



FOSTERING YOUTH PARTICIPATION
AND SOCIAL JUSTICE



Funded by
the European Union

NEXTGENVOICE

Guidebook of Non-Formal Learning Activities

Fostering Youth Participation and Social Justice

PROJECT NUMBER	2024-3-DE04-KA154-YOU-000271505
ACTION / FIELD	Erasmus+ KA154 Youth participation activity
WORKSHOP ARC	Budapest · Bilecik · Iasi · Darmstadt

A youth-facing facilitator resource for turning ideas into visible participation.



Prepared for NGOs, youth workers, schools and mixed student groups

A practical, colourful and youth-facing facilitator resource for turning ideas into visible participation.

PROJECT NUMBER	2024-3-DE04-KA154-YOU-000271505
ACTION / FIELD	Erasmus+ KA154 Youth participation activity
PROJECT ARC	Budapest, Bilecik, Iasi and Darmstadt workshops

★ Use this guide when you need energy, structure and transfer.

The redesigned version keeps the facilitator logic of the original document but makes the surface more attractive for youth audiences, partner sharing and quick workshop navigation.

EU visibility note.

The supplied project visual includes an EU funding statement. For public dissemination, use the official EU emblem and funding-statement package required for EU-funded communication materials.

Youth-facing visual edition / Prepared for NGOs, youth workers, schools and mixed student groups

START HERE

What this guidebook is for and how it should feel in use

→ Core promise.

Pick an activity, read the room, choose the right level of visibility, and leave with something visible on the wall, in the group, or in public space.

1 Designed for action, not passive reading.

This guidebook was designed as a practical working document rather than a narrative report. It selected the strongest reusable non-formal learning formats from the four KA154 workshops and turned them into facilitator-facing activity entries. Each activity was presented in the same structure so that practitioners could quickly see its purpose, group size, time, space, materials, facilitation logic, debrief direction,...

2 Keep the path gradual.







The project evidence showed that these activities worked best when facilitators adjusted language load, pacing and public visibility gradually. Activities that appeared demanding in plenary often became accessible once participants had first worked in pairs, trios, image-based tasks, movement formats or assigned-position speaking. Users of the guidebook were therefore encouraged to treat adaptation as part of good...

3 Partnership logic.

The project brought together Phoenix Knowledge Wings gGmbH in Germany as applicant organisation, Creative Youth Academy Hungary, ERFEY Bilisim ve Danismanlik in Türkiye, and SKILLHUB Inclusivity in Romania. The partnership mattered methodologically because each workshop chapter benefited from a different organisational lens while still feeding a common arc of youth participation, social justice, inclusion and practical...

VISUAL NAVIGATION

Six strands, nineteen selected activities and one practical continuation logic

 Civic engagement 4 activity cards	 Digital transformation 5 activity cards	 Social inclusion 4 activity cards
 Human rights 4 activity cards	 Cross-cutting 1 activity cards	 Supplementary practice 1 activity cards

ACTIVITY MENU

Fast planning map for timing, setting and best use

Activity	Strand	Time	Mode	Best use
Avatar and Identity Mapping	Civic	45-60	Indoor	Opening, trust
Community Issues to Advocacy Messages	Civic	60-75	Mixed	Issue-to-message
Street Action for Youth Participation	Civic	75-120	Outdoor	Public voice
Digital Collaboration Studio	Digital	60-75	Indoor	Shared problem-solving
Data-to-Idea Lab	Digital	60-75	Indoor	Evidence to action
Future of Work Sprint	Digital	55-70	Mixed	AI, justice, work
Embodied Leadership Archetypes	Inclusion	70-90	Indoor	Power and roles
Re-moving Debate	Inclusion	45-60	Indoor	Voice and fairness
Forum Theatre: Exclusion	Inclusion	90-110	Indoor	Conflict practice
Rights Mapping to Campaign	Rights	60-75	Indoor	Campaign logic
TV Interview under Pressure	Rights	55-65	Indoor	Public framing
Consent Circle for a Youth Action	Rights	40-50	Indoor	Collective decisions
Burnout Budget Battle	Cross	55-70	Indoor	Care and systems
Mirrors and Guided Pair Walk	Supplementary	30-45	Blended	Attention shift
One-Page Reading Lab	Supplementary	45-60	Indoor	Critical reading
Prototype and Pitch Clinic	Supplementary	60-90	Indoor	Digital refinement
Open Space Resource Wall	Supplementary	Ongoing	Blended	Youth-led ownership
Reconnect the Missing Youth	Supplementary	55-70	Indoor	Outreach design
Newcomers in the District	Supplementary	55-70	Indoor	Integration planning

WORKING PRINCIPLES

Keep methods energetic without making the room unsafe or chaotic

Choice first

Make role-play, movement and public formats voluntary. Participants can reduce exposure, change role or observe.

Visibility grows

Move from pairs, trios, images and short prompts into public speaking only when the room is ready.

Evidence stays visible

Use whiteboards, wall notes, mission boards and posted phrases so the room remembers what it produced.

Mixed modes win

Move between body, speech, design, reflection and public presentation instead of forcing one participation channel.

Youth-led, not trainer-empty

Let participants shape examples, cases, roles and next steps while facilitators protect timing and safety.

Adjust early

Treat hesitation as information. Change mode before a small problem becomes a failed activity.

© Audience reading.

Reading the audience meant observing the room before trying to change it. Across the project, facilitators looked for visible signals such as who entered quickly and who hovered at the edge, which participants spoke easily in pairs but withdrew in plenary, whether humour softened the room or made some people disappear, and whether the English load was creating silence that could be misread as disinterest. This early reading...

↔ Culturally aware warm-ups.

Energisers and warm-ups worked best when facilitators treated them as a pedagogical choice rather than as an automatic ritual. In mixed cultural and religious groups, the project avoided activities that assumed comfort with physical contact, eye-closing, public silliness, fast self-disclosure or body-based imitation without consent. Low-contact formats, position lines, short paired observation tasks, mirrors without touch,...



CIVIC ENGAGEMENT AND COMMUNITY LEADERSHIP

From identity and local issues to public voice and respectful city contact



01. Avatar and Identity Mapping

Civic engagement and community leadership

? Why run it.

To open a group through symbolic identity work rather than through long self-introductions, and to build an early bridge between personal agency and public participation.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 24 participants

TIME

45 to 60 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with wall or floor space; can be followed by an outdoor pair walk

MATERIALS

A4 sheets, coloured markers, tape, optional prompt cards or short quote strips

LANGUAGE LOAD

Low to medium, because images and hashtags reduce pressure at the start

Make it move

1

Do: Invite each participant to draw a simple avatar or symbolic self-portrait and add two to four words or hashtags that reflect how they currently locate themselves in relation to youth work,...

Why: The room entered through image, symbol and choice instead of performance-heavy introductions.

2

Do: Pair participants and ask each pair to read one another's page with curiosity rather than accuracy. The partner described what they saw, what kind of energy the page carried, and what...

Why: Participants practised listening and interpretation before speaking for the whole room.

3

Do: Bring the group into a short gallery walk or clustering moment. Participants placed their pages where they felt they belonged in relation to themes such as voice, fairness, uncertainty,...

