

Practical AI Youth Work Toolkit

Seven participant-designed workshops, prepared for facilitators

EU Networking Lab for AI & Digital Youth Work

Project number: 2025-3-BG01-KA153-YOU-000388331

EXPLORE

CREATE

REFLECT

A ready-to-run collection for youth workers and facilitators



**Funded by
the European Union**

The 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. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Contents

01 Working with AI Instead of Competing Against It	· p. 5
02 Click, Connect, Create	· p. 8
03 AI Image Generation and Prompt Engineering	· p. 11
04 Talking to AI: The Art of Good Prompting	· p. 14
05 Think Big, Sing Smart!	· p. 17
06 AI and Power: When Technology Becomes a Weapon	· p. 20
07 Can You Trust What You See?	· p. 23
Printable supporting materials	· p. 35
R01 Career and study case cards	· p. 36
R02 AI or Human activity pack	· p. 41
R03 Image prompt demonstration and offline route	· p. 44
R04 CRAFT scenario cards and worked practice	· p. 45
R05 AI music creative case briefs	· p. 50
R06 Media literacy simulation cards	· p. 56
R07 Fictional social posts and verification checklist	· p. 61
About this toolkit, credits and editorial approach	· p. 34

Welcome to the toolkit

This collection turns participant-created workshop plans into practical session guides for youth workers. The seven workshops explore career change, future youth services, AI prompts, music, image generation, misinformation and deepfakes. Each chapter keeps the source design's core activity and learning aim, then gives facilitators a common structure for preparation, delivery, reflection and adaptation.

The plans were written for different audiences and lengths, so the group sizes and timings vary. Where a source gives two schedules or an unclear detail, the chapter says so and marks any proposed solution as a suggested facilitator adaptation. Tool names come from the source materials; check what is currently available and appropriate for your group before the session.

How to use the workshop chapters

- Choose a workshop that fits your group, time and learning need. Read the full chapter before the session.
- Use the timed plan as a guide, then adjust it to your setting. Keep the learning aim and reflection even if you shorten an activity.
- Prepare an offline route. None of the learning aims depends on every participant having an account or personal device.
- Use fictional scenarios and avoid putting private information into AI tools. Check age, privacy, safeguarding and local consent requirements.
- Treat AI output as material to review, not as authority. Invite participants to check facts, representation, tone and rights before reusing it.

A SHARED FACILITATION PRINCIPLE

Keep human connection, inclusion, critical thinking and participant choice at the centre. AI can support an activity; it should not decide what is true, safe or valuable for the group.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

Use a before—during—after check: before, choose a real learning need, check tools and prepare an offline route; during, support inclusion and participant choice while keeping responsibility for safety and group care with the facilitator; after, invite reflection and review learning without entering personal participant details into AI tools.

The seven workshops

Workshop	Main practice
Working with AI Instead of Competing Against It	Participants examine how AI may change work connected to different fields of study, then identify practical ways people can adapt and where human judgement remains important.
Click, Connect, Create	A 90-minute non-formal session exploring AI opportunities and risks in youth work.
AI Image Generation and Prompt Engineering	Participants compare a simple and a structured image prompt, practise a six-element prompt template, improve their own prompt and discuss where generated images could be useful in youth work.
Talking to AI: The Art of Good Prompting	Participants learn to make prompts clearer by adding Context, Role, Action, Format and Tone.
Think Big, Sing Smart!	Teams use a short case brief to develop a prompt and generate a song for a fictional situation.
AI and Power: When Technology Becomes a Weapon	The participant design uses a guessing game to explore emotional manipulation, false authority, astroturfing, selective framing and coordinated inauthentic behaviour.
Can You Trust What You See?	Participants compare real and synthetic visual examples, try a bounded image-generation activity with fictional subjects, then assess a fictional social post and decide what to verify before sharing.

Working with AI Instead of Competing Against It

A case-study workshop about study, work and changing skills

1. Workshop at a glance

Participants examine how AI may change work connected to different fields of study, then identify practical ways people can adapt and where human judgement remains important. The participant design uses a deliberately provocative title; the workshop should explore uncertainty rather than present degree replacement as a fact.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Young people and youth workers interested in study or career choices; basic AI familiarity is assumed in the source design	25 in 5 teams of 5 (source); adaptable	90 minutes	Basic AI; participants can be beginners with support

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Compare possible AI-related changes in a field of study without treating predictions as certainties.
- Use AI tools to find and compare information, then check claims against reliable sources.
- Identify human skills, ethical concerns and practical learning steps relevant to a career area.
- Present a balanced case-study conclusion with evidence and uncertainty clearly stated.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–20	Opening and energizer	Introduce the topic, invite an energizer and discuss five claims about fields that AI may affect. Treat the claims as questions to investigate.
20–30	Brief and teams	Explain the case-study task; form five teams and distribute one field or study scenario to each.
30–60	Case study	Teams research the scenario, identify possible changes and develop practical responses.
60–90	Present and reflect	Teams share findings, followed by group reflection. The split between presentations and reflection is a suggested allocation.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source suggests presenting five degrees as expected to be replaced by AI, but gives no evidence for that claim. Reframe these as five fields to investigate and ask teams to verify any prediction before presenting it.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Five short, fictional or general career case cards.

- Flipchart paper, sticky notes, markers and pens.
- Shared phones or laptops; projector and internet if available.
- Printed source-checking prompts and a timer.

Included printable material: [R01 Career and study case cards \(p. 36\)](#)

Room setup: Arrange five small-group spaces and a presentation wall. Provide a paper-only route so no participant needs an individual account.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Choose five fields that are relevant to the group and prepare neutral case cards. Avoid claims that a whole degree or profession will disappear.
- Prepare two or three trustworthy sources per case, including sources that distinguish evidence from forecasts.
- Test any digital tools and prepare printed excerpts or screenshots for an offline version.
- Agree roles such as researcher, evidence checker, note-taker and presenter so everyone can contribute.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Welcome and frame the question

Use the opening to surface participants' hopes and worries. Present the "degree is useless" wording as a claim to examine, not a conclusion.

Try saying: *"Today we will test claims about AI and work. What evidence would make a prediction credible?"*

2. Introduce the case task

Give each team one field or study scenario. Ask them to map tasks that may change, skills that stay valuable, and questions that remain uncertain.

Try saying: *"Your task is not to predict the future perfectly. Build the most balanced answer you can from the evidence you find."*

3. Research and discuss

Teams use the source pack or approved tools to gather information. Ask them to record where each claim comes from and separate facts, forecasts and opinions.

Try saying: *"What does the source actually show? What is still a forecast?"*

4. Prepare a response

Each team prepares a short response with one opportunity, one risk, one human skill and one practical next step for a learner.

Try saying: *"What could someone do next month to prepare, without assuming they need to abandon their field?"*

5. Present and reflect

Use the final 30 minutes for concise team presentations and reflection. With five teams, allow about 4 minutes per team (20 minutes total) and reserve the final 10 minutes for group reflection.

7. Debrief and reflection

- Which claim changed or complicated your view?
- What evidence did you trust most, and why?
- Which skills in your case are technical, relational, creative or ethical?
- What is one next step you can take without needing to know exactly how work will change?

8. Inclusion and access

- Offer cases across different study and work routes, including vocational and community work.
- Allow drawing, speaking, writing or paired presentation.

- Provide printed source extracts and a glossary; do not require personal accounts.
- Let participants choose a role that fits their confidence and language needs.

9. Safety and responsible use

Do not ask participants to disclose their personal education, employment or financial situation. Use fictional cases. Treat generated answers as starting points and check claims before repeating them.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Invite participants to update one career assumption after checking a source.
- Create a shared list of skills they want to practise, including communication, creativity, critical thinking and digital judgement.

