

CONTENT TABLE

Disclaimer on Ethical Standards	2
Introduction to the CERV program	3
Presentation of Youth DemocRAID	4
Theoretical Introduction: Introduction to Democracy and Citizenship	5
Agenda (2 proposals)	8
2 hours proposal	8
4 hours proposal	8
Ice breakers	9
Activity 1 - Quiz “How does my democracy work?”	10
Activity 2 - “Be a fake news content creator”	12
Activity 3 - Managing a national budget	14
Final Debate: Should there be limits to free speech?	16
Annexes	19
Annex 1: Budget Proposal Handout	19
Explaining the activity to participants	20
Annex 3: Debate framework	21

Disclaimer on Ethical Standards

Welcome, everyone, to this workshop. Before we begin, I would like to take a moment to highlight some important values and ethical standards that will guide our discussions and activities. These principles are not only central to this workshop but also reflect the core values of the European Union under the Citizens, Equality, Rights, and Values (CERV) program.

- **Respect for Human Dignity:** Everyone deserves respect. All voices and perspectives are welcome, and we'll listen with open minds.
- **Equality:** Every person is valued equally, regardless of gender, race, religion, or background. Discrimination won't be tolerated.
- **Gender Equality:** All genders are treated equally, ensuring equal opportunities to contribute and participate.
- **Non-Discrimination & Anti-Racism:** We embrace diversity and stand against racism and discrimination. Let's challenge any biased behavior.
- **Freedom of Expression:** Share your ideas freely, but always with respect for others' dignity and rights.
- **Tolerance & Understanding:** Our differences are strengths. We'll focus on dialogue based on mutual understanding.
- **Participation & Inclusion:** Every voice matters, especially those that are often marginalized. Let's ensure everyone feels heard.
- **Solidarity & Cooperation:** Let's support and collaborate with each other to find solutions that benefit all.
- Our **Child Protection Policy** aims to protect children and young people from harm, exploitation, negligence, and violence in all activities organized by our organization, while ensuring a safe and inclusive environment for everyone involved.

By upholding these values, we'll foster a positive, respectful, and productive environment. Thank you, and I look forward to our session!

Introduction to the CERV program

The Citizens, Equality, Rights, and Values (CERV) programme is a major European Union initiative aimed at protecting and promoting the fundamental rights and values enshrined in the EU Treaties and the Charter of Fundamental Rights. The programme supports projects operating at local, regional, national and transnational levels, with the aim of building open, inclusive and rights-based societies founded on the principles of democracy, equality and the rule of law.

These projects focus on promoting social inclusion, combating discrimination and protecting the rights of vulnerable groups, such as minorities and migrants. The programme also addresses issues such as racism and xenophobia, encouraging respect for diversity across Europe.

A key part of the programme is the promotion of democratic engagement and citizen participation in decision-making processes. By fostering dialogue between civil society and government, the CERV programme aims to ensure that citizens' voices are heard in shaping the future of Europe.

It also contributes to preserving Europe's shared history and cultural heritage, strengthening the sense of unity among European citizens. It supports initiatives that celebrate common values while recognising the richness of different European cultures.

Overall, the CERV programme plays a key role in creating a more inclusive and just European society. By strengthening civil society and promoting civic participation, the programme helps to ensure that equality, democracy and human rights remain central to the life of the European Union.

Presentation of Youth DemocrAID

In today's fast-changing world, the importance of engaged and informed citizens cannot be underestimated. Active participation in democratic processes, from voting to community involvement, is fundamental to the health and vitality of any democracy. However, recent research and polls have revealed a worrying trend: a significant decline in political participation among young people, particularly those between the ages of 15 and 25, in several countries in Europe and beyond. Low voter turnout, disengagement from institutional politics and lack of civic awareness have become pressing problems.

'Youth DemocrAID' is a project created within the framework of the Citizens, Equality, Rights and Values (CERV) programme. Its main objective is to support and promote democracy, particularly with regard to the involvement of young people. They represent the emerging generation of citizens whose active engagement is essential to strengthen democracy and make the European Union more inclusive and united.

