highlight the importance of participation for the learning process. Make participation process-oriented rather than output-oriented, ensuring that everyone has a space to contribute in their own way, without forcing anyone to speak. If needed, offer alternative ways to participate, such as writing ideas on post-its and placing them on a flipchart or wall, so they can then be read and used as part of the discussion.

Your role as facilitator

Your role is not to guide the content of the discussion or suggest solutions. Instead, you:

- support the process and keep groups aligned with the steps and roles
- emphasise the importance of the process over the final decision
- focus attention on participation and group dynamics, also helping the group become aware of them
- encourage participants to explain their ideas, develop them further, and go deeper through triggering questions
- Avoid influencing decisions or evaluating outcomes.

Additional resources

Barton, K. C., & Ho, L. C. (2023). Collaborative deliberation in the classroom. Phi Delta Kappan, 104(5), 44–49. https://doi.org/10.1177/00317217231156229

Critical thinking

Critical thinking is a core competence in civic and democratic education. It enables learners to analyse information, evaluate arguments, make independent, evidence-based decisions, and communicate their conclusions effectively (Hubert, 2020).

In educational contexts, this involves not only logical reasoning, but also recognising biases, assessing sources critically, and approaching controversial topics without unexamined assumptions: skills that protect against uncritical acceptance of misinformation or polarised views and support informed engagement in democratic processes.

Critical thinking also supports the development of complementary competences, including leadership, creative and flexible problem-solving, decisiveness, self-confidence, and the ability to articulate and defend one's opinions. These skills contribute to the holistic development of young people's personal and civic capacities.

The activities that follow introduce participants to these capacities, demonstrate their relevance to civic engagement, and provide opportunities to apply them to real social issues and information environments, including digital contexts where critical evaluation of sources and evidence is increasingly essential.

Activity – Reading between the lines

This activity encourages students to compare how the media portrays similar social events or groups. This reveals implicit biases, double standards and patterns of structural injustice that privilege some groups while marginalising others. They analyse and reflect on how these framing choices shape public perception, social attitudes and policy debates; consider how the media can reproduce or challenge social inequalities, as well as the ethical and civic implications of these patterns.

DURATION: 45-90 min | **AGE**: 15 to 18 yrs | **GROUP SIZE**: 12–25 (groups of 4–5)

MATERIALS: worksheets, highlighters or pens, flipchart or whiteboard

LEARNING OBJECTIVES:

- Analyse and compare media texts, identifying how language, tone, and framing shape the representation and understanding of events and people.
- Recognise implicit bias and double standards in media texts.
- Apply critical thinking and ethical reasoning.
- Reflect on how media representations influence public attitudes, reinforce stereotypes, and shape civic understanding.

INSTRUCTIONS:

Step 1 (5 min):

4. Tell pupils that they are going to analyse examples of media excerpts on similar subjects or topics and that they should look for possible differences between them.
5. Students work in small groups, using a worksheet to guide their comparison.

Step 2 (35 min):

- Students present their findings in a plenary (4 min max for each group)
- As each analysis is presented, guide the discussion step by step towards the idea of how reporting can differ and what effects this has on how people understand it.
- Gradually draw attention to the key dimensions of media framing:
    - what is included or left out
    - tone and word choice
    - how responsibility is presented
    - which perspectives are highlighted
    - emotional framing (e.g. sympathy, fear, criticism, neutrality)
    - possible bias or double standards when they emerge.
- Ask students to briefly share other examples they know from news, social media, or personal experience.

Additional questions:

- What consequences might these narrative choices have for public perception and debate?
- What is the responsibility of the media in shaping fair narratives?

SCENARIOS

Article A – “Eco-activists paralyse city centre: chaos and delays for commuters”

“The environmental group “Last Generation” blocked traffic in the city centre today by gluing themselves to the asphalt on one of the busiest streets. Motorists were stuck for hours, public transport was diverted, and local businesses reported losses. “They are irresponsible,” said a frustrated commuter. “They want to impose their ideas using terrorist-like tactics.” Police had to remove the activists with the help of firefighters and ambulances. The Interior Minister called it an “intolerable violation of democratic rules.”

