Future Youth Schools Forums: External Evaluation

2018

Frances Hunt[1]

1 Introduction

The Future Youth Schools Forums (FYS Forums) Project aims to develop skills for active citizenship through youth-led forums for young people. This report is an external evaluation of the FYS Forums project over the period September 2015 – July 2018. The FYS Forums is European Commission Erasmus + funded, and has partners in the UK, Italy, Lithuania, Poland and Cyprus[1].

Through the FYS Forums project young people work through a series of training resources around a particular theme – people forced to flee (2016-17) and gender inequality (2017-8). Schools are based in networks and the young people in the lead 'hub/trial[2]' school develop a one-day forum event around the theme for young people in other 'participating' schools. The young people in these forums then decide on an 'action' which they carry out after the forum event. Teachers support the young people as necessary, in terms of helping develop / deliver training resources, aiding logistics for the forum and setting up the network.

> *The idea is a number of schools would come together under the leadership of young people to explore a global issue and to jointly plan an action, which the individual schools would take back to their communities and carry on. So the forum wasn't just the meeting itself it was a process of learning before coming to the meeting, the meeting under the leadership of young people to share perspectives to share learning and to discuss actions and then to return to their schools, to carry out the actions they had discussed at the forum (partner organisation).*

According to bid documents, the overall goal of the FYS Forums project is:

> *Small-scale global citizenship youth forums in school education drive increased motivation, participation and skills development equitably within education and civic life for young people aged 11-18 across the EU.*

The project is based on the following needs:

> Need 1: to better motivate and engage EU youth within education, particularly those at risk of dropping out.

> Need 2: better develop youth transversal skills and competences in EU youth (EU Framework for key competences; competences, learning to learn, social and civic competences)

> Need 3: for EU teachers to develop more relevant and inspiring curricula and student centred pedagogies

> Need 4: to increase EU youth civic engagement and active citizenship

The project had the following objectives:

> Objective 1: to create an inclusive, sustainable, networked model of EU wide curriculum linked global citizenship youth forums that are delivered by schools for schools

> Objective 2: to provide teachers and young people with the tools to promote effective and inclusive youth leadership across formal and informal education through global citizenship forums

> Objective 3: to influence at local, national and EU levels to promote more inclusive and participatory youth led policies and opportunities within EU education systems

---

[1] Oxfam GB, Oxfam Italia, Cardet (Cyprus), JKC (Lithuania), University of Lodz (Poland).
[2] In year one the lead school running a forum is a 'hub school'. In year two, two 'trial' schools also run forums.

It is hoped the project will have the following impacts:

- Young people more motivated in education and EU civic life
- Young people develop transversal skills and competencies
- Young people feel more connected to political and civic processes
- Young people feel more connected to the EU

While a separate project, many of the partners of the FYS-Forums project also worked on the Erasmus + funded, Schools for Future Youth (SFYouth[3]). The SFYouth project ran 2014-2017 and had many similar aims and activities. However, the two projects differ: the FYS Forums is focused more on a single event, which is bigger in scale and brings young people from different schools together.

The FYS Forums team commissioned this independent evaluation towards the end of the project. I was asked to produce a short summative report that focuses on the effectiveness and efficiency of the FYS Forums and respond to the terms of reference for the external evaluation can be found in

---

[3] https://sfyouth.eu/index.php/en/

Appendix 1: Terms of reference for external evaluation. I had previously collected and analysed data on the SFYouth project (Hunt, 2017) and was familiar with many of the project partners.

In this report I describe the methods I used to collect and analyse data. The findings are grouped around the areas of focus for the evaluation as per the terms of reference. Finally a conclusion section brings the research results together and highlights any recommendations for the future.

2 Methodology

The evaluation draws on a range of data for this external evaluation.

2.1 Interviews

I carried out a series of interviews as part of the evaluation process. All interviews used a semi-structured interview schedule which aimed to guide, though not determine, the interview process (see Appendix 2). The questions asked focused on exploring questions related to the terms of reference, which include queries into the design, implementation and impact of the project.

I carried out the following:

- 5 Skype interviews with 4 project partners
- 1 Skype interview with M&E partners, which followed a different schedule

Table 1**Error! Reference source not found.** provides detail of the interviews.

Table 1: Interviews carried out

Interview	Role on FYS Forum, Partner organisation	Format
Amy Jones	Project Manager, Oxfam GB (Aug 2017-2018)	Skype, 60 mins.
Federica Cicala	Oxfam Italy (2014-2018)	Telephone, 30 mins
Anna Jarkiewicz, Joanna Leek, Marcin Podogrocki	Monitoring and evaluation, University of Lodz, Poland (2014-2018)	Group interview. Skype, 60 mins
John McLaverty	Oxfam GB (2014-2018)	Skype, 60 mins.
Laura Pekiene (supplemented by written responses by JKC staff member who worked more directly with schools)	Project administrator, JKC Lithuania (2017-2018)	Skype, 30 mins
Sotiris Themistokleous	CARDET (2014-2018)	Skype, 30 mins.

While all partners were keen and willing to take part in interviews, changes in staff meant that some of the detail might have been lost, both from the project implementation and historical perspectives on the project. This was not the case for all partner organisations and I took opportunities to try to address any possible gaps, for example, by trying to interview respondents who had been in place since the start of the project.

While partner organisations worked closely with hub/trial schools in order to ensure the youth-led forums took place, there was less engagement of partner organisations with participating schools. This means the majority of their school-based insights are likely to be from hub/trial rather than participating schools.

All interviews were recorded with the consent of respondents. The interviews were transcribed verbatim.

I also met two school teachers from UK hub/trial schools at the national multiplier event (see 6.2.3) and spoke briefly to them about how the project had worked in their schools and the impact they perceived it had had. I asked additional questions about the FYS Forums resources, to which I got one response from a teacher in a UK school.

Ethical guidelines were followed during the data collection and analysis process which assured anonymity and confidentiality were assured for evaluation participants; informed consent was guaranteed and I asked permission to record all interviews on the basis that the recordings would be destroyed once the transcription had been made.

2.2 Document review

Document analysis was a key part of the evaluation. In particular the following documents were reviewed:

- Project outputs: IO1 – 6
- FYS Forums bid document
- FYS Forums Theory of Change
- FYS Forums Logframe
- FYS Forums Youth outcomes Matrix
- FYS Forum Review of Transnational Meetings
- FYS Forums Forum Survey Analysis

2.3 Data analysis

The data was analysed in relation to the evaluation questions, taking into account emerging themes and drawing on quotes to illustrate findings.

3 Project design and implementation

3.1 Project design

In this section I look at the project design and specifically refer to the question in the terms of reference:

- Whether the design of the FYS Forums project was appropriate for the intended outcomes and for all of the partner countries.

In addition to interviews with project staff, I reviewed various documents which support the design of the project, including the project bid, Theory of Change, project logframe and the Youth Outcomes Matrix. These documents present an organised and structured approach to project design and measurement, with the groundwork clearly established early in the project cycle. It is clear from the evidence presented that the basic design of the project was good and it generated a number of good outputs and impacts.

Some of the detail and areas of design which might not have worked so well are discussed to follow:

There is an overwhelming sense from project partners that the project was well-designed and that the majority of tasks and outputs were relevant and realised.

> *I think the proposal was designed in a proper way so I wouldn't have changed the design …, it's fine.*

> *I think by definition it was appropriate because it was approved … I think the actual project management was conducted in that way that it was reached within the expectations of the proposal.*

One partner concludes, by reaching the project objectives, the project design was thus appropriate:

> *Looking at the objectives, I think … I've seen (we) really meet the objectives around young people and young people's transversal skills and young people's agency to get involved in political life.*

3.1.1 Youth led forums

In particular the youth-led forum model seems well received and appropriate. Partners identified the youth-led training activities and the forum event as particularly positive aspects of the project design:

> *I think the forum, youth leadership and the activities that the young people … I think for me that was the main strength of the project.*

> *I think the space for youth leadership works well and the space for peer education space for peer education worked well …*

> *I think because it was based around set event it was easier (than SFYouth) … This one was, on the 18th of March we are handing over to the pupils I think in a way it's easier for them to do that.*

> *Everything went really well I think the schools were interested in organising (forums) and the kids enjoyed it and they really presented nice material on the issues that they discussed in the forums so I think it was quite successful.*

> *The forum I think it was amazing. It was very useful for the students it shows the students something different and they collaborate.*

The forum model was seen as good because it gives space for young people to learn and think, to discuss ideas and become confident in their own voice.

> *The collaboration of teachers with our team worked very well and also the commitment of the students because of their overall the philosophy and material that we offered in this project I think it was they work very well.*

> *I think to give space for these things to be talked about in a more structured way I think teachers talked about the fact that they these things are happening in and around school but they don't have the space to think talk about it.*

It is also evident the project design built on previous learning from project partners on the SFYouth project, with the forum model progressing the ideas around youth participation, pupil voice and spaces for engagement.

> *Compared with the SFYouth which was really a trial this was a real project where people came together and run events and took action afterwards so as to me we took people further on a journey then we did with SFYouth.*

> *I have certainly been massively inspired by the role of young people forums because in SFYouth young people were still in the formal space in the school, but in this young people are out there.*

> *I think the two projects are really linked to each other because probably without having done the SF Youth project it would have been much more difficult to work on the forums …. I think one's really the follow-up of the other one it was a natural progression.*

3.1.2 Hub/trial school model and school targets

The FYS Forums used a 'hub and spoke' model of school recruitment, whereby hub/trial schools recruit participating schools to engage on the project within their network. The hub/trial schools organise and run the forums for each network and were expected to recruit 10 participating schools. The idea for the hub and spoke model was borrowed from the SFYouth project (and before that the Global Learning Programme in England) and Hunt (2017) outlines difficulties of using this model within the context of the SFYouth project. There appear to have

been similar difficulties on FYS Forums. From the evidence presented, I would claim that the hub/trial school model as a means of recruiting schools is not without problem, and the targets set for recruitment were not realistic.

Indeed, it was not possible for hub/trial schools (or NGOs working on behalf of hub/trial schools) to recruit ten participating schools each (see: Table 2 for actual school recruitment). One partner noted the idea of 10 schools per network had not been thought through in any detail.

> *We understood that that was just a number taken from the air and there wasn't a reason for the ten schools.*

Partners describe how this target put pressure onto both schools and project partners to recruit, which may not have been the most productive use of their time.

Table 2: Hub/ trial and participating school engagement

Country	Period of engagement	Focus of forum	Number of participating schools
Cyprus: Hub School 1	2016-2017	People forced to flee	9
Cyprus: Hub School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	8
Cyprus: Trial School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	10
Cyprus: Trial School 1	2017-2018	Youth Building a Better Future	1
Cyprus: Trial School 2	2017-2018	Gender equality	6
Italy: Hub School 1	2016-2017	People forced to flee	4
Italy: Hub School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	4
Italy: Trial School 1	2017-2018	People forced to flee	4
Italy: Trial School 2	2017-2018	Gender equality	4
Lithuania: Hub School 1	2016-2017	People forced to flee	8
Lithuania: Hub School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	7
Lithuania: Trial School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	5
Lithuania: Trial School 2	2017-2018	Gender equality	4
UK: Hub School 1	2016-2017	People forced to flee	4 (including 2 trial schools)
UK: Hub School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	2
UK: Trial School 1	2017-2018	People forced to flee	2
UK: Trial School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	4
UK: Trial School 2	2017-2018	Gender equality	7
Poland: Hub School 1	2017-2018	People forced to flee	0
Poland: Hub School 1	2017-2018	Gender equality	0
Total numbers			93 (91)
Unique participating schools			71

Interviews indicate the recruitment of ten participating schools per network was problematic, particularly as recruiting schools into networks is not necessarily something teachers know or should know about. In many cases it was the partner organisations rather than the hub/trial schools that recruited participating schools into the networks.