Click, Connect, Create

Design an inclusive AI-supported youth centre of the future

1. Workshop at a glance

A 90-minute non-formal session exploring AI opportunities and risks in youth work. Participants move from an “AI or Human?” energizer and an opinion line to a group design challenge for a youth centre in 2040.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Youth leaders, youth workers, organisations and students interested in AI; beginner or occasional users	20–30 participants in teams of 4–5	90 minutes	Basic digital skills; no specialist knowledge required

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Explain in simple terms where AI appears in daily life and youth work.
- Name opportunities and risks related to privacy, bias, misinformation and digital citizenship.
- Design an AI-supported youth service that responds to a young person’s need.
- Include ethical principles and a clear human role in the design.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–5	Welcome	Introduce the purpose, group agreements and guiding question.
5–20	AI or Human?	Participants judge whether examples are AI-made or human-made and explain their clues.
20–35	Opinion line	Participants position themselves on statements about AI in youth work and may move after discussion.
35–65	Design challenge	Teams create an AI-supported youth centre for 2040 on a flipchart.
65–80	Pitches	Each team gives a short presentation and receives one question or appreciation.
80–90	Reflection	Participants name an opportunity, a concern and one responsible use.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source plan gives 15 minutes for pitches. Four to six teams can share for about 2 minutes each with brief transitions. For seven or eight teams, use a 20-minute pitch block (2 minutes per team plus 4 minutes for transitions) and reduce the design challenge from 30 to 25 minutes; the revised 90-minute sequence is 0-5, 5-20, 20-35, 35-60, 60-80, 80-90.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Six to eight short text, slogan or image examples, with answers for the facilitator.

- YES / NO / IN BETWEEN signs.
- Flipcharts, markers, sticky notes, timer and optional projector.
- Optional devices for a short demonstration; the design challenge works without participant accounts.

Included materials: [R02 AI-or-Human activity pack](#); [R02b opinion-line signs \(pp. 41-43; signs p. 43; canvas p. 27\)](#)

Room setup: Keep enough open floor for an opinion line and provide one flipchart space per team.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Select examples that are safe to show and can be discussed without shaming participants for incorrect guesses.
- Print the debate statements and a one-page youth-centre canvas.
- Decide whether to demonstrate an AI tool; if so, check privacy and access rules in advance.
- Prepare a backup example set in case the internet fails.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Welcome and guiding question

Introduce the agenda and invite a short pair discussion.

Try saying: *“How can AI support young people without replacing human connection?”*

2. AI or Human?

Show one example at a time. Invite a vote, then ask two or three people to explain their reasoning before revealing its origin.

Try saying: *“What clue shaped your guess? How certain are you?”*

3. Opinion line

Read one statement at a time. Participants stand at YES, NO or IN BETWEEN, explain their view and move if they choose. Statements can include: “AI should support decisions in youth programmes, not replace people” and “AI content should be checked before sharing.”

Try saying: *“What experience or value is behind your position?”*

4. Design the future youth centre

Teams imagine a centre in 2040. Ask them to include three AI services, three activities, three ethical principles, the youth worker’s role and one inclusion measure.

Try saying: *“Start with a real need young people have. Then decide whether AI helps with that need.”*

5. Pitch and close

Give each team two to three minutes. Ask for one constructive question or appreciation, then close with a reflection round.

7. Debrief and reflection

- What clue helped you judge the examples, and what could still mislead you?
- Which proposed service would be useful to young people who face access barriers?
- Where must a person remain responsible?
- What is one privacy or fairness rule your centre needs?

8. Inclusion and access

- Allow participants to contribute by drawing, writing, speaking or presenting.
- Use simple language and explain technical terms with everyday examples.
- Share devices fairly; offer a paper-only version of the design challenge.
- Let participants pass on speaking and invite contributions in pairs first.

9. Safety and responsible use

Do not use real participant data in AI demonstrations. Use fictional examples, disclose when content is generated and discuss bias or errors without presenting AI output as authoritative.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Turn one centre concept into a small, low-cost pilot activity.
- Ask young people who would use the service to review its accessibility and risks.

AI Image Generation and Prompt Engineering

A short, hands-on session for building and testing visual prompts

1. Workshop at a glance

Participants compare a simple and a structured image prompt, practise a six-element prompt template, improve their own prompt and discuss where generated images could be useful in youth work. The source estimates 43 minutes while also describing the session as 30–40 minutes.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Youth workers; the source also refers to young people using the session	6–8 participants in the workshop design; adaptable	43 minutes as timed; 30–40 minutes described as flexible	Beginner

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Explain what an image prompt is and why structure can matter.
- Use subject, environment, medium, quality, style and mood or colour as optional prompt elements.
- Compare two outputs and describe what changed after revising a prompt.
- Name a practical use and an ethical question for generated images.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–5	Icebreaker	Compare an image made from a simple prompt with one made from a more structured prompt.
5–15	Short input	Introduce the six prompt elements using examples from the handbook.
15–25	Prompt challenge	Each participant writes a prompt, generates an image, revises the prompt and compares the results.
25–33	Gallery and discussion	Participants share on their own device or show an image locally; discuss the prompt choices.
33–38	Voting	Optional in-room vote using clear judging criteria.
38–43	Reflection	Name one use in youth work and one risk or question.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source gives a detailed 43-minute schedule and also describes the session as 30–40 minutes. The 43-minute source schedule is retained. A separate, fully timed 40-minute editorial adaptation is: 0–5 compare prompts; 5–13 explain six elements; 13–23 prompt challenge; 23–30 gallery; 30–34 optional vote; 34–40 reflection. The shorter route reduces sharing and discussion time; it does not provide the same depth as the source schedule.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Phones or laptops, ideally shared in pairs.
- Prompt Engineering Handbook or the six-element prompt card.
- Access to one image tool if appropriate; printed example images for an offline version.
- Optional sticky dots for an in-room gallery vote.

Included materials: [R03 prompt demonstration and offline route; see Worksheet 4, Image prompt builder \(p. 44; Worksheet 4, p. 29\)](#)

Room setup: Pair participants where devices are limited. If there is a screen, project only images that participants agree to show.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Test one image tool and prepare an offline pair of sample images.
- Prepare a prompt card with the six elements and one blank line for the final prompt.
- Set a clear rule: do not upload faces, names, personal photos or private information.
- Decide whether the vote is a low-stakes in-room activity; do not promise publication of a winning image.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Compare two examples

Show a simple prompt result beside a structured result. Ask participants which prompt may have produced each image and why.

Try saying: *“Which words seem to have changed the result?”*

2. Introduce the six elements

Explain that prompts do not need all six elements. Start with the subject, then add setting, medium, detail, style direction and mood or colour.

Try saying: *“Which detail matters most for the image you want?”*

3. Write and test

Participants choose a neutral topic, write a first prompt, generate an image, then add or change details and compare.

Try saying: *“What is one change you can test, rather than changing everything at once?”*

4. Share and discuss

Invite participants to show their image on their device or submit it to a local screen only with their agreement. Discuss usefulness and limits.

Try saying: *“What would a youth worker need to check before using this image in public materials?”*

5. Optional vote and close

If the group votes, use categories such as clearest prompt structure or most useful youth-work idea. Close with one takeaway.

7. Debrief and reflection

- What surprised you about the first result?
- What changed between your first and revised prompt?
- When might a generated image help in a youth activity?
- What should be checked before an image is shared publicly?

8. Inclusion and access

- Let participants work in pairs or use printed examples instead of an online tool.

- Offer prompt starters and picture choices for participants who prefer not to write.
- Avoid relying on colour alone to communicate instructions.
- Allow participants to pass on displaying their work.

9. Safety and responsible use

Use fictional subjects and broad visual descriptions. Avoid copying a living artist's signature style. Do not generate or upload a real person's likeness without clear permission. Label generated images when they could be mistaken for documentary images. Check accessibility, bias and representation in the output.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Invite participants to revise one image prompt for a real youth-work communication need using fictional content.
- Ask a small group of young people to review the image for clarity and representation before any public use.