Youth DemocrAID aims to prepare engaging learning materials using non-formal education methods, offer workshops specifically designed for young people and connect them with their peers in partner countries by organising an international youth forum.

The activities are mainly aimed at young people aged between 15 and 25, enabling them to engage with their peers in the five participating European countries (Italy, Poland, Slovakia, Portugal and Greece) during a series of local workshops and debates conducted in each country.

Theoretical Introduction: Introduction to Democracy and Citizenship

We at *GloUni* believe that at the heart of a thriving democratic society lies an informed, active, and critically engaged citizenry. This workshop, Introduction to Democracy and Citizenship, seeks to provide a non-formal educational framework to guide young individuals in understanding democracy not just as a system of governance but as an interconnected and interdependent relationship between institutions and active citizen involvement.

Political socialization begins early in life, influenced by family, formal education, friends and peers, and societal contexts, shaping the political orientations and beliefs of individuals. Recognizing the formative nature of these early experiences, the workshop targets youths aged 15 to 19 — high-school students who are at a critical stage in developing their understanding of political systems and their roles within them. Targeting this influential age period provides an opportunity to make young people understand and experience the mechanisms of democracy and active citizenship more effectively. Moreover, engaging them at this stage lays the groundwork for sustainable and meaningful participation in political life as they grow older.

While formal education systems in Portugal provide foundational political knowledge, many young people still express a lack of clarity about how their government operates, the ideologies of political parties, and the ways to engage meaningfully in civic life. This gap in understanding is even more pronounced regarding the structures and functions of the European Union. Thus we believe that bridging this divide between formal, often abstract education and the tangible, lived experiences of democracy is essential.

A robust and sustainable democracy requires citizens who are well-informed about their rights and responsibilities in a democratic society. It is essential to cultivate awareness among the younger generation about the vital role they play in preserving and enhancing democratic values. A deeper understanding of their responsibilities as citizens, coupled with an appreciation of how democratic systems impact their lives, can inspire them to contribute meaningfully to their communities. This awareness also extends to developing the ability to recognize and critically evaluate fake news and misinformation, empowering young people to make informed decisions based on reliable and accurate information. By fostering these skills, they can navigate complex societal and political issues with confidence and certainty, and contribute to a democratic process that is both reasoned and resilient.

We aim for students to understand democracy and citizenship, as well as their historical and cultural evolution, as we think it is essential for fostering a society of informed, active, and engaged citizens. This foundation equips participants with critical thinking skills to analyze governance systems and their impact on individuals and communities. By exploring the diverse ways democracy has been interpreted and implemented, participants can develop the ability to appreciate its existence while also critically assessing its strengths and challenges compared to alternative forms of governance. These analytical skills are vital for recognizing the unique

advantages of democratic systems, particularly their emphasis on individual agency and collective decision-making.

Fake news and misinformation represent significant challenges to democracies, particularly given their potential to polarize public opinion, promote extremism, and undermine trust in democratic institutions. Young individuals, who are increasingly exposed to online content, are particularly vulnerable to misinformation due to a lack of critical evaluation skills. Studies indicate that two-thirds of EU citizens encounter fake news at least once a week, with over 80% perceiving it as a threat to their democracy. Furthermore, half of EU citizens aged 15-30 acknowledge the need for enhanced critical thinking and media literacy skills to combat fake. For the Portuguese youth traditional media sources such as television are regarded as more reliable, while social media platforms are seen as particularly susceptible to the spread of misinformation. However, we observe that children and young people in Portugal often do not analyze the information they encounter thoroughly.

Thus, it becomes essential to equip students with the skills to evaluate the reliability of information, recognize fake news, and make informed decisions. Addressing this issue not only safeguards democratic processes but also empowers youth to navigate an increasingly complex and digitally interconnected world. We at *GloUni* want to create informed, active, and critically engaged citizens that have the ability to address the challenges posed by misinformation and the increasing complexity of modern political landscapes. Ultimately, participants are taught to evaluate the reliability of information sources, identify their core values, and align these with political ideologies and representatives.