> *I think really we overestimate the capacity of schools to reach out to their peers and the teachers to work with teachers in other schools and recruit them and inform them and keep them engaged…*
>
> *I think schools did struggle to recruit schools to come especially in the UK*
>
> *I think the I think I would be more conservative in terms of numbers especially in the case of Cyprus because it's just very small country (compared to other partner countries).*
>
> *The project is quite demanding for Italian schools and they're not very used to self-organising and implementation … we have to support a lot the schools … The first years we organised the Hub school.*

Not only was the recruitment of ten schools by each hub/trial school difficult in itself, the actual logistics of hosting a running a forum for ten participating schools, in some cases would not have been possible. For example, in terms of school spaces that could host young people from ten school and coordinating school timetables so all young people were available to come together on the same day, was not always realistic. At times the forum event might be out of the comfort zone of teachers:

> *I think the workload has been big for the teachers … they have had a lot to organise on top of their teaching. It's kind of an event management type of role which many teachers obviously don't do so it's been a big learning curve …*

Project partners highlighted the different capacities for schools to deliver the project. Those schools with increased capacity were able to work more independently, whereas those with less capacity required additional support, either from within the school or more usually from project partners. This was the case for both hub/trial and participating schools.

The changing nature of schooling in different country contexts means that schools might have different capacities to deliver at different stages of the project. For example, the schooling context in England has undergone quite significant changes over the course of the project, which has affected teachers' capacity to deliver. Partners indicate that a more flexible approach to project design might have supported schools during these times of change. So, the rigidity of project design might be adapted enough to allow for more flexibility in delivery by schools. Indeed, many partners thought the forum might work better with smaller numbers of schools and young people. In the future:

> *I would be a lot more flexible about how we actually reach out to the participants. I might do it just between 2 schools.*
>
> *Maybe have smaller forums and not having one big forum, maybe smaller forums.*

This discussion has focused on issues with the hub/trial school recruitment model and the targets put in place for schools within the project design. This is not to say that getting fewer schools involved in the project was less of a success for the project partners or schools themselves. Indeed, many partners in reality thought smaller networks potentially worked better.

> *Getting three schools at the forum … doesn't make it less of a success.*
>
> *It's the quality of the interaction between the young people's what matters not necessarily how many*

The discussion in 3.1.2 has implications for the realisation of logframe targets. Table 10 in Appendix 3: Analysis tables provides an account of how school engagement is mapped against logframe targets. It indicates that the project was not able to meet logframe targets in terms of: numbers of schools and numbers of teachers engaged. However, by running more forums that than required in the logframe (20 compared to 12), the discrepancy in terms of schools and teachers, was not that great. Moreover, there were more young people involved

in forums than required in the logframe. That said, the logframe requirement of ten schools in each forum was unrealistically high.

3.1.3 Participating school involvement

Partner organisations worked closely with hub/trial schools in order to ensure the youth-led forums took place. There was less engagement of partner organisations with participating schools, and as a result less awareness of how participating schools engaged in the project and less understanding of the impacts of the project in participating schools. This was reinforced by focus group data collection which focused more on hub/trial schools. Partners indicate that this was a problem and that probably more thinking needs to be done on how to more fully engage those participating schools into the forum process.

> *From what we heard it was some of (the participating schools) did the whole activity and some just came on the day and don't necessarily have time to do all of it.*

> *I think for the participating schools it was harder to get greater buy in from them other than just an interesting day out. The challenge going forward would be how to make any more level partnership between schools who are taking part in the forum.*

This is not to say that working with hub/trial and participating schools was a bad idea, in fact there seem to have been many benefits to having a range of schools come together – especially where young people can bring different perspectives. In one example a mixed state school ran a forum with a single-sex and an independent school – which resulted in 'interesting discussions'. In another example:

> *We organised three school in Rome and three schools between Florence and Arezzo and it was nice because … it was a regional exchange. With all the perspectives on migration and all the impacts on migration … and also the feedback in the realities of the people living in Rome was totally different from that was confronted from Florence and Arezzo, where there that are very little migration*

3.1.4 Involving teachers and young people in resource design

The design of the project had teachers' involvement in developing and delivering a more engaged curriculum as key (see need 3, logframe targets). There were spaces allocated to involve teachers within the resource design phases. For example, learning exchanges (Feb, 2016; March 2017) took place where teachers and project partners could work together to develop resources for the project. Learning exchanges gave opportunities for teachers to be involved in resource design, but the time available was seen as too short by one partner:

> *It could have been in the learning exchange which was in Cyprus and in Rome we were trying to involve the teachers to build with them the toolkit but it was not enough time for us the learning exchange week is a good idea but maybe it should be 10 days one meeting.*

Partners gave a number of examples of how teachers in particular were able to feedback and give ideas about resources and activities. For example, there were a series of 'bitesize' activities that were developed in response to a request by a teacher:

> *Who wanted something that was maybe succinct and quick and easy for everybody to do … They came up with the format and I developed the format that they suggested and padded out the framework and designed the actual activities. So that really was a teacher-led type structuring and I think that I think that's good.*

Similarly, the active learning methods was developed at the request of partners in order to support participatory learning methods for teachers who perhaps had less experience or confidence in using those.

While young people may have had less direct influence on resources, they were given a vote as to what the 2017-8 should be based on. Young people chose gender as a theme.

The involvement and influence of teachers and young people is important in a project which aims to develop participation and voice. Time is always an issue with making activities participative, but I wonder whether there may have been any further chances to engage participants. Similarly, I wonder whether, without the intervention of the NGOs' developing new resources on different themes, teachers will have the time and / or opportunity to add to the topics that are currently available.

3.1.5 Working with at risk pupils

Within the original bid there was a commitment to work with young people at risk. This was discussed within the Needs Analysis report (5.1) and early meetings of the project team. Discussions focused on how to define these young people at risk which would differ between different country contexts.

In the UK, for example, pupils at risk was defined as young people at risk of getting a grade D at GCSE[4]. The initial hub school was chosen because they had a number of young people at risk of getting lower grades and the school is working in challenging circumstances. Similarly, in Lithuania the hub school is in an economically disadvantaged area and in Cyprus it was selected as it is located in an area of disadvantage. Thus the project was opening up opportunities to young people who don't necessarily get the chance to engage in initiatives of these types. I think this is good and appropriate.

I wonder the extent to which partners are fully able to follow through on this commitment to working with young people at risk throughout the project. In a project of this type, where new systems are being put in place and ideas trialled, it is often easier for the partner organisation to engage with schools which are known to them. Without the support and commitment of engaged educators within schools it is very difficult to ensure projects like these get off the ground. I therefore understand why partner organisations did not recruit all of their schools from those with high levels of at risk pupils. If that had been the case, without the commitment key staff, it is likely the project would not have succeeded in the way it did.

Overall the design of the project and the focus on forums was good. However, the project design did not fully take into account the realities of schooling and the capacities of schools to run the project.

3.2 Working as a team

In this section I look at how well the partners worked together as a team and specifically refer to the terms of reference:

- Identification of best practice in the development of the Future Youth Schools Forums Project through ways of working as a Partnership and as a recipient of Erasmus+ funding.

3.2.1 Organisation of the team

Partners had different responsibilities on the project. Oxfam GB was the lead partner and carried out project management duties. Cardet managed the information technology, in particular the website and delivery of IO5. The University of Wodz was in charge of monitoring and evaluation and the delivery of IO1 and IO6. In terms of resources, Oxfam UK took the lead role in the delivery of IO3, Oxfam Italy IO2 and JKC in Lithuania, IO4. All partners were involved in project implementation, although in the case of Poland, this was on a smaller scale (one hub school) and the school didn't take part in any data collection exercises.

There were particular ways in which the project team kept in touch:

---

[4] Exams taken at age 16. Grades A-C are pass grades.

- Monthly project management meetings which all partners attended via online conferencing. Project agendas were set in advance and meeting minutes with action points written up promptly.
- Project materials were located centrally on a shared server and kept up to date by Oxfam GB. All partners could access project materials at any stage.
- Annual face-to-face meetings took place throughout the project
  - Transnational meeting 1 (Project set-up), December 2015, London
  - Transnational meeting 2, June 2016, Poland
  - Transnational meeting 3, May 2017, Lithuania
  - Transnational meeting 4 (final meeting), April 2018, Rome

At the end of each face-to-face meeting project partners completed a review of the meeting, which was analysed by University of Lodz and collated into three outputs. In these outputs partners allocated scores to a range of factors:

- In the first project meeting for example partners talked about how they had a better understanding of what is meant by forums in the different country contexts, the educational systems in the participating countries and the different student leadership programmes in the countries. They also were clearer about the terminology being used.
- Meetings two, three and four were more focused on progress and the practical aspects of project implementation. Partners were able to indicate what was working well (coordination, communication) and not so well (dissemination).

Learning exchanges took place for teachers and project partners to build relationships, consult on / develop resources (intellectual outputs) and induct teachers into using the project resources. There were two learning exchanges:

- Learning exchange 1, Feb 2016, Rome
- Learning exchange 2, March 2017, Cyprus

3.2.2 What worked well or didn't work so well

Overall there was a sense that the project team had worked well together:

I think we did work really well together

I think it was very good communication very good collaboration

I think everything is fine it works quite well.

- **Project leadership**

Oxfam GB provided the project leadership for FYS-Forums was led by Oxfam GB. The first leader started after winning the bid and the second worked on the project for the final year. By all accounts the project leadership has been excellent. In particular the partners noted how well the move between leadership had been managed by Oxfam GB.

… the handovers and continuity has been very good, I don't think we could we could attribute any sort of problems to the changeover. I don't think there were problems I think it was a really well done project. (Leadership has) been a strength of the project and it's been thought out in advance, it had permanent foundations for people to come and go.

There was no problems, the handover was smooth, no problem at all.

I was impressed from the transition … I think I didn't really realise the change

Oxfam was very involved and respond very quickly to any issue

One partner noted that they had felt as the lead partner Oxfam GB sometimes made more decisions than other partners, and that they had expected more shared decision-making. This

was not a criticism, sometimes joint decision making is time-consuming. It suggests partners trusted Oxfam GB to make appropriate choices.

- **Ongoing contact and level of organisation**

It was a very well organised and managed project. Standards of engagement and protocols were set at the beginning and were sustained throughout the project. The project team appreciated the regular contact and level of organisation from Oxfam GB:

> *I think the monthly calls … people came to calls and participated and we use that as a constant and that's been a good thing. The meetings were set up in a structured way, in a clear way, meeting minutes, project plans and Gantt chart. All documentation was on Box so anyone could see … I think the partners appreciated being able to read the actions after the meeting. I think that worked well.*

> *The team working seems to have gone well in the part of meetings partners can raise issues and partners did talk about concerns between themselves.*

> *The communication is very good and the project management as well (review doc).*

> *The project meeting (online & F2F) are very effective (review doc.)*

The strong communication meant that tasks were allocated appropriately to partners:

> *Excellent cooperation and division of tasks between the partners.*

Similarly feedback from the face to face meetings was mainly positive and the data presented in the meeting review documents (generally in response to project meetings) was good.

> *I was only involved in one face to face meeting and that was good.*

It seems apparent the successful collaboration the SFYouth project meant partners were able to establish the FYS Forums quickly, setting up systems which replicated the positive practices (Collins, 2017) from the previous project. Working with known partners and ways of working was ultimately saved time and allowed partners to focus on important tasks quickly.

> *The three groups that were involved in SFY the links have been very useful … I think at the learning from SFY in terms of how to set up the project and how to do the partner meetings and things was very useful.*

> *The core partnership between Oxfam GB Oxfam Italy and Cardet was already in place so we working well quite well together*

That said, partners noted there had been some tensions in the project, particularly in the early stages, as a result of differing expectations and understandings of what the project wanted to achieve in the different contexts. Some of this is normal within a project and the example below shows the importance of face to face meetings to resolve issues.

One partner noted slight tensions that had arisen the earlier stages of the project as partners had not fully understood how the project was being interpreted differently in the different country contexts. It specifically related to the age group of participating young people, which differed between countries and as a result required different approaches to engagement (ages of participants varied between 14 and 19 years). Once this was realised at a face-to-face meeting, it was addressed and outputs that have a wider scope were developed.