Article B – “Students take to the streets for climate: ‘It’s our future, listen to us’”

Thousands of students marched today across the country to demand urgent action on the climate crisis. Young people with colourful signs walked in an orderly procession, with no violent incidents. “They are our future,” said a passer-by. “They are right to protest, even if skipping school might not be the best solution.” The mayor met a delegation of young activists, praising their civic commitment.

Article A – “*Working mother returns to office: “At what cost to her baby?*”

A mother of a newborn has gone back to work just eight weeks after giving birth, sparking a fierce debate about modern parenting. Jessica, a marketing manager from Bristol, says she had no choice, but child development experts are warning that prolonged separation so early could damage bonding. “The first months are critical for attachment,” said psychologist Dr Helen Marsh. “Regular, long hours away from the primary caregiver can have lasting effects on emotional development.” Online commenters were quick to judge. “Why have a baby if you’re not going to raise it?” one wrote. Another called her “neglectful” and “selfish”. Jessica defends her choice: “I’m doing this for his future too. We can’t afford for me to stay home.” But the question remains – at what cost?”

Article B – “Marcus, the Modern Dad Who ‘Helps Out’ at Home and Impresses His Colleagues”

Marcus, 40, works in administrative services and has recently started “helping out” more at home by taking care of his children when his wife is at work. “It’s not always easy,” Marco explains, “but I’m learning how to spend more time with the kids.” His colleagues describe him as “very supportive” and “unusually involved for a father.”

At home, Marco tries to be more present, occasionally helping with homework and taking the children to their after-school activities when he can.Observers see his growing involvement in family life as a positive example of modern fatherhood.

Article A – “Daniel Brooks Claims Bronze in 100m Final After ‘Smart and Controlled’ Race”

Daniel Brooks earned a bronze medal in the 100m final at the World Athletics Championships, delivering a well-executed and tactical race. Brooks started conservatively but showed strong composure in the final meters, securing his place on the podium. Commentators praised his “intelligent race strategy” and “ability to deliver under pressure.” Analysts highlighted his “experience and race awareness” as key factors in his performance. Brooks said: “It was about timing everything right. I’m happy I executed my plan well.” Fans and media outlets celebrated that he continues to be a reliable presence in major competitions.

Article B – “Emma Carter Wins Bronze After ‘Promising but Uneven’ Performance in 100m Final”

Emma Carter won the bronze medal in the 100m final at the World Athletics Championships, finishing with a time of 10.97 seconds in a tightly contested race. Carter started strongly, but commentators noted that she “appeared to tighten up slightly in the final phase,” losing some of her early rhythm. Analysts also pointed out that she “seemed to struggle to maintain fluidity under pressure,” particularly in the last 20 meters. At the finish line, she was visibly emotional, briefly covering her face before acknowledging the crowd. Some observers described her reaction as a sign of “how heavily the moment weighed on her,” while others suggested she may still be “developing the physical consistency needed at the highest level.” Despite the result, Carter expressed satisfaction: “I’m proud to be on the podium, but I know I have more to improve.” Experts suggest that while Carter remains one of the top sprinters in the world, she still needs to “prove she can dominate on the biggest stage.”

Article A – “Solidarity and Opportunity: Ukrainian Families Quickly Building New Lives Across Europe”

Across several European countries, Ukrainian families displaced by war continue to receive widespread support from local communities. Officials describe the arrivals as “families fleeing an immediate and visible war crisis,” emphasizing the importance of rapid humanitarian response. Municipalities, NGOs, and private citizens have created efficient reception networks that allow for rapid and dignified integration, with many volunteering to host families in their homes. Many of the arrivals are women with children, often already possessing skills that match labor market needs. “They are very motivated, eager to rebuild their lives and integrate,” says a volunteer working with a reception program. “The goal is to help them regain stability as quickly as possible.” Authorities have also simplified administrative procedures for school enrollment and employment access, enabling fast integration into local communities. Aid organizations describe the response as a “successful European model” based on cooperation and shared responsibility.