With an examination of democracy in Portugal we want to provide participants with a localized understanding of their own governance structures, empowering them with knowledge about state entities, political parties, and electoral processes. These insights enhance their ability to navigate political systems effectively and make informed decisions, such as voting. With hands-on experience we want to encourage a proactive approach to citizenship and strengthen their confidence in engaging with political processes.

Finally we believe that broadening the scope to the European Union level is essential. We plan to introduce participants to the interconnected nature of governance beyond national borders. By demystifying the structures and functions of EU institutions, the workshop provides the skills necessary for understanding how supranational policies affect individual lives and communities. This should foster a sense of global citizenship and empower participants to see themselves as active contributors to broader political and social dynamics, equipping them with cross-cultural awareness and systems-thinking capabilities.

By addressing these foundational topics, the workshop aims to equip participants with a solid understanding of democracy and citizenship, emphasizing their interdependence. Citizenship, as a dynamic relationship between individuals and the state, encompasses not only the fulfillment of responsibilities, but also the enjoyment of rights protected by the state.

Through engaging activities and critical discussions, this workshop seeks to inspire the younger generation to actively participate in democratic life. Understanding that democracy is both a

privilege and a responsibility, we hope to foster a generation that values informed decision-making, civic engagement, and the continuous development of a just and sustainable society.

Reading references:

https://european-union.europa.eu/easy-read_en

https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-658-45440-1_5

<https://www.greeneuropeanjournal.eu/a-disaffected-generation-the-youth-vote-and-europes-future/>

<https://ejop.psychopen.eu/index.php/ejop/article/view/352/352.html>

Jee, Haemin, Hans Lueders, and Rachel Myrick. "Towards a unified approach to research on democratic backsliding." *Democratization* 29, no. 4 (2022): 754-767.

Wiseman, Alexander W., M. Fernanda Astiz, Rodrigo Fabrega, and David P. Baker. "Making citizens of the world: The political socialization of youth in formal mass education systems." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 41, no. 5 (2011): 561-577.

Mair, P. (2014). Democracies. In D. Caramani (Ed.), *Comparative politics* (3rd ed., pp. 63–79, excerpts: pp. 79–90). Oxford University Press.

Neundorf, Anja, and Kaat Smets. "Political socialization and the making of citizens." (2015).

Little, Andrew T., and Anne Meng. "Measuring democratic backsliding." *PS: Political Science & Politics* (2023): 1-13.

Wiseman, Alexander W., M. Fernanda Astiz, Rodrigo Fabrega, and David P. Baker. "Making citizens of the world: The political socialization of youth in formal mass education systems." *Compare: A Journal of Comparative and International Education* 41, no. 5 (2011): 561-577.

Agenda (2 proposals)

2 hours proposal

10 min	I. Introduction - Ethical Standards and European Values, Introduction to the CERV program, presentation of the project
10 min	II. Theoretical Introduction
15 min	III. Icebreaker
45 min	IV. Non formal activities
30 min	VI. Debate
10 min	VIII. Conclusions, Feedback and thanks

4 hours proposal

10 min	I. Introduction - Ethical Standards and European Values, Introduction to the CERV program, presentation of the project
25 min	II. Theoretical Introduction
20 min	III. Icebreaker
50 min	IV. Non formal activities
15 min	V. Coffee Break
50 min	VI. Non formal activities
15 min	VI. Coffee Break
40 min	VII. Debate
15 min	VIII. Conclusions, Feedback and thanks

Ice breakers

Toilet paper pass

Each participant is invited to take as many squares as they think they'll need for a day. At the end, each shares as much about themselves as the number of toilet paper squares picked.

This allows for team members to get acquainted with each other as well as with workshop facilitators.

Speed Meetings

Speed meetings are much like speed dating but with ice-breaker questions. Each pair of participants has 30 seconds to chat about a question you provide. When you announce the 30 seconds are up, one member of the pair moves over to the chair to their right. Once they've changed seats, you have a different question to debate. Go around until they've all debated with everyone.