> *We got there but we had to work on that just … we have ended up with something that is very flexible and it makes that sort of that little bit of pain at the beginning was worth the effort when we finally realised we're talking about young people leading the event.*

Some partners also talked about the quality expected by partner organisations on the project and in the initial stages in particular, there were some tensions around the standard of work in some instances being produced. It was felt that this had held the project up.

4 Monitoring and evaluation of the project

This section looks at the monitoring and evaluation of the project and specifically it refers to the following item in the terms of reference:

- Analysis of project data (qualitative and quantitative) to address the following question: Were the methods of data collection chosen by partners the right ones for the impact they were seeking to address?

Monitoring, evaluation and measuring impact was obviously a priority for the project at the outset.

> *We are aiming to ensure we have a robust way of measuring / tracking skills development so at the end of the project we can show how we have had impact on learning / thinking / action (Partner meeting agenda, 25.11.15).*

The project M&E Plan (August 2016) outlines a mixed methods approach to M&E: collecting large scale quantitative baseline and impact data via online surveys and qualitative data via focus groups. There is value both in collecting both qualitative and quantitative data, especially in terms of triangulating evidence. Quantitative data brings inputs from larger groups of pupils and teachers, who might not be included in focus groups, but still potentially have things to say. The qualitative data adds more in-depth insight.

4.1 Design and implementation of monitoring and evaluation tools

In this section I look at the various M&E tools used on this project, how they were designed, implemented and how data was analysed.

4.1.1 Youth outcomes matrix

The Learner Outcomes Matrix (YOM) was developed as a priority at the beginning of the project, with the outcomes matrix for SFYouth (Hunt, 2017) used as an initial guide (partner meeting agenda, 25.11.15). It was developed to identify which learner outcomes to focus on and track the impact of those through the project. The YOM would then be directly linked to the development of M&E tools to track impact on young people (partner meeting agenda, 25.11.15) and to guide partners in terms of skills development (M&E plan, August 2016).

The YOM is a useful guide to the types of skills, attitudes and knowledge the FYS Forums hopes to develop in young people. It outlines certain areas of focus for the project, including those transversal skills and competences needed for logframe requirements. However, while it is useful it can be slightly confusing. For example, there is no explanation as to what the matrix is, how it is being presented and how to use it. It also uses a 'yes / no' response box to indicate whether young people have certain skills and attributes. I would suggest a continuum would work better in this instance. According to partners the YOM was used to support development of the curriculum resources (IO3) and the focus of questions in the initial focus group data collection. There is no reference to it in data analysis discussions (IO1 and IO6).

4.1.2 Online surveys

The project team used online surveys (via Google docs.) to collect baseline and impact data from teachers and pupils involved in the project between 2016 and 2018. According to the M&E plan, the aim was that participants would take the survey as they started engagement in the project and the same participants would take it at the end of the project. Table 3 provides a (slightly amended) outline of the expected online survey completions from the academic report (IO6).

Table 3: Expected online survey data collection

	Teachers – online surveys	Young people – online surveys

Amended header	Forum 1 baseline & impact (2016-17)	Forum 2 baseline & impact (2017-18)	Forum 1 baseline & impact (2016-17)	Forum 2 baseline & impact (2017-18)
Cyprus	5 (1 school)	15 (3 schools)	100 (1 school)	500 (5 schools)[5]
Italy	5	15	100	500
Lithuania	5	15	100	500
UK	5	15	100	500
TOTAL	**20**	**60**	**400**	**2000**

There are various points that are not clear in IO6 in relation to expected data collection numbers. Firstly, I think the impact numbers for young people might be incorrect in Table 3, as I think these should be 300 young people per country, rather than 500 as there are three forum events, each with 100 young people. The M&E plan seems to suggest this is the case as well. Another confusion arises in the Academic Report (IO6) where the author states, because of various issues:

> We made a decision to use the data only from 1st baseline survey and 2nd endline survey

But the numbers presented in actual completions in Table 4 below do not seem to confirm this. If year one baseline data were only included, then there should be a maximum of 20 teachers and 400 pupils in baseline for Table 4. Clearly this is not the case. Indeed, Table 4 provides information on actual online survey numbers taken from the academic report. It shows differences in baseline and impact cohorts, but it is not clear how many schools the respondents are from and whether these schools correspond.

Table 4: Actual online survey data collection

	Teachers – online surveys		Young people – online surveys	
	Baseline survey	**Impact survey**	**Baseline survey**	**Impact survey**
Cyprus	17	28	283	194
Italy	26	15	38	97
Lithuania	10	28	54	95
UK	15	7	26	43
TOTAL	**68**	**78**	**401**	**429**

That said, the baseline and impact surveys do not match those highlighted in Table 3. Taking my amendments into account: Teachers expected: 80; Teachers actual: 68-78; Young people expected: 1600; Young people actual: 401-429. This might partly be explained by the difficulties in baseline surveys (see below), but also because it can be difficult to ensure online surveys are completed. Collins (2017) in his evaluation of the SFYouth project suggested partner organisations should take a more active role in helping ensure young people can complete surveys (e.g. be present when they are taken). It is not certain the extent to which this was followed up in FYS Forums and whether this actually made a difference.

A longer baseline survey was administered to 2016 participants, but was shortened for subsequent surveys as it was thought to be too long, repetitive and not always understandable.

> it was very complicated the partners told us, it was quite hard for them to convince young people to sit there to write so many information … we thought we could easily skip some questions they were not the best and the information we wanted together through the survey we can find out easily in the focus groups.

---

[5] I think this should be amended to 300 pupils per country, making the total 1200 rather than 2000.

We were involved in leading them to make the surveys more acceptable … we spent time with them trying to get them to develop so they developed this and then tweak them to redesign them slightly.

Unfortunately there are major flaws in both the design of the questions within the surveys and as a result the potential for how the surveys are analysed.

Design of initial and revised online survey questions

The surveys do not fully respond to the data requirements for the project, in terms of what the project is expected to measure.

Table 11: Analysis of initial and revised survey questions against logframe requirements

Table **11** in Appendix 3: **Analysis tables**provides a map of survey questions against the logframe requirements. It shows there are substantial gaps in coverage both in the design of initial survey questions and the revised survey questions. For example the surveys do not directly and or adequately ask questions about:

- Young people's *motivation* to get engage in education and civic life
- Young people's transversal skills and competences.
- Young people's *connection to* political processes
- Young people feeling connected to the EU community
- Changes to the curriculum
- Changes to pedagogy
- Engaging at-risk pupils.

The project team decided to rewrite the online surveys for the cohort of young people working on the forums 2017-8. The revised surveys benefited from being shorter and more manageable for young people, and questions were retained so data from 2016 could be compared to that of 2017-8. However, the team missed an opportunity to amend the content of the questions so they more directly responded to the data requirements of the project as set out in the logframe. It could be that the logframe itself needed changing, to more directly respond to the project that developed and / or the focus of the M&E and in that case, this should have taken place.

The omission of key questions in the online surveys, means that triangulation on certain indicators and impact targets is not possible, and as a result focus group evidence becomes less reliable.

Mapping baseline against impact surveys

The online surveys do include any personal identifier (e.g. name or individual code), so it is impossible for the project team to match baseline respondents to impact respondents (for both teachers and young people). Without personal identifiers they don't know whether the same people have taken both baseline and impact surveys or if there is a mismatch between the two. Without assurances that the cohort of participants for both the baseline and impact surveys correspond, the analysis of 'impact' is not possible. We could be analysing the relationship between two entirely different groups of respondents[6] – as a result any quantitative impact analysis for this project is not valid.

Moreover without the personal identifiers, statistical analysis which will match individual responses between baseline and impacts surveys is not possible. So, it is not possible to run statistical analyses such as T-tests which match individual responses and more accurately show how individuals rather than cohorts have changed. These tests also have the potential

---

[6] Some partners noted a high attritions rate of participants.

to show statistical significance, i.e. where results show the likelihood of repetition given the same circumstances.

When questioned about the lack of personal identifier and the inability to map baseline against impact survey data, the M&E team stated that it had been intentional on their behalf to omit this because young people might be afraid to respond if they give their names:

> *It was intentional not to learn about names, surnames … It was completely our idea to not include names I can say … because the children it was the first question of the children who were are afraid … if not we will be afraid a little bit to give an answer to some question especially if you remember the context where these surveys were done by the children it was not at home but a public place with the teacher so that is why we would like to give them confidence.*

I understand the importance of ensuring young people feel safe when responding to demands for data. There are ethical guidelines and processes that researchers adhere to when constructing and implementing data collection which insist that people are able to withdraw from research at any time and are not obliged to answer any question if they do not wish to.

I would dispute the assertion that young people providing their name inhibits young people and suggest that if this actually were the case, then there are measures that researchers can take to provide a unique identifier to ensure anonymity for respondents as well as the required data for the researcher. For example, when I have carried out similar surveys in the past, I have used first name and first initial of the last name in the surveys, but you can also provide individual codes as well. This alongside age and name of the school provides enough data to fairly confidently map individual responses between baseline and impact surveys. None of the young people I have worked with previously have expressed inhibitions about providing this, participation is always voluntary and they are reminded before taking surveys that they do not have to take part. Moreover, the nature of the questions asked in the FYS surveys are not particularly personal and do not require responses that are likely to generate fear. Indeed, for many young people speaking up in a (focus) group setting might be more intimidating.

I think the project team made a mistake by not including personal identifiers and the reasons given for not so doing were not realistic. It is not clear whether this was discussed with other project partners and whether other project partners understood the implications of not including these identifiers. This has major implications for the quality of quantitative data analysis within the Academic Report (IO6) (see: 5.6) as the quantitative impact data cannot be viewed as valid.

4.1.3 Focus groups

The project M&E plan and academic report describes the expected following focus groups in Table 5. The focus of the first set of focus groups would form the basis for the transnational report (IO1), whereas the second set of focus groups would provide data for the academic report (IO6). While baseline data was to be collected from hub schools only, trial/participating schools were to be included in impact data collection activities. It was suggested that there should be five participants per focus group (M&E plan).

Table 5: Expected focus groups

	Teachers – focus groups		Young people – focus groups	
	Baseline 2016	Impact 2018	Baseline 2016	Impact 2018
Cyprus	1 (1 school)	3 (3 schools)	1 (school)	3 (3 schools)
Italy	1	3	1	3
Lithuania	1	3	1	3
UK	1	3	1	3
TOTAL	**4**	**12**	**4**	**12**

Actual focus group activities can be found in Table 6. These do not include interviews with participating schools (apart from Italy), which is a shame.

Table 6: Actual focus groups

	Teachers – focus groups		Young people – focus groups	
	Baseline 2016	Impact 2018	Baseline 2016	Impact 2018
Cyprus	1 (1 school)	1 (6 participants, from 3 schools)	1 (1 school)	1 (16 participants from 3 schools)
Italy	1	2 (9 teachers in total)	1	2 (more than 15 total participants)
Lithuania	1	3 (11 teachers in total)	1	2 (16 participants in total)
UK	1	3 (12 teachers in total)	1	3 (12 participants in total)
TOTAL	**4**	**9 (11 schools)**	**4**	**8 (10 schools)**

Table 12 in Appendix 2 shows that the focus groups with young people more directly relate to the requirements of the logframe as compared to the online surveys. They do, for example, ask about skills and competences of young people, but there remain many gaps in coverage, for example the focus group questions do not cover:

- Young people's motivations to engage in education
- Teachers' development of curriculum or teaching methods
- Young people's civic engagement and active citizenship
- Young people's attitudes towards the EU.

Given the focus groups are the main source of data as triangulation with quantitative data is not possible (see 4.2.2), then this one source, requires scrutiny in terms of the quality of interview transcriptions, how interviews are recorded and transcribed and the sampling of respondents' voices (who do we hear?). This is to some extent covered within the IO6 Academic Report. One gap, is that focus groups only appear to have taken place with hub and trial school participants[7], so it is not a full picture of engagement and it would have been useful to have further evidence from participating schools.