Talking to AI: The Art of Good Prompting

A CRAFT-based practice session for everyday youth-related tasks

1. Workshop at a glance

Participants learn to make prompts clearer by adding Context, Role, Action, Format and Tone. They test, review and improve outputs for fictional scenarios. The source design is three hours with breaks and states that a 90-minute version is possible.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Young people aged 15–25, youth workers, educators and curious students	12–20 participants; pairs or teams of 3–4	3 hours including a 15-minute break; 90-minute adaptation suggested below	Basic phone or computer use; no prior AI expertise

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Describe a prompt and explain why context and wording affect an answer.
- Build a prompt with the five CRAFT elements.
- Review an AI answer critically and revise a prompt at least twice.
- Identify limitations, privacy questions and a responsible next step.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–15	Welcome and icebreaker	Introduce the theme and use “Two Truths and an AI” with fictional statements or a made-up character.
15–35	What is prompting?	Short accessible input, then brainstorm features of a useful question.
35–60	CRAFT	Explain Context, Role, Action, Format and Tone; compare weak and improved prompts.
60–75	Break	Optional example display.
75–110	Prompt challenge	Teams work with a youth-relevant fictional scenario, test a prompt and revise at least twice.
110–130	Gallery and feedback	Share best prompt and output locally; peer feedback on clarity and usefulness.
130–160	Tool comparison	Demonstrate a small number of tools or compare prepared outputs; discuss risks and fact checking.
160–180	Reflection	Use Rose, Thorn, Bud and complete the prompt card.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

For 90 minutes, keep the welcome to 8 minutes, prompting input to 12, CRAFT practice to 15, prompt challenge to 30, gallery to 10, tool and safety discussion to 8, and reflection to 7. This condensed schedule is a suggested facilitator adaptation because the source only says that a 90-minute version is possible.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Flipchart, markers, sticky notes, pens and tape.
- CRAFT handout and fictional scenario cards.
- Projector and one device per pair where possible.
- Printed sample prompts and outputs for offline use.

Included materials: [R04 four scenario cards, worked CRAFT example and offline responses \(pp. 45-49\)](#)

Room setup: Use pairs or teams of 3–4 with shared devices. Keep a printed route ready and avoid sign-in steps during the session.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Test any tools at least 30 minutes before the session; prepare sample outputs in case the service is unavailable.
- Choose scenarios that do not require personal, medical, financial or other sensitive information.
- For ages 15–17, follow the organisation's safeguarding and consent policies and check tool age requirements.
- Print CRAFT cards and prepare the four scenarios in the worksheet section.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Welcome and warm-up

Ask “What makes a useful instruction?” Use two truths and an AI-generated statement about a fictional person, never about participants.

Try saying: “We can explore AI without sharing private details.”

2. Explore prompt quality

Compare a vague request with one that adds context and a clear task. Ask what improved.

Try saying: “What would the AI need to know to help, and what should it not need to know?”

3. Teach CRAFT

Explain the five parts; pairs rewrite a weak prompt and mark each part in a different colour.

Try saying: “Context = situation; Role = perspective; Action = task; Format = shape; Tone = voice.”

4. Prompt challenge

Teams test and revise a prompt for a fictional scenario at least twice. Ask them to check facts and remove sensitive details.

Try saying: “What would you change in the prompt after seeing this answer?”

5. Gallery and feedback

Teams share a prompt and short output excerpt; peers give one strength and one question.

Try saying: “Does the answer meet the task? What would you verify before using it?”

6. Tool comparison and close

Compare approved tools on one fictional prompt, then close with Rose, Thorn, Bud.

7. Debrief and reflection

- What changed after you added context or format?

- What would you fact-check, and what information should never go into a prompt?
- What is one prompt you can reuse for a low-risk task?

8. Inclusion and access

- Use plain-language cards and allow participants to dictate, draw, pair-write or use shared devices.
- Provide offline printouts and a non-AI option.
- Choose culturally adaptable scenarios that do not assume one education or work pathway.

9. Safety and responsible use

AI answers can be wrong, biased or overconfident. Do not enter private data or real case details. For minors, check age restrictions, privacy terms and local safeguarding policy before any tool use.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Participants keep the CRAFT card and add one prompt that has been tested and checked.
- Facilitators complete a short reflection log: what worked, what needs adaptation, engagement, safeguards and follow-up support.

Think Big, Sing Smart!

Create a short AI-assisted song around a social theme

1. Workshop at a glance

Teams use a short case brief to develop a prompt and generate a song for a fictional situation. The activity combines basic AI literacy, creative expression, teamwork and reflection.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Young people aged 18–30, especially beginners interested in AI and creative work	30 participants in six groups of five (source); adaptable	90 minutes	Basic AI knowledge

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Explain one way generative AI can support music or lyric creation.
- Write and improve a prompt for a specific audience and purpose.
- Critically review an AI-generated song for accuracy, tone, inclusion and fit.
- Collaborate on a creative response to a social or community theme.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–10	Energizer	Play a song and use a follow-the-leader guessing game to build energy.
10–25	Introduction	Introduce generative AI, song creation and the purpose of the session.
25–30	Teams and brief	Form six teams and distribute a fictional case card.
30–60	Create	Teams draft a prompt, generate a short song and refine it.
60–80	Listen and share	Teams present a short excerpt and explain their prompt choices.
80–90	Debrief	Reflect on the creative process, AI's limits and responsible use.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source gives two different schedules. This run-of-show reconciles them as a suggested facilitator adaptation, using the overview's 30-minute creation, 20-minute sharing and 10-minute debrief blocks while retaining the detailed 10-minute energizer and 15-minute introduction.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Six fictional case cards, such as a sports business, maths class, florist, graduation, welcome celebration or accounting firm.
- Shared phones or laptops, speakers and internet if approved.
- Pens, paper and a timer; optional projector.

- Offline alternative: teams create lyrics and a rhythm without an AI tool.

Included materials: [R05 six creative case briefs; see Worksheet 5, AI music creative brief \(pp. 50-55; Worksheet 5, p. 30\)](#)

Room setup: Make six group spaces and set up speakers for short playback. Do not use a messaging group as the only way to distribute case cards; print or display them.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source plan gives six teams 20 minutes to share. Cap each excerpt and explanation at 2 minutes (12 minutes total), leaving 8 minutes for transitions and one brief appreciative response. If the group wants longer listening, select one excerpt per team in a gallery playlist and retain the full debrief.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Test the approved music tool and audio playback. Check account, age, privacy and usage rules before the session.
- Replace case cards that could invite personal disclosures with fictional examples.
- Decide how long each excerpt may be so every team can share.
- Prepare the no-internet route: write lyrics, choose a rhythm and perform or read the result.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Energizer: follow the leader

One volunteer steps outside while the group chooses a leader whose movements others copy. Play a short, appropriate track; the volunteer returns and guesses the leader. Offer a seated version.

Try saying: *"You can join by moving, keeping rhythm, or simply watching."*

2. Introduce AI music

Explain that teams will create a short song for a fictional situation. Ask what a song needs to fit its audience and purpose.

Try saying: *"What should the song make its audience understand or feel?"*

3. Form teams and unpack the brief

Give each team a case card. Ask them to agree on the message, audience, language, tone and one thing the song should avoid.

Try saying: *"Keep the brief fictional. Do not include real people or private details."*

4. Write prompt and create

Teams draft a prompt, try an approved tool and refine the result. Ask them to review lyrics and audio for errors, stereotypes and unintended messages.

Try saying: *"Which part of your prompt most improved the result?"*

5. Share excerpts

Each group plays or performs a short excerpt and describes one choice they made. Invite appreciative, specific feedback.

Try saying: *"What did the human team add that the tool could not decide for you?"*

6. Reflect and close

Discuss how AI supported or constrained the creative process; name one responsible use and one limitation.

7. Debrief and reflection

- How did the prompt shape the song?
- Where did human judgement improve or change the AI output?
- Did the song represent its audience respectfully?
- What should a creator check before publishing AI-assisted music?