Pick a fun subject to debate in small groups. Examples:

1. Best pizza topping
2. Best song of all time
3. Ice cream and fries? Yes or no?
4. Nutella or peanut butter?
5. Should there be a law prohibiting pineapple on pizza?
6. Eat an Oreo whole or open it and have the cream in the middle first?
7. Which is the best hero: Percy Jackson or Harry Potter?
8. Best pet: cats or dogs?
9. Would you rather breathe underwater or fly?
10. Travel back in time, or travel forward in time?
11. Which is better, warm or cold weather?
12. Matching socks or mismatching?
13. Is there life somewhere else in the Universe?
14. Are there aliens living among us?
15. Which came first, egg or chicken?
16. Would you rather live underwater or in space?
17. Should Superman wear his underwear over or under his shiny leggings?
18. Is vanilla the best ice-cream flavour?
19. If you could choose a person you'd absolutely love to meet, anyone, alive or dead, who would it be?
20. If you could choose to have a super power, what would it be, and what would your superhero name be?

This particular ice-breaker will be a fun moment of relaxation between activities and it will help to foster a simple argument building mindset for the debate that will follow suite.

Activity 1 - Quiz “How does my democracy work?”

Objective:

In this 45 minute activity participants will engage in a quiz where they will receive simple and practical information about how their nation's democracy works. Our aim is to generate an exchange of knowledge regarding political parties, government institutions, as well as a clear understanding of the impact of electoral choices in their lives. The same exchange and understanding will then be expanded to the level of the European Union.

The purpose is to motivate and empower participants to become interested, active and informed citizens of their country and the European Union.

Content of the quiz:

The quiz will have both open and closed questions. Open questions will be answered via Wordcloud - these will make the activity more interactive, but also enable facilitators to assess current knowledge about the subject and also identify misunderstandings or gaps that need to be addressed during the activity. The purpose is for the following questions to be adapted to each country's reality, they are mere suggestions.

The online platform chosen is <https://www.mentimeter.com/>.

We start by asking “What is democracy?” - the answer will be given by Wordcloud

The following questions will ask participants to share how they think their democracy works:

- Do you know the name of the Institution where laws are created?
- How do you think that happens? - open question

National Assembly

- Can you name the political parties with representation?
- How do you know which one you'd choose? - explain briefly and share the basic model of political compass and place political parties.
- Optionally, offer as an example a bill proposal and use it to explain the difference in the way each political view will affect the outcome, in practical terms - eg. legislation about whether rent prices should be regulated by the government or established by the free market.

Voting

- Do you know how often will you have a chance to vote? - answer multiple answer. Share the different moments for voting (Central Government, Local Government and European Union Parliament).

- If there was an election tomorrow, do you know where (physical location) you'd cast your vote? - explain how to know where exactly participants can get the information as to where to vote.
- Do you think that you're voting directly for a party? A person? - explain how votes are counted and considered according to national specificities.

European Parliament

- What do you think the European Parliament does?
- When you vote for EU Parliament representatives, are they organised by country? - Explain how votes are considered (proportionally) and political families.
- If the EU Parliament issues a recommendation, what does that mean for you? - give a practical example of recommendation and how it can have an impact on citizens of countries who choose to adopt it.

Closing

Highlight the importance of having a clear understanding of how participants' national democracy works and how it fits into the EU. Invite participants to reflect on what are their thoughts regarding personal values and how it relates to a broader outlook on society and the way it should be run. Democracy is based on a social contract between its citizens and the State. In order for it to be healthy and properly serving its citizens, they have to be an active part in the system.

Activity 2 - “Be a fake news content creator”

Objective:

This 40 minute activity has the objective of developing digital literacy in youngsters. By understanding how social media algorithms work and being capable of identifying false content, participants will develop critical thinking skills as well as the know-how to do fact checking research. Exposing participants to the tactics and manipulation techniques commonly used will help to develop cognitive resistance to these forms of manipulation that are so abundant in social media.