4.1.4 Forum surveys

The M&E team also carried out data collection at the end of the forum events, which participants in the forum completed. The questions asked participants about:

- The extent to which the forum was informative and useful
- The extent to which they were satisfied by the forum (in terms of structure, support and their participation)
- How well the training activities supported their knowledge development on the topic and whether they thought they would use that knowledge in the future
- Whether they would like to collaborate with students in the future with and recommend the forum to others

The surveys are useful as a way of viewing how participants feel about the forums and the activities that had taken place there. There is less information on mapping longer term impact or learning that takes place before the forums.

4.1.5 Internal partner review surveys

The M&E team developed online surveys that partner organisations were to complete after taking part in face-to-face meetings, with the following participants:

---

[7] With the exception of Italy.

Table 7: Number of internal survey participants after transnational meetings

	Number participants
London, 2015	11
Poland, 2016	9
Lithuania, 2017	6
Italy, 2018	9

There were three annual reports based on feedback from these meetings.

1st year internal evaluation report (August 2016)

2nd year internal evaluation report (August 2017)

3rd year internal evaluation report (2018)

The information in internal partner review reports is interesting and maps how partners are feeling about the project at a particular stage, the meetings, working relations and progress towards objectives. The qualitative insights are particularly useful. The data though should not be used to map progression between meetings or as a comparator as is suggested within the reports and partner meetings. The participants were not the same so the surveys were not comparing like for like and the missing unique identifiers means it is not possible to map actual progress between meetings with any accuracy.

Partner organisations were not interviewed as part of the internal review process which might have helped support understanding in the final academic report (IO6).

4.2   Data analysis

There were various stages of data analysis on the project. Initial focus group data was analysed in order to provide data to the transnational report published in 2016. Baseline data from the first round of surveys was analysed in 2017. After that, however, there was no more data analysis until the end of the project and no impact evidence available before July 2018. Often projects collect mid-point impact data so they have a grasp on what is working and make amendments to the project and data collection tools. In this instance, the lack of a mid-point data analysis, meant there was limited understanding of the data (either qualitative or quantitative), before the final report was presented.

5   Review of intellectual outputs

In this next section I look at the intellectual outputs from the project to respond to the following:

- Comparison and realization of the final Intellectual Outputs to those outlined in the original bid proposal including the aims and objectives of the Project.
- Review of the quality and content of the final Intellectual Outputs available on the FYS Forums Website from March 2018 (English content).

5.1   Output 1: European Education Needs Analysis

Bid documents describe Output 1 as an analysis of the educational needs for each project country and the wider EU contexts. It will:

> - *Examine the needs of teachers / youth / schools in relation to the four needs identified in the project rationale and project objectives, and explore their nature and dimensions in more detail.*
> - *Synthesise information between countries to understand similarities and differences and compare the wider European trends to understand transversal needs across Europe.*
> - *Consider in more detail the current application of global citizenship youth forums and global citizenship / youth participation in each of our give countries and therefore across seven nation systems (as Wales and Scotland have different systems) and also transversally across Europe.*
>
> *The aim of this report was to better support partners to understand the project needs in order to design the project outputs more effectively. To this end it is planned at the beginning of the project.*

To fulfil this output, Youth participation and global citizenship transnational report (Jarkiewicz & Leek) was produced in 2016. The report has four main sections:

- Introduction and methodology
- Policy context / GCE in practice / definition of at risk young people in each country
- Teachers perspectives on future youth forums (country by country)
- Young people's perspectives on future youth forums (across countries)

Partners were key to producing the country policy information and carrying out the focus groups and the M&E team provided a framework tool into which partners inputted into. These sections were assembled by the M&E partner into the transnational report.

In terms of analysis I firstly look at the report in relation to the aims and objectives of the project and the information outlined in the bid document. Table 13 in Appendix 3 provides an account of how the required elements from the bid are included in the report.

- The report includes discussions on how at risk pupils are defined in each country context.
- There is some discussion on skills needs of young people in relation to participation and global citizenship and also the training needs of teachers.

However the discussion on most required items is not systematic and lacks consistency between countries. There is probably too much of a focus on national policy and less on practice across schools, rather than within an individual school.

What is also evident is the analysis sections (teachers and young people's perspectives) are based on the experiences and ideas of teachers and young people from one school in each country. There is limited school contextualisation and no reference to relevant literature to locate their ideas within. These ideas are then presented by country[8], rather than being a contextualised account of perceptions linked to school setting and individual ideas. More work could have been done to locate these useful accounts within wider country based themes and contexts.

Further, while the requirement for reference to academic literature is not made explicit in the project bid, it has implications for the quality of report produced. There is a lack of literature exploring the theoretical and conceptual underpinnings of the project in the report. There is no reference to academic literature that frame conceptual debates around key terms used in the project such as global citizenship education, youth participation, civic engagement and active

---

[8] This is presented as a 'national case study' approach Jarkiewicz A and Leek J. (2016) Youth Participation and Global Citizenship: Challenges and Recommendations for Future Youth School Forums. London: Oxfam GB.

citizenship. So while these are a focus of the project, the paper does not address terminology around these often contested terms that might support the implementation of the project.

The study looks at what initiatives are in place in policy and lists some initiatives related to youth forums / youth voice in the participating countries. It does not explore academic literature or evaluation reports about how the policy and initiatives work in practice, for example providing examples of good practice and limitations on practice.

Overall very little academic literature is included. Most of literature included in the bibliography is not referred to in the text and the paper does not acknowledge key texts on youth participation and global citizenship education in Europe (e.g. Bourn, 2016; Keating, 2009, 2015; Keating and Jamaat, 2016).

Partners thought the transnational report had been useful in some ways, in terms of setting the scene in the various country and schooling contexts, particularly in the earlier stages of the project. It allowed them to see how the contexts varied between country settings and what schools expected from the project. In some instances partners had not actively used the content to support their work.

Overall I think the transnational needs analysis report is adequate and fulfils much of the necessary criteria. However, I think it had the opportunity to do more than it does. For example, because partners wrote most of the policy / context section for their country, the report doesn't inform them as much as it could. A more in-depth analysis of literature (conceptual as well as practical) would have provided additional insight and develop some of the key themes around youth participation in a contemporary European context. Perhaps this could have been developed more fully in the bid document.

5.2   Output 2: Global citizenship youth forums planning toolkit

According to the bid IO2:

> *The global citizenship youth forum planning toolkit (IO2) provides schools with full information and support to either plan and host a forum or to participate in one. It will be online therefore containing online guidance, interactive displays, online and downloadable content (videos workshop materials etc.). It will capture and present the main design aspects of the GC youth forum model. It is designed to be used in conjunction with the IO3-5.*
>
> *This output is fundamental as it will guide schools in how to plan and run a forum. Our needs analysis identifies that teachers have little time to plan and organise these types of events and therefore comprehensive and detailed guidance which is simple to use interactive and visually attractive is essential.*

The team has developed a guide to running a forum, with an online interactive map that maps the stages of the process from start to finish. The steps seem straight-forward and understandable[9].

1. School registration
2. Forurm preparation
3. Working group set-up
4. Communication and promotion
5. Raising awareness
6. Forum organization
7. Keep on organizing
8. Your forum
9. Post-forum activities
10. Choose your idea

---

[9] Although there is a bit of confusion as to how many steps there are 10 or 12.

11. Time to act
12. Spread your voice

Overall the guide is a comprehensive account of how to run a forum and provides clearly laid out steps provides that are required. It is presented in a way that is understandable to both teachers and young people. Feedback from the partners and schools suggests the forum planning toolkit is comprehensive, but at times had to be simplified for schools:

> *(they) created their own slightly simplified version of it for teachers, I presume because they did that because they found it difficult to manage or difficult to use*

The only other caveat, might how it appears on the website as it took a while for me to understand how to navigate them via the interactive map. Once realised, though it was easy to move around and access the materials.

5.3   Output 3: Global citizenship youth forum curriculum toolkit

According to the bid O3:

> *Provides schools with all the information and support and to plan pre-conference curriculum work with schools. It is intended to be an online teachers' toolkit, therefore containing online guidance, displays and downloadable content (videos, workshop material etc.). It supports teachers to embed the content of the forum global theme into core curriculum areas e.g. literacy, numeracy, humanities. Curriculum led activities will therefore support engagement with different aspects of the issue, and also through promoting leadership in the curriculum, selection of forum participants through their work on the curriculum activities. This means forum participant selection will be more open, transparent and inclusive, and broader engagement will be achieved across the school. It will support IO2 and IO4.*

To this end resources on the following themes were developed for forum organisers and participants:

- Gender inequality resources (used 2017-8)
- People forced to flee resources (used 2016-7)

Within those sets of resources there are:

Workshops 1-7: provides a clearly laid out set of workshops for participants and teachers to work through to prepare for the forum, carry out the forum and plan the actions after the forums. The workshops aim to develop knowledge, examine values and help guide participants as they plan for action. In practice there appears a strong focus on skills development, such as developing critical thinking, skills for research, public speaking and working as a team. There is a significant active learning element:

> *Young people have to actually go away and think something through and develop their own meaning from it, not being told what to do.*

The workshops followed a similar pattern, which makes sense if the initial set of workshops worked well in practice (they did). The workshops are well-planned, informative and appear pitched at a level where a range of participants can engage. Overall the feedback for the workshop resources was very positive.

> *Enjoyed using the resources with students. Session on research/internet not necessary. The lesson plans were easy for the students to use themselves to teach to peers also (teacher).*

> *Teachers will follow really easily the Workshops.*

Other resources included:

- Quiz
- Treasure hunt

- Whole school presentation
- Posters
- Active learning methods
- Whole school classroom activities

In general the outputs are seen very positively by partners and teachers. One partner notes how the shorter activities such as the treasure hunt, Gala Bingo, the quizzes and videos have been well received by the pupils and useful. Others note:

> *They worked really well. The resources I think are fit for purpose and I think the bite sized resources, people were saying they worked really well.*

> *In general I think they are I think they're good resources.*

> *It was very positive experiences they (teachers) were very engaged and very enthusiastic.*

> *I think the materials gave an overview of a topic and the way it worked it was flexible enough that young people could do with it what they want it as schools could do with it what suited them and I think that's a real strength of the project.*

There are one or two reservations, mainly in terms of amount of material, the time available for schools to complete and the text-heavy content of materials. However, schools adapted how they engaged, so were able to take part in a way that suited their needs:

> *I think the workshops worked well but the problem particularly in XX was finding the time to deliver them.*

> *We did so many resources start, not all of them were perfect. I think putting in a lot of text don't work I think we could focus more on images, graphics and videos this would be better.*

> *I think that 6 workshops was too much … (rather than planning young people wanted to) work out what to do, they wanted to do the action*

> *Another person commented on the materials and how it had helped when they toned it down to a manageable topic … they could tone it down to something that was meant their school, something that was really impressive … They didn't reduce the quality of that topic area … the task for teachers is to think about how they can maybe change it so it's really manageable.*

5.4 Output 4: Youth leadership transversal skills training module

The youth leadership transversal skills training module (IO3) is to support the development of transversal youth leadership skills (such as communication, organisation, conflict resolution, critical thinking) for youth participating in forums. It is aimed at both youth directly and also at teachers; supporting their improved pedagogy to promote youth leadership skills development within both the forum and informal curriculum in school. It will be interactive with online modules for each audience, including guidance, displays and downloadable content (videos, workshops, materials, etc.). It will be generic but use contexts related to the global theme for the forum model. It will support IO2 and IO3.