Why: A visible group landscape began to form and later served as an early map of the room.

4

Do: Close with a short debrief in which participants named one thing that felt recognised and one thing they wanted the group to understand about how they entered the workshop.

Why: The activity produced both emotional safety and a first record of the diversity in the room.

↔ Make it easier

This activity became more accessible when facilitators clearly said that artistic quality did not matter and when people were not pushed too fast into full-plenary explanation. In mixed-English groups it helped to allow...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Which symbols or words carried the strongest sense of agency; what kinds of identity entered the room quietly rather than loudly; and how did the gallery layout already show different starting points for participation?



★ Project value.

The final project toolkit showed that early identity work was especially useful when the wider workshop was going to ask participants to move into public voice, outdoor observation or urban contact later in the week. It made later...



02. Community Issues to Advocacy Messages

Civic engagement and community leadership

? Why run it.

To move participants from naming local issues toward crafting short, credible advocacy messages that can survive contact with real audiences.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 28 participants

TIME

70 to 90 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with wall space and enough room for short standing exchanges

MATERIALS

Sticky notes, markers, wall sheets or whiteboard, optional issue prompts

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Ask participants to write concrete local issues they recognised in their own community life, especially where young people felt unheard, over-managed or insufficiently included.
Why: The discussion stayed anchored in lived reality rather than general values.

2

Do: Sort the issues publicly into a small number of live clusters such as urgent, invisible, difficult to change or requiring a local response. Let groups name the clusters in their own words.
Why: The room built a public evidence wall and began to see patterns rather than isolated complaints.

3

Do: In small groups, choose one cluster and create a short advocacy message that identified the problem, named who was affected, and indicated what first action or decision was needed.
Why: Participants practised compression, audience awareness and relevance.

4

Do: Run very short message tests between groups. One group delivered the message, another group responded as a sceptical public audience, and the original group tightened the wording.
Why: Messages became more credible because they were forced to survive challenge.

↔ Make it easier

When some participants felt that their English was too weak for advocacy language, facilitators first let groups build the message in plain, short sentences and only later refined the wording. This prevented style from...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Which messages sounded morally correct but practically vague; which ones became stronger after public challenge; and what changed when the group had to decide who exactly the message was for?

★ Project value.



Across the project, participants responded better when issue-based work did not jump directly from values to polished speech. The practical sequence of issue wall, clustering, small-group drafting and short challenge rounds helped hesitant...



03. Street Action for Youth Participation

Civic engagement and community leadership

? Why run it.

To test whether ideas about youth participation and social justice can be communicated clearly, respectfully and credibly in real public space.

BEST GROUP SIZE

8 to 20 participants, ideally in pairs or trios

TIME

90 to 150 minutes including preparation and debrief

SPACE

Public urban space with calm foot traffic and room for short exchanges

MATERIALS

Short question sheet, optional consent reminder card, note sheets, optional phone for documentation

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium, but short openings reduce pressure

Make it move

1

Do: Prepare indoors. Clarify the method, choose one short question, rehearse a simple opening line, and agree that the goal is not performance but respectful civic contact.

Why: Participants entered the city with a shared ethical frame rather than with random curiosity.

2

Do: Move into public space in pairs or trios. Participants first asked whether someone was open to one very short question and only then asked whether documentation was acceptable.

Why: Consent became part of the pedagogy rather than an afterthought.

3

Do: Keep the exchange short. The pair asked the question, listened carefully, took one useful note or short recording if permitted, and thanked the person without trying to prolong the...

Why: The activity rewarded clarity, listening and humility.

4

Do: Return indoors and convert what happened into evidence. Groups sorted what kinds of responses opened, resisted or complicated the topic, and reflected on how public space changed their own...

Why: The debrief turned raw contact into learning rather than anecdote.

↔ Make it easier

This activity worked best when facilitators discouraged over-explanation and when participants understood that a refusal was not a failure. In mixed-confidence groups, a pair structure with one speaker and one note-taker...

© Debrief that matters

How did public space change tone, speed and confidence; which opening line sounded most natural; what kinds of people had time for the exchange; and what did participants learn about respectful refusal?



★ Project value.

The final toolkit described the Germany Street Action as distinctive because it turned participation into practice rather than discussion. It also showed that a modest format with short openings and two-step consent was stronger than a...



04. Mirrors and Guided Pair Walk for Attention, Trust and Civic Observation

Civic engagement, participation readiness and outdoor transition

? Why run it.

To move a group from embodied attention into low-pressure outdoor observation so that later civic or advocacy work begins from real noticing rather than from abstraction alone.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 24 participants

TIME

35 to 50 minutes

SPACE

Large room with distance for pairs, then outdoor route or semi-outdoor transition area

MATERIALS

No special materials required; optional observation cards or one simple collection sheet

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

The group is hesitant, mentally scattered or about to move from indoor trust work into public-space activity

Make it move

1

Do: Invite participants into paired mirroring at a comfortable distance. One leads with slow movement while the other follows, then roles switch without discussion.
Why: The group enters through attention, rhythm and observation rather than through immediate verbal performance.

2

Do: Keep the pair structure but ask participants to walk side by side and notice one thing that supports participation in the environment and one thing that blocks it.
Why: Embodied work is translated into local civic noticing without a jarring change of mode.

3

Do: Bring the pairs back and ask them to post or say one resource and one barrier in short language only.
Why: The activity produces visible evidence quickly and prevents the return to the room from dissolving into vague reflection.

4

Do: Close with a short synthesis on what the environment reveals about access, comfort, invitation and exclusion.
Why: Participants begin to connect body, space and participation as one system rather than as separate topics.

↔ Make it easier

In practice this format worked best when facilitators framed mirroring as an attention exercise rather than as performance. No-touch rules, distance options and silent participation helped participants who were shy, tired or...

🕒 Debrief that matters

What became easier to notice after the mirroring phase; which resources and barriers had been invisible before leaving the room; and how did the outdoor transition affect confidence for later public or advocacy work?



★ Project value.

The applied methodology notes from Germany stressed that purposeful movement formats were stronger than generic energisers. This activity repeatedly helped facilitators reset the room, widen observation and lower the threshold before more...



DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION AND INNOVATION

Use technology as shared social problem-solving, not as tool display



05. Digital Collaboration Studio

Digital transformation and innovation

? Why run it.

To help participants use digital tools as shared problem-solving instruments rather than as isolated technical demonstrations.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 24 participants

TIME

60 to 75 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with stable connection if possible, but can be adapted with analogue placeholders

MATERIALS

Laptops or phones where available, collaborative board or shared document, projector optional

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Introduce one collaborative task linked to a real social challenge, for example a community issue map, campaign board, shared prototype page or youth-voice evidence wall.

Why: Technology was immediately framed as a means rather than as the theme in itself.

2

Do: Assign mixed roles inside each team, for example navigator, content keeper, clarity checker and practical tester. Avoid grouping only by pre-existing confidence.

Why: The room became less dependent on a few confident users.

3

Do: Give groups a short production task and keep the public objective visible. The output might be a live board, a collaborative list of barriers, or a rough digital concept for social use.

Why: Participants learned by building together instead of by listening about tools.