Explaining the activity

We start by explaining that social media algorithms exist to capture our attention, so they're made to calculate how long you spend on a given content to then “feed” you more on the same subject. Psychologically speaking, we have a “confirmation bias”, meaning, we tend to look for content that aligns with what we already believe in. This activity provides participants with the tools and resources to detect suspicious content more easily, as well as with the knowledge to assess if it is true/factual or fake.

So we will play a game developed by Cambridge University Social Decision-Making Lab that places us in the role of a fake content creator who is aiming at increasing his online following.

<https://www.getbadnews.com/en>

Explain to the participants the purpose of the game and that the goal is to gather as many followers to their platform as possible and become a famous influencer. They can either be divided into groups, this will require access to the internet per group - by computer or phone. Or we can play all together and decide the next course of action voting on what to do at each round, this requires internet access for the facilitator only.

After playing a few rounds of this game, the facilitator will provide 5 examples of content for the participants to identify if they are true or false, thus going back to a quiz format. 3 examples will be false, and we will show how we've searched to find the facts. 2 will be real. The examples should be from a national level as well as international in order to make it as broad as possible. This will put the recently acquired skills as a fake content creator to the test and provide the participants with the awareness that they have the knowledge to navigate information in a much more critical way.

Closing

Invite participants to reflect on how they will choose to be in social media after gaining this understanding of how it works, highlighting that it is a useful and very valid means to obtain information, as long as you understand its traps and pitfalls. Additionally, explain the difference between facts and opinions, that sources matter and it is important to discern what is reliable and what is merely a personal view to be considered and thought about. Critical thinking and questioning things is an empowering skill for many areas of life. Being able to discern what is

true and what is fake is practical and necessary. By using this resource, youngsters will be empowered to become informed citizens who make choices based on their core values and beliefs, rather than manipulation and misinformation.

Activity 3 - Managing a national budget

Objective

This 45/50 minute activity provides participants an experience in managing a country's budget from a political party point of view. Participants will develop the ability to think within a political framework and make decisions based on that set of principles, regardless of sharing them or not. This promotes the capacity to leave a comfort zone, thinking in a different way in order to foster the ability to see other points of view, even when disagreeing. Also, participants become more aware of limitations regarding managing a budget considering funds are easily spent and often aren't enough to fulfil every need. No political party will have a proposal that satisfies 100% of personal needs. Difficult choices often need to be made. This is true for a country, for their personal lives and for the EU. Lastly, this activity highlights the need to be informed regarding a political party's values and principles regarding governing a country. This will be of the utmost importance for the moment of voting for the Government and for the European Parliament, and with this exercise in budgeting, participants understand the practical implications in their lives of the choice manifested in the ballot.

Explaining the activity

Divide the participants into 6-10 groups, with a minimum of 3 people per group. Two groups will have the same political party and will compete to have their budget proposal chosen at the end by the general assembly. These will be Group A and Group B. Participants will be provided with two handouts: one will explain the general rules for the activity, the second one will have a description of the political party they represent and a board for them to fill out how much is assigned to each Ministry. (Annex 1 and 2)

They will have 20 minutes to read through, research (in the party's official website) and make the decisions accordingly.

Use a simple powerpoint presentation to provide a table where you describe briefly what each Ministry is responsible for doing for the country, and what happens if it fails. This will help with better understanding and decision making.

Example (simplified)

Ministry	What it's responsible for	What happens if it doesn't work properly for lack of funds
Health	Provides healthcare. Runs Hospitals, healthcare centers, treatment and diagnostic clinics.	Increased mortality. Difficulty accessing proper healthcare. Increased costs for people.

Once the participants finish defining their budget proposal, collect both groups' information and show the results of their decisions for the assembly to see. Facilitator reads the short description provided for that political party so everyone knows what it is. Then open the space for questions to be directed at both groups from the assembly, facilitator and teacher included.