The project team has developed a series of 'leadership' skills training modules that can be accessed online individually by young people or by teachers. Each module is around 30-40 minutes long and consists of 1-3 short activities. The activities are on a range of topics:

- Assess your strengths
- Motivating others
- Action planning
- Goal setting

- What is leadership
- Email communication
- Time management
- Decision making skills
- Teachers and students working together
- Constructive feedback
- Stress management
- Solving disagreements
- Problem solving / dealing with a setback
- Teamwork and collaboration
- Negotiation and persuasion

This is a comprehensive set of resources and they are easily accessible for young people. My caveat is around the topics covered and whether some are focused more on skills for future employment, rather than skills for active global citizenship. A range of skills identified in the Youth Outcomes Matrix (i.e. those skills the project wants to develop in young people) are included in the resources, such as leadership, participation, planning and managing. However a number of the skills identified are not. These include developing critical thinking, confidence and voice, creativity and innovation and skills for global action. Perhaps it is imagined these skills are developed through the resources in Outputs 2 and 3, which after reviewing, appears to be the case.

In terms of the skills modules, it was not imagined that all young people would access the transversal skills training module:

> *It was very much needs-based and not every young person would go through all of those skills one by one and develop some. It was felt that at any stage of the forum delivery, that they needed to focus on for example building confidence, or public speaking that they could take a pause and dip into a workshop from that package.*

As a result, the skills resources appear to have been used less in schools, but they are something schools could come back to where relevant.

> *These are a lovely resources but we did not have time to use them (teachers).*

> *Some schools used the skills work out but some teachers didn't.*

5.5 Output 5: European online global citizenship youth forum portal

In the bid it states:

> *The European online global citizenship youth forum portal is both the EU gateway to the FYS Forum project, and also the space through which the EU wide network of youth forums will connect and share with each other. The portal will enable all target groups to access outputs and provide a central focus for communication and dissemination activities. The online forum will allow each school participating in a forum to create a profile, who is attending, ideas are on the topic, post-forum global citizenship activities and view comments on profiles of other EU schools. In addition each forum will post a forum 'resolution' here and this space will be used to choose the forum global theme (democratically) for Y2 (and possibly beyond). The planning and dissemination of the EU transnational youth policy forum in Brussels will also take place in this space. Webinar functionality will also allow school-school 'virtual' forums to take place. The site will have essential child safeguarding firewalls.*

The digital-side of the project was managed by one project partners, which included the project website and other online tools.

The online youth forum was set up, but discontinued after a time. Partners explain:

> *It was decided not to use it because it wasn't being used by young people.*

> *In terms of communication that was not working because they were not really looking at (it) … most of the time the blog articles were written by ourselves because we could not get really input from the students. We ask teachers to push them to do so but after a while we needed to put something on the platform so we decided to write it ourselves*

Indeed this is not surprising. Other projects that have tried to enable online social spaces / interactions have also failed. Collins (2017) outlines the failure to engage young people in the Youth Wall on the SFYouth project and some of the reasons for this. Indeed, online forums can be difficult because of language and access to online spaces in schools. It might also be the case that 'conversations' can be stilted and lack the immediacy of other online media. Or participants might chose to use other online platforms to engage.

The project website is in place and provides a comprehensive account of information about the project and project resources. In this sense it is successful. However, I have found the navigation to be not always straightforward. For example, scrolling down the entry page there is a link to the SFYouth project, before the FYS Forums project; and the top level navigation does not seem to be present on the landing page. A teacher agrees:

> *Website is still 'busy' and difficult to navigate. Not user friendly. Some useful resources and ideas on there but a little daunting (teacher).*

5.6   Output 6: Academic report on the impact of youth leadership through global citizenship using youth forums in school education

The description of the final impact report in the bid:

> *This output is an academic report which outlines the benefits and best practice of applying youth leadership through global citizenship youth forums in school education. It will capture how such approaches as practiced through FYS-Forums have impacted on the 4 needs identified in our project rationale (improved motivation and engagement, improved transversal skills, improved curriculum and pedagogy and civic participation), and the relevant related Results and Impact (as listed in section F.1 and H. 1). It will therefore capture the outcomes for teachers, young people and also the wider school. This will be based on the experience of schools participating in the forum using the various project outputs (IO2-5) which promote these, and use both qualitative and quantitative feedback as gathered through our MEL activities. It will include an examination of the in depth process of learning and engagement with global and civic issues within formal and informal education, including data from a series of longitudinal case studies. It will synthesize data from across all 4 delivery partner countries and therefore will contain sub-sections on each of them, and so will be published in the national languages of each partner country. The report will also include the (youth led) policy recommendations arising from the transnational youth policy forum multiplier event.*

The academic report was presented to me in final draft form and although I was not able to review the final version submitted, I was assured only proofing (rather than content) changes would be made at that stage. The report included the following sections:

- About Future Youth Schools Forum project
- Introduction, purpose of the study and methodology
- Future Youth School Forums – Teachers perspective (four country perspectives)
- Future Youth School Forums – Youth perspective (four country perspectives)
- Recommendations

Data analysis focused on quantitative data collected via the online surveys completed by teachers and young people and the focus group interviews with teachers and young people. Focus groups were carried out by project partners in country, if needed translated into English and the project team in Poland analysed the data and pulled the report together.

I firstly look at the report in relation to the aims and objectives of the project and the information outlined in the bid document (as above and Table 15 in Appendix 3 for further information).

An important point to make is that the project needs and intended impacts of the project, whilst identified in the introductory section are not clearly referred to in the text, meaning the evidence of impact against these requirements is not easily identifiable. The focus group data does offer insight into the impact of the project in the countries on the pupils and the teachers/teaching. However, this evidence is embedded in individual quotes rather than being clearly identified around themes or subthemes. There are interesting insights from teachers and young people that highlight how the project worked and what teachers and young people gained from engagement with the project. These are the highlights of the report.

In terms of meeting needs and impacts there is most evidence around young people developing transversal skills and knowledge – and many of the interviews cover this. The transversal skills they mostly note are around leadership, organisation and planning. Also evident are pupils' increased knowledge around key themes, an increase in confidence and critical thinking. The Youth Outcomes Matrix which is expected to guide the development of learner outcomes is not referred to.

Some teachers in Lithuania and Italy indicate this project supports them to develop different approaches to teaching.

There is minimal, if any, reference to how the project has:

- better motivated or engaged EU youth, especially those at risk of dropping out
- enabled teachers to develop more relevant and inspiring curricula
- increased EU youth civic engagement and active citizenship
- helped young people feel more connected to civic and political processes
- helped young people feel more connected to the EU.

Additionally, the report fails to include a conclusion or synthesize data from across the four countries within the main text, although the Executive Summary provides a general picture of some wider findings or impacts.

While the report includes some recommendations, there is no signposting or contextual information to support these recommendations. So it's uncertain where these recommendations come from and their intended audience. It's not evident whether these are the youth led policy recommendations (as per the requirements of the bid) or recommendations based on the evidence provided. As policy recommendations are key, the FYS Forums team should have been looking for something like the quality of Bourn (2017).

It is my contention that the gaps in its coverage and ability to respond fully to the requirements outlined in the bid, stem largely due to the design of the questions both in the online surveys and in the focus groups as outlined in 4.1.2 and 4.1.3, where there were gaps in questions asked.

There are also issues with the quality. In 4.1.2 I noted because no names / personal identifiers were required within the surveys it was both impossible to ensure survey cohorts were the same between baseline and impact, and it was also impossible to see changes in individual scores. The data online survey data presented in the report compares the baseline and survey data – even though cohorts are different in numbers and the data has been collected two years apart, which means it is unlikely to be from the same participants, young people in particular. There will also different schools included in the impact compared to the baseline data collection (in 2016 there were fewer schools engaged – the numbers expanded in 2017-8). This means that although the online survey data is presented as 'impact' data and comparative, this is not the case. It does not show impact and unfortunately is not valid.

Overall there are other ways the report could be improved.

- The report fails to refer to key academic literature in the field (e.g. (Bourn, 2016; Hunt, 2017; Keating, 2009; Keating and Janmaat, 2016; Keating, 2015). The majority of references in the Bibliography are not included in the actual text.
- A conclusion is needed that draws all the analysis together into key points of learning.
- The report would benefit from a very good edit, cutting out repetition – making the text clearer and findings more concise.
- The report should be making reference to the project aims, objectives and logframe targets within the analysis and the concluding remarks.

6 Meeting project objectives

6.1 Meeting impact targets

6.1.1 Impact 1

- **Young people more motivated in education and EU civic life**

As noted in 0 due to inadequacies in the design of the online survey instruments it is not possible to use survey data to identify whether there has been impact on young people's motivation in education and EU civic life. There are some links to this question in qualitative research tools (see: 0), but the question is not asked directly and as a result it is difficult ensure a full response to this impact target.

While there is some evidence that young people are motivated within the forums, the evidence related to youth being better motivated and engaged within education, is minimal.

Evidence from the post-forum actions (

Table **14**) show young people getting more involved in certain aspects of civic life, but there is little evidence about their *motivation* to get involved. These examples include activities with refugees and migrants within their local communities and local community initiatives.

6.1.2 Impact 2

- **Young people develop transversal skills and competencies**

As noted in 0 due to inadequacies in the design of the online survey instruments it is not possible to use survey data to identify whether young people have developed transversal skills as competences as indicated in project logframe. There are questions about young people developing skills within the focus groups (see: 0), young people presented at the international multiplier event in Rome and partners highlight skills development within their interviews.

The academic report provides evidence from teachers and young people. Individual quotes highlight evidence of impact on young people's:

- Leadership, management and organisational skills
- Knowledge of global issues e.g. gender and migration
- Critical thinking
- Confidence to speak out and join in
- Team working and collaboration skills.

Evidence from partners suggests there have been impacts on young people's transversal skills and competences. Partners suggested that those young people in hub/trial schools are likely to have gained more than those in participating schools, although there is no data to back this claim up:

> *I think the participating school's might not have got so much out of it than those who ran the forums themselves I think running the forum sets in extra dimension I*

think maybe they come along to see how it goes, so maybe they can do it themselves.

The transversal skills and competences highlighted:

- **Changing relations between teachers and young people**

  Also young people talked about how schools work if you need to get things done, the bureaucracy and the real life experience and how teachers feel and there was empathy from that side …

  Young people have talk to different teachers about topics I think it's impact making … the relationships between the teachers and young people that mutual respect of young people, understanding the difficulties of teaching and their teachers understanding that young people can do given the opportunity within school.

- **Understanding global issues**

There is evidence that young people's understandings of the thematic areas has increased. 80% of the young people taking the post forum survey (2016) think that the preparatory activities had helped them to understand people forced to flee better.

  For the students … they came familiar with global issues but they managed to connect some global focuses to local conditions

- **Participation as part of a network**

  (there was) a lot of excitement and talk around meeting other people from other young other schools hearing about the topics being part of the bigger network

- **Communication and team work**

  For the students … they … develop basic social skills, communication and collaboration.

- **Building confidence and voice**

One teacher described how the project had helped develop the voice of young people, who possibly hadn't felt confident to use it before.

  One of the young people is very nervous about speaking in front of people teachers also said that in class you don't necessarily have to have the opportunity to talk about these things gives young people the chance to shine who don't necessarily get involved in this sort of work

  We could see how the young people really took the lead and even in situations out of their comfort zones the people that they didn't know before they speak up to make their own points and discuss with the people …

- **Leadership and organisation**

  And there was talk from young people about … the planning, the organisation skills, the leadership, in general so leading on the activities having to work with other young people that definitely came through and

  I think we have planted the seed and particularly the leaders, it's a real challenge for them but they have got something out of it that will stay with them

6.1.3 Impact 3

- **Young people feel more connected to political and civic processes**

As noted in 0 due to inadequacies in the design of the online survey instruments it is not possible to use survey data to identify whether there has been impact on young people's connection to political and civic processes. In the qualitative questions (4.2.3), there were

queries about young people's civic engagement to young people, but nothing to teachers, nor was anything covered in terms of political engagement or feeling 'more connected'. There was no evidence in the academic report around young people feeling more connected to civic or political processes.

We can see though in the types of post-forum activities (Table 14) that young people did engage in political and civic processes as a result of being involved in the project that they might not have done beforehand. For example:

- In Italy young people contacted MPs about migration and got involved in activities where they met refugees
- In the UK young people wrote to MPs and the prime minister about migration and had an NGO visit to talk about the situation in Syria and refugees.
- In Cyprus young people got involved in local community work around gender equality and met migrants / linked to organisations supporting migrants
- In the UK young people campaigned against everyday sexism in their school

Moreover the forum survey analysis (2016) show that 75% of young people think they will be able to use the knowledge gained before and after the forum within their life (although, whether this refers to political or civic processes is not clarified).