4

Do: Close with a comparison round in which groups explained not only what they made but what made collaboration easier or harder.

Why: The debrief captured both technical and social learning.

↔ Make it easier

The post-workshop Budapest review showed that plain-language framing at the start was essential. Mixed-role teamwork consistently worked better than separating the room into confident and less-confident technical...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Which role made the collaboration more inclusive; where did technical confidence create dependency; and when did the tool stop being abstract and become useful for a social purpose?

★ Project value.

The toolkit's Budapest chapter stressed that the strongest digital sessions stayed tied to fairness, access

and local problem-solving. This activity was therefore best introduced as a social-use workshop rather than as a generic digital...



06. Data-to-Idea Lab for Community Problem Solving

Digital transformation and innovation

? Why run it.

To help groups move from scattered information toward an actionable, data-aware idea without turning the room into a statistics seminar.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 28 participants

TIME

75 to 90 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with tables and visible wall or board

MATERIALS

Short data snapshots, local examples, markers, wall sheets, optional digital board

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Present a small number of data points, quotations or patterns linked to a local challenge. Keep the evidence readable and avoid overloading the room.

Why: The activity began with interpretation, not with technical intimidation.

2

Do: Ask small groups to decide what the evidence suggested, what it still did not explain, and what kind of youth-led action might respond to it.

Why: Participants practised moving from information to judgement.

3

Do: Have each group produce one clear idea using a simple structure: issue, affected group, first action, and what evidence would make the idea more credible.

Why: The room translated data into design logic.

4

Do: Compare ideas publicly and test whether they remained understandable to someone who had not seen the original evidence set.

Why: This protected the activity from becoming inward-looking.

↔ Make it easier

Facilitators observed that participants engaged more strongly when data points were short, visible and socially recognisable. Long explanation reduced energy quickly, especially in afternoon blocks.

© Debrief that matters

What kind of evidence felt meaningful rather than decorative; what remained unknown; and how did the group avoid pretending that data alone could solve a social problem?

★ Project value.



Project reflection showed that participants valued challenge but not obscurity. This activity therefore worked best when it stayed demanding yet concrete and did not require advanced technical vocabulary.



07. Future of Work Sprint

Digital transformation and innovation

? Why run it.

To explore the social, political and unequal dimensions of AI, skills change and youth entry into work through a movement-based simulation.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 16 participants in four groups

TIME

55 to 75 minutes

SPACE

Large indoor room with four corners and central whiteboard

MATERIALS

Scenario sheet, role cards, whiteboard or wall board

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium to high, but roles help distribute the pressure

Make it move

1

Do: Frame the scenario as a local urgency around AI-assisted productivity, shrinking junior entry routes and unequal access to digital tools. Put four groups in corners quickly.

Why: The room entered through urgency and positioning rather than through lecture.

2

Do: Each group identified one fear and one opportunity, then prepared its first public line. Encourage function sharing inside the group.

Why: Participants could hold a role without speaking from their personal identity.

3

Do: Open movement and public bargaining. Keep a whiteboard with three headings such as what changed, who benefits first and what protection is missing.

Why: Movement turned abstract labour-market talk into visible negotiation.

4

Do: Introduce a twist, then reopen bargaining and end with a short public package that includes skills, protections and entry routes.

Why: The simulation forced participants to think beyond enthusiasm for innovation alone.

↔ Make it easier

This worked best when the facilitator insisted that the AI question was not only technical. Participants who were initially less confident with digital language entered more strongly once the issue was reframed around...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Who was expected to adapt first; what kind of protection entered the room too late; and which proposals sounded innovative but ignored inequality?

★ Project value.

The simulation file described this game as powerful because it connected digital change with access,

dignity, income and social inequality. This matched the wider project logic in Budapest, where digital sessions worked best when they...



08. One-Page Reading Lab and Assumption Surfacing

Digital transformation, social analysis and critical interpretation

? Why run it.

To help participants move from fast opinion into structured reading, hidden-assumption analysis and alternative framing, especially when the group needs intellectual depth without a lecture-heavy tone.

BEST GROUP SIZE

8 to 24 participants

TIME

45 to 60 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with tables, wall space or floor space for clustering

MATERIALS

One short text per person, markers, tape, optional coloured cards for claims and assumptions

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

A workshop needs analytic depth, but long plenary explanation would reduce energy or widen confidence gaps

Make it move

1

Do: Give each participant a one-page text, image-rich article, opinion extract or issue brief and ask for a silent first read with only two marks: one strong claim and one unclear point.
Why: This slows the room down and gives quieter participants an equal starting position.

2

Do: Move participants into pairs or trios and ask them to reconstruct the text's visible argument, missing voices and likely assumptions.
Why: The task shifts from opinion to interpretation and helps mixed-confidence groups build meaning together.

3

Do: Ask each trio to post a short cluster under three headings: claim, assumption, silence.
Why: The wall structure prevents the analysis from remaining invisible inside table talk.

4

Do: Close with a short synthesis on how assumptions shape public language and how alternative framing changes the possible response.
Why: Participants leave with a more transferable method for critical reading and message design.

↔ Make it easier

This activity became much stronger when facilitators limited the text to one page and used plain headings instead of abstract literary prompts. In mixed-English groups, it helped to allow a first pair summary in very simple...

© Debrief that matters

Which assumption changed the reading most sharply; which voices were missing but important; and how did the activity affect the way participants later built arguments, campaigns or project language?



★ Project value.

The six-day methodological planning notes repeatedly treated the one-page lab as a bridge between attention work and public speaking. In implementation it helped groups move from reaction into interpretation, and it reduced domination by...



09. Prototype and Pitch Clinic for Socially Grounded Digital Ideas

Digital transformation and innovation

? Why run it.

To turn a digital or social idea into a simple, testable prototype and a short pitch that remains grounded in people, access and fairness rather than drifting into generic innovation talk.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 24 participants

TIME

60 to 80 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with tables, wall space and enough room for short public pitches

MATERIALS

Paper, markers, sticky notes, optional cards for users, obstacles and next-step routes

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

Participants have ideas but need help moving from concept to practical form without requiring advanced technical skill

Make it move

1

Do: Ask each group to define one social problem, one user group and one concrete situation in which the problem appears.

Why: This stops the design process from floating above real life.

2

Do: Have groups sketch a paper prototype, a storyboard or a simple user route showing how the proposed tool or idea would work.

Why: Low-tech prototyping keeps the focus on logic, not software polish.

3

Do: Run a short challenge round in which another group asks what the prototype changes, who it excludes and what it requires to survive.

Why: Early challenge improves realism before the pitch stage.

4

Do: Ask each group for a ninety-second pitch followed by one clarifying question from the room.

Why: The final public moment remains manageable while still requiring clarity and credibility.

↔ Make it easier

The Budapest evidence showed that digital work became more inclusive when facilitators gave role variety inside each team. Not everyone needed to act as the most technical member. Participants could hold user perspective,...

© Debrief that matters

Which pitch sounded useful rather than merely exciting; where did the prototype reveal hidden access problems; and what changed once another group challenged the idea from the user side?

★ Project value.

Partner review after Budapest highlighted that the strongest digital blocks were the ones that stayed tied to social use and practical benefit. This clinic captured that lesson and turned it into a repeatable structure that suited both...