Example of how to present the results:

(Political Party name)

Group A

Ministry	Amount
Health	
Education	
Justice	
Defense	
Culture	
Labour and Social Security	
Total	1.000.000

And Group B's right next to it.

After all questions have been answered, move on to a vote on which group presented the best management of the budget - criteria being faithfulness to the parties main priorities and values. This part of the activity should take 20-30 minutes, depending on the number of participants.

Conclusion

At the end of this activity, participants will have a practical awareness of the fact that money is limited and the choices one makes as to how it should be spent can be different and vary according to one's values and priorities. Questions at the end help them understand that managing a budget is not linear nor irrelevant, that there are intricacies and priorities that need to be taken into consideration. Additionally, there's always a cost to a decision regarding applying limited resources to a very wide range of needs. Voting is a cornerstone of democracy and being an informed citizen, who understands that the choice should reflect their interests for their personal life as well as for society.

Final Debate: Should there be limits to free speech?

Objective:

To engage participants in critical thinking, argumentation, and collaborative problem-solving through structured debates on the topic of free speech, fostering a deeper understanding of its complexities and nuances.

The activity begins with an introduction to the Oxford-style debate format, where participants learn about the roles of speakers, moderators, and judges, as well as the rules of structured argumentation. Ethical guidelines are emphasized, fostering a respectful and constructive environment for discussion. The moderator is introduced as a neutral participant responsible for maintaining order, enforcing time limits, and ensuring a fair and respectful discussion. Participants are introduced to debate topics related to free speech.

Explaining the activity

The group is divided into teams of three to four members, with each team assigned to argue either the affirmative or opposition side of a specific topic. Additional moderators are chosen not actively debating, and the remaining individuals act as judges for the rounds. Teams are provided with a structured framework (Annex 3 and 4) to develop their arguments, including an opening statement, rebuttals, and closing remarks.

During the preparation phase, which lasts for 20/30 minutes, teams work collaboratively to develop their arguments, focusing on using facts, examples, and logical reasoning to support their stance. While the teams prepare their arguments, the moderator will get a detailed explanation of their role and tasks. The debate rounds follow, each lasting 10 minutes. In each round, the affirmative team presents their opening statement, followed by the opposition. Teams then engage in rebuttals, addressing points raised by their opponents, and conclude with brief closing statements. The roles of debaters, moderators, and judges rotate across rounds with each debate case to ensure all participants actively engage in different roles.

After the debates, judges deliberate and provide evaluations based on clarity, relevance, teamwork, and delivery. Facilitators offer constructive feedback, highlighting strengths and areas for improvement. Finally, at the end of all debate rounds a group reflection session follows, where participants share their experiences and insights. This discussion explores how preparing arguments enhanced their understanding of free speech, the challenges encountered in presenting or refuting ideas, and the practical application of debating skills in real-world contexts.

Timeframe & Debate Topics:

Conduct three to five debates (15-20 minutes per debate). Each debate follows this structure:

1. Moderator Introduction (1 minute): Introduces the topic and rules.

2. Affirmative Opening Statement (3 minutes).
3. Opposition Opening Statement (3 minutes).
4. Rebuttals (2-3 minutes per side).
5. Closing Statements (1 minute per side).

Possible topics include:

- "Should social media platforms regulate hate speech?"
- "Is freedom of speech more important than public safety?"
- "Should governments have the right to censor misinformation?"
- "Does free speech include the right to offend?"
- "Should anonymity be allowed online to protect free speech?"

1. The Banned Blogger

A young activist named Max runs a popular blog where he openly criticizes the government's handling of public housing. One day, Max's blog is suddenly taken down by the hosting platform, citing a new policy against "content that undermines public trust in government institutions." Max claims his freedom of speech has been violated, but the platform argues it has the right to moderate content as a private company. Should Max have the right to continue publishing his critiques, or does the platform's decision align with ethical moderation?