8. Inclusion and access

- Offer roles beyond singing or speaking, such as prompt writer, lyric reviewer, timekeeper or sound checker.
- Let participants use a language they are comfortable with where the tool supports it.
- Provide lyrics on paper and keep the playback volume comfortable.
- Use a paper-based creative route if participants lack devices or do not want to use an AI tool.

9. Safety and responsible use

Do not upload a participant's voice or imitate a real artist or person. Avoid real names and personal stories. Review generated lyrics for stereotypes, harmful language and rights concerns before sharing.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Invite a youth group to adapt one fictional case brief to a local community theme.
- If any output is shared beyond the room, check permissions, tool terms and attribution requirements first.

AI and Power: When Technology Becomes a Weapon

A safer simulation for recognising propaganda and misinformation techniques

1. Workshop at a glance

The participant design uses a guessing game to explore emotional manipulation, false authority, astroturfing, selective framing and coordinated inauthentic behaviour. This toolkit keeps the learning objective but changes the group task into analysis and repair rather than creating deceptive, hateful or harassing content.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Young people aged 16–30 and youth workers; no AI experience required	15–30 participants in five groups of 3–6	90 minutes	Beginner

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Recognise five common manipulation techniques in fictional content.
- Identify what needs verification and who could be harmed by a misleading post.
- Rewrite or annotate a fictional post to make uncertainty and evidence visible.
- Name actions individuals and platforms can take to reduce harm.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–10	Real or fictional?	Use clearly labeled, fictional examples. Participants vote on what they would question or verify.
10–20	Brief and teams	Introduce the five techniques and form five groups. Give each group a fictional sample to analyse.
20–50	Detect and repair	Groups identify clues, missing context, target audience and likely harm, then create a verification note or responsible correction.
50–75	Presentations and guessing	Groups present their analysis without naming the technique; others identify it and explain the clues.
75–88	Debrief	Discuss how manipulation works and how to respond.
88–90	Close	Each participant names one check they will use before sharing.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source's creation tasks include fake endorsements, deceptive grassroots activity, scapegoating and coordinated harassment. This version replaces those tasks with detection, verification and correction so participants learn the same methods without producing material that could be reused to harm people.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

With five teams in the 25-minute presentation block, set a 3-minute limit per team (15 minutes) and reserve 10 minutes for the audience to identify clues and for transitions. Keep the 90-minute source schedule unchanged.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Five fictional, facilitator-prepared sample cards, each marked “SIMULATION — DO NOT SHARE”.
- A revised media-literacy detective sheet.
- Projector or paper copies, pens and sticky notes.
- Optional AI tool for a neutral fact-checking demonstration using fictional content only.

Included materials: [R06 five simulation cards and correction template; see Worksheet 6 \(p. 31\)](#)

Room setup: Keep all examples within the room and visibly mark them as fictional. Use paper cards if internet is unavailable.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Prepare fictional examples that do not name or resemble real people, groups, organisations or current events.
- Do not include slurs, fabricated accusations against real people, fake expert endorsements, fake accounts or instructions for coordinated harassment.
- Create one analysis card per group with questions about evidence, framing, source, target and possible harm.
- Prepare a correction or verification template and explain that detection tools can make mistakes.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Opening example

Show a short fictional post with a sensational headline and ask what the group would check before trusting or sharing it. Do not ask participants to create a misleading post.

Try saying: “*What would you want to know before deciding whether this is reliable?*”

2. Introduce techniques

Name emotional manipulation, false authority, astroturfing, selective framing and coordinated inauthentic behaviour. Explain each through a neutral description.

Try saying: “*A technique is a clue to investigate, not proof by itself.*”

3. Analyse and repair

Each team receives a fictional sample. They mark claims, evidence, missing context, signals of manipulation, possible targets and potential harm. Then they write a short verification note or a neutral correction.

Try saying: “*What is claimed? What can be checked? What context is missing?*”

4. Guessing presentations

Teams present their analysis without naming the technique. Audience members use the detective sheet to identify it and cite a clue. The team then reveals its reasoning.

Try saying: “*Which clue supports your guess? What else could explain it?*”

5. Debrief and close

Discuss prevention, verification and responsible platform or user responses. Close with one personal verification action.

7. Debrief and reflection

- Which technique was easiest to recognise? Which was harder?
- What evidence would you check before repeating a claim?
- Who could be harmed even if a post is later corrected?

- How can we respond without amplifying the misleading content?

8. Inclusion and access

- Provide plain-language definitions and let teams annotate in words, symbols or drawings.
- Offer a quiet analysis role for participants who do not want to present.
- Avoid examples that target a participant's identity or current conflict.
- Use printed examples so no account or personal device is required.

9. Safety and responsible use

Do not create or publish deceptive content, fake identities, hateful material or harassment. Keep all examples fictional, labeled and contained to the session. Do not use an AI tool to generate realistic claims about real people or groups.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Practise a simple verification routine: pause, identify the claim, check the source and date, look for independent evidence, then decide whether to share.
- Compare a sensational fictional headline with a neutral rewrite and note what changes.

Can You Trust What You See?

AI images, videos and deepfakes through observation and verification

1. Workshop at a glance

Participants compare real and synthetic visual examples, try a bounded image-generation activity with fictional subjects, then assess a fictional social post and decide what to verify before sharing.

Audience	Group size	Duration	Experience
Young people aged 15–20, students and beginners in AI	20 participants; small teams	90 minutes	Beginner

2. Learning aims and outcomes

By the end of the session, participants can:

- Describe a few clues that may prompt further checking of an image or video.
- Explain why visual clues alone cannot prove whether content is authentic.
- Use a verification routine before trusting or sharing a post.
- Reflect on how synthetic media could affect people and communities.

3. Timed session plan

Time	Stage	What happens
0–15	Real or AI?	Participants assess a prepared set of real and synthetic examples; facilitator reveals answers and discusses uncertainty.
15–25	Tools and context	Introduce image, video and detection tools as examples, with a reminder that tools and labels can be wrong.
25–40	Create a fictional image	Teams make one clearly fictional image using a neutral prompt, or use printed sample outputs.
40–55	Present and reflect	Teams describe the prompt and consider how the image might influence viewers.
55–80	Misinformation challenge	Groups analyse a fictional social post with an AI-generated image and sensational headline; decide what to check and whether to share.
80–90	Reflection	Name one learning, one verification clue and one action before sharing.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

Keep image generation to neutral fictional scenes. Mark each case post as a simulation, do not use a real person's likeness, and do not publish workshop outputs.

SUGGESTED FACILITATOR ADAPTATION

The source gives 15 minutes for presenting and reflecting but no team count. For up to five teams, allow 2 minutes each and reserve 5 minutes for reflection. For more teams, use a gallery walk or parallel small-group sharing so the block remains 15 minutes.

4. Materials and setup

MATERIALS

- Eight to ten prepared real and synthetic examples with reliable answer notes.
- Printed fictional social-post case cards, clearly labeled as simulations.
- Laptop, projector, optional shared phones and internet.
- Printed verification checklist; optional approved image-generation tool.

Included materials: [R07 fictional social-post cards and verification checklist \(pp. 61-64\)](#)

Room setup: Set up a screen for examples and small-group tables. Have a complete offline option ready.

5. Facilitator preparation

- Choose examples with permission to use and no sensitive or distressing imagery.
- Prepare explanations that emphasize uncertainty: visual artifacts can suggest a need to verify but are not definitive proof.
- If generating images, use fictional scenes or objects rather than real people; check age, account and privacy requirements.
- Prepare an offline case card and verification checklist in case tools or the internet are unavailable.

6. Step-by-step facilitation

1. Real or AI?

Show examples one at a time. Participants vote privately or in pairs, then explain what made them uncertain. Reveal the answer and the source of the example.