SOCIAL INCLUSION AND EQUALITY

Turn inclusion from slogan into structure, pace and room culture



10. Embodied Leadership Archetypes for Participation

Social inclusion and equality

? Why run it.

To explore how different styles of holding power affect inclusion, group rhythm and participation culture.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 22 participants

TIME

70 to 90 minutes

SPACE

Open room with room to move and work in pairs

MATERIALS

Optional role prompts or short descriptive cards

LANGUAGE LOAD

Low to medium, because body work reduces early verbal pressure

Make it move

1

Do: Introduce several leadership archetypes, for example care, action, authority and vision. Keep the wording simple and avoid turning the categories into fixed identities.
Why: Participants entered through experiment rather than judgment.

2

Do: In pairs or small groups, ask participants to embody each archetype through posture, movement, tempo and spatial relation. Short rounds are enough.
Why: The body made power styles legible before debate began.

3

Do: Invite the group to compare what each style made easier and harder for participation, especially for quiet, uncertain or marginalised people.
Why: Inclusion became a design question rather than a slogan.

4

Do: Bridge the exercise into real youth-work situations by asking which style dominates too easily and which style is underused in practice.
Why: The method connected body awareness to facilitation choices.

↔ Make it easier

The Bilecik review showed that embodied entry made later sensitive discussion much more workable. It helped to name clearly that no one was being asked to reveal a private truth; they were testing modes of leadership in a...

© Debrief that matters

Which leadership style created space and which one reduced it; how did movement reveal hidden assumptions about authority; and what did inclusive leadership require beyond good intentions?

★ Project value.

The toolkit's Türkiye chapter highlighted that inclusion became strongest when the workshop focused on who set the pace, who spoke first and whose comfort shaped the room. This activity made those

questions visible very early.



11. Re-moving Debate: Voice, Fairness and Power

Social inclusion and equality

? Why run it.

To help participants interrogate hard questions about participation and justice without hiding inside their usual opinions.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 28 participants

TIME

45 to 60 minutes

SPACE

Open room with two visible sides or positions

MATERIALS

Provocative statements, floor markers or tape

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Mark two sides of the room and introduce one provocative statement related to fairness, participation or inclusion. Randomly assign positions rather than letting people start from their...

Why: The activity broke predictable alignment.

2

Do: Allow brief preparation in pairs or micro-groups, then open the first round of speaking from the assigned side.

Why: Participants could speak through a temporary position rather than from exposed personal identity.

3

Do: After one or two rounds, allow people to move if their view has shifted. Ask them to explain what changed.

Why: Movement itself became evidence of thinking.

4

Do: Capture the final pattern publicly and identify which arguments sounded strong, weak, emotionally persuasive or practically empty.

Why: The room learned to separate conviction, rhetoric and design logic.

↔ Make it easier


This method became especially accessible for shy participants once facilitators allowed a short pair-preparation moment before public speaking. It also helped to keep statements sharp but not insulting, so that the tension...

🕒 Debrief that matters

What argument did participants defend without fully believing it; what changed when movement was allowed; and which forms of fairness remained hardest to articulate clearly?

★ Project value.

The adapted activity pack framed this debate as a strong way to interrogate participation and justice questions without letting participants hide inside fixed opinions. Project evidence also showed that this graduated visibility model...



12. Forum Theatre: Exclusion Inside a Youth Campaign

Social inclusion and equality

? Why run it.

To test how exclusion can reproduce itself inside well-intentioned campaigns and to rehearse alternative interventions before real life.

BEST GROUP SIZE 12 to 20 participants	TIME 90 to 110 minutes	SPACE Indoor room with clear central playing area and safe observation line
---	----------------------------------	---

MATERIALS Simple scene prompts, chairs, optional name labels	LANGUAGE LOAD Medium, but scenes can begin with simple language
--	---

Make it move

1	<p>Do: Collect or build a short scene in which a campaign that claims to be inclusive still reproduces exclusion through pace, access, language or decision-making.</p> <p>Why: The issue moved from theory into a recognisable micro-situation.</p>
2	<p>Do: Play the scene once without interruption. Ask observers to notice where exclusion became visible and which choices shaped that moment.</p> <p>Why: The first run created shared evidence.</p>
3	<p>Do: Replay the scene and allow participants to stop the action, replace a role or test another move. Keep the interventions focused and short.</p> <p>Why: Participants practised action rather than post-event moral commentary.</p>
4	<p>Do: Debrief the tested alternatives. Distinguish between gestures that looked kind and changes that actually shifted structure, timing or power.</p> <p>Why: The room learned to evaluate interventions critically.</p>

↔ Make it easier

The trainer notes stressed that forum theatre should remain voluntary and that participants must be allowed to choose low-contact, non-touch and low-exposure versions of the work. In practice, this safety frame helped the...

© Debrief that matters

Where exactly did exclusion reproduce itself; which intervention changed the structure rather than only the tone; and what would be needed to make the alternative sustainable beyond one good moment?

★ Project value.

The Türkiye workshop review explicitly noted forum theatre as one of the methods that best tested

whether an apparently inclusive campaign still reproduced exclusion in practice. It therefore earned a central place in this guidebook.



13. Reconnect the Missing Youth

Social inclusion, youth participation systems and outreach design

? Why run it.

To let participants test how local institutions, outreach services, schools and community voices might build believable routes back to participation for young people who have slipped out of visibility.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 20 participants, usually in four groups

TIME

55 to 70 minutes including debrief

SPACE

Indoor room with four corners and one clearly visible whiteboard

MATERIALS

Scenario sheet, role cards, whiteboard or flip-wall, markers, optional twist card

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

The workshop needs to connect inclusion language to institutions, trust and realistic outreach choices

Make it move

1

Do: Introduce the scenario as a politically sensitive local problem and place four stakeholder groups in separate corners.

Why: The room enters the simulation as a live decision space rather than a discussion club.

2

Do: Ask each group to prepare one subgroup of young people they believe is being missed most often and one first action they think the system could take.

Why: This prevents generality and makes the groups choose a concrete focus.

3

Do: Open movement and use a visible pathway on the whiteboard with stages such as first contact, first yes, first practical support and next step.

Why: The board turns negotiation into public evidence and keeps the room from collapsing into vague talk.

4

Do: Introduce a constraint, such as delayed transport support or loss of one trusted outreach role, and ask the room to revise the pathway.

Why: The twist forces the design to survive beyond the easiest promise.

↔ Make it easier

This simulation became more workable when facilitators said clearly that participants were speaking from positions and pressures, not from their own identities. It also helped to keep the whiteboard sequence visible from the...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Which young people the room still struggled to imagine clearly; what practical support made the biggest difference between first contact and first yes; and where the system still sounded believable to itself but not to the...

★ Project value.

The detailed simulation guide treated this game as a strong way to expose the myth of one generic pathway for disengaged youth. In project use it proved especially valuable for inclusion work because it connected empathy to sequence,...



HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE

Move from local issues to rights, public framing and collective decisions



14. Rights Mapping from Local Issue to Campaign

Human rights and social justice

? Why run it.