2. The Exhibition

An artist named Ana presents a new piece in the central gallery. The sculpture depicts a political figure in a way some find offensive, sparking outrage from a part of the community. Protests erupt outside the gallery, demanding the piece be removed. Ana argues that her work is an expression of free speech, while protesters claim it encourages division and hatred. Should the gallery take down the sculpture to maintain peace, or stand by Ana's artistic freedom?

3. The Comedian

A popular comedian named Tom uses his latest stand-up special to mock stereotypes and social norms. While many laugh and praise Tom's humour, others feel deeply offended, claiming the jokes perpetuate harmful stereotypes about minority communities. The local council debates banning Tom's performances in public venues, sparking a heated debate about whether comedy should have boundaries. Is Tom's freedom of speech in comedy more important than the community's concerns?

4. The Fired Employee

A leading tech company employee Sara writes an anonymous online article criticizing the company's lack of environmental responsibility. The article goes viral, and Sara's identity is eventually revealed. Claiming a breach of loyalty, the company fires her, but Sara argues that she was exercising her right to freedom of speech and raising awareness about a public issue. The court now has to decide: Was Sara's dismissal justified, or did the company suppress her right to speak out?

5. The Satirical Play

A local theatre group performs a satirical play making fun at the mayor and his policies. The mayor's supporters demand the play be cancelled, claiming it spreads misinformation and damages the mayor's reputation. The playwright, however, insists it is a work of satire meant to provoke thought and debate. Is the theatre's argumentation valid or does the mayor have a point?

The expected outcomes of this activity include increased critical thinking and public speaking skills, improved abilities to construct and deconstruct arguments, and a greater understanding of the complexities of free speech. Participants also develop stronger collaboration and active listening skills, fostering an environment of mutual respect and democratic engagement. This activity inspires participants to critically examine the balance between the rights and responsibilities associated with free speech, encouraging active participation in democratic discourse.

Annexes

Annex 1: Budget Proposal Handout

Name of Political Party + logo

Ideology	
Political position	
European Affiliation	
Main priorities and values	

Budget Proposal

Ministry	Amount
Health	
Education	
Justice	
Defense	
Culture	
Labour and Social Security	
Total	1.000.000 Monetary Units

Official website:

Explaining the activity to participants

Annex 2: Propose a National Budget handout

December is approaching and your party has to present a National Budget Proposal at the National Assembly. Choose how to distribute the Monetary Units (MU) available according to your parties economic and social policies.

At the end, you will submit your proposal to the Assembly where it will be submitted to questioning and then voting. The proposal that makes more sense according to your party's priorities and values will win.

Time to define your budget: 20 minutes.

Total amount of MUs available: 1.000.000 MUs

Total amount of MUs for every Ministry to run perfectly: 1.600.000 MUs

Ministry in bankruptcy: Under 140.000 MUs

Closing of facilities; collective redundancies (loss of jobs); lack of equipment; no funding for innovation, renovation or maintenance; severe lack of personnel; terrible service to citizens.

Ministry with severe flaws: Under 200.000 MUs

Closing of some facilities; letting go of some staff; not enough replacement personnel and in precarious conditions; under funding of innovation, renovation or maintenance; very faulty service.

Ministry running in perfect conditions: 250.000 MUs

Good maintenance or acquisition of new facilities; improvement of work conditions for staff and good service provided to citizens; ideal number of employees; investment in new equipment, and in maintaining older fully functioning ones.

Good luck!

Annex 3: Debate framework

Debate: (in favor/against)

Opening statements (3 minutes)	
Rebuttals (3 minutes)	
Closing arguments (1 minute)	

Annex 4 Guidelines

Preparation time: 20 minutes

As you prepare for your debate, keep these guidelines in mind:

- Write down the points and arguments that support your position (for or against) - focus on 2-3 main arguments
- Be short and concise
- Be factual (give examples) and clear
- Be respectful, listen to what your opponent is saying - don't interrupt - and respond without making your argument personal
- Consider all the points and arguments against your position that the opposing team may present, and prepare your rebuttal as best you can
- Your closing statement should be a summary of your main arguments and why they are the right ones.

Good luck!