6.1.4 Impact 4

- **Young people feel more connected to the EU**

As noted in 0 due to inadequacies in the design of the online survey instruments it is not possible to use survey data to identify whether young people feel more connected to the EU. Indeed, this question was neither asked within the survey, nor within the focus group discussions. This area was not covered in the academic report.

Apart from there being value in attending cross-EU meetings and being involved in an EU project, there is little evidence that young people feel more connected to the EU. This isn't to say that there wasn't impact, rather no evidence has been provided to support this.

6.2 Meeting project objectives

6.2.1 Objective 1

- **To create an inclusive, sustainable, networked model of EU wide curriculum linked global citizenship youth forums that are delivered by schools for schools**

This objective incorporates a number of themes, but the question here focuses on whether the project has created a sustainable, networked model of curriculum, focused around youth forums. I think in some way the project has largely been successful in this regard, with some caveats.

As discussed in 3.1.2 the notion of a 'network' has been problematic. Schools came together around a youth forum event, but activities before and after were largely separate and there is no evidence that these school links will be sustained through other future activities. That said, 84 schools engaged in 20 forums around common themes in five countries in the EU. So this extent you could say the model of engagement has been successful.

The forums have proved to be inclusive in terms of attracting some schools in difficult circumstances and targeting young people who may be at risk (see: 3.1.5). The hub/trial schools tended to be those known to partner organisations, so it would be interesting to know more about the participating schools or to see how the model spreads after the project finishes.

The project team has developed a set of resources to set up and run youth forums and produced thematic resources around migration and gender inequality. Those resources have been translated into the four project languages and are available online for any schools to

access. The project team also developed resources that can be used within registration or subjects like PSHE. One partner explained that it would have been very difficult to influence the curriculum in all countries, so this was a way of accessing the curriculum spaces through a different means:

> *There was an idea that participation in the forum would influence the curriculum, but we recognised that this was going to be very difficult and one project could not do this. So … we developed a package of Bitesize activities that were six little workshops that were 15 minutes each. That we designed to be delivered to the whole school at registration time, in PSHE, in those moments of the day when the school does possibly have the capacity to do those small things.*

Given the idea of influencing the curriculum was quite an ambitious objective, the approach the project team has taken to this is reasonable.

Respondents noted a drive to continue the forums from schools and groups of schools as they have seen how young people have engaged and noted the success of the forums. This impetus to continue mainly comes from those teachers and schools involved in the current project.

> *I think we got more enthusiasm from schools and groups of schools to continue doing stuff and moving forwards, so we are having school saying to us that they want to do a forum … so I think there is maybe a willingness there to use the tools of the project to keep going and to do something for the future*

> *Some schools want to run the forums again so they've seen this has been a good way to engage young people …*

> *I would say in our country the teachers will be using these methods in school after the project is over because I think this is a very interesting method that they can actually use in their class to discuss issues*

> *At national level a huge number of teachers were involved and a number of teachers will keep this approach in their teaching and courses they will think about these activities with more interactive skills … I don't know for how long but in the next year the next school yet least one third of the schools involved will be somehow directly or indirectly using materials and activities from this project.*

Partners indicate how the resources for FYS Forums provide a framework for engagement by schools that can be replicated across institutions (HE, FE, formal education, youth groups), varying the model of engagement.

> *The project is a framework you don't have to stick to. So you're going to write saying you're not going to get 10 schools but in the future they could just have this forum within the school between different classes.*

> *I think it suits the context (of schools). I also like to see how it worked in other environments as well youth groups of universities I think the fact that it is done informally within a formal environment is quite a strength.*

Indeed, one partner noted that they had 'talked about sustainability and creating a template' and I think this is important. It is good that the project team is going to set up templates so those interested schools can set up or continue engagement (e.g. accessible templates for thematic resources, a paired down forum guide). However, questions remain as to how the teacher-driven model of sustainability will work without direct intervention from partner organisations, particularly if new / revised thematic resources are required. Will busy teachers, for example, have the confidence and time to pursue the development of the thematic content material?

In other country contexts there are pupil-led frameworks available to which the FYS Forums model can be encouraged to tap into. In Italy, there is a system of school assemblies, a

formalised representation system, where students are represented within their own school, at provincial and regional levels. In recent years this school assembly system has lacked some of the drive of the past, but there is an opportunity with the FYS Forums model to influence this body to take on some of the good practice from the FYS model.

> *I've been trying to see if feeding to the students that I've been working with in the first place so they become candidates for this representation system. So now they know what it means to be attending a meeting on behalf of your school in the first place and secondly because now having a learnt how to organise forum they to know how they can organise themselves for their full assembly. So there was some students that already were representatives of the classrooms and schools and they were really when they can see light in their minds, so now they're saying and I'm going to do a proposal some day … I took the law to them.*

In other instances, the project partners are actively integrating the design of the forums into subsequent projects:

> *We have been integrating the methodology of for three national projects that have been funded by the Italian national project by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In the first we're going to work with eight NGOs and another place within another 35 NGOs. We will use the forums and have discussions. In one case it's going to be about inequalities and the other case about the importance of the Italian cooperation system with developing countries. I think it's going to be sustainable.*

In Lithuania the partner organisation has received funding for a national anti-corruption project and they will use the forum methods to shape the project. A thousand students will take part in the project over the next two years and the intention is to make the young people more politically aware and engaged in upcoming elections.

> *We also used the method of forums developed during this project within the anti-corruption project and we will work with different schools in Lithuania …*

In the UK there is interest in the forum model in other nations:

> *I've been invited up to Scotland to talk to Ideas network to see how they can adapt the project … I think it might be more sustainable and have a longer shelf life.*

6.2.2 Objective 2

- **To provide teachers and young people with the tools to promote effective and inclusive youth leadership across formal and informal education through global citizenship forums**

This objective focuses on the extent to which the project has provided young people and teachers with the tools to promote youth leadership. Evidence gathered from discussions in 5.2, 5.3, 5.4 and 6.1.2 suggest this is the case. The resources developed are at a high quality and have been positively received by teachers and young people. Both teachers and young people have been able to use the resources to set up and run youth-led forums in the partner countries.

Teachers and schools have had different capacities to run youth forums, with project partners in some cases taking a more active role and others a more hands-off approach. Resources were developed also to support teachers' skills development in participatory learning methods. However, it is difficult for a project like this to make big changes to teaching and learning cultures in schools, so in contexts where teachers were less confident or had less perceived capacity to take this project on, the partner organisations stepped in and worked directly with young people. One partner describes how:

> *My colleagues go into the school and run the workshops, that we have had for five directly led by ourselves and the teachers were just there as observers.*

This was also the case when schools had less time to engage. That said, there is some evidence of impact on teachers and ways of teaching:

> *The teachers have been able to strengthen their capacity and talking about controversial issues …*

> ***T**he impact of the project and teachers is that we give (teachers) a different perspective in engaging students and participation. We also provided them with new topics to consider and also we trained them to implement more interactive activities.*

There is some limited evidence provided in the final academic report that adds to evidence to support this objective in terms of developing teachers' approaches to teaching and enhancing skills to support youth leadership.

From the evidence provided, it seems the forum model has been a success. Partners have given teachers and young people resources to effectively set up and run forums around global themes, with young people taking a more active role in their schools, particularly in terms of running the forum event:

> *The collaboration of teachers with our team worked very well and also the commitment of the students because of their overall the philosophy and material that we offered in this project I think it was they work very well.*

> *Going to the forums was just amazing because you saw young people run a day of their schools life with teachers hardly speaking, which for me that is catnip, it's what keeps me going.*

> *The teachers at the beginning they said they were more involved in it and the second time they are more aware of what young people are capable of … and what support they need to get. One teacher said (the young people) had exceeded their expectations.*

> *In terms of the organisation of forums I realised that students will be very good at the logistics so we put them in charge of the logistical aspects of the organisation. It was really a positive approach, the teachers were quite surprised about the sense that students really took the responsibility of organising these forums.*

There is a particularly strong focus on the forum 'event', however also important to the success of the model are the post-forum actions and the extent to which young people can take their discussions and shift them into actions in the political and civic arena. There is evidence that young people did engage in these political and civic spaces, to raise awareness, learn more and encourage change. In other cases, actions were more low-key, such as peer teaching, dissemination to fellow pupils in schools or engaging with project resources further. I wonder if the project team needs to think more about this post-forum phase and what can be done by partners to support this phase in order to drive some of those more localised or low key responses more into public (and political) spaces.

6.2.3 Objective 3

- **To influence at local, national and EU levels to promote more inclusive and participatory youth led policies and opportunities within EU education systems**

The project had systems and events in place to promote the inclusion of youth led participation to key stakeholders within national and EU contexts. There has been ongoing dissemination activities throughout the project these included:

- Awareness raising of the project to teachers and head teachers via flyers and presentations, at training and school events
- Inclusion of project flyers in dissemination activities for other projects, partners are running

- Awareness raising at conferences to policy makers, academics, NGOs and other potential stakeholders
- Presentation of academic papers relating to this topic in conferences
- Information about FYS Forums on partner organization websites

Most of these tended to be local or regional events, with some exceptions. Some saw FYS Forums as the focus, in others the forums were an add-on element to other activities. Notable examples included:

- CARDET's annual Innovative Learning Environments (ILE) Conference, a 2 day event with participants from Yale School of Public Health, the Ministry of Education and Culture, the Minister of Health and the Pedagogical Institute. There was a poster session with posters from the project and the conference themes also related to FYS Forums.
- FYS Forums was presented at by Oxfam Italia at an Oxfam International networking event on Youth as Active Citizens group. Oxfam affiliates working in the youth field were present from Netherland, Denmark, Quebec, Australia, GB, Vietnam, America, Belgium, and Brazil.
- A paper on Global citizenship education - A Polish perspective, was published in an academic journal by University of Lodz.
- Curriculum resources (IO3) presented at Oxfam Cymru Welsh Government funded International Education Programme conference.
- Project information shared at meetings with Department for International Development (DFID) & Comic Relief.
- Twitter takeover by young people in schools around particular forum themes.
- FYS Forums presented during LITDEA (Lithuanian Development Education Association) members meeting. Representatives of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were present.

There were a series of international webinars (see Table 8).

Table 8: International webinars

Date	Topic	Host	Young people and teachers	Number of schools	Countries present
18/10/2017	Sharing forum experiences and outcomes	CARDET	81	11	UK, Italy, Lithuania, Poland, Cyprus
01/03/2018	International Multiplier event, sharing forum experience and outcomes	OGB	19	8	Lithuania, Poland, Cyprus
08/03/2018	Sharing forum learning on forum day	OIT	231	21	UK, Italy

Partner organisations also held national multiplier events to which key people within the national and regional educational context were present.

Table 9: National and international multiplier events

	Participants
Cyprus	Teachers and pupils from across Cyprus
Italy	Teachers, head teachers, NGO's, members of Global Coalition for Education and regional authorities
Lithuania	Young people and Teachers from hub/trial schools, European Stakeholders
Poland	Teachers and head teachers from across Poland

UK	Two MPs, including the Chair of the International Development Select Committee and Minister of State at the Foreign Office. Various NGOs, the British Council, teachers and pupils from a range of schools.
International event (Rome)	OBESSU, The North-South Centre of the Council of Europe, teachers and pupils from hub/trial schools in 5 countries, Heads of Education at Oxfam GB and Oxfam Italy. Interested participants who were unable to visit Rome were able to join part of the meeting using social media.

Also, other opportunities were taken to engage key stakeholders. For example the forums took place on International Women's Day in the UK and in the three forum schools the local MPs visited and answered questions.