Try saying: *“A clue can make us curious, but it does not prove authenticity.”*

2. Introduce synthetic media

Explain that AI tools can generate or alter images and video. Briefly discuss opportunities and risks without recommending any one detection service as definitive.

Try saying: *“What questions would help you verify the source and context?”*

3. Create a fictional image

Teams use a neutral prompt such as a future garden, a community mural or a fictional robot. They do not use real faces, names or personal photos. Review the result for errors and bias.

Try saying: *“Keep it clearly fictional. We are exploring how images are made, not impersonating someone.”*

4. Present and reflect

Teams describe their prompt and the changes they made. Discuss why a polished image may feel convincing and what context a viewer would need.

Try saying: *“How could someone mistake this image for a real event? What label would help?”*

5. Misinformation challenge

Give each team a fictional post. Ask them to identify the claim, source, date, missing context and next verification step. They decide whether to trust, share, question or hold.

Try saying: *“What would you check before this reached someone else?”*

6. Close

Invite each person to name one sign that prompts checking and one action they will take before sharing.

7. Debrief and reflection

- Which example was hardest to assess, and what would you check next?
- What can a detector or visual clue tell you, and what can it not prove?

- What harm should you consider before sharing?

8. Inclusion and access

- Provide printed examples with captions and verbal descriptions.
- Do not require participants to reveal social-media habits or personal photos.
- Offer a non-screen role such as evidence recorder or discussion facilitator.
- Give participants a quiet alternative if an example feels uncomfortable.

9. Safety and responsible use

Do not generate or edit a real person's likeness, voice or identity. Avoid political, sexual, humiliating or distressing depictions. Label generated examples as simulations and do not post them. Treat detection tools as fallible and check source context.

10. Tips and follow-up

- Pause before sharing: check the claim, original source, date, context and independent corroboration; then make a reminder card for the group.

Reusable worksheets and facilitator tools

Print the pages you need. These blank templates are designed to work on paper or on a shared screen. Adapt the wording to your group, and keep any AI-generated examples clearly labeled.

Worksheet 1 / Career case study

Use with Workshop 01. Keep the case fictional and distinguish evidence from prediction.

FIELD OR STUDY AREA

What field is the case about?

POSSIBLE CHANGES

Which tasks or processes might AI change? What evidence supports this?

HUMAN CONTRIBUTION

Which skills, relationships or decisions still need people?

RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES

Who may benefit? Who could face barriers or harm?

PRACTICAL NEXT STEP

What is one useful learning step that does not depend on a perfect prediction?

SOURCES CHECKED

Write the source, date and claim you checked.

Worksheet 2 / Future youth centre canvas

Use with Workshop 02. Start with a real youth need, then decide if AI is useful.

YOUNG PEOPLE'S NEED

What need does the centre respond to?

THREE SERVICES

What could the centre offer, and where might AI help?

THREE ACTIVITIES

What could young people do together?

ETHICAL PRINCIPLES

How will the centre protect privacy, fairness and human dignity?

INCLUSION MEASURE

Who might have difficulty accessing this idea, and what will you change?

HUMAN ROLE

What must youth workers and young people decide themselves?

Worksheet 3 / CRAFT prompt card

Use with Workshop 04. Add only the context needed. Use a fictional scenario and do not include private details.

C / CONTEXT

What is the situation?

R / ROLE

What helpful perspective should the AI take?

A / ACTION

What task should it do?

F / FORMAT

What shape or length should the answer have?

T / TONE

What voice or style should it use?

REVIEW AND REVISE

What was useful, inaccurate, missing or unsafe? What will you change next?

Worksheet 4 / Image prompt builder

Use with Workshop 03. These elements are optional; change one or two at a time to see what matters.

SUBJECT

Main object, character or idea:

ENVIRONMENT

Setting, atmosphere or background:

MEDIUM

How should it look as if it was made?

QUALITY

Useful detail or level of finish:

STYLE DIRECTION

Use a broad visual description, such as collage, paper cut-out or soft 3D illustration:

MOOD AND COLOUR

Emotional tone, palette or lighting:

PROMPT TO TEST

Combine the details you chose:

REVIEW

Is it clear, inclusive, accurate for its purpose and safe to share?

Worksheet 5 / AI music creative brief

Use with Workshop 05. Keep characters and situations fictional.

AUDIENCE AND PURPOSE

Who is the song for, and what should it do?

THEME OR MESSAGE

What social or community idea should it express?

LANGUAGE AND TONE

Which language, mood and energy fit the audience?

PROMPT DRAFT

Write the instruction for the music tool:

HUMAN REVIEW

What needs correction or a human creative choice?

SHARING CHECK

Do you have permission and a clear label before sharing beyond the room?

Worksheet 6 / Media literacy detective sheet

Use with Workshops 06 and 07. These are questions for analysis, not instructions to create misleading content.

CLAIM

What does the post ask you to believe?

SOURCE AND DATE

Who published it, where did it first appear, and when?

EVIDENCE

What can be checked independently?

MISSING CONTEXT

What detail could change how a reader understands it?

POSSIBLE TECHNIQUE

Which pattern might be present: emotional appeal, false authority, astroturfing, selective framing or coordinated inauthentic behaviour? What clue supports your answer?

POSSIBLE HARM

Who could be affected if the post spreads?

NEXT STEP

What will you verify, correct or avoid sharing?

Worksheet 7 / Rose, Thorn, Bud

Use at the end of any workshop. Participants can write, draw, speak or pass.

ROSE

One useful or enjoyable thing:

THORN

One challenge or point to improve:

BUD

One idea I want to explore next:

Worksheet 8 / Personal AI compass

Optional reflection worksheet. Use with any workshop; participants can write, draw, speak or pass.

WHERE I AM TODAY

What have I tried, noticed or wondered about AI?

MY HUMAN STRENGTHS

Which strengths do I want to bring to my work with young people?

WHERE I WOULD LIKE TO BE IN ONE YEAR

What would I like to understand or feel more confident doing?

ONE NEXT STEP

What is one small, responsible step I can take?

About this toolkit, credits and editorial approach

This toolkit presents seven participant-created workshop designs as practical session guides for youth workers and facilitators. The original titles, core activities and intended learning purposes are retained. Clearer facilitation steps, printable cards, examples and worksheets support reuse.

The participant designs are distinct from editorial guidance. Every new fictional case, sample response, analysis card, checklist and facilitation adaptation added in this revision is labelled as an editorial addition for future use. These materials are not evidence that an activity was delivered, tested or evaluated during the project.

Substantive adaptations are disclosed. The media-literacy workshop uses safe fictional analysis, verification and correction in place of creating harmful or deceptive material. Workshop 03 retains the source 43-minute plan and adds a separate, timed 40-minute adaptation. Offline activities are identified where they change what participants practise.

Learning outcomes are intended outcomes. This publication does not claim that participants achieved measured learning or that workshops were externally validated.

Publication information

Toolkit	Practical AI Youth Work Toolkit
Project	EU Networking Lab for AI & Digital Youth Work
Project number	2025-3-BG01-KA153-YOU-000388331
Version	1.1 - revised 10 October 2026
Responsible organisation / contributors	Not verified in the accessible project workspace; confirm before public release.
Contact / resource location	No verified publication contact or public resource location supplied.
Reuse / attribution	No reuse licence or permission statement verified. Confirm permissions before redistribution beyond applicable law.

The existing European Union funding acknowledgement and approved visual identifier are retained.

Editorial additions and labels

“Editorial addition for future use” identifies newly prepared fictional scenarios, sample outputs and facilitator tools. “Suggested facilitator adaptation” identifies a practical change to a participant design. The resource pack does not replace local safeguarding, access, consent or tool checks.

Printable supporting materials

Use the linked resource cards below with their matching workshop. New cards in this revision are editorial additions for future use; they are not participant outputs or evidence of delivery.