Article B – “Security Concerns Grow as Irregular Migration from North Africa and the Middle East Intensifies”

Southern European border regions are reporting a renewed increase in irregular arrivals from North Africa and the Middle East, raising concerns among authorities over border security and system capacity. Border officials describe the situation as “increasingly difficult to control,” with surveillance and interception operations being stepped up. Authorities emphasize the need to distinguish between legitimate asylum claims and potential misuse of migration channels, while local reception systems are reportedly under significant strain, with officials describing a growing “administrative and security burden” on coastal municipalities. Some political representatives are calling for stricter deterrence measures and faster return procedures for those not qualifying for protection. At the European level, discussions continue on strengthening external border enforcement and expanding cooperation with transit countries to reduce irregular flows.

WORKSHEET

1 – FIRST READ

Read Article A and Article B. In a few words, what do you think is the main message?

Article A: _____

Article B: _____

2 – COMPARE THE TWO SOURCES

Fill in with short answers or examples from the text.

Feature	**Source A**	**Source B**
Headline tone (How does the headline sound? Neutral, dramatic, positive, negative?)		
Word choice (1–2 words that show how people/events are understood; e.g. activist vs rioter)		
Main facts highlighted (What facts are emphasized?)		
Omitted facts (what is not mentioned that might help understand the story better?)		
Framing (Does the article present the situation as a problem, success, conflict? What feeling does it create about the people involved?)		

GLOSSARY

WORD	DEFINITION
TONE	How the article sounds and the feeling it creates. It can make you feel calm, worried, angry, excited, or supportive. The tone shows the emotional attitude of the text.
WORDING	The exact words chosen in the article. Words are important because they can change how we judge people or events without changing the facts.
VOICE	Who is allowed to speak or be quoted in the article. This includes experts, politicians, citizens, police, or others. If only one type of voice is included, the story may feel one-sided, because we do not hear other perspectives.
FRAMING	The way the story is "presented" or "shaped." It is the angle the journalist chooses: what they highlight and what they put in the background. For example, the same event can be framed as a problem, a success, a danger, or a support story.
DOUBLE STANDARD	When two similar situations are treated differently. One group is described more positively, another more negatively, even if the situations are similar.
BIAS	A tendency to show a preference or prejudice for or against a person, group, or idea, which leads to a one-sided perspective. Bias often happens without people realizing it, because of habits in thinking, language, or stereotypes. Some common biases include: • *Confirmation Bias*: Paying attention only to information that supports what you already believe. Example: If you think a group is "dangerous," you only notice news that confirms this idea and ignore positive stories. • *Negativity Bias*: Focusing more on negative information than positive information. Example: One small violent episode in a protest gets more attention than hours of peaceful demonstration. • *Implicit Bias*: Unconscious stereotypes or assumptions that affect how we think, feel, or act. Example: Thinking a young person is "suspicious" just based on their appearance, without any evidence. • *Authority Bias*: Trusting or giving more importance to information just because it comes from an authority figure (like politicians, experts, or police), even if it is not questioned.

FACILITATION TIPS

Before you start

- Prepare all materials (worksheets, highlighters or pens, flipchart or whiteboard) and organize the space for small group work followed by plenary discussion.
- Explain that learning will take place only through participants' engagement, and therefore their active participation is essential. To make this possible, everyone is responsible for contributing to and maintaining a safe space based on respect, no judgement, and open exchange.
- Clarify that there are no right or wrong answers, but rather different interpretations that will be explored through comparison and dialogue.
- Acknowledge that sensitive topics may emerge during the activity. Emphasise that emotions are legitimate and part of the learning process, and that they can be expressed and managed collectively in a respectful way, with shared responsibility for maintaining a safe environment.