However engaging relevant stakeholders and policy makers (and those who influence policy makers) in a project like this can be difficult. In some cases the multiplier events did not host participants beyond schools and therefore their remit to influence more widely would be limited. For one partner this is the key caveat to the project:

> *What didn't work very well in my opinion was the engagement of stakeholders and policymakers people who can influence and multiply the impact of the project. We have participation from policymakers but we didn't see their willingness to transfer this in it official way or part of the official curriculum another dimension of education was fully informed they were very interested about the project but it's a personal opinion I don't see them to follow up for the next year for example*

At this stage it is not certain whether these events have had subsequent wider impact or influence at a policy level. More likely is that partner-led initiatives to integrate the forum model into future projects or existing policy initiatives (see: 6.2.1) will have more success. More opportunities might be taken to get more EU and national buy-in.

> *I haven't seen whether it'll become official or not and remains in the curriculum which is an issue for sustainability … I really hope the project will be sustainable. I think we need to do some more work in dissemination, to communicate better the results and the output of this project to the European Union, to the Ministries, education authorities, this kind of thing. I'd like to see more communication with the partners, maybe do some specialised papers for the European Union.*

The M&E team are hoping to publish the results of the project in academic journals and take part in academic conferences to support dissemination. And it might also be good if the project team could think more about short documents to provide accessible information on a wider scale to those key stakeholders who might not have been able to make those meetings.

7 Conclusions and recommendations for the future

The FYS Forums project has undoubtedly been a success for the project partners, hub/trial school teachers and young people that have been involved. The project was well planned, resources well developed. Two out of three objectives have been largely met, and the third more difficult to gauge in the short term. In terms of reaching project impacts, there is evidence of impact on young people for example in skills development, but the evidence is not always robust. The lack of evidence does not mean it did not happen, just that the data collection and analysis has weaknesses.

Indeed, the project has been let down by a lack of viable evidence to demonstrate impact as set out in the project logframe. The difficulties in evidence are located in the design of the data collection tools as questions asked do not adequately reflect data requirements and the lack of comparability between baseline and impact. The quality of the final academic report in particular is also found to be lacking.

In terms of learning from this project for future projects I would suggest the following:

- Examine the hub school model as a viable way of recruiting schools
- Look more at how the participating schools have engaged in the project and whether that can be enhanced at all
- Ensure an independent overview of data collection tools by an experienced M&E expert takes place before data collection.
- Insist interim data analysis takes place against logframe targets. This will help the project team be more aware of the types of impact the project is having (or not) and identify any issues with data collection
- Before including online 'spaces for discussion' examine where they have been successful on other projects and try to replicate aspects of that. If no evidence can be found I would think on a project of this type, they should probably not be included.

In the final stages of the project the team could provide templates for schools in order to develop new thematic forums and possibly shorten the forum process. They might think about dissemination to key European stakeholders and find a way to present findings from the project in a way that is accessible and clear. The website should be finalized and updates made where necessary.

8   Appendix 1: Terms of reference for external evaluation

- Identification of best practice in the development of the Future Youth Schools Forums Project through ways of working as a Partnership and as a recipient of Erasmus+ funding.
- Comparison and realization of the final Intellectual Outputs to those outlined in the original bid proposal including the aims and objectives of the Project.
- Review of the quality and content of the final Intellectual Outputs available on the FYS Forums Website from March 2018 (English content).
- Overview of whether the design of the Project was appropriate for the intended Outcomes. Highlighting of what worked well and best practice through the tools offered on the website.
- Reflection of whether the chosen design was right in all of the Partner Countries, and an analysis of whether these types of Projects should be developed using the same design and tools for all Countries (in practice all Partners found differing levels of success in engaging with schools to implement global citizenship education and youth participation in formal and non-formal education).
- Analysis of Project data (qualitative and quantitative) to address the following questions; Were the methods of data collection chosen by Partners the right ones for the impact they were seeking to address? Should Partners have developed additional tools, for example, to train teachers? How might the Partners approach this type of Project in the future to ensure a greater impact on beneficiaries (teachers and young people)?
- Oxfam GB and Partners' compliancy with the rules and requirements of the European Commission and Erasmus+.
- The External Evaluation should be produced in English.

9   Appendix 2: Questions for partner organisations

POSSIBLE FYS-FORUM QUESTIONS FOR PARTNERS

1. Can you briefly let me know your role (and your organisation) on the project?
2. What do you think about the project design?
   - In what way do you think the design was appropriate for the intended project goal and objectives?
   - What worked and didn't work in terms of the way the project was designed in relation to your country context?
   - With hindsight would you have designed the project any differently?
3. How well do you think the partners worked together as a team?
   - How was the project leadership?
   - What were the strengths and weaknesses of working together?
   - What factors supported partners working together or would you change anything?
4. Can you talk about how the project was implemented?
   - How many schools / teachers and pupils did you (your organisation) work directly with?

- What aspects of the project worked well in schools?
- What aspects of the project didn't work so well in schools?
- In terms of project implementation are there changes that could have been made to improve the project?

5. Can you talk about the monitoring and evaluation of the project?
   - What monitoring and evaluation activities took place during the project?
   - What were the monitoring and evaluation tools seeking to measure?
   - How were the monitoring and evaluation tools designed?
   - How is monitoring and evaluation data being analysed?
   - What aspects of the monitoring and evaluation process worked well and what worked less well?
   - What is analysis telling us about the impact of the project?

6. I'm now going to ask about the intellectual outputs from the project. It would be useful to know a) how these were developed (prompt: were teachers and pupils involved); b) how these have been used; c) what you see as their strengths and weaknesses; d) would you have changed anything about these:
   - Gender inequality resources
   - Migration resources
   - Skills resources
   - Step by step guides for participants and organisers
   - Youth participation and global citizenship transnational report (2016)
   - Final impact report

7. Can you let me know what you think the impact of the project has been on:
   - Local networks of schools
   - Teachers
   - Young people

8. What activities / outputs do you think might have had the most influence on impact?

9. What do you think the influence of the project has been at local, national and EU levels?

10. How sustainable do you think the project will be?

11. Is there anything else you want to say about the project that you haven't had a chance to say yet?

10 Appendix 3: Analysis tables

Table 10: Mapping school engagement against logframe targets

TARGET	INDICATOR	ACTUAL
R1: Youth aged 11-18 participate in the forum; debate issues, determine actions, make plans	960 youth participate directly (12x forums = 8 schools per forum = 96 schools x10 pupils each) Quality of discussions and plans	1784 pupils involved in 20 forums in total. 84 schools involved.
R2: Youth trained in transversal youth leadership skills through global citizenship	2,880 youth trained (30 pupils per school x 96 schools) Youth motivated by training	1460 pupils trained
R3: Youth aged 11-18 lead global citizenship civic activities in their schools with other youth aged 11-18	14,400 youth engaged with post-forum activities (96 schools, x150 pupils per school) High quality ideas and plans	10,845 young people engaged in post forum activities 303 teachers engaged in post forum activities
R4: Teachers deliver more engaging curriculum preparing youth for forum	Of 288 Teachers (3x teachers x96 schools), 75% report more engaging/relevant curriculum planning 8,640 pupils (90 pupils x96 schools) receive more relevant curriculum	188 teachers engaged in forum activities
R5: Teachers develop improved pedagogy for promoting youth leadership in school	Of 288 teachers (3x teachers per school x96 schools) 75% report improved pedagogy for youth leadership High quality pedagogies used	
R6: Youth in forums connect across EU	Each school contributes to the transnational web forum (x96 contributions) Each hub/trial school sends 4 delegates to the transnational event from their forum network	

Table 11: Analysis of initial and revised survey questions against logframe requirements

Impact target and result / indicator	Comment on initial survey	Comment on revised survey
Impact target: I1: Young people (aged 11-18) more motivated in education and EU civic life. Indicator: 75% of youth participating report increased motivation	**Young people survey:** Survey questions could be condensed (some repetition) but ask fairly good questions in Section B about type and how much civic engagement. Questions on young people perceptions on how hard they work at school and the responsibility they take for their learning in Section D. Less relevant questions e.g. about grades.	**Young people survey:** Reduction in number of questions about civic engagement in Section B has lost some of the quality and insight. There is a question about types of involvement with organisations – but no previous question about whether YP engage in organisations. Questions on young people perceptions on how hard they work at school and the

	Could have asked more direct questions about YPs' **motivation to engage** in education and civic life. **Teacher survey:** No questions about YPs motivations to engage.	responsibility they take for their learning in Section D. Could have asked more direct questions about YPs' **motivation to engage** in education and civic life. **Teacher survey:** No questions about YPs motivations to engage.
Impact target: I2: Young people (aged 11-18) develop transversal skills and competencies Indicator: 75% of youth participating in the forum/training report increased transversal skills 75% of teachers report increase in transversal skills and competencies of youth	**Young people survey:** No direct questions about YP's perceived transversal skills and competences such as leadership, planning, managing, creativity, innovation, communication, confidence and self-esteem. Questions focus on YPs attitudes towards participation and voice and how school encourages participation. No direct questions about YP's perceived transversal skills and competences or detail of what these might be. Questions do not relate to skills and competences identified in Learner Outcomes Matrix. **Teacher survey:** No relevant questions about transversal skills and competences of YP.	**Young people survey:** No direct questions about YP's perceived transversal skills and competences such as leadership, planning, managing, creativity, innovation, communication, confidence and self-esteem. Questions focus on YPs attitudes towards participation and voice and how school encourages participation. No direct questions about YP's perceived transversal skills and competences or detail of what these might be. Questions do not relate to skills and competences identified in Learner Outcomes Matrix. **Teacher survey:** No relevant questions about transversal skills and competences of YP.
Impact target I3: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to political and civic processes Indicator: 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to political and civic processes	**Young people survey:** No direct questions about young people **feeling connected** to political and civic processes. Two or three relevant questions about civic engagement (Section B), perceptions of political processes and civic engagement and whether they feel they can make a difference (Section C). But these do not fully respond to impact target requirements. **Teacher survey:** No relevant questions about connectedness of YP to civic and political processes.	**Young people survey:** No direct questions about young people **feeling connected** to political and civic processes. Two or three relevant questions about civic engagement (Section B) and the perceived importance of civic engagement (section C). No direct questions about political engagement, nor how young people **feel connected** to political and civic processes. **Teacher survey:** No relevant questions about connectedness of YP to civic and political processes.
Impact target I4: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to the EU Indicator: 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to EU community	**Young people survey:** No questions about young people feeling connected to the EU. **Teacher survey:** No questions about young people feeling connected to the EU.	**Young people survey:** No questions about young people feeling connected to the EU. **Teacher survey:** No questions about young people feeling connected to the EU.

Result 4: Teachers deliver more engaging curriculum preparing youth for forum	**Young people survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues, develop their ideas and speak out about things that are important to them. Also questions on whether school provides opportunities for YP to take part with social and political issues / events and act as active global citizens.	**Young people survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities develop their ideas and speak out about things that are important to them. Questions on whether there are opportunities for engagement in schools not present.
Indicator: 75% of teachers report more engaging / relevant curriculum planning 8640 pupils receive more relevant curriculum	**Teacher survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues and take leadership roles. Not fully relevant, but related.	**Teacher survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues and take leadership roles. Not fully relevant, but related.
Result 5: Teachers developed improved pedagogy for promoting youth leadership in school 75% of teachers report improved pedagogy for youth leadership High quality pedagogies used.	**Young people survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues, develop their ideas and speak out about things that are important to them. Also questions on whether school provides opportunities for YP to take part with social and political issues / events and act as active global citizens. **Teacher survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues and take leadership roles. Not fully relevant, but related.	**Young people survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities develop their ideas and speak out about things that are important to them. Questions on whether there are opportunities for engagement in schools not present. **Teacher survey:** Questions on whether pupils have opportunities to discuss global issues and take leadership roles. Not fully relevant, but related.
Result 7: Youth forum engage more at risk pupils Indicator: Teachers report that the model is inclusive and supports at risks pupils	**Young people survey:** Not included. **Teacher survey:** Not included.	**Young people survey:** Not included. **Teacher survey:** Not included.