[R01 Career and study case cards](#)

[R02 AI or Human activity pack](#)

[R03 Image prompt demonstration and offline route](#)

[R04 CRAFT scenario cards and worked practice](#)

[R05 AI music creative case briefs](#)

[R06 Media literacy simulation cards](#)

[R07 Fictional social posts and verification checklist](#)

R01 Career and study case cards

Five fictional cases for Workshop 01. They invite investigation; they make no forecast that a degree or occupation will disappear. Each team records evidence and uncertainty.

R01.1 Community nurse in training

USE AND SAFETY

EDITORIAL ADDITION FOR FUTURE USE. Fictional case. Before the session, add a dated source excerpt and full citation; the case itself contains no evidence claim.

SITUATION

Mira is in a fictional nursing programme and volunteers at a community clinic. The clinic is considering digital tools for appointment reminders and routine documentation.

TASK

Map which tasks might be supported by automation and which require professional judgement, care, consent or accountability.

EVIDENCE TASK

Find one dated primary source on digital health or health-work tasks and one source from a professional or public health body. Record what each source actually says; separate current practice from forecasts.

CHECK BEFORE PRESENTING

Who produced the source? What date and country does it cover? Does it describe a task, a whole job, or a prediction? What evidence and limitations are stated?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R01.2 Graphic designer for a youth centre

USE AND SAFETY

EDITORIAL ADDITION FOR FUTURE USE. Fictional case. Before the session, add a dated source excerpt and full citation; the case itself contains no evidence claim.

SITUATION

Sam creates posters and accessible social-media graphics for a fictional youth centre. The team is considering image-generation tools for early concepts.

TASK

Compare the stages of a design task: brief, research, concept, accessibility review, rights check and final approval. Identify where a tool might assist and where human review remains needed.

EVIDENCE TASK

Prepare a dated source from a public intellectual-property office or accessibility standards body about image rights or accessible communication.

CHECK BEFORE PRESENTING

Is the source law, guidance or opinion? What jurisdiction applies? Does it address the exact use being discussed? What remains uncertain?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R01.3 Electrician working on community energy

USE AND SAFETY

EDITORIAL ADDITION FOR FUTURE USE. Fictional case. Before the session, add a dated source excerpt and full citation; the case itself contains no evidence claim.

SITUATION

Alex is an apprentice electrician supporting a fictional community building retrofit with solar panels and smart controls.

TASK

List tasks involving physical inspection, safety, planning, data interpretation and communication. Discuss which could use digital assistance and what requires qualified people.

EVIDENCE TASK

Prepare a dated source from a government energy agency or occupational safety authority about the specific technology or safety practice.

CHECK BEFORE PRESENTING

Does the source concern this technology and setting? Is it current? Does it describe a tool or predict workforce change? Who is responsible for safety?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R01.4 Youth worker planning a group activity

USE AND SAFETY

EDITORIAL ADDITION FOR FUTURE USE. Fictional case. Before the session, add a dated source excerpt and full citation; the case itself contains no evidence claim.

SITUATION

Niko is preparing a fictional intercultural youth session. They are considering using an AI tool to brainstorm icebreakers and translate a draft invitation.

TASK

Identify possible support and risks around inclusion, cultural assumptions, privacy, translation quality and the youth worker's relationship with the group.

EVIDENCE TASK

Prepare a dated primary source from a youth-work, child-rights or data-protection authority relevant to the discussion.

CHECK BEFORE PRESENTING

Is the source an official rule or practical guidance? Who does it protect? What should a youth worker verify locally?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R01.5 Small cooperative accountant

USE AND SAFETY

EDITORIAL ADDITION FOR FUTURE USE. Fictional case. Before the session, add a dated source excerpt and full citation; the case itself contains no evidence claim.

SITUATION

Lea works with a fictional local cooperative. It is testing software that can sort receipts and draft routine summaries.

TASK

Map routine processing, exception handling, confidentiality, checking and explaining decisions. Discuss what a useful human review would look like.

EVIDENCE TASK

Prepare a dated source from a national tax authority, accounting body or public digital-skills agency. Avoid general job-loss claims.

CHECK BEFORE PRESENTING

What task does the source cover? Does it report observed use or forecast change? What data or method supports the statement?

Notes / evidence / questions:

FACILITATOR SOURCE-PREPARATION CHECKLIST

For each case, print two short dated excerpts from primary or authoritative sources, with organisation, title, date, URL or publication ID, exact claim and scope. Use one source on current tasks or guidance and another that describes uncertainty or limits. Do not treat forecasts as facts. If no suitable source is found, run the case as a question-mapping exercise and label it accordingly.

R02 AI or Human activity pack

An origin-aware activity for Workshop 02. The workspace did not contain a verified, permission-cleared set of human-authored comparison examples. Four newly generated AI examples are included with their origin stated; add four traceable human-authored examples before running a blind comparison.

EDITORIAL ADDITIONS FOR FUTURE USE. The examples below were generated for this revision by ChatGPT on 10 October 2026. They are not participant outputs. Keep the answer notes with the facilitator. Do not conceal origin information when sharing outside the exercise.

R02.1 A youth centre welcome message

EXAMPLE

“New here? You do not need to know anyone or have everything figured out. Come as you are; we can show you around.”

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Origin: AI-generated by ChatGPT for this toolkit revision on 10 October 2026. It is fictional, made for this exercise and not copied from a participant file. No external source is claimed. Keep this note with the card; do not describe it as human-authored.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.2 A short slogan about checking information

EXAMPLE

“Pause, check the source, then choose whether to share.”

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Origin: AI-generated by ChatGPT for this toolkit revision on 10 October 2026. It is fictional, made for this exercise and not copied from a participant file. No external source is claimed. Keep this note with the card; do not describe it as human-authored.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.3 A fictional activity description

EXAMPLE

“In pairs, design a quiet corner for a busy youth space. Add one feature that helps someone feel welcome.”

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Origin: AI-generated by ChatGPT for this toolkit revision on 10 October 2026. It is fictional, made for this exercise and not copied from a participant file. No external source is claimed. Keep this note with the card; do not describe it as human-authored.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.4 A fictional poster caption

EXAMPLE

“Bring one question about AI. Leave with one thing you want to check.”

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Origin: AI-generated by ChatGPT for this toolkit revision on 10 October 2026. It is fictional, made for this exercise and not copied from a participant file. No external source is claimed. Keep this note with the card; do not describe it as human-authored.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.5 Human-authored example slot 1

EXAMPLE TO INSERT

FACILITATOR PREPARATION REQUIRED: insert a short human-authored text only after verifying its original author or publishing organisation, source URL/title, date and reuse basis. Keep the text, attribution and permission evidence together.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Leave blank until the example is documented. Never guess whether a text is human-written. If origin or reuse basis cannot be verified, do not use it in the game.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.6 Human-authored example slot 2

EXAMPLE TO INSERT

FACILITATOR PREPARATION REQUIRED: insert a short human-authored text only after verifying its original author or publishing organisation, source URL/title, date and reuse basis. Keep the text, attribution and permission evidence together.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Leave blank until the example is documented. Never guess whether a text is human-written. If origin or reuse basis cannot be verified, do not use it in the game.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.7 Human-authored example slot 3

EXAMPLE TO INSERT

FACILITATOR PREPARATION REQUIRED: insert a short human-authored text only after verifying its original author or publishing organisation, source URL/title, date and reuse basis. Keep the text, attribution and permission evidence together.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Leave blank until the example is documented. Never guess whether a text is human-written. If origin or reuse basis cannot be verified, do not use it in the game.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02.8 Human-authored example slot 4

EXAMPLE TO INSERT

FACILITATOR PREPARATION REQUIRED: insert a short human-authored text only after verifying its original author or publishing organisation, source URL/title, date and reuse basis. Keep the text, attribution and permission evidence together.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Leave blank until the example is documented. Never guess whether a text is human-written. If origin or reuse basis cannot be verified, do not use it in the game.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R02a Opinion-line statements

- AI should support decisions in youth programmes, but a person should remain accountable.
- Young people should be told when an AI tool helped create content shown to them.
- A youth centre should offer a non-AI way to access every essential service.
- It is acceptable to use AI for a first draft if a person checks the facts and tone.
- Youth workers should ask young people before using AI-generated images in public materials.