Adapting the activity

Less time: Focus on fewer article pairs, or even just one pair if this allows for a deeper analysis within the available time. Skip detailed worksheet completion and move directly to guided comparison in plenary. Keep final reflection, as it is essential for critical thinking development.

Inexperienced or less engaged groups:
Also in this case, you may work with only one scenario to support deeper discussion. It is better to explore fewer issues in depth rather than many superficially. Similarly, focus on one dimension (e.g. framing or double standards) and guide reflection more closely, continuously linking it to participants' own experiences, ideas, and everyday life.

Large groups:
Strictly manage time during presentations (set a clear maximum per group). Prioritise comparison patterns rather than group-by-group reporting, and encourage collective discussion through questioning of all so that participants remain engaged.

What to do if…

Students express biased or potentially aggressive/strong statements: Unless verbally aggressive, do not correct directly or shut down contributions. Instead, pause and use guiding questions such as:

- "What makes you say that?"
- "Can you give me some examples?"
- "Is there another possible interpretation?"

In general, reframe towards reflection and evidence-based reasoning without adopting a judging attitude towards the participant.

Students struggle to identify bias or differences: Use the worksheet as a guiding tool. It can be used flexibly depending on time and group needs: if needed, transform the questions into prompts displayed on a flipchart to guide collective analysis.

Your role as facilitator

Your role is not to provide correct interpretations or explain the media texts. Instead, you:

- support the analytical process step by step
- guide attention towards language, framing, perspective, bias and double standards
- ensure discussion remains grounded in evidence
- encourage comparison and multiple interpretations
- help students move from description to critical analysis
- Avoid evaluating answers or indicating "right readings". Focus on how students construct and justify their interpretations.
- Ask triggering questions that connect the analysis to students' own experiences and everyday reality, so that reflection remains meaningful and not purely theoretical.

Additional resources

End Violence Against Women Coalition. (2024). Reporting on rape: Changing the narrative.

https://www.endviolenceagainstwomen.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2024/09/FINAL-RESOURCE-REPORTING-ON-RAPE.pdf

Kellner, D., & Share, J. (2007). Critical media literacy: Crucial policy choices for a twenty-first-century democracy. Policy Futures in Education, 5(1), 59–69. https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2007.5.1.59

Annexes

Self-assessment questionnaires

The pre-questionnaire should be administered before the activity begins, while the post-questionnaire should be completed right at the end of the activity in order to evaluate participants' learning outcomes, feedback, and overall experience.

Pre-activity questionnaires

This questionnaire helps you reflect on what you learned during the workshop. Your answers are anonymous and will help us improve future activities!

Rate each statement from 1 to 5: 1 = strongly disagree | 5 = strongly agree

Workshop 1: Embodying EU Values

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I can name at least three of the core EU values	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can connect EU values with my own feelings and my daily life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

3. I understand how an abstract value like "equality" can be respected or violated in real-life situations at school, online, or in my community.					
4. When I see a situation where a democratic value is being threatened, I can imagine a small, realistic action that I or my friends could take to defend it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5 I can understand perspectives and communicate ideas using different forms of expression, not only words.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I feel comfortable discussing values and opinions with others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Workshop 2 – Practicing Collaborative Deliberation

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1. I understand the difference between debate and collaborative deliberation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can express my ideas clearly and take into account different perspectives in group discussions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I can stay involved in a group discussion even when people disagree.					
4. Everyone in my group had a fair change to speak and share their opinion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I can follow and contribute to a structured process to reach a decision together in a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I can help my group make a decision that considers different opinions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Workshop 3 – Reading Between the Lines

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. When I read a news article, I can identify key words that show a point of view or influence opinions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can tell when a news article is trying to make me feel a specific emotion (like fear, anger, or sympathy).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I understand what double standards are and I can recognize them in news articles.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I can identify an important/different point of view that a news article leaves out.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I can explain how media representations of certain groups or situations can affect real life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. I feel confident analysing a news article and explaining what message it gives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Post-activity questionnaires

This questionnaire helps you reflect on what you learned during the workshop. Your answers are anonymous and will help us improve future activities!