To connect local human-rights issues to legal language, strategic framing and credible campaign design without collapsing into textbook explanation.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 28 participants

TIME

75 to 95 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with group tables and visible board

MATERIALS

Issue sheets, framework prompts, markers, wall board

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium to high, but can be scaffolded through pair work

Make it move

1

Do: Start from a concrete local issue rather than from a legal document. Ask groups to identify who is affected, what is happening and why it matters publicly.

Why: The room entered through recognisable social reality.

2

Do: Only then invite groups to connect the issue to one or two relevant rights frameworks, protections or legal principles. Keep the language usable.

Why: Rights language became a tool rather than a wall of terminology.

3

Do: Ask each group to turn the issue into a campaign outline with message, target audience, first action and desired change.

Why: Participants translated rights into action rather than stopping at recognition.

4

Do: Run short public tests so that another group can question clarity, realism and audience fit.

Why: The design became more strategic and less rhetorical.

↔ Make it easier

This method worked best when facilitators did not overload participants with too many frameworks at once. The Romania evidence suggested that the sequence mattered more than the volume of legal content.

🕒 Debrief that matters

What happened when the group started from the issue rather than the law; which legal framing actually strengthened the campaign; and where did the design become too broad to remain credible?

★ Project value.

The toolkit's Romania chapter emphasised that rights language could either empower or distance a mixed group depending on sequencing. This activity therefore treated legal content as a middle stage, not as the opening move.



15. TV Interview: Youth Power Under Pressure

Human rights and social justice

? Why run it.

To test how participants hold a position under public questioning, simplification and pressure, especially when working on justice or rights topics.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 20 participants

TIME

55 to 65 minutes

SPACE

Indoor room with two visible chairs or standing interview zone

MATERIALS

Question prompts, timer, optional camera for playback

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Frame the room as a public interview environment. One person or pair takes the role of spokesperson, while another takes the role of interviewer or sceptical public voice.

Why: The activity creates pressure without requiring a formal speech first.

2

Do: Use short, sharp questions linked to fairness, legitimacy, realism or public resistance. Keep answers brief and public.

Why: Participants practise concise positioning under pressure.

3

Do: Rotate roles quickly so that more than one participant can test the format. Observers note where the answer stayed clear and where it drifted into vagueness.

Why: The room learns from contrast, not only from success.

4

Do: Collect patterns about language, tone, simplification and staying credible when challenged.

Why: The method turns pressure into visible learning.

↔ Make it easier

In the project, this format worked especially well once participants had already built their thinking in small groups. Short pair preparation before the interview usually improved confidence without killing spontaneity.

© Debrief that matters

Which answers stayed grounded under pressure; where did participants start to defend too much; and what made a rights-based position sound credible rather than preachy?

★ Project value.

The Romania post-workshop review highlighted interview-based formats as especially effective for helping participants cope with pressure, simplification and sceptical questions. This made the activity highly reusable in follow-up settings.



16. Consent Circle for a Youth Action

Human rights and social justice

? Why run it.

To let a group select one next action through participatory governance rather than through rushed majority voting or trainer decision.

BEST GROUP SIZE

8 to 20 participants

TIME

40 to 50 minutes

SPACE

Indoor circle or semi-circle

MATERIALS

Proposal sheet or visible board, simple consent prompts

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium

Make it move

1

Do: Present one concrete youth action proposal or invite the group to refine one from earlier work. Keep the action specific enough to be judged.

Why: The method needs a real object of decision.

2

Do: Clarify the difference between preference and objection. Participants are not asked whether the action is perfect, but whether they see a serious reason why it should not go ahead in its...

Why: The room shifts from taste to workable collective judgement.

3

Do: Run one round for clarifying questions and one round for concerns or amendments. Keep the proposal visible and adjust it publicly where needed.

Why: Group decision-making becomes transparent rather than hidden.

4

Do: Check for consent and record the final version, together with first responsibilities or next steps.

Why: The group leaves with a visible outcome rather than a vague mood.

↔ Make it easier

This activity became more accessible when facilitators modelled objection language carefully. Participants often needed to see how a reasoned objection differed from personal dislike or general hesitation.

🕒 Debrief that matters

How did the consent process change the tone of decision-making; which concerns improved the proposal; and what made the final action feel more legitimate than a simple show of hands?

★ Project value.

The adapted activity pack presented this format as a transparent alternative to majority voting. In the project context it also supported the wider commitment to youth-led structure and visible public evidence.



17. Newcomers in the District

Human rights, social justice and local integration

? Why run it.

To help participants design the first ninety days of support and belonging for young newcomers while making trade-offs, waiting lists and public tension visible rather than pretending that inclusion is frictionless.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 20 participants, usually in four groups

TIME

55 to 70 minutes including debrief

SPACE

Indoor room with four corners, wall or whiteboard space for a visible sequence

MATERIALS

Scenario sheet, group cards, markers, whiteboard, optional media-pressure twist

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

The workshop needs to move from values language into practical rights, access and belonging sequences

Make it move

1

Do: Frame the simulation carefully and state that the public objective is to protect the most important doors of access in the first ninety days after arrival.

Why: This clarifies that integration will be treated as a sequence of access points, not as a general sentiment.

2

Do: Place four stakeholder groups and ask each one to prepare one promise, one limit and one concern about fairness under pressure.

Why: The room begins from trade-offs rather than slogans.

3

Do: Build a visible board with stages such as arrival, first access, first trusted contact and first real belonging, then open negotiation.

Why: The board helps the room see where plans are thin, delayed or unrealistic.

4

Do: Introduce a tension point such as a waiting list, negative public narrative or reduced capacity, and ask groups to defend their priorities publicly.

Why: The design is pressure-tested in a way that resembles local public life.

↔ Make it easier

This activity needed careful framing so that no participant felt pushed into representing a real identity position. In practice, it also worked better when facilitators kept the focus on first ninety days rather than on...

🕒 Debrief that matters

Which step in the sequence looked most fragile; which forms of support sounded generous but unrealistic; and what made a district response feel like real belonging rather than only first service contact?

★ Project value.

The simulation materials described this game as especially strong for showing that integration is a sequence of doors that either open or stay shut. In project use, it gave rights and inclusion work a highly practical structure and...



CROSS-CUTTING SIMULATION

Make participation, care and trade-offs visible under pressure



18. Burnout Budget Battle

Human rights, care and youth participation systems

? Why run it.

To expose the hidden costs of youth participation when care, money and visibility compete inside one local crisis.

BEST GROUP SIZE

12 to 16 participants in four groups

TIME

55 to 75 minutes

SPACE

Large indoor room with four corners and central board

MATERIALS

Scenario and role cards, whiteboard

LANGUAGE LOAD

Medium to high

Make it move

1

Do: Frame a local crisis in which funding has tightened, visible participation is still being demanded, and support structures are under strain. Place four groups in corners.

Why: The room enters a recognisable political and emotional problem.

2

Do: Ask groups to prepare one first demand and one first concession, then open movement, bargaining and public writing on the board.

Why: Coalition logic starts to replace abstract opinion.

3

Do: Introduce a twist such as a media leak showing that visibility spending is being protected before support and recovery.

Why: The moral geometry of the room changes and credibility becomes central.