R02b Printable YES / NO / IN BETWEEN signs

YES

I agree / this is acceptable

NO

I disagree / this is not acceptable

IN BETWEEN

I am unsure, mixed, or need more information

Print one copy of each sign and place across the room. Participants may point, use a card, stay seated, or pass.

Existing companion: [Worksheet 2. Future youth centre canvas \(p. 27\)](#)

R03 Image prompt demonstration and offline route

A printable demonstration for Workshop 03. The paired outputs below are explanatory mock descriptions, not actual generated images. No historical output file was available in this project workspace.

PROMPT A - SIMPLE
"A youth centre garden."

Illustrative mock description only: imagine a garden beside a youth centre. This is not a generated image and does not predict what a particular tool will produce.

PROMPT B - STRUCTURED
"A shared youth-centre garden with raised planters, a wide step-free path and a small shaded table; late afternoon light; friendly paper-collage illustration; calm greens and warm yellow; no text or identifiable people."

Illustrative mock description only: the prompt names a setting, access feature, objects, visual medium and mood. A real system may interpret these instructions differently. If online, generate both with the same tool and settings, label each output, and compare the actual results.

Participant comparison task

- ☐ Circle the details that appear only in Prompt B.
- ☐ Before generating, sketch or list what you expect each prompt to specify.
- ☐ If using an image tool, generate both prompts without adding other changes. Record the actual outputs and tool/date; do not substitute the mock descriptions for the generated results.
- ☐ Use Worksheet 4, Image prompt builder, to revise one detail at a time.

Offline route

Without a generator, pairs receive the two prompts and draw a quick thumbnail or make a paper collage showing what each instruction asks for. Compare which details are specified and which are left open. This practises prompt reading and visual planning; it does not demonstrate how an image model responds.

Existing companion: [Worksheet 4, Image prompt builder \(p. 29\)](#)

Avoid faces, personal photos, private details and imitation of a living artist's signature style.

R04 CRAFT scenario cards and worked practice

Four fictional youth-work scenarios for Workshop 04. Each card supports two prompt revisions. Sample responses are newly prepared editorial teaching examples, not historical project outputs.

R04.1 Plan a low-cost welcome activity

SITUATION

Situation: A fictional youth centre expects eight first-time visitors, some arriving alone. The room has chairs, paper and markers; the activity must take 15 minutes.

TASK

Task: Ask for three optional welcome activities.

INTENDED AUDIENCE AND OUTPUT

Audience/output: Youth worker; numbered list with timing and materials.

PRACTICAL CONSTRAINTS

Constraints: Low-cost; no forced introductions or physical contact; offer quiet participation.

PRIVACY REMINDER

Privacy: Use no real names or personal histories.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

Review: Is the activity inclusive? Can someone observe or pass? Does it fit 15 minutes?

REVISION RECORD

Draft prompt → Revision 1 after checking answer → Revision 2 after checking again. What changed, and why?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R04.2 Make an event invitation accessible

SITUATION

Situation: A fictional community group is inviting young people to a free afternoon workshop in a local library. The address and date are not provided.

TASK

Task: Draft a short invitation with clearly marked placeholders for missing details.

INTENDED AUDIENCE AND OUTPUT

Audience/output: Young people aged 16-20; 70-word plain-language message.

PRACTICAL CONSTRAINTS

Constraints: Do not invent date, address, registration link or accessibility features.

PRIVACY REMINDER

Privacy: Do not enter contact lists or participant data.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

Review: Are unknown details marked? Is the invitation welcoming and readable?

REVISION RECORD

Draft prompt → Revision 1 after checking answer → Revision 2 after checking again. What changed, and why?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R04.3 Explain a digital-safety topic

SITUATION

Situation: A youth worker is preparing a 10-minute discussion about checking a surprising online claim. The group has mixed experience.

TASK

Task: Suggest a neutral explanation and three open questions.

INTENDED AUDIENCE AND OUTPUT

Audience/output: Facilitator; simple language, short bullet points.

PRACTICAL CONSTRAINTS

Constraints: No current-event examples, scare tactics or claims about a real person.

PRIVACY REMINDER

Privacy: Use only fictional examples.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

Review: Does it distinguish a clue from proof? What facts need an authoritative source?

REVISION RECORD

Draft prompt → Revision 1 after checking answer → Revision 2 after checking again. What changed, and why?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R04.4 Adapt a group activity for access

SITUATION

Situation: A fictional group includes people who prefer speaking, writing, drawing, using a screen reader, or observing before joining.

TASK

Task: Suggest ways to offer choices in a 20-minute small-group activity.

INTENDED AUDIENCE AND OUTPUT

Audience/output: Youth worker; practical checklist.

PRACTICAL CONSTRAINTS

Constraints: Do not assume a diagnosis or ask anyone to disclose a need publicly.

PRIVACY REMINDER

Privacy: Do not include identifiable access or health information.

REVIEW QUESTIONS

Review: Are choices genuine? Does the plan preserve equal participation and dignity?

REVISION RECORD

Draft prompt → Revision 1 after checking answer → Revision 2 after checking again. What changed, and why?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R04b Worked CRAFT example

C - CONTEXT

A fictional youth centre has eight first-time visitors and 15 minutes for a welcome activity.

R - ROLE

Act as a youth-work facilitator who offers choice and does not force disclosure.

A - ACTION

Suggest three activities that help newcomers understand the room and choose how to join.

F - FORMAT

Give a numbered list; for each, include minutes, materials and one quiet option.

T - TONE

Warm, plain-language and non-pressuring.

Prompt v0: "Give me a welcome activity."

Revision 1: add the group context, time limit and request for several options.

Revision 2: add the no-forced-disclosure constraint, quiet option, materials and exact output format. Participants should write their own actual revisions and review any live output.

R04c Offline sample responses

These are editorial samples, not model outputs. Use them to practise review and revision without live access.

SAMPLE ANSWER A

1. Room map: 5 min, paper and markers; invite people to mark a place they would like to know about, or simply look.
2. Choice cards: 5 min, paper; choose "talk," "draw," or "observe."
3. Pair tour: 5 min; optional, with a no-pair alternative.

SAMPLE ANSWER B

Ask a staff member to tell everyone one interesting fact about themselves, then invite every visitor to do the same. This may create pressure to disclose and gives no opt-out.

Review: Sample A offers choices but verify the timing and room details locally. Sample B conflicts with the no-disclosure constraint; revise it. A possible Revision 2 adds an explicit pass option, no personal-story request, and materials that are actually available.

R05 AI music creative case briefs

Six fictional case briefs for Workshop 05. Each preserves the source design's creative purpose while making the audience, message, tone and exclusions explicit.

R05.1 Community sports shop

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: young people visiting a neighbourhood sports shop. Message: try a new activity and encourage one another. Tone: energetic, friendly, inclusive. Avoid: body shaming, stereotypes, pressure to buy or promises of success.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R05.2 Maths learning group

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: teens who meet for a supportive maths club. Message: mistakes are part of learning and asking questions is welcome. Tone: playful, encouraging, not childish. Avoid: mocking learners, grades or claims that everyone learns at the same speed.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R05.3 Local flower shop

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: a fictional small florist's community customers. Message: notice seasonal colour and small acts of care.