Table 12: Analysis of focus group questions (2017-8) for young people against logframe requirements

Impact target / indicator	YP Focus group question and comment	Teacher Focus group question and comment
Impact target: I1: Young people (aged 11-18) more motivated in education and EU civic life. Indicator: 75% of youth participating report increased motivation	Whether taking part in the forum has resulted in YP taking part in additional extra-curricular activities in school or in the community. Question about the impact of the project on type and impact of civic engagement within school or outside of school. No direct questions on YP motivation in their education.	Question about how young people have benefitted from learning about global issues through the forums, e.g. their engagement in school. Linked to target indicator around youth engagement. Does not ask direct question around motivation in education, nor about civic life. Question about whether participation in a forum

Impact target / indicator	YP Focus group question and comment	Teacher Focus group question and comment
	Also could have asked direct question about YPs' **motivation to engage** in education and civic life.	encourages YP to be more motivated to learn inside the formal curriculum and within extra curriculum activities. This question is relevant to the indicator, but does not include reference to civic life.
I2: Young people (aged 11-18) develop transversal skills and competencies 75% of youth participating in the forum/training report increased transversal skills 75% of teachers report increase in transversal skills and competencies of youth	Question about the type of skills young people have gained as a participant of the forum (e.g. public speaking, leadership, expressing opinions, leadership). YP are asked the skills they have developed in both the training, the forums and the actions afterwards. And also how the forum helped develop the skills.	Question about how young people have benefitted from learning about global issues through the forums, e.g. in terms of personal life, responsibility, awareness of global issues, their skills – leadership – management, etc.) Linked to target indicator, but not fully linked to transversal skills and competences as identified in Matrix.
I3: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to political and civic processes 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to political and civic processes	Question about the impact of the project on type and impact of civic engagement within school or outside of school. And how this has impacted young people. While there are some questions about civic processes, there are no direct questions about political engagement, nor how young people **feel connected** to political and civic processes.	Not included in questions
I4: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to the EU. 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to EU community	No questions that directly ask this.	No questions that directly ask this.
Result 4: Teachers deliver more engaging curriculum preparing youth for forum Indicator: 75% of teachers report more engaging / relevant curriculum planning	No related questions	Teachers are asked about the opportunities in school to develop YP engagement and active participation following involvement in a forum. Not directly asking question to respond to indicator, but related. Teachers are asked the impact of carrying out student participation work on their teaching practice.

Impact target / indicator	YP Focus group question and comment	Teacher Focus group question and comment
8640 pupils receive more relevant curriculum		Again, not directly asking question to respond to indicator, but related.
Result 5: Teachers developed improved pedagogy for promoting youth leadership in school 75% of teachers report improved pedagogy for youth leadership High quality pedagogies used.	No related questions	Teachers are asked about the opportunities in school to develop YP engagement and active participation following involvement in a forum. Not directly asking question, but related. Teachers are asked the impact of carrying out student participation work on their teaching practice. Again, not directly asking question to respond to indicator, but related.
Result 7: Youth forum engage more at risk pupils Indicator: Teachers report that the model is inclusive and supports at risks pupils	No related questions	Question about what recommendations teachers might have for their school to support YP who are at risk of failing academically to increase their levels of participation. Question fails to directly ask whether or the extent to which the model is inclusive and supports at risk pupils.

Table 13: Transnational report compared to project objectives and bid

Information in bid	Comment about content
Need 1: to better motivate and engage EU youth within education, particularly those at risk of dropping out.	Report attempts to define those young people at risk of drop out in different country contexts using policy and responses from teachers. It does not look at strategies to better motivate and engage youth in education.
Need 2: better develop youth transversal skills and competences in EU youth (EU Framework for key competences; competences, learning to learn, social and civic competences).	Report does not refer to academic literature on transversal skills and competences in relation to global citizenship and participation. It does not refer to the Youth Outcomes Matrix. Within the teachers' section there is discussion on what skills should be developed in young people; and some discussion on young people's awareness of global issues. Young people described the skills they expected schools to help them to develop (55). Young people also describe which global issues they think are most important to learn.
Need 3: for EU teachers to develop more relevant and inspiring curricula and student centred pedagogies.	There is discussion on where GCE and participation are located in different countries. Report does not locate discussions within those of best practice around what an inspiring literature might look like. There isn't clear discussion on student-centred pedagogies. Teachers in some schools discussed their training needs.

Need 4: to increase EU youth civic engagement and active citizenship.	The report maps (some) ways that young people actively engage in activities. It does not clearly look at ways to increase civic engagement or active citizenship of youth
Synthesise information between countries to understand similarities and differences and compare the wider European trends to understand transversal needs across Europe.	The national and teacher data is introduced by country and also compared (via interviews located at school rather than country level). Young people data merged.
Consider in more detail the current application of global citizenship youth forums and global citizenship / youth participation in each of our give countries and therefore across seven nation systems (as Wales and Scotland have different systems) and also transversally across Europe	In the national context section the focus is on policy and curriculum in relation to GCE. There is less discussion of the application and what is actually happening in practice in schools (e.g. in terms of teaching and learning). There is limited focus on youth forums or youth participation and more on policy in relation to GCE.
Within the teacher sections there is discussion on perceptions of participation and where participation, active citizenship and GCE is located in the curriculum (which ones are covered vary between country). Also where youth participation activities are located in their school and what they consist of.
Young people described opportunities to take part in activities e.g. school clubs and how they currently engage as active citizens.
There is some discussion of some of the activities available to young people, e.g. school councils, debating clubs, youth ambassador groups. Although the lack of consistency means there are gaps.

Table 14: Actions of young people

	Forced to flee	Gender equality
Cyprus	Various activities such as: organisation of visits for young pupil who are from migrant families within the school so they can better understand Cypriot culture; dissemination of material on migration to peers and local community; awareness raising; presentations to fellow students, writing news item on website; visitor to the school to present on migration and refugees; young people meeting migrants; visits / workshops to learn more about migration and refugees	Poster campaigns and local community work
Italy	Various activities including meeting refugees; awareness raising with other pupils; developing video on conflict and refugees; contacting MPs; art and history projects.	Various activities e.g. workshops, making a video, presentations on areas such as sexual health and reproductive rights; FGM; the abuse of women.
Lithuania	Teachers and students organised events on forced migration including inviting an academic to speak about migration; engaging with FYS resources they hadn't done previously; peer teaching a lesson for classmates; pupils wrote an article for school newspaper.	Peer education, awareness raising and presentations to peers in school

UK	Various activities e.g. writing newsletter entries; writing to MPs and Prime Minister; arranging visitor from a NGO to talk about Syria and refugees	One school did a poetry competition about gender equality and published it in a book; another around everyday sexism and had a campaign to challenge everyday sexism in school; girl education and send my friend to school.

Table 15: Academic report compared to project objectives and bid

Information in bid	Comment about content
Need 1: to better motivate and engage EU youth within education, particularly those at risk of dropping out.	This is identified as a key question the report responds to in the introductory section, but not referred back to *clearly* in the analysis or concluding remarks.
	In the evidence from teachers there is minimal reference to youth being better motivated and engaged within education. Teachers (e.g. UK) indicate that the forums have been for all young people and not just those that are stronger academically.
	This is not covered in evidence from young people.
Need 2: better develop youth transversal skills and competences in EU youth (EU Framework for key competences; competences, learning to learn, social and civic competences).	This is identified as a key question the report responds to in the introductory section, but not referred back to *clearly* in the analysis or concluding remarks. The Youth Outcomes Matrix which includes key competences that the project hoped to achieve is not referred to in the report.
	In the qualitative evidence from teachers there is some reference in individual quotes to youth developing transversal skills and competences. This relates particularly to leadership, confidence and pupil voice. There is also discussion of young people developing knowledge and organisational skills.
	In the qualitative evidence from young people there is some evidence from individual quotes of young people developing transversal skills and competences. These relate to: collaboration, confidence, thinking critically and organisational skills. Young people also talk of increased knowledge.
Need 3: for EU teachers to develop more relevant and inspiring curricula and student centred pedagogies.	This is identified as a key question the report responds to in the introductory section, but not referred back to *clearly* in the analysis or concluding remarks.
	There is minimal reference to teachers' development of curriculum materials and student centred pedagogies in the analysis text.
	There is discussion of what teachers think of the importance of including global issues. Also quantitative questions refer to opportunities for young people to discuss global issues and teachers' confidence to facilitate discussion – but the quantitative analysis (as discussed in 4.2.2) is not valid.
	In Italy and Lithuania teachers spoke about using different pedagogical approaches to teaching.
Need 4: to increase EU youth civic engagement and active citizenship.	This is identified as a key question the report responds to in the introductory section, but not referred back to *clearly* in the analysis or concluding remarks.

	In the evidence from teachers there is minimal reference to youth civic engagement and active citizenship.
	The question about young people engaging in social processes does not show evidence of impact because the quantitative data is not valid (4.2.2). There is minimal reference to youth involvement and participation in other activities (e.g. one youth in UK will join other activities).
Impact target: I1: Young people (aged 11-18) more motivated in education and EU civic life. Indicator: 75% of youth participating report increased motivation	The quantitative data analysis for this report (as discussed in 4.2.2) is not valid. Qualitative evidence from one or two teachers in the UK indicates that involvement in the forum has enabled young people to find their passion. There is no evidence from young people.
Impact target: I2: Young people (aged 11-18) develop transversal skills and competencies Indicator: 75% of youth participating in the forum/training report increased transversal skills 75% of teachers report increase in transversal skills and competencies of youth	The quantitative data analysis for this report (as discussed in 4.2.2) is not valid. The Youth Outcomes Matrix which includes key competences that the project hoped to achieve is not referred to in the report. In the qualitative evidence from teachers there is some reference in individual quotes to youth developing transversal skills and competences. This relates particularly to leadership, confidence and pupil voice. There is also discussion of young people developing knowledge and organisational skills. In the qualitative evidence from young people there is some evidence from individual quotes of young people developing transversal skills and competences. These relate to: collaboration, confidence, thinking critically and organisational skills. Young people also talk of increased knowledge.
I3: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to political and civic processes 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to political and civic processes	The quantitative data analysis for this report (as discussed in 4.2.2) is not valid, so the question about young people engaging in social processes does not show evidence of impact. In the evidence from teachers there is minimal reference to youth civic engagement and active citizenship. There is minimal reference to youth involvement and participation in other in qualitative data.
I4: Young people (aged 11-18) feel more connected to the EU. 75% of youth in forum and post forum report feeling more connected to EU community	The quantitative data analysis for this report (as discussed in 4.2.2) is not valid. There is no evidence in the report.
Synthesize information between countries	The Executive Summary provides a generalised picture of the findings / impacts, but there is no concluding remarks within the text.
Provide policy recommendations	Recommendations included, but not certain what these are based on and whether these are policy recommendations.

REFERENCES

Bourn D. (2016) Global Citizenship and Youth Participation in Europe. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Bourn D. (2017) Putting the voice of young people at the heart of global citizenship education. London: UCL Institute of Education.

Collins A. (2017) Schools for Future Youth: External evaluation report. London: Oxfam GB.

Hunt F. (2017) Schools for Future Youth Evaluation Report: Developing young people as active global citizens. London: UCL Institute of Eduation.

Jarkiewicz A and Leek J. (2016) Youth Participation and Global Citizenship: Challenges and Recommendations for Future Youth School Forums. London: Oxfam GB.

Keating A. (2009) Educating Europe's citizens: moving from national to post-national models of educating for European citizenship. *Citizenship Studies* 13: 135-151.

Keating A. (2015) Learning by doing?: The role of political learning activities in promoting youth political engagement. *Teaching Citizenship*.

Keating A and Janmaat JG. (2016) Education through citizenship at school: do school activities have a lasting impact on youth political engagement? *Parliamentary Affairs* 69: 409-429.

---

[1] Dr Frances Hunt is an education researcher based part-time in the UCL Institute of Education. For further information see: http://ioe.academia.edu/FrancesHunt