4

Do: End with a public package and a layered debrief on visibility, hidden labour and what a participation system with care built in would require.

Why: The simulation moves from decision to structural reflection.

↔ Make it easier

This worked best when the facilitator made clear that the objective was not to play heroes or villains but to make trade-offs visible. The board needed to stay active throughout the game, otherwise the learning became too...

© Debrief that matters

Who could sound reasonable most easily; when did hidden labour become visible; and what kind of sacrifice felt quietly normal even though it would be damaging in real life?

★ Project value.

The detailed simulation guide described this activity as especially strong for making structures of power, trade-off and care visible. It also matched one of the toolkit's wider lessons, namely that youth participation becomes more...



SUPPLEMENTARY PRACTICE

Flexible formats for attention, critical reading, ownership, outreach and integration



19. Open Space Resource Wall and Participant-Led Contribution Zone

Cross-workshop ownership, visibility and participant agency

? Why run it.

To keep the workshop visibly youth-led by maintaining a shared contribution zone where participants add resources, questions, sketches, quotes, routes and follow-up ideas throughout the event.

BEST GROUP SIZE

10 to 30 participants

TIME

Ongoing method with a ten-minute setup and short daily returns

SPACE

One visible wall, long table or floor strip that remains available throughout the workshop

MATERIALS

Blank cards, tape, markers, envelopes or small category labels

WORKS ESPECIALLY WELL WHEN

Facilitators want participant agency to be visible in the room rather than only mentioned in opening remarks

Make it move

1

Do: Create one visible contribution zone from the beginning and explain that it will collect participant-made content rather than trainer handouts only.

Why: The room is framed as a shared learning environment, not a one-way delivery space.

2

Do: Offer a few simple categories such as useful idea, unresolved question, line worth keeping, local issue, next-step route or resource to share.

Why: Light structure helps contributions remain readable and reusable.

3

Do: Return briefly to the wall at the end of each day and invite one or two participants to name what should stay visible for the next day.

Why: The wall becomes a living memory rather than decoration.

4

Do: Use selected items from the wall in later debriefs, action planning or follow-up messaging.

Why: Participant contributions begin to shape the workshop trajectory in practical ways.

↔ Make it easier

This method worked best when facilitators kept the invitation simple and did not overload the wall with too many categories. In shorter events, even one row of cards was enough. In the

© Debrief that matters

What kinds of contributions participants were willing to post without being asked directly; which materials returned later as genuinely useful; and how did the wall change the feeling of ownership in the room?



Fasanerie methodological notes,...

★ Project value.

The idea-map additions treated open-space logic as one of the clearest ways to increase participant agency without making the programme structurally chaotic. In practice, it helped quieter participants leave a trace in the room even when...



CONTINUATION MODULE

Transfer, follow-up and digital-game linkage after the live workshop

→ Continuation logic.

The original project did not end with mobility alone. It relied on partner follow-up, digital continuation, structured reflection and visible next steps. This final section therefore gathered the practical transfer logic that other organisations often need most once a workshop has finished: what to run next, how to adapt the activities for other settings, and how to support participants who need a lower-pressure route into visibility.

→ Practical transfer.

The Germany chapter showed the value of ending a participation workshop not only with reflection but with route knowledge. A short continuation module on mobility and project routes helped participants understand which programme pathways, organisational forms and practical setups could carry youth-led work further. In practice, this worked best when facilitators resisted the temptation to overload the room with bureaucracy. The most useful version focused on one route, one likely actor, and one...

→ Practical transfer.

The project evidence repeatedly showed that participation confidence grew most reliably when facilitators used a graduated visibility model. Pairs and trios often worked before plenary. Image, posture and short written prompts often worked before longer explanation. Assigned roles often worked before open-floor ownership. This did not make the workshop softer in a negative sense. It made it more usable. A guidebook that ignored this lesson would risk turning strong activities into avoidable...

→ Practical transfer.

The project would keep the mixed-mode structure, the partnership review rhythm, the visible whiteboard evidence, the careful movement from low-risk entry into public voice, and the use of real urban or community-facing application where appropriate. The project would still adjust three things next time. It would prepare even shorter low-threshold language scaffolds for mixed-English groups in the first public speaking blocks. It would protect slightly more time between technically demanding...

Mobility and project routes

Field	Guidebook note
Recommended use	Final half-day block, follow-up clinic or post-workshop online session
Core question	What is the next realistic route for this group, not the most impressive route on paper
Useful output	One route choice, one likely host or organisational actor, one short task for the coming week
Observed value	Prevented the workshop from ending as inspiration without structure

Adaptation matrix

User context	Activities that usually transferred best	Main facilitation caution
--------------	--	---------------------------

Youth NGOs and local initiatives	Street Action, Community Issues to Advocacy Messages, Consent Circle, Burnout Budget Battle	Keep the outputs concrete and record who will carry the next step.
Schools and educational institutions	Avatar and Identity Mapping, Removing Debate, Data-to-Idea Lab, Rights Mapping	Reduce language load, keep public exposure gradual, and connect issues to the students' real environment.
Youth workers and facilitator teams	Forum Theatre, Embodied Leadership Archetypes, TV Interview, Burnout Budget Battle	Maintain a strong safety frame and do not confuse emotional intensity with learning quality.
Mixed student groups and transnational teams	Digital Collaboration Studio, Future of Work Sprint, Mobility and Project Routes, Street Action	Clarify legal and organisational pathways carefully and avoid assuming the same programme access for every participant.

Workshop-to-game link

Workshop theme	Linked game or continuation logic	Follow-up use after mobility
Civic engagement and community leadership	Public voice, issue clustering, urban contact and route planning	Use as a local campaign starter, school action lab or youth-centre participation block.
Digital transformation and innovation	Collaborative problem framing, future-of-work scenarios and prototyping	Use as a social-innovation lab, digital confidence module or mixed student follow-up session.
Social inclusion and equality	Embodied power work, inclusion design, forum interventions	Use in youth-worker training, volunteer preparation or community inclusion dialogue.
Human rights and social justice	Issue-to-rights mapping, pressure interviews, consent-based decisions	Use in campaign labs, educator workshops or online follow-up reflection with concrete action choices.



FACILITATOR TOOLBOX

Compact annex tools as visual cards for quick reuse

How to use the toolbox.

The original annex was converted into compact card-style tools. Each card keeps the function of the template while reducing the heavy table feel and making the page easier to scan during facilitation.

A1. Quick activity adaptation sheet

This sheet helped facilitators adapt a chosen activity without weakening its core logic. It worked especially well during partner preparation before a workshop or when one block had to be adjusted overnight after participant feedback.

Template field	Facilitator use
Original activity title	State the activity you are adapting and the theme it serves.
What must remain intact	Name the one or two elements without which the activity would stop being itself.
What can change safely	Note timing, grouping, materials, public exposure level or room setup that can change without damaging the method.
Group factors to consider	Record confidence in English, energy level, cultural sensitivity, public-speaking confidence, and room size.
Low-threshold entry route	State how participants will enter the activity before any full-plenary or high-visibility moment.

A2. Daily participant feedback card

The project gathered feedback every day, but the most useful versions were short enough to complete honestly. This card can be printed, copied into a notebook or turned into a quick digital form without losing the logic.