Rate each statement from 1 to 5: 1 = strongly disagree | 5 = strongly agree

Workshop 1: Embodying EU Values

Statement	Strongly agree	Agree	Neither	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I can name at least three of the core EU values	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can connect EU values with my own feelings and my daily life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I understand how an abstract value like "equality" can be respected or violated in real-life situations at school, online,					

or in my community.					
4. When I see a situation where a democratic value is being threatened, I can imagine a small, realistic action that I or my friends could take to defend it.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5 I can understand perspectives and communicate ideas using different forms of expression, not only words.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I feel comfortable discussing values and opinions with others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I liked this workshop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The workshop was well organized (clear objectives, useful materials, adequate duration)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

9. The facilitator was clear and created a safe atmosphere where I could speak, participate and collaborate well with others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. What I learned will be useful for school or everyday life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Workshop 2 – Practicing Collaborative Deliberation

Statement	1	2	3	4	5
1. I understand the difference between debate and collaborative deliberation.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can express my ideas clearly and take into account different perspectives in group discussions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I can stay involved in a group discussion even when people disagree.					

4. Everyone in my group had a fair change to speak and share their opinion.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I can follow and contribute to a structured process to reach a decision together in a group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I can help my group make a decision that considers different opinions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I liked this workshop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The workshop was well organized (clear objectives, useful materials, adequate duration)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The facilitator was clear and created a safe atmosphere where I could speak, participate and collaborate well with others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

10. What I learned will be useful for school or everyday life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Workshop 3 – Reading Between the Lines

	Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. When I read a news article, I can identify key words that show a point of view or influence opinions.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I can tell when a news article is trying to make me feel a specific emotion (like fear, anger, or sympathy).	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I understand what double standards are and I can recognize them in news articles.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I can identify an important/different point of view that a news article leaves out.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

5. I can explain how media representations of certain groups or situations can affect real life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I feel confident analysing a news article and explaining what message it gives.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I liked this workshop	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. The workshop was well organized (clear objectives, useful materials, adequate duration)	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. The facilitator was clear and created a safe atmosphere where I could speak, participate and collaborate well with others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. What I learned will be useful for school or everyday life	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Reporting template

Trainers: [Insert Trainer Name]

Participants: [Insert Number of participants]

School : [Insert name of school and location]

Session overview :

Session number	Date	Activity implemented

Overall feedback

Engagement level:

[Comment on the level of engagement and participation of the participants]

Overall Feedbacks of the trainers on the implementation:

[Provide an overall satisfaction rating or comment on the training program].

Self-assessment evaluations results and observations

[Results of pre and post-questionnaires]

Other comments:

[Include additional comments or suggestions you may have]

Evidence collection checklist

Date	Item
☐	Teacher declaration
☐	Pre-questionnaires
☐	Post-questionnaires
☐	Photos (Photos (remind: take pictures without including students' faces)
☐	Activity materials and outputs (if you use them)
☐	Activity report

Coordinator

University of Tartu, Johan Skytte Institute of Political Studies
Estonia
skytte.ut.ee/en

University of Siena
Italy
en.unisi.it

Georg-August-Universität Göttingen
Germany
www.uni-goettingen.de

Centro per lo Sviluppo Creativo Danilo Dolci – ETS
Italy
danilodolci.org

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 National Agency (Haridus- ja Noorteamet). Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Project Number: 2025-1-EE01-KA220-HED-000358939

Co-funded by the European Union