Tone: gentle, bright, appreciative. Avoid: environmental claims that have not been checked, luxury pressure or stereotypes about who gives flowers.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R05.4 Graduation celebration

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: a mixed group completing a course or training programme. Message: recognise effort and different paths forward. Tone: hopeful, warm, collective. Avoid: assuming everyone has a job, degree, family support or the same next step.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R05.5 Welcome gathering

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: newcomers at a fictional youth exchange. Message: curiosity and mutual respect can help people connect. Tone: open, light, welcoming. Avoid: national stereotypes, forced disclosure or treating one culture as the norm.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R05.6 Community accountancy cooperative

CREATIVE BRIEF

Audience: young volunteers learning how a fictional cooperative keeps records. Message: careful teamwork and transparent decisions matter. Tone: rhythmic, clever, approachable. Avoid: financial advice, real client information or claims about tax rules.

PROMPT TASK

Write a short instruction that names the audience, message, tone and one exclusion. Keep people and events fictional.

HUMAN REVIEW

Check language, stereotypes, factual claims, rights and whether the result fits the brief.

Notes / evidence / questions:

Existing companion: [Worksheet 5, AI music creative brief \(p. 30\)](#)

R06 Media literacy simulation cards

Five safe fictional analysis cards for Workshop 06. Every card is marked SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. The aim is detection, verification and correction, never practice in producing deceptive material.

R06.1 Emotional manipulation

USE AND SAFETY

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Keep inside the learning session; do not publish or attach to real people, groups, organisations or current events.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITION

Definition: wording designed to provoke a strong emotion so a reader reacts before checking.

ANALYSIS CARD

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A fictional notice says: "If you care about your neighbours, forward this immediately."
No source or evidence is provided.

FACILITATOR REASONING NOTE

Reasoning note: urgency and moral pressure are clues to pause, not proof that the claim is false. Check the original source, date and independent evidence.

ASK

What is the claim? What can be verified independently? What is missing? Who might be affected? What should we avoid amplifying?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R06.2 False authority

USE AND SAFETY

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Keep inside the learning session; do not publish or attach to real people, groups, organisations or current events.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITION

Definition: a claim borrows credibility from a supposed expert or institution without verifiable support.

ANALYSIS CARD

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A fictional poster says “Experts confirm this new youth-centre rule” but names no expert, report or date.

FACILITATOR REASONING NOTE

Reasoning note: absence of a citation is a verification gap. Do not invent a quote or accuse a real organisation.

ASK

What is the claim? What can be verified independently? What is missing? Who might be affected? What should we avoid amplifying?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R06.3 Astroturfing

USE AND SAFETY

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Keep inside the learning session; do not publish or attach to real people, groups, organisations or current events.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITION

Definition: an organised message is made to look like many independent people spontaneously agree.

ANALYSIS CARD

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Five fictional comments use the same unusual phrase and appear within one minute, but their authorship is unknown.

FACILITATOR REASONING NOTE

Reasoning note: repetition and timing may justify checking coordination; they do not prove it. Avoid identifying real accounts or users.

ASK

What is the claim? What can be verified independently? What is missing? Who might be affected? What should we avoid amplifying?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R06.4 Selective framing

USE AND SAFETY

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Keep inside the learning session; do not publish or attach to real people, groups, organisations or current events.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITION

Definition: some information is shown while relevant context is left out, changing how the whole is understood.

ANALYSIS CARD

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A fictional chart shows attendance rising from 2 to 4 people but omits its title, scale, date range and total capacity.

FACILITATOR REASONING NOTE

Reasoning note: ask for the full chart, denominator, time period and source before drawing a conclusion.

ASK

What is the claim? What can be verified independently? What is missing? Who might be affected? What should we avoid amplifying?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R06.5 Coordinated inauthentic behaviour

USE AND SAFETY

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. Keep inside the learning session; do not publish or attach to real people, groups, organisations or current events.

PLAIN-LANGUAGE DEFINITION

Definition: multiple accounts act together while misleading people about who is behind them or why they are acting.

ANALYSIS CARD

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A fictional set of posts repeats one link and phrase; the operator and relationship between accounts are not known.

FACILITATOR REASONING NOTE

Reasoning note: patterns warrant investigation but do not establish coordination or intent without corroborating evidence.

ASK

What is the claim? What can be verified independently? What is missing? Who might be affected? What should we avoid amplifying?

Notes / evidence / questions:

R06b Verification and correction template

CLAIM

What exactly is being claimed?

ORIGINAL SOURCE AND DATE

Where did it first appear? When?

EVIDENCE CHECKED

What primary or independent evidence supports or contradicts it?

UNCERTAINTY

What cannot be established yet?

POTENTIAL HARM

Who could be affected by repeating it?

CORRECTION / HOLDING STATEMENT

Write a neutral note that states what is known, what is not known and what will be checked.

SAFE NEXT STEP

Correct with context, ask a trusted source, or do not share.

Existing companion: [Worksheet 6, media literacy detective sheet \(p. 31\)](#)

R07 Fictional social posts and verification checklist

Fictional practice cards for Workshop 07. They do not refer to actual events, people or organisations. The project workspace did not contain a rights-cleared, traceable set of eight to ten real/synthetic visual examples; see the facilitator dependency below.

R07.1 A dramatic sky

USE AND SAFETY
SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE.

FICTIONAL POST

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. "Strange lights appeared over our town last night. Officials are hiding the truth." No source, date or location is shown.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Answer note: Entirely fictional text created for this revision. No image is supplied, and no event is claimed. Ask what source and date would be needed before sharing.

GROUP TASK

Identify the claim, missing context, source/date gaps, potential harm and a safe next step. Do not guess whether an image is real or synthetic.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R07.2 A cropped chart

USE AND SAFETY
SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE.

FICTIONAL POST

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A crop shows a steep line rising, with no labels or axes. Caption: "This proves the programme worked."

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Answer note: Entirely fictional scenario. The chart has no dataset, title, date or attribution. No conclusion can be verified from the crop.

GROUP TASK

Identify the claim, missing context, source/date gaps, potential harm and a safe next step. Do not guess whether an image is real or synthetic.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R07.3 A supposed announcement

USE AND SAFETY
SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE.

FICTIONAL POST

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A post says a fictional youth club will close tomorrow, but has no link to the club or named contact.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Answer note: Fictional scenario; no real venue or announcement. Verify through a known official contact channel before acting or forwarding.

GROUP TASK

Identify the claim, missing context, source/date gaps, potential harm and a safe next step. Do not guess whether an image is real or synthetic.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R07.4 A reused photograph claim

USE AND SAFETY
SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE.

FICTIONAL POST

SIMULATION - DO NOT SHARE. A caption says a photograph shows “today’s event,” but the post provides no original source or capture date.

FACILITATOR ANSWER NOTE

Answer note: Fictional scenario. No photograph is included. The date and context cannot be inferred from appearance; find the original publication and independent corroboration.

GROUP TASK

Identify the claim, missing context, source/date gaps, potential harm and a safe next step. Do not guess whether an image is real or synthetic.

Notes / evidence / questions:

R07b Verification checklist

- ☐ State the exact claim and separate it from opinion.
- ☐ Find the earliest available source and verify the account or publisher through a known channel.
- ☐ Check date, location, caption and whether the image or clip appears in an earlier context.
- ☐ Seek independent corroboration from a relevant primary source.
- ☐ Inspect context and provenance; visual oddities and detector scores are prompts for checking, not proof.
- ☐ Record what remains uncertain. Do not fill gaps with a guess.
- ☐ Consider the harm of sharing, even to debunk. If unverified, hold or do not share.

Facilitator dependency: real/synthetic visual set

Before running the eight-to-ten-example guessing activity, select 8-10 suitable images only when each has a traceable origin and documented reuse basis. Use a balanced set of documented authentic photographs and synthetic images from a source that explicitly permits reuse or a tool output whose terms and attribution requirements have been checked. For every item, record: resource ID; original URL and publisher/creator; capture date; documented real/synthetic status and how that status is known; licence or written permission; attribution line; any uncertainty; and an accessible caption. Keep originals and answer notes together. Do not infer authenticity from appearance or a detector. If this set is not ready, replace the guessing activity with the four fictional text-post cards above and say that participants are practising verification questions, not image-origin classification.