Template field	Facilitator use
What helped learning most today	Ask for one block, moment or method that genuinely helped understanding or confidence.
What felt difficult in a useful way	Separate productive challenge from simple confusion.
What felt difficult in an unhelpful way	Capture where pacing, wording or public exposure may have worked against the group.
One thing to keep tomorrow	Identify what should not be changed.
One thing to adjust tomorrow	Capture a practical improvement in timing, language, grouping or room use.

A3. Mentor observation note

Mentor notes were most useful when they stayed close to behaviour, not judgement. This template

helped mentors record what actually happened in a block and what could improve without writing long reports.

Template field	Facilitator use
Activity observed	Record the session title and time block.
What participants were asked to do	State the task in simple terms.
What the group did well	Note concrete behaviours, not praise in the abstract.
Where the method became hard to follow	Identify the moment of drift, overload, confusion or energy drop.
Which adaptation helped	Record any change in grouping, wording or pacing that improved the block.

A4. Post-workshop Zoom review minutes template

After each national workshop the partners met on Zoom, compared what had happened and kept minutes. This template turns that habit into a reusable review routine for future projects.

Template field	Facilitator use
Workshop reviewed	Note location, dates and theme strand.
Participants in the review meeting	Record which partner representatives joined the call.
Three strongest blocks	Name the activities that worked best and why.
Two blocks needing adjustment	Record where language load, timing, public exposure or materials should change.
Observed group-pattern lesson	Capture one cross-cutting lesson about confidence, participation or facilitation.

A5. Debrief question bank by phase

The project repeatedly showed that debriefing worked best when questions moved in layers rather than being asked all at once. This bank can be used after simulations, public work, movement tasks or reflective sessions.

Template field	Facilitator use
Perception phase	What did you notice first; what changed in the room; what surprised you?
Experience phase	What felt easy, difficult, energising or tense while the activity was happening?
Structure phase	Who had power, access, legitimacy or visibility; what became hidden?
Transfer phase	Where does this pattern appear in your youth work, school, group or community context?
Action phase	What would you test, keep, adjust or avoid next time?

A6. Whiteboard mission board template

Whiteboards mattered across the project because they turned movement into evidence. This template can be recreated on any board, wall or large sheet.

Template field	Facilitator use
Public objective	Write the single decision or output the room must reach.
Three visible columns or stages	Use categories such as protect first, can pause, hidden cost; or arrival, first access, trusted contact.
Who must post	State whether every group or every participant must leave at least one public phrase.
Twist moment	Mark when pressure or new information will be introduced.
Decision round	Reserve visible space for the final package, sequence or agreement.

A7. Street Action observation and privacy checklist

Street Action worked best when participants knew both the method and the boundaries. This checklist keeps the activity respectful, brief and usable.

Template field	Facilitator use
Public-space suitability	Confirm the location is open, non-blocking and appropriate for short interaction.
First-contact wording	Use one short explanation of who you are, why you are asking and how long it will take.

Two-step consent logic	Ask first whether the person is open to a short question; only then ask about filming or note-taking.
No minors and no sensitive capture	Do not record minors and stay alert to background faces, screens or number plates.
Respectful exit	If someone declines, close the contact quickly and politely without pressure.

A8. Low-resource adaptation grid

Many organisations using this guidebook will not have ideal rooms, large budgets or stable technical support. This grid helps them adapt without abandoning the activity.

Template field	Facilitator use
If there is no projector	Use printed prompts, whiteboard columns, spoken scenario framing or one-page handouts.
If the room is small	Run shorter rounds, use pairs instead of four large corners, and keep the board central.
If English confidence is mixed	Reduce task language, allow key words first, and use pair preparation before public sharing.
If the group is shy	Begin with image, position, pair or role-based formats before open-floor speaking.
If weather blocks outdoor work	Move to indoor observation, threshold spaces, windows, corridors or semi-public areas with a clear return task.

A9. Follow-up card linking workshops to the digital game and next-step action

This card helped close the gap between a good workshop and what happened afterwards.

Template field	Facilitator use
Live workshop insight	Write the strongest issue, argument or decision that emerged in the room.
Digital-game link	State which game logic or scenario best extends the learning and why.
Next small action	Record one realistic follow-up step for the next week, not a vague ambition.
Likely actor	Name who will carry that step: participant, youth group, school contact, NGO team or mixed cluster.
Support needed	State what would make the follow-up more likely to happen.

A10. Pre-session facilitation readiness checklist

This checklist supported preparation before a session began. It was useful when facilitators were adapting a known activity to a new venue, a mixed-English group or an uncertain technical setup. The point was not to over-plan, but to confirm the few conditions that prevented avoidable stress later.

Checklist area	What to confirm before the room starts
Purpose and outcome	Name the single most important learning outcome, the minimum version of the activity that would still be worth running, and the sign that the room had...
Group readiness	Check age, language confidence, prior familiarity, likely energy level, accessibility needs, and whether any method in the session required a voluntary opt-out...
Materials	Lay out paper, markers, tape, cards, speaker notes, and backup low-tech materials before participants enter rather than introducing delay once momentum has...
Movement and space	Test whether the room allows people to stand, cross the space, cluster, and see the board without furniture blocking the method.
Timing logic	Decide which block can be shortened first if discussion runs long, and which debrief question must survive even in a compressed version.

A11. If the room shifts: improvisation options

The project repeatedly showed that a session rarely failed because participants lacked ability. It usually faltered because the format no longer matched the room. The table below gathered the kinds of small improvisations that helped facilitators keep a method alive without pretending that the

original plan had to remain untouched.

What the facilitator noticed	Fast improvisation	When it helped
Participants stayed silent after the prompt	Move immediately into pairs or trios for ninety seconds before returning to plenary	Useful with shy groups or mixed-English groups that needed rehearsal before public speech
The room became abstract and over-verbal	Return to the board, floor positions, cards, or a one-minute writing task that made claims visible	Useful when concepts were floating without concrete examples
One confident voice began carrying the group	Introduce a messenger role, silent writing round, rotation of speaker, or observer report-back	Useful in simulations, debates and design tasks
The activity felt too heavy too early	Shorten content, add a grounding pause, and state again that passing or observing remained acceptable	Useful before forum theatre, identity work or tense campaign material
The plan was running late	Keep the core round, shorten explanation, cut decorative examples, and protect the debrief question that carried transfer value	Useful when timing drift threatened the whole day

A12. Preparing the venue for non-formal activities

Venue preparation mattered more than room appearance. Across the workshops, the most effective spaces were not the most polished ones, but the ones that let participants move, pause, see each other, hear each other and understand where the method would happen next.

Venue factor	Preparation move	Why it mattered in practice
Entry zone	Leave a clear entry area where participants can arrive, place materials and understand the first task without crossing a maze of chairs.	This reduced hesitation at the start and made the first minutes feel intentional rather than improvised.
Wall and board space	Reserve at least one surface for live tracking, clustering, or whiteboard missions before the session begins.	Activities stayed stronger when movement produced visible public evidence.
Chair logic	Use movable chairs or clear chair clusters that can be opened quickly into pairs, circles or corners.	This prevented the room from freezing into lecture mode.
Quiet and recovery corner	If possible, hold one small side space for pair reflection, observation or decompression after demanding scenes.	This was especially useful for mixed-confidence groups and after more emotionally loaded methods.



Outdoor access

Check in advance whether outdoor transition blocks are realistic, safe, and close enough not to waste energy in transit.

Outdoor work helped when it served the method, not when it became an excursion.

A13. Plan B matrix for technical or logistical disruption

A resilient facilitator plan did not require a second full programme. It required a low-tech version of the same pedagogical intention. This matrix kept the focus on what had to survive even if the technical wrapper collapsed.

Disruption	Low-tech switch	What to preserve
No internet	Replace live digital work with printed screenshots, pre-written examples, board clustering or card sequencing.	Keep the collaboration or critical-thinking logic, not the platform itself.
Power cut or blackout	Move to window light, paper-based tasks, standing debate, or outdoor pair reflection if safe.	Keep momentum and group connection.
Projector or speaker failure	Read out the scenario, print or display still images on phones in pairs, and use the board for key lines.	Keep the stimulus short and interpretable.
Room suddenly unavailable	Run a shortened version in a corridor, sheltered outdoor area or secondary room with only essential materials.	Keep one visible task, one interaction round and one debrief question.
Participant numbers drop	Merge roles, reduce groups, or treat one missing perspective as a facilitator-injected public voice.	Keep tension and plurality of viewpoints.

A14. Optional use of video and music for preparation and illustration

Video and music worked best in the project when they were used as short interpretive triggers rather than as content that explained everything. A well-chosen excerpt opened tone, tension or imagery. It did not replace the activity.

Resource type	How to use it well	Practical caution
Short video excerpt	Use twenty to ninety seconds to frame a dilemma, public mood or leadership tension before participants move into discussion or simulation.	Do not screen long clips that delay participant action or produce passive watching.
Still image sequence	Use a small sequence of images when sound, internet or time is uncertain but the room still needs a shared stimulus.	Choose images that open interpretation rather than forcing a single moral lesson.
Instrumental music	Use brief instrumental passages for transitions, reflection writing or image work where tone matters more than explanation.	Keep volume low and avoid using music that overwhelms multilingual processing.

Song with lyrics	Use only when the lyric genuinely contributes to the subject and when the language load is manageable.	Avoid turning the room into a lyric-comprehension exercise unless that is the real purpose.
Preparation material for facilitators	Watch or listen in advance and decide the exact question, pause point or follow-up move before bringing the resource into the room.	Do not improvise the meaning of a media resource after it has already confused the group.

A15. Indoor, outdoor and blended scenarios

The workshops showed that indoor and outdoor methods should not be treated as competing versions of the same session. They served different pedagogical functions. The strongest design often moved from indoor focus to outdoor perception or embodiment and then back indoors for synthesis.

Scenario	Best use	Practical benefit
Fully indoor	Concept-building, media use, structured simulations, legal mapping and final presentations.	Acoustics and shared focus are easier to control.
Fully outdoor	Pair walks, observation tasks, silent reflection, simple clustering and low-equipment movement formats.	Public space and distance can make participation feel less performative.
Indoor to outdoor	Use indoor framing first, then move outside for observation, contact or embodied transition work.	Participants enter the outdoor task with clearer intention.
Outdoor to indoor	Use an outdoor stimulus first, then bring the material back for mapping, synthesis or structured debrief.	This helped participants move from lived perception to shared analysis.
Blended loop	Use short alternating blocks when the venue allows quick movement between spaces.	This created rhythm and prevented fatigue in longer workshop days.

A16. Keeping activities youth-led without losing structure

Across the project, youth-led did not mean facilitation absence. It meant designing visible choices, real contribution points and meaningful responsibility while keeping the frame clear enough that the workshop did not dissolve into drift or hidden trainer control.

Facilitation move	How it kept the process youth-led	How disruption was contained
Offer meaningful choices, not infinite choices	Participants selected roles, examples, routes, wall contributions or action priorities inside a visible task frame.	The facilitator kept time, sequence and safety boundaries explicit.

Use participant-generated material	Participants worked from their own issues, stories, images, assumptions and proposals rather than from trainer-only content.	The facilitator clustered, sharpened and sequenced rather than taking authorship away.
Rotate speaking functions	Messenger, observer, note-keeper and spokesperson roles spread ownership across the group.	This prevented the same confident voices from becoming the informal permanent leaders.
Make public evidence visible	Whiteboards, pathways, mission boards and clustering sheets showed what the group had actually produced.	Visible evidence reduced the risk that youth-led would become unstructured conversation.
Close with choice plus commitment	Participants left with one next step, one refinement or one follow-up connection rather than only with impressions.	This kept agency linked to continuation rather than to momentary enthusiasm.

A17. Feedback and improvement loop

The project improved because facilitators and partners treated feedback as a design instrument rather than as a formality. Short daily participant reflections, mentor notes and partner Zoom reviews were read together, and the next event was adjusted accordingly. The table below can be used to keep that loop active in future use of the guidebook.

Stage	Core prompt	How the information was used
End of the day	What worked strongly today, what felt unclear, and what should happen differently tomorrow	Used for overnight changes in pacing, explanation load, grouping and debrief emphasis.
After a demanding activity	What helped participants stay in the method, and where the room needed more safety or more challenge	Used to refine facilitation language and level of voluntary participation.
Mentor observation	Which behaviour showed participation, exclusion, confusion, initiative or fatigue	Used to correct facilitator blind spots and to compare intention with actual room dynamics.
Post-workshop partner Zoom	Which activities transferred best, what needed contextual adaptation, and what should be kept, changed or dropped	Used to strengthen the next national workshop and to record minutes for later resource development.
Guidebook reuse	Which annex tools were actually used, which sections stayed too dense, and what new examples would help future users	Used for later versions of the guidebook and related training materials.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT AND RESPONSIBLE USE

Keep the file attractive, but keep the project logic transparent

★ Project evidence base.

This visual edition is based on the original KA154 guidebook text, its four workshop strands, continuation module, annex toolkit, daily feedback logic, partner review logic and activity descriptions.

EU disclaimer.

This guidebook was developed as a project output within the Erasmus+ KA154 project Fostering Youth Participation and Social Justice. It was prepared for educational and non-commercial use by facilitators, youth organisations, schools, mixed student groups and other practitioners who wish to adapt the activities responsibly to their own context. The content reflected the implementation logic and learning of the project partnership and did not claim to represent the official views of the European Commission. The project was funded by the European Union...

✓ Participant acknowledgement.

The partnership also wished to acknowledge the workshop participants whose honest feedback, practical suggestions, reflective comments and willingness to share their experience strengthened this guidebook at every stage. Their contributions informed the refinement of activity sequencing, language load, debrief questions, adaptation choices and follow-up guidance, and they helped ensure that the workshops remained genuinely youth-led throughout the project.

✦ Design note.

The visual redesign intentionally favours colourful wrappers, scan-friendly cards, stronger hierarchy, youth-facing language, and reduced spreadsheet-style density while keeping the original facilitation logic usable for NGOs, youth workers, schools and mixed